Core5 Evidence Table

Notes:
A - indicates that the information was not provided in the study or not applicable.

Article Information				Grade							Urbanicity	
Title	Year	Review Type	ESSA Level	Pre-K	K	1	2	3	4	5	Urban	Rural
O'Callaghan et al. A randomized controlled trial of an early-intervention, computer-based literacy program to boost phonological skills in 4- to 6-year-old children	2016	Peer Review	Strong	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	-	-
Wilkes et al. Exploration of a blended learning approach to reading instruction in second grade	2016	Peer Review	Strong	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	-	-
Schechter et al. Exploration of a blended learning approach to reading instruction for low SES students in early elementary grades	2015	Peer Review	Strong	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	●	○
Macaruso & Rodman Efficacy of computer-assisted instruction for the development of early literacy skills in young children	2011	Peer Review	Strong	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○
Macaruso & Rodman Benefits of computer-assisted instruction to support reading acquisition in English Language Learners	2011	Peer Review	Strong	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	●
Macaruso & Walker The efficacy of computer-assisted instruction for advancing literacy skills in kindergarten children	2008	Peer Review	Strong	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	○
Macaruso et al. The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students	2006	Peer Review	Strong	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○
Macaruso et al. An investigation of blended learning to support reading instruction in elementary schools	2020	Peer Review	Moderate	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	-	-
Wilkes et al. Measuring the impact of a blended learning model on early literacy growth	2020	Peer Review	Moderate	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	○
Evaluation and Training Institute Early intervention reading software program report	2019	3rd Party	Moderate	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	-	-
Evaluation and Training Institute Early intervention interactive reading software report	2018	3rd Party	Moderate	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	-	-
Evaluation and Training Institute Utah's early intervention reading software program 2016-2017 K-3 program evaluation results	2017	3rd Party	Moderate	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	-	-
Leap Innovations Personalized learning(s) from the field: A report for the LEAP Innovations pilot network cohort 2	2017	3rd Party	Moderate	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	●	○
Evaluation and Training Institute Early intervention software program evaluation 2015-2016 program results	2016	3rd Party	Moderate	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	-	-

Core5 Evidence Table

Notes:
A - indicates that the information was not provided in the study or not applicable.
*A closed circle indicates that the subpopulation in the study consisted of at least 30% of the sample/population AND/OR if the subpopulation was specifically analyzed in the study.
A closed circle for the low-SES variable indicates that the study described the sample/population as such AND/OR if low SES students consisted of at least 40% of the sample/population AND/OR if the subpopulation was specifically analyzed in the study. When applicable, free or reduced lunch status was used as a proxy for low SES status.

Article Information	School Type		Population Variables*								
Title	Public	Charter	African American/ Black	Latinx	Caucasian/ White	Asian	English Learner	Non-proficient /Struggling Readers/ Intervention	Special Education	Dyslexia	Low SES
O'Callaghan et al. A randomized controlled trial of an early-intervention, computer-based literacy program to boost phonological skills in 4- to 6-year-old children	-	-	-	-	-	-	●	●	○	-	●
Wilkes et al. Exploration of a blended learning approach to reading instruction in second grade	-	-	○	●	○	○	●	-	-	-	●
Schechter et al. Exploration of a blended learning approach to reading instruction for low SES students in early elementary grades	-	-	○	●	○	○	●	-	○	-	●
Macaruso & Rodman Efficacy of computer-assisted instruction for the development of early literacy skills in young children	●	○	○	●	●	○	-	-	○	-	●
Macaruso & Rodman Benefits of computer-assisted instruction to support reading acquisition in English Language Learners	-	-	○	●	○	○	●	●	○	-	●
Macaruso & Walker The efficacy of computer-assisted instruction for advancing literacy skills in kindergarten children	●	○	-	-	-	-	○	●	○	-	●
Macaruso et al. The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students	●	○	-	-	-	-	○	●	○	-	●
Macaruso et al. An investigation of blended learning to support reading instruction in elementary schools	○	●	●	●	●	○	-	-	-	-	●
Wilkes et al. Measuring the impact of a blended learning model on early literacy growth	-	-	○	●	○	○	●	-	○	-	●
Evaluation and Training Institute Early intervention reading software program report	-	-	○	○	●	○	○	●	○	-	●
Evaluation and Training Institute Early intervention interactive reading software report	-	-	○	○	●	○	○	●	○	-	○
Evaluation and Training Institute Utah's early intervention reading software program 2016-2017 K-3 program evaluation results	-	-	○	○	●	○	○	●	○	-	●
Leap Innovations Personalized learning(s) from the field: A report for the LEAP Innovations pilot network cohort 2	●	●	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Evaluation and Training Institute Early intervention software program evaluation 2015-2016 program results	-	-	○	○	●	○	-	●	○	-	●

Core5 Evidence Table

Notes:
A - indicates that the information was not provided in the study or not applicable.

