



## Instructional Intervention Tools Chart:

Updated May 2012

The tools chart below reflects the results of the third annual review of research studies of Instructional Programs by the [Center's Technical Review Committee \(TRC\)](#).

***The Center defines instructional interventions as follows:*** Additional or alternative instructional intervention programs to the core curriculum conducted in small groups or individually with evidence of efficacy for improving academic outcomes for students whose performance is unsatisfactory in the core program.

### Chart Features

- Across the top of the chart are the standards by which the TRC reviews each program study. Click on each standard for a detailed description of how the rating was defined.
- The vendors/developers of the program have provided implementation information which includes the cost of the program, what is needed to implement it, the support provided, how the program is intended to be used, and with whom it should be used. To access this information, click on name of the program in the "Program" column.
- The ratings in the chart can be clicked on to view the specific data submitted for Participants, Design, Fidelity of Implementation, Measures, and Effect Size.
- Every column of the chart can be sorted by clicking the arrows at the top of the column.
- The programs in the chart can be filtered by subject and by grade using the filter tool at the top of the chart. To see all tools again, hit "Reset."
- Programs and studies can be compared by clicking the boxes on the far right of the chart. Pick as many studies as you wish to compare and hit the "Compare" button. To see all programs/studies again, hit "Reset."

The National Center on RTI publishes this chart to assist educators and families in becoming informed consumers who can select instructional intervention programs that best meet their individual needs.

The Center's Technical Review Committee (TRC) on Instructional Intervention independently established a set of criteria for evaluating the scientific rigor of studies demonstrating the efficacy of instructional intervention programs. The TRC rated each submitted study against these criteria but did not compare it to other studies on the chart. The presence of a particular program on the chart does not constitute endorsement and should not be viewed as a recommendation from either the TRC on Instructional Intervention or the National Center on RTI.

Please note that all submissions to the TRC review process were voluntary. An individual, firm, or other vendor whose program appears on the chart chose to submit its program for TRC review and then to have its program and TRC ratings displayed on the chart. The National Center on RTI does not publish the names of individuals, firms, or other vendors who submit programs for review but decide against having the results included on the chart.



Program	Study	Study Quality					Effect Size			
		Participants	Design	Fidelity of Implementation	Measures		# of Outcome Measures	Mean based on adjusted posttests	Mean based on unadjusted posttests	Disaggregated Data Available
					Proximal	Distal		Proximal (P) Distal (D)	Proximal (P) Distal (D)	
Academy of MATH	*Torlaković (2011)	●	●	○	◐	◐	4 Math	P = 0.59 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.29	P = 0.63 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.37	No
Academy of READING	*Torlaković (2011)	●	◐	○	●	◐	8 Reading	P = 0.36 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.50 <sup>a</sup>	P = 0.55 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.33	Yes
	Fiedorowicz & Trites (1987)	●	◐	○	◐	●	24 Reading	—	P = 0.19 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.36	No
Access Code	McMurray, et al. 2010	●	◐	○	●	●	5 Reading	P = 0.23 D = 0.29	P = 0.04 D = 0.04	No
AWARD Reading	Block, & Mangieri (Tech. Rep.)	○	◐	○	●	—	5 Reading	—	—	No
Corrective Reading Decoding	Benner, Kinder, Beaudoin, Stein & Hirschmann (2005)	○	○	◐	●	—	4 Reading	—	—	No
	Gunn, Biglan, Smolkowski, & Ary (2000)	●	●	○	●	●	5 Reading	—	—	No
Early Vocabulary Connections	Nelson, Vadasy, & Sanders (2011)	●	●	◐	●	●	3 Reading	—	P = 0.67 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.23	No
Failure Free Reading	Torgesen, Myers, Schirm, Stuart, Vartivarian, et al. (2006)	●	◐	●	●	●	14 Reading	P = 0.08 D = -0.03	—	No

**Legend:** ● Convincing evidence | ◐ Partially convincing evidence | ○ Unconvincing evidence | — Data unavailable or inadequate  
\* Added in the 2011 review <sup>a</sup>Effect size is positive and statistically significant for at least one measure



