

Tutoring: By certificated teachers, small-group, structured Pre-K to 12 Education

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2018. Literature review updated June 2014.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [Technical Documentation](#).

Program Description: The programs included in this analysis are structured, systematic approaches to tutoring small-groups of struggling students in grades K–6 in specific English language arts and/or mathematics skills. The evaluated programs include a variety of specific approaches and curricula such as (in no particular order) Read Aloud, Proactive Reading, Responsive Reading, Leveled Literacy, Spell Read, Corrective Reading, and Number Rockets. An average program provides about 40 hours of tutoring time to groups of two to six (usually three) early elementary students. Certificated teachers provide tutoring and receive about 35 hours of training with a focus on the specific content and strategies used in the programs.

Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

Benefits to:

Taxpayers	\$4,100	Benefit to cost ratio	\$10.51
Participants	\$8,461	Benefits minus costs	\$13,991
Others	\$3,526	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	(\$625)	benefits greater than the costs	97 %
Total benefits	\$15,462		
Net program cost	(\$1,471)		
Benefits minus cost	\$13,991		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2017). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

Benefits from changes to: ¹	Benefits to:				
	Participants	Taxpayers	Others ²	Indirect ³	Total
Labor market earnings associated with test scores	\$8,524	\$3,871	\$3,775	\$0	\$16,169
Health care associated with educational attainment	(\$62)	\$229	(\$249)	\$115	\$33
Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$741)	(\$741)
Totals	\$8,461	\$4,100	\$3,526	(\$625)	\$15,462

¹In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

²"Others" includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

³"Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.


Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

	Annual cost	Year dollars	Summary	
Program costs	\$1,406	2013	Present value of net program costs (in 2017 dollars)	(\$1,471)
Comparison costs	\$0	2013	Cost range (+ or -)	10 %

In the evaluations included in this meta-analysis, a certificated teacher provides, on average, 40 hours of tutoring to nine students per year in groups of three and receives 35 hours of training. To calculