

**September 2014**  
**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
<b>Tutoring Support</b>				
Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, structured	●	87%		72%
Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, non-structured	P	51%	Weight of evidence/Benefit-cost	66%
Tutoring: By adults, for English language learner students	P	61%	Weight of evidence/Benefit-cost	91%
Tutoring: By certificated teachers, small-group, structured	●	96%		67%
Tutoring: By non-certificated adults, small-group, structured	●	77%		69%
Tutoring: By peers, same-age and classwide	●	76%		68%
Tutoring: By peers, cross-age	⊙	83%	Heterogeneity	NR
<b>Extended Learning Time</b>				
Summer learning programs: Academically focused	●	92%		85%
Out-of-school-time tutoring by adults	●	75%		84%
Summer book programs: Multi-year intervention	P	71%	Single evaluation/Weight of evidence/Benefit-cost	95%
Summer book programs: One-year, with additional support	P	60%	Weight of evidence/Benefit-cost	78%
Summer book programs: One-year intervention	P	57%	Weight of evidence/Benefit-cost	86%
<b>Professional Development</b>				
Teacher professional development: Targeted	●	84%		83%
Teacher professional development: Not targeted	⊙	24%	Produces null or poor outcomes	47%
Teacher professional development: Use of assessment data to guide instruction	●	100%		58%
Educator professional development: Use of data to guide instruction ("train the trainers")	P	53%	Weight of evidence/Benefit-cost/Heterogeneity	23%
Teacher professional development: Online, targeted	⊙	57%	Benefit-cost/Heterogeneity	31%
Teacher induction/mentoring	P	60%	Weight of evidence/Benefit-cost	88%
Professional Learning Communities	P	NA	Research on outcomes of interest not yet available	NA
<b>Consultant Teachers</b>				
Coaching	●	86%		42%
Coaching: Content-Focused Coaching	⊙	68%	Single evaluation/Benefit-cost	96%
Coaching: Literacy Collaborative	⊙	89%	Heterogeneity	29%
Coaching: Online	⊙	73%	Single evaluation/Benefit-cost/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
<b>Parent Outreach</b>				
Parents as tutors with teacher oversight	⊙	55%	Benefit-cost	58%
Parent and family engagement coordinators	P	NA	Research on outcomes of interest not yet available	NA
<b>Community Partnerships</b>				
Mentoring for students: School-based (taxpayer costs only)	●	79%		78%
Mentoring for students: School-based (including volunteer costs)	●	78%		78%
Mentoring for students: Community-based (taxpayer costs only)	⊙	67%	Mixed results/Benefit-cost	80%
Mentoring for students: Community-based (including volunteer costs)	⊙	60%	Mixed results/Benefit-cost	80%
Case management in schools	⊙	66%	Mixed results/Benefit-cost	76%
<b>Behavior Support</b>				
School-wide positive behavior programs	●	99%		66%
<b>Services for 8th, 11th &amp; 12th Grades</b>				
Credit retrieval	P	NA	Research on outcomes of interest not yet available	NA
<b>Other</b>				
Special literacy instruction for English language learner students	⊙	69%	Benefit-cost	98%

**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 under current law or the proposed definition, 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 ( $p \leq 0.20$ ). 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 of the following outcomes: child abuse, neglect, or the need for out of home placement; crime; children’s mental health; education; or employment. 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.