Program	Study	Study Quality					Effect Size			
		Participants	Design	Fidelity of Implementation	Measures		# of Outcome Measures	Mean based on adjusted posttests	Mean based on unadjusted posttests	Disaggregated Data Available
					Proximal	Distal		Proximal (P) Distal (D)	Proximal (P) Distal (D)	
Fast ForWord Language Series	Miller, Merzenich, Tallal, DeVivo, Linn, et al. (1999)	●	◐	○	◐	◐	3 Reading	—	P = 7.45 <sup>a</sup> D = —	Yes
	Scientific Learning Corporation (2004)	●	○	●	●	●	2 Reading	—	P = 0.49 D = 0.52	No
	Slattery (2003)	○	◐	●	●	●	2 Reading	—	P = 1.46 <sup>a</sup> D = 1.05 <sup>a</sup>	No
focusMATH Intensive Intervention	*Styers & Baird-Wilkerson (2011)	●	●	●	●	—	15 Math	P = 0.23 <sup>a</sup> D = —	P = 0.21 <sup>a</sup> D = —	No
Hot Math Tutoring	Fuchs, Fuchs, Craddock, Hollenbeck, Hamlett, et al. (2008)	●	●	●	●	●	4 Math	P = 1.16 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.60 <sup>a</sup>	P = 1.15 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.67 <sup>a</sup>	No
Leveled Literacy Intervention System	Ransford-Kaldon, Flynt, Ross, Franceschini, Zoblotzky, et al. (2010)	○	●	◐	●	●	12 Reading	—	P = 0.65 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.22 <sup>a</sup>	No
Lexia Reading	*Macaruso & Rodman (2009)	●	◐	○	●	●	6 Reading 1 Writing	P = 0.10 D = -0.08	P = -0.35 D = -0.19	No
	*Macaruso & Walker (2008)	○	◐	○	●	●	6 Reading	P = -0.11 D = 0.31 <sup>a</sup>	P = -0.09 D = 0.35 <sup>a</sup>	Yes
	*Macaruso & Rodman (2011)	●	○	○	●	●	11 Reading	P = 0.49 <sup>a</sup> D = -0.28	P = 0.28 D = -0.56 <sup>a</sup>	No
	*Macaruso, Hook, & McCabe (2006)	●	◐	○	—	●	1 Reading	P = — D = 0.16	P = — D = 0.06	Yes

**Legend:** ● Convincing evidence | ◐ Partially convincing evidence | ○ Unconvincing evidence | — Data unavailable or inadequate  
\* Added in the 2011 review <sup>a</sup>Effect size is positive and statistically significant for at least one measure



Program	Study	Study Quality					Effect Size			
		Participants	Design	Fidelity of Implementation	Measures		# of Outcome Measures	Mean based on adjusted posttests	Mean based on unadjusted posttests	Disaggregated Data Available
					Proximal	Distal		Proximal (P) Distal (D)	Proximal (P) Distal (D)	
Math Recovery	*Smith, Cobb, Earran, Cordray, Munter, & Dunn (2007)	○	◐	●	○	●	—	—	—	No
My Reading Coach	Crews (2004)	○	○	○	—	●	3 Reading	—	—	No
	Serido & Wilhelm (2006)	○	◐	○	—	●	3 Reading	P = — D = 0.26 <sup>a</sup>	P = — D = 0.31 <sup>a</sup>	Yes
My Reading Coach with A Fluent Reading Trainer	Serido & Wilhelm (2008)	○	◐	○	○	●	6 Reading	P = — D = 0.04	P = — D = 0.04	No
My Sidewalks Intensive Reading Intervention	Baird-Wilkerson (2008)	●	●	○	●	●	14 Reading	P = 0.04 D = -0.03	P = 0.04 D = -0.05	No
Number Rockets	Fuchs, Compton, Fuchs, Paulsen, Bryant, et al. (2005)	●	●	●	●	●	7 Math	P = 0.45 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.10	P = 0.44 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.08	No
Pirate Math Individual Tutoring	Fuchs, Powell, Seethaler, Cirino, Fletcher, et al. (2009)	●	●	●	●	●	6 Math	P = 0.65 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.57 <sup>a</sup>	P = 0.57 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.54 <sup>a</sup>	No
QuickReads	*Vadasy & Sanders (2008)	●	●	●	●	●	6 Reading	P = 0.22 D = 0.21 <sup>a</sup>	P = 0.10 D = 0.19 <sup>a</sup>	No
Reaching All Readers	Evaluation Services Center (2010)	○	○	○	—	○	—	—	—	No

**Legend:** ● Convincing evidence | ◐ Partially convincing evidence | ○ Unconvincing evidence | — Data unavailable or inadequate  
\* Added in the 2011 review <sup>a</sup>Effect size is positive and statistically significant for at least one measure



