

**July 2020**  
**Updated Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices:**  
**Washington’s Learning Assistance Program**

| Program/intervention  | Level of evidence | Benefit-cost percentage | Reason program does not meet suggested evidence-based criteria | Percent children of color |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| <b>Tutoring support</b>   |                   |                         |  |                           |
| Tutoring: By certificated teachers, small-group, structured   | ●                 | 97%                     |  | 63%                       |
| Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, structured   | ●                 | 92%                     |  | 66%                       |
| Tutoring: By peers  | ●                 | 81%                     |  | 46%                       |
| Tutoring: By non-certificated adults, small-group, structured   | ⊙                 | 69%                     | Benefit-cost   | 65%                       |
| Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, non-structured   | ⊙                 | 69%                     | Benefit-cost   | 77%                       |
| Tutoring: Supplemental Educational Services (under Title I)   | ⊙                 | 62%                     | Benefit-cost   | 95%                       |
| Tutoring: By adults, for English language learner students  | Null              | 60%                     | Weight of evidence   | 91%                       |
| Tutoring: Supplemental computer-assisted instruction for struggling readers (vs. regular classroom instruction) | Null              | 64%                     | Weight of evidence   | 91%                       |
| <b>Extended learning time</b>   |                   |                         |  |                           |
| Double dose classes   | ●                 | 98%                     |  | 91%                       |
| Out-of-school-time tutoring by adults   | ●                 | 93%                     |  | 75%                       |
| Summer learning programs: Academically focused  | ●                 | 87%                     |  | 85%                       |
| Summer book programs: One-year, with additional support   | Null              | 58%                     | Weight of evidence   | 77%                       |
| Summer book programs: One-year intervention   | Null              | 57%                     | Weight of evidence   | 86%                       |
| Summer book programs: Multi-year intervention   | P                 | 71%                     | Weight of evidence   | 95%                       |
| <b>Professional development</b>   |                   |                         |  |                           |
| Teacher professional development: Use of data to guide instruction  | ●                 | 98%                     |  | 54%                       |
| Teacher professional development: Targeted  | ●                 | 79%                     |  | 96%                       |
| Teacher professional development: Online, targeted  | ⊙                 | 60%                     | Benefit-cost/heterogeneity                                     | 31%                       |
| Teacher professional development: Induction/mentoring   | Null              | 64%                     | Weight of evidence   | 92%                       |
| Teacher professional development: Not targeted  | Null              | 38%                     | Weight of evidence   | 51%                       |
| Educator professional development: Use of data to guide instruction ("train the trainers")                      | Null              | 29%                     | Weight of evidence   | 46%                       |
| Professional learning communities   | P                 |                         | No rigorous evaluation with outcome of interest                |                           |
| <b>Consultant teachers</b>  |                   |                         |  |                           |
| Consultant teachers: Online coaching  | ●                 | 93%                     |  | 53%                       |
| Consultant teachers: Coaching   | ●                 | 81%                     |  | 53%                       |
| Consultant teachers: Literacy Collaborative   | ⊙                 | 100%                    | Heterogeneity  | 29%                       |
| Consultant teachers: Content-focused coaching   | ⊙                 |                         | Single evaluation  | 96%                       |

● Evidence-based    ⊙ Research-based    P Promising    ⊖ Poor outcomes    Null Null outcomes    NR Not reported    See definitions and notes on pages 4 and 5.

Note:

# This program is a special analysis for this inventory and does not have a program-specific webpage on WSIPP’s website.

*The classifications in this document are current as of July 2020.*  
*For the most up-to-date results, please visit the program’s page on our website <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost>*

**July 2020**  
**Updated Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices:**  
**Washington's Learning Assistance Program**

