

July 2015

**Updated Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices:
Washington's Learning Assistance Program**

More information on the programs and findings can be found by clicking here *

Program/intervention	Level of evidence	Benefit-cost percentage	Reason program does not meet evidence-based criteria (see full definitions below)	Percent minority
Tutoring Support				
Tutoring: By certificated teachers, small-group, structured	●	95%		67%
Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, structured	●	90%		72%
Tutoring: By non-certificated adults, small-group, structured	●	75%		69%
Tutoring: By peers, cross-age	◎	82%	Heterogeneity	NR
Tutoring: By peers, same-age and classwide	◎	72%	Benefit-cost	68%
Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, non-structured	◎	68%	Benefit-cost	66%
Tutoring: Supplemental Educational Services (under Title I)	◎	44%	Benefit-cost	95%
Tutoring: By adults, for English language learner students	P	61%	Weight of evidence/benefit-cost	91%
Extended Learning Time				
"Double dose" classes	●	98%		91%
Out-of-school-time tutoring by adults	●	90%		84%
Summer learning programs: Academically focused	●	82%		85%
Summer book programs: Multi-year intervention	P	70%	Single evaluation/weight of evidence/benefit-cost	95%
Summer book programs: One-year intervention	P	58%	Weight of evidence/benefit-cost	86%
Summer book programs: One-year, with additional support	P	57%	Weight of evidence/benefit-cost	78%
Professional Development				
Teacher professional development: Use of assessment data to guide instruction	●	100%		58%
Teacher professional development: Targeted	●	76%		83%
Teacher professional development: Online, targeted	◎	59%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	31%
Professional Learning Communities	P	NA	Research on outcomes of interest not yet available	NA
Teacher professional development: Induction/mentoring	P	63%	Weight of evidence/benefit-cost	88%
Educator professional development: Use of data to guide instruction ("train the trainers")	⊖	31%	Produces null or poor outcomes	23%
Teacher professional development: Not targeted	⊖	28%	Produces null or poor outcomes	47%
Consultant Teachers				
Coaching	●	81%		42%
Coaching: Literacy Collaborative	◎	100%	Heterogeneity	29%
Coaching: Content-Focused Coaching	◎	94%	Single evaluation	96%
Online coaching	◎	86%	Single evaluation/heterogeneity	27%

Key:

- Evidence-based
- ◎ Research-based
- ⊖ Produces null or poor outcomes
- P Promising
- NR Not reported

Program/intervention	Level of evidence	Benefit-cost percentage	Reason program does not meet evidence-based criteria (see full definitions below)	Percent minority
Parent Outreach				
Parents as tutors with teacher oversight	⊙	56%	Benefit-cost	58%
Families and Schools Together (FAST)	⊙	47%	Benefit-cost/mixed results	58%
Conjoint Behavioral Consultation	P	1%	Single evaluation/weight of evidence/ Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	25%
Parent and family engagement coordinators	P	NA	Research on outcomes of interest not yet available	NA
Community Partnerships				
Case management in schools	⊙	86%	Mixed results	76%
Mentoring for students: School-based (taxpayer costs only)	⊙	70%	Mixed results/benefit-cost	78%
Mentoring for students: School-based (with volunteer costs)	⊙	68%	Mixed results/benefit-cost	78%
Mentoring for students: Community-based (taxpayer costs only)	⊙	66%	Mixed results/benefit-cost	80%
Mentoring for students: Community-based (with volunteer costs)	⊙	60%	Mixed results/benefit-cost	80%
Behavior Support				
Positive Action	●	87%		74%
Good Behavior Game	●	85%		49%
Becoming a Man (BAM)	⊙	73%	Single evaluation/benefit-cost	99%
School-wide positive behavior programs [#]	⊙	65%	Benefit-cost	70%
Daily Behavior Report Cards	⊙	63%	Single evaluation/benefit-cost/heterogeneity	13%
Behavioral Monitoring and Reinforcement Program (BMRP)	⊙	62%	Benefit-cost	40%
First Step to Success	⊙	49%	Benefit-cost	59%
"Check-in" behavior interventions	⊙	45%	Mixed results/benefit-cost	83%
Fast Track prevention program	⊙	0%	Mixed results/benefit-cost	53%
Becoming a Man (BAM) with high-dosage tutoring	P	71%	Single evaluation/mixed results/benefit-cost	99%
Second Step	P	34%	Mixed results/benefit-cost/heterogeneity	31%
Services for 8th, 11th & 12th Grades				
Credit retrieval	P	NA	Research on outcomes of interest not yet available	NA
Other				
Special literacy instruction for English language learner students	●	80%		98%

[#]In August 2015, WSIPP modified statistical adjustments, updated our cost estimate, and added a new study to our analysis of school-wide positive behavior programs. The program moved from evidence-based to research-based as a result of these adjustments.

Key:

- Evidence-based
- ⊙ Research-based
- ⊖ Produces null or poor outcomes
- P Promising
- NR Not reported

Reasons Programs May Not Meet Suggested Evidence-Based Criteria:

Benefit-cost: The WSIPP benefit-cost model was used to determine whether a program meets this criterion. Programs that do not achieve at least a 75% chance of positive net present value do not meet the benefit-cost test.

Heterogeneity: To be designated as evidence-based, a program must have been tested on a "heterogeneous" population. We operationalized heterogeneity in two ways. First, the proportion of minority program participants must be greater than or equal to the minority proportion of children in Washington State aged 0 to 17. From the 2010 Census, for children aged 0 through 17 in Washington, 68% were white and 32% minority. Thus, if the weighted average of program participants had at least 32% minorities then the program was considered to have been tested on a heterogeneous population. Second, the heterogeneity criterion can also be achieved if at least one of the studies has been conducted on youth in Washington and a subgroup analysis demonstrates the program is effective for minorities ($p \leq 0.2$). Programs passing the second test are marked with a ^. Programs that do not meet either of these two criteria do not meet the heterogeneity definition.

Mixed results: If findings are mixed from different measures (e.g., undesirable outcomes for behavior measures and desirable outcomes for test scores), the program does not meet evidence-based criteria.

Program cost: A program cost was not available to WSIPP at the time of the inventory. Thus, WSIPP could not conduct a benefit-cost analysis.

Research on outcomes of interest not yet available: The program has not yet been tested with a rigorous outcome evaluation.

Single evaluation: The program does not meet the minimum standard of multiple evaluations or one large multiple-site evaluation contained in the current or proposed definitions.

Weight of evidence: Results from a random effects meta-analysis ($p > 0.20$) indicate that the weight of the evidence does not support desired outcomes, or results from a single large study indicate the program is not effective.

Level of Evidence:

Evidence-based: A program or practice that has been tested in heterogeneous or intended populations with multiple randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluations, or one large multiple-site randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluation, where the weight of the evidence from a systematic review demonstrates sustained improvements in at least one outcome. Further, "evidence-based" means a program or practice that can be implemented with a set of procedures to allow successful replication in Washington and, when possible, has been determined to be cost-beneficial.

Research-based: A program or practice that has been tested with a single randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluation demonstrating sustained desirable outcomes; or where the weight of the evidence from a systematic review supports sustained outcomes as identified in the term "evidence-based" in RCW (the above definition) but does not meet the full criteria for "evidence-based."

Promising practice: A program or practice that, based on statistical analyses or a well-established theory of change, shows potential for meeting the "evidence-based" or "research-based" criteria, which could include the use of a program that is evidence-based for outcomes other than the alternative use.

Other Definitions:

Benefit-cost percentage: The percent of the time where the monetary benefits exceed costs.