Program	Study	Study Quality					Effect Size			
		Participants	Design	Fidelity of Implementation	Measures		# of Outcome Measures	Mean based on adjusted posttests	Mean based on unadjusted posttests	Disaggregated Data Available
					Proximal	Distal		Proximal (P) Distal (D)	Proximal (P) Distal (D)	
READ 180	*Hamilton, Meisch, Chen, Quintanilla, Fong, et al. (2011)	●	◐	○	—	●	9 Reading	P = — D = 0.07 <sup>a</sup>	P = — D = 0.04 <sup>a</sup>	Yes
	*Haslam, White, & Klinge (2006)	●	○	○	—	●	1 Reading	—	P = — D = 0.07	No
	*Interactive, Inc. (2002)	○	○	○	—	●	5 Reading	—	—	No
	*Kim, Capotosto, Hartry, & Fitzgerald (2011)	●	●	○	●	●	2 Reading 1 Writing	—	P = — D = 0.25 <sup>a</sup>	No
	*Lang, Torgesen, Vogel, Chanter, Lefsky, & Petscher (2009)	●	●	◐	—	●	2 Reading	—	—	Yes
	*Sprague, Zaller, Kite, & Hussar (2011)	●	◐	○	—	●	2 Reading	P = — D = 0.20 <sup>a</sup>	P = — D = 0.15	No
	*Scholastic Research (2008); White & Haslam (2005a); White & Haslam (2005b)	●	○	○	—	●	3 Reading	—	P = — D = 0.16 <sup>a</sup>	Yes
Read Naturally	Heistad (2005)	●	◐	○	●	—	3 Reading	—	P = 0.26 D = —	No
	Christ & Davie (2009)	○	◐	●	●	●	7 Reading	P = 0.36 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.17 <sup>a</sup>	P = 0.02 D = 0.13 <sup>a</sup>	No

**Legend:** ● Convincing evidence | ◐ Partially convincing evidence | ○ Unconvincing evidence | — Data unavailable or inadequate  
\* Added in the 2011 review <sup>a</sup>Effect size is positive and statistically significant for at least one measure



Program	Study	Study Quality					Effect Size			
		Participants	Design	Fidelity of Implementation	Measures		# of Outcome Measures	Mean based on adjusted posttests	Mean based on unadjusted posttests	Disaggregated Data Available
					Proximal	Distal		Proximal (P) Distal (D)	Proximal (P) Distal (D)	
Read Right	Scott, Nelsestuen, Auto, Deussen, & Hanita (2010)	●	●	◐	—	●	5 Reading	P = — D = 0.25 <sup>a</sup>	P = — D = 0.22 <sup>a</sup>	Yes
Reading Mastery	Carlson & Francis (2002)	○	○	○	○	○	2 Reading	—	—	No
	Gunn, Biglan, Smolkowski, & Ary (2000)	●	●	○	●	●	5 Reading	—	—	No
Reading Plus	*Reutzel, Petscher, & Spichtig (in press)	●	◐	○	—	●	2 Reading	—	P = — D = 0.73 <sup>a</sup>	No
Reading Recovery	Center, Wheldall, Freeman, Outhred, & McNaught (1995)	●	○	○	●	◐	8 Reading	—	—	No
	Iversen & Tunmer (1993)	●	○	○	●	●	8 Reading 2 Writing	—	—	No
	Schwartz (2005)	●	◐	○	●	●	10 Reading	—	P = 1.16 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.49 <sup>a</sup>	No
Responsive Reading Instruction	Denton, Nimon, Mathes, Swanson, Kethley, et al. (2010)	●	◐	●	●	●	15 Reading	—	P = 0.43 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.46 <sup>a</sup>	No
	Mathes, Denton, Fletcher, Anthony, Francis, et al. (2005)	●	◐	●	●	●	3 Reading 1 Writing 1 Math	—	P = 0.86 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.17 <sup>a</sup>	No

**Legend:** ● Convincing evidence | ◐ Partially convincing evidence | ○ Unconvincing evidence | — Data unavailable or inadequate  
\* Added in the 2011 review <sup>a</sup>Effect size is positive and statistically significant for at least one measure