| Program/intervention   | Level of evidence | Benefit-cost percentage | Reason program does not meet suggested evidence-based criteria | Percent children of color |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| <b>Parent outreach</b>   |                   |                         |  |                           |
| Parents as tutors with teacher oversight   | ⊙                 | 56%                     | Benefit-cost   | 58%                       |
| Families and Schools Together (FAST)   | Null              | 50%                     | Weight of evidence   | 83%                       |
| Conjoint behavioral consultation   | Null              | 23%                     | Weight of evidence   | 21%                       |
| Parent and family engagement coordinators  | P                 |                         | No rigorous evaluation with outcome of interest                |                           |
| <b>Community partnerships</b>  |                   |                         |  |                           |
| Case management in schools <sup>#</sup>  | ⊙                 | 68%                     | Mixed results/benefit-cost                                     | 61%                       |
| Mentoring: School-based (taxpayer costs only) <sup>#</sup>                         | ⊙                 | 19%                     | Benefit-cost   | 74%                       |
| Mentoring: School-based (with volunteer costs) <sup>#</sup>                        | ⊙                 | 16%                     | Benefit-cost   | 74%                       |
| Mentoring: Community-based (taxpayer costs only) <sup>#</sup>                      | ⊙                 | 66%                     | Benefit-cost   | 68%                       |
| Mentoring: Community-based (including volunteer costs) <sup>#</sup>                | ⊙                 | 57%                     | Benefit-cost   | 68%                       |
| PROSPER (PROmoting School-community-university Partnerships to Enhance Resilience) | ⊙                 | 39%                     | Benefit-cost/heterogeneity                                     | 15%                       |
| <b>Behavior support</b>  |                   |                         |  |                           |
| Positive Action  | ●                 | 94%                     |  | 63%                       |
| Good Behavior Game   | ●                 | 76%                     |  | 50%                       |
| Second Step  | ●                 | 85%                     |  | 53%                       |
| Becoming a Man (BAM)   | ⊙                 | 74%                     | Benefit-cost   | 98%                       |
| Becoming a Man (BAM) with high-dosage tutoring                                     | ⊙                 |                         | Single evaluation  | 99%                       |
| Mentoring: Community-based for children with disruptive behavior disorders         | ⊙                 | 67%                     | Benefit-cost/heterogeneity                                     | 7%                        |
| Mentoring: School-based by teachers or staff                                       | ⊙                 | 71%                     | Benefit-cost   | 86%                       |
| School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports                         | ⊙                 | 74%                     | Benefit-cost   | 50%                       |
| Behavioral Monitoring and Reinforcement Program (BMRP)                             | ⊙                 | 64%                     | Benefit-cost   | 81%                       |
| Coping Power Program   | ⊙                 | 57%                     | Benefit-cost   | 80%                       |
| "Check-in" behavior interventions  | ⊙                 | 57%                     | Benefit-cost   | 72%                       |
| Restorative justice in schools   | ⊙                 | 11%                     | Mixed results/benefit-cost                                     | 65%                       |
| Fast Track prevention program  | ⊙                 | 0%                      | Benefit-cost   | 53%                       |
| Daily Behavior Report Cards  | ⊙                 |                         | Single evaluation  | 13%                       |
| First Step to Success  | Null              | 47%                     | Weight of evidence   | 59%                       |
| Caring School Community (formerly Child Development Project)                       | Null              | 60%                     | Weight of evidence   | 47%                       |
| Responsive classroom   | Null              | 4%                      | Weight of evidence   | 57%                       |
| Curriculum-based Support Group (CBSG)  | P                 |                         | Single evaluation  | 90%                       |

● Evidence-based   ⊙ Research-based   P Promising   ⊖ Poor outcomes   Null Null outcomes   NR Not reported   See definitions and notes on pages 4 and 5.

**Note:**

<sup>#</sup> This program is a special analysis for this inventory and does not have a program-specific webpage on WSIPP's website.

*The classifications in this document are current as of July 2020.*

*For the most up-to-date results, please visit the program's page on our website <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost>*

**July 2020**  
**Updated Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices:**  
**Washington’s Learning Assistance Program**

| Program/intervention  | Level of evidence | Benefit-cost percentage | Reason program does not meet suggested evidence-based criteria | Percent children of color |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| <b>Services for 8<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, &amp; 12<sup>th</sup> grades</b> |                   |                         |  |                           |
| Credit retrieval  | P                 |                         | No rigorous evaluation with outcome of interest                |                           |
| <b>Other</b>  |                   |                         |  |                           |
| Special literacy instruction for English language learner students                | ●                 | 81%                     |  | 98%                       |
| Growth mindset interventions  | ⊙                 | 56%                     | Benefit-cost   | 71%                       |
| Academic vocabulary instruction   | P                 |                         | Weight of evidence   | NR                        |
| Transition programs for incoming kindergarteners                                  | P                 |                         | Single evaluation  | 45%                       |

● Evidence-based    ⊙ Research-based    P Promising    ⊘ Poor outcomes    Null Null outcomes    NR Not reported    See definitions and notes on pages 4 and 5.

Note:

# This program is a special analysis for this inventory and does not have a program-specific webpage on WSIPP’s website.

**July 2020**  
**Updated Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices:**  
**Washington's Learning Assistance Program**

---

**Definitions and Notes**

---

**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:**

Cost-beneficial: Benefit-cost estimation is repeated many times to account for uncertainty in the model. This represents the percentage of repetitions producing overall benefits that exceed costs. Programs with a benefit-cost percentage of at least 75% are considered to meet the "cost-beneficial" criterion in the "evidence-based" definition above.

**July 2020**  
**Updated Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices:**  
**Washington's Learning Assistance Program**

**Reasons Programs May Not Meet Suggested Evidence-Based Criteria:**

- Benefit-cost:** The proposed definition of evidence-based practices requires that, when possible, a benefit-cost analysis be conducted. We use WSIPP's benefit-cost model to determine whether a program meets this criterion. Programs that do not have at least a 75% chance of a positive net present value do not meet the benefit-cost test. The WSIPP model uses Monte Carlo simulation to test the probability that benefits exceed costs. The 75% standard was deemed an appropriate measure of risk aversion.
- 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 program participants must be greater than or equal to the proportion of children of color in Washington State aged 0 to 17. From the 2010 Census, among children aged 0 through 17 in Washington, 68% were White and 32% were children of color. Thus, if the weighted average of program participants were at least 32% children of color 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 children of color ( $p < 0.20$ ). 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.
- No rigorous evaluation measuring outcome of interest:** The program has not yet been tested with a rigorous outcome evaluation.
- Null outcomes:** If results from multiple evaluations or one large multiple-site evaluation indicate that a program has no significant effect on outcomes of interest ( $p > 0.20$ ), a program is classified as producing "null outcomes."
- Poor outcome(s):** If results from multiple evaluations or one large multiple-site evaluation indicate that a program produces undesirable effects ( $p < 0.20$ ), a program is classified as producing "poor outcomes."
- 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.