Article Information				Grade							Urbanicity	
Title	Year	Review Type	ESSA Level	Pre-K	K	1	2	3	4	5	Urban	Rural
Leap Innovations Finding what works: Results from the LEAP Innovations pilot network 2014-2015	2016	3rd Party	Moderate	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	●	○
McMurray An evaluation of the use of Lexia Reading software with children in Year 3, Northern Ireland (6- to 7-year olds)	2013	Peer Review	Moderate	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	-	-
Macaruso & Rodman Efficacy of computer-assisted instruction for the development of early literacy skills in young children	2011	Peer Review	Moderate	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	○
Baron et al. Can educational technology effectively differentiate instruction for reader profiles?	2019	Peer Review	Promising	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	-	-
Macaruso et al. Longitudinal blended learning in a low SES elementary school	2019	Peer Review	Promising	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	○
Macaruso et al. Three-year longitudinal study: Impact of a blended learning program—Lexia® Core5® Reading—on reading gains in low-SES kindergarteners	2019	Peer Review	Promising	○	●	●	●	○	○	○	●	○
Kazakoff et al. Efficacy of a blended learning approach to elementary school reading instruction for students who are English Learners	2017	Peer Review	Promising	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	-	-
Mitchell & Macaruso Assessment without testing: Using performance measures embedded in a technology-based instructional program as indicators of reading ability	2017	Peer Review	Promising	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	-	-
Prescott et al. Elementary school–wide implementation of a blended learning program for reading intervention	2017	Peer Review	Promising	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○
Schechter et al. Exploring the impact of engaged teachers on implementation fidelity and reading skill gains in a blended learning reading program	2017	Peer Review	Promising	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	-	-
Draper et al. Using primary language support via computer to improve reading comprehension skills of first-grade English language learners	2012	Peer Review	Promising	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○

Core5 Evidence Table

Notes:
A - indicates that the information was not provided in the study or not applicable.
*A closed circle indicates that the subpopulation in the study consisted of at least 30% of the sample/population AND/OR if the subpopulation was specifically analyzed in the study.
A closed circle for the low-SES variable indicates that the study described the sample/population as such AND/OR if low SES students consisted of at least 40% of the sample/population AND/OR if the subpopulation was specifically analyzed in the study. When applicable, free or reduced lunch status was used as a proxy for low SES status.

Article Information	School Type		Population Variables*								
Title	Public	Charter	African American/ Black	Latinx	Caucasian/ White	Asian	English Learner	Non-proficient /Struggling Readers/ Intervention	Special Education	Dyslexia	Low SES
Leap Innovations Finding what works: Results from the LEAP Innovations pilot network 2014-2015	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	-	○	-	●
McMurray An evaluation of the use of Lexia Reading software with children in Year 3, Northern Ireland (6- to 7-year olds)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	●	-	●	-
Macaruso & Rodman Efficacy of computer-assisted instruction for the development of early literacy skills in young children	●	○	○	●	●	○	-	●	○	-	●
Baron et al. Can educational technology effectively differentiate instruction for reader profiles?	-	-	○	○	●	○	○	●	-	-	-
Macaruso et al. Longitudinal blended learning in a low SES elementary school	-	-	●	○	●	○	○	-	-	-	●
Macaruso et al. Three-year longitudinal study: Impact of a blended learning program—Lexia® Core5® Reading—on reading gains in low-SES kindergarteners	-	-	●	○	●	○	○	-	-	-	●
Kazakoff et al. Efficacy of a blended learning approach to elementary school reading instruction for students who are English Learners	-	-	-	●	-	-	●	●	-	-	●
Mitchell & Macaruso Assessment without testing: Using performance measures embedded in a technology-based instructional program as indicators of reading ability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prescott et al. Elementary school–wide implementation of a blended learning program for reading intervention	-	-	●	○	●	○	●	-	-	-	●
Schechter et al. Exploring the impact of engaged teachers on implementation fidelity and reading skill gains in a blended learning reading program	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Draper et al. Using primary language support via computer to improve reading comprehension skills of first-grade English language learners	-	-	○	●	○	○	●	-	-	-	●

Core5 Evidence Table

Notes:
A - indicates that the information was not provided in the study or not applicable.

Article Information				Grade							Urbanicity	
Title	Year	Review Type	ESSA Level	Pre-K	K	1	2	3	4	5	Urban	Rural
Hurwitz & Vanacore Impact of the Lexia® Core5® reading program on students with reading difficulties	2020	Research Brief	Strong	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○
Hurwitz & Vanacore Impact of the Lexia® Core5® reading program on students with reading and language-Based disabilities	2020	Research Brief	Strong	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○
Lexia Research & Analytics Lexia Reading Core5 Kansas Reading Initiative: Two-Year Comparison Study	2016	Research Brief	Moderate	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	-	-
Lexia Research & Analytics Lexia Reading Core5 Kansas Reading Initiative School Comparison Study (2014-2015)	2015	Research Brief	Moderate	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	-	-
Lexia Research & Analytics Lexia Reading Core5 Kansas Reading Initiative School Comparison Study (2013-2014)	2015	Research Brief	Moderate	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	-	-
Marshall & Macaruso Benefits of Core5 in a low SES school following three months of use	2020	Research Brief	Promising	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	●	○
Lexia Research & Analytics How Core5 can help mitigate summer slide	2019	Research Brief	Promising	○	●	●	●	○	○	○	●	○
Lexia Research & Analytics Impact of Core5 for entering English learners with low English proficiency	2018	Research Brief	Promising	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	○
Lexia Learning & Analytics ELL and non-ELL kindergartners: Progress in Core5 and on GRADE	2016	Research Brief	Promising	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Albert et al. Impact of Core5 in a summer program for English learners	2020	Research Brief	-	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	●	○
Lexia Research & Analytics Impact of Lexia® Core5® reading on Black/African American students	2020	Research Brief	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lexia Research & Analytics Impact of Lexia Core5 Reading on English learners	2020	Research Brief	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marshall et al. Lessons learned in implementation of Core5	2019	Research Brief	-	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○
Lexia Research & Analytics Impact of re-auto placement in Core5 on reading performance	2019	Research Brief	-	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○
Prescott et al. Improving reading instruction: Advantages of providing tiered, year-long implementation support	2018	Research Brief	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lexia Learning & Analytics Lexia Core5 Reading National Progress Reports	2014-2020	Progress Report	-	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	-	-

Core5 Evidence Table

Notes:
A - indicates that the information was not provided in the study or not applicable.
*A closed circle indicates that the subpopulation in the study consisted of at least 30% of the sample/population AND/OR if the subpopulation was specifically analyzed in the study.
A closed circle for the low-SES variable indicates that the study described the sample/population as such AND/OR if low SES students consisted of at least 40% of the sample/population AND/OR if the subpopulation was specifically analyzed in the study. When applicable, free or reduced lunch status was used as a proxy for low SES status.

Article Information	School Type		Population Variables*								
Title	Public	Charter	African American/ Black	Latinx	Caucasian/ White	Asian	English Learner	Non-proficient /Struggling Readers/ Intervention	Special Education	Dyslexia	Low SES
Hurwitz & Vanacore Impact of the Lexia® Core5® reading program on students with reading difficulties	●	○	○	○	●	○	○	●	-	-	○
Hurwitz & Vanacore Impact of the Lexia® Core5® reading program on students with reading and language-Based disabilities	●	○	○	○	●	○	○	-	●	●	○
Lexia Research & Analytics Lexia Reading Core5 Kansas Reading Initiative: Two-Year Comparison Study	-	-	○	○	●	○	-	●	○	-	●
Lexia Research & Analytics Lexia Reading Core5 Kansas Reading Initiative School Comparison Study (2014-2015)	-	-	○	○	●	○	-	-	○	-	●
Lexia Research & Analytics Lexia Reading Core5 Kansas Reading Initiative School Comparison Study (2013-2014)	-	-	○	○	●	○	-	-	○	-	●
Marshall & Macaruso Benefits of Core5 in a low SES school following three months of use	●	○	○	●	○	○	-	●	-	-	●
Lexia Research & Analytics How Core5 can help mitigate summer slide	●	○	●	○	●	○	○	-	-	-	●
Lexia Research & Analytics Impact of Core5 for entering English learners with low English proficiency	●	○	●	○	-	-	●	●	-	-	●
Lexia Learning & Analytics ELL and non-ELL kindergartners: Progress in Core5 and on GRADE	●	○	●	○	-	-	●	-	-	-	●
Albert et al. Impact of Core5 in a summer program for English learners	●	○	○	●	○	○	●	-	-	-	●
Lexia Research & Analytics Impact of Lexia® Core5® reading on Black/African American students	-	-	●	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lexia Research & Analytics Impact of Lexia Core5 Reading on English learners	-	-	-	●	-	-	●	-	-	-	-
Marshall et al. Lessons learned in implementation of Core5	●	●	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	●
Lexia Research & Analytics Impact of re-auto placement in Core5 on reading performance	●	○	●	○	●	-	○	-	-	-	●
Prescott et al. Improving reading instruction: Advantages of providing tiered, year-long implementation support	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	●	-	-	-
Lexia Learning & Analytics Lexia Core5 Reading National Progress Reports	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	●	-	-	-