Program	Study	Study Quality					Effect Size			
		Participants	Design	Fidelity of Implementation	Measures		# of Outcome Measures	Mean based on adjusted posttests	Mean based on unadjusted posttests	Disaggregated Data Available
					Proximal	Distal		Proximal (P) Distal (D)	Proximal (P) Distal (D)	
ROOTS	*Clarke, Doabler, Smolkowski, Baker, Fien, & Strand Cary (2011)	●	◐	●	—	●	4 Math	P = — D = 0.21	P = — D = 0.09	No
Seeing Stars	*Bell, Hungerford, Flowers, Worthington, & Fidler (Tech. Rep)	●	◐	○	●	●	10 Reading 1 Writing	P = 0.50 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.19 <sup>a</sup>	P = 0.60 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.20 <sup>a</sup>	No
	*Bell, Worthington, Hungerford, Fidler, & Flowers (Tech. Rep)	●	○	◐	●	●	10 Reading 1 Writing	P = 0.54 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.03	—	No
Seeing Stars plus Visualizing and Verbalizing and Phoneme Sequencing	*Burke, Howard, & Evangelou (2005)	●	○	○	●	●	10 Reading 1 Writing	—	P = 0.47 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.41 <sup>a</sup>	No
Sound Partners (1-3)	Vadasy, Sanders, & Peyton (2005)	●	◐	◐	●	●	8 Reading 1 Writing	P = 0.81 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.77 <sup>a</sup>	P = 0.82 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.77 <sup>a</sup>	No
Sound Partners Kindergarten	Vadasy & Sanders (2008)	●	◐	●	●	●	6 Reading 1 Writing	P = 0.22 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.40	P = 0.32 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.49 <sup>a</sup>	No
	Vadasy & Sanders (2010)	○	●	●	●	●	5 Reading 1 Writing	P = 0.77 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.40 <sup>a</sup>	P = 0.79 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.42 <sup>a</sup>	Yes
	Vadasy, Sanders, & Peyton (2006)	●	●	●	●	●	6 Reading 1 Writing	P = 0.57 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.41 <sup>a</sup>	P = 0.57 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.41 <sup>a</sup>	No

**Legend:** ● Convincing evidence | ◐ Partially convincing evidence | ○ Unconvincing evidence | — Data unavailable or inadequate  
\* Added in the 2011 review <sup>a</sup>Effect size is positive and statistically significant for at least one measure



Program	Study	Study Quality					Effect Size			
		Participants	Design	Fidelity of Implementation	Measures		# of Outcome Measures	Mean based on adjusted posttests	Mean based on unadjusted posttests	Disaggregated Data Available
					Proximal	Distal		Proximal (P) Distal (D)	Proximal (P) Distal (D)	
SRSD For Writing Strategies	Graham, Harris, & Mason (2005)	●	◐	●	●	—	15 Writing	—	P = 1.36 <sup>a</sup> D = —	No
	Harris, Graham, & Mason (2006)	●	◐	●	●	—	15 Writing	—	P = 1.38 <sup>a</sup> D = —	No
	Lane, Harris, Graham, Driscoll, Sandel, et al. (2011)	●	●	●	●	●	14 Writing	—	P = 0.58 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.43	No
Stepping Stones to Literacy	Nelson, Benner, & Gonzalez (2005)	●	●	●	●	●	6 Reading	—	P = 0.79 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.60 <sup>a</sup>	No
	Nelson, Sanders, & Gonzalez (2010)	○	●	◐	●	●	4 Reading	—	P = 0.16 D = 0.36	No
	Nelson, Stage, Epstein, & Pierce (2005)	●	●	●	●	●	5 Reading	—	P = 0.84 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.48 <sup>a</sup>	No
Structured Supplemental Spelling Instruction	Graham, Harris, & Chorzempa (2002)	●	◐	●	●	●	2 Reading 7 Writing	—	P = 0.76 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.27 <sup>a</sup>	No
SIPPS Program (Systematic Instruction in Phoneme Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words)	*Bernard & Larson (2000)	○	○	○	◐	—	—	—	—	No

**Legend:** ● Convincing evidence | ◐ Partially convincing evidence | ○ Unconvincing evidence | — Data unavailable or inadequate  
\* Added in the 2011 review <sup>a</sup>Effect size is positive and statistically significant for at least one measure





Program	Study	Study Quality					Effect Size				
		Participants	Design	Fidelity of Implementation	Measures		# of Outcome Measures	Mean based on adjusted posttests	Mean based on unadjusted posttests	Disaggregated Data Available	
					Proximal	Distal		Proximal (P) Distal (D)	Proximal (P) Distal (D)		
Words Their Way: Word Study In Action Developmental Model	*Eddy, Ruitman, Hankel, Matelski, & Schmalstig (2011)	●	●	●	●	●	●	2 Reading 1 Writing	P = 0.11 D = 0.00	P = 0.14 <sup>a</sup> D = 0.01	No
Zoo-phonics Multisensory Language Arts Program	*Wrighton (2010)	○	○	○	○	—	—	—	—	—	No

**Legend:** ● Convincing evidence | ● Partially convincing evidence | ○ Unconvincing evidence | — Data unavailable or inadequate  
\* Added in the 2011 review <sup>a</sup>Effect size is positive and statistically significant for at least one measure