Final Report of Project	Project No. : 2007 / 0450

Part A

Project Title: _School-based remedial Program to Accelerate the Reading Ability of Students with Dyslexia_

Name of Organization/School: _____HKU_____

Project Period: From ____ Oct 2008 ____ *(month/year)* _ Sep 2010 _____ *(month/year)*

Part B

Please read the Guidelines to Completion of Final Report of Quality Education Fund Projects before completing this part of the report.

Please use separate A4-size sheets to provide an overall report with regard to the following aspects:

1. Attainment of objectives
   a. To establish a school-based, theory-driven remedial programme for primary 2 and 3 students with specific reading difficulties (SpLD) in Chinese.
      i. After trials in three primary schools, a remedial programme to accelerate the reading ability of students with dyslexia (p2 and p3) has been established. The content of the programme is attached as deliverables.
   b. To develop a teacher-friendly manual for this school-based remedial programme.
      i. The manual and reports are written based on the data we have obtained and our experience we have had in the three primary schools mentioned above. The manual is also submitted as deliverables.
2. To establish an e-learning centre for schools using this or related programmes to share teaching materials and teaching experience and for those professionals who are interested in learning to use the programme.
   a. An e-learning system is written and is housed in the webpage: http//www.hku.hk/dyslexia.

3. Project impact on learning effectiveness, professional development and school development
   a. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the programme is written in detail in the report we submitted as deliverable. Below is a summary of our findings:

1. The comparison of pre and post treatment scores on standardized reading tests:

School 1

	治療前 CNT	治療後 CNT	治療前 SpLD	治療後 SpLD
平均得分	30.60	38.20	18.80	31.00
得分標準差	5.08	5.93	5.45	7.18

Each of the eight participants made progress.

School 2

	治療前 CNT	治療後 CNT	治療前 SpLD	治療後 SpLD
平均得分	69.57	81.29	66.29	75.43
得分標準差	12.78	9.45	16.21	15.31

Out of the eight participants, six completed the evaluation. Each of the six participants made progress. Out of the six participants, two attained a score within normal standard.

School 3

	治療前 CNT	治療後 CNT	治療前 SpLD	治療後 SpLD
平均得分	69.57	81.29	66.29	75.43
得分標準差	12.78	9.45	16.21	15.31

Each of the eight participants made progress. Out of the eight, three attained a post treatment score within the normal standard.

2. The comparison of pre and post treatment on the relative rank of students on their Chinese subject

School 1

	治療前	治療後
平均排名	92.38%	5.68%
排名標準差	86.67%	9.61%

There is a slight progress when the average score is examined. Out of the six students four made progress, one remained the same and one regressed.

School 2

	治療前	治療後
平均排名	92.38%	5.68%
排名標準差	86.67%	9.61%

There is an improvement in rank when we examine the average percentile。 Out of the eight participants, six provided the pre and post ranking scores. Out of the six on regress, four made progress and one remained unchanged.

School 3 has a change in the format examination during our administration of the programme, in which there is no ranking percentile available for our examination.

Basically, we can conclude that the programme did facilitate the ability recognize and reading aloud of single

Chinese character. Regarding the progress made in ranking percentile, the average score support the claim that it helps. However, there are individual who did make much progress although their character reading score improved. It may take time for the character naming skill to sink in before it can have more impact on their academic performance which require skills more than single character recognition.

Regarding impact of the environment of different school setting on the effectiveness of the programme, detailed evaluation and discussion are included in the reports attached as deliverable.

4. Deliverables and modes of dissemination; responses to dissemination
   - A report is written together with a user manual submitted as deliverable.
   - The results of the project and the content of it is shared with primary as well as secondary school teachers in thematic courses run by Poly University
   - Resutls of the project and the content is shared with parents at two different schools
   - The programme is now run by the three participating programme schools, one Middle school on their form 1 students and one Middle school who offer help to other neighbour primary schools which have students with dyslexia .

5. Activity list
   a. Data analysis
   b. Writing up of manual
   c. Dissemination through courses and talks to schools.

6. Difficulties encountered and solutions adopted
   a. The most difficult part of the project was about the employment of staff. Luckily, the QEF committee does have the flexibility to allow some adjustment to our original budget.
   b. Another difficulty is getting the right school for the project. The commitment is about two years, a change of personnel because of health or change of jobs, even the change of examination system can upset our plan. What we did is that we tried to make use of the change and comment on the effectiveness of the programme in school with different restrictions and characteristics.

*The report should be signed by the supervisor of the school/the head of the organization or the one who signed the Quality Education Fund Agreement for allocation of grant on behalf of the organization.

For Office Use Only

| DI | V | D | E | RC |

Annex

Table 1: Attainment of Objectives

Objective statement	Activities related to the objective	Extent of attainment of the objective	Evidence or indicators of having achieved the objective	Reasons for not being able to achieve the objective, if applicable
Objective 1	Activity 1 Activity 2	Fully achieved		
Objective 2	Activity 1 Activity 2	75% attained		

Table 2: Budget Checklist

Budget Items *(Based on Schedule II of Agreement)*	Approved Budget (a)	Actual Expense (b)	Change [(b)-(a)]/(a) +/- %
Staff Cost	$240,000	$200,000	-16.7%
Equipment	$60,000	$65,000	+8.3%

Table 3: Dissemination Value of Project Deliverables

Item description (e.g. type, title, quantity, etc.)	Evaluation of the quality and dissemination value of the item	Dissemination activities conducted (e.g. mode, date, etc.) and responses	Is it worthwhile and feasible for the item to be widely disseminated by the QEF? If yes, please suggest the mode(s) of dissemination.
Two teacher manuals on "Team Building"		distributed to 100 participants at the dissemination seminar in 6/2001; about 10 teachers indicated that they would use the materials as try-out	
One CD-ROM on "Workshops on Team Building Activities"		distributed to 50 schools on request in 7/2001	

Table 4: Activity List

Types of activities *(e.g. seminar, performance, etc.)*	Brief description *(e.g. date, theme, venue, etc.)*	No. of participants				Feedback from participants
		schools	teachers	students	others (Please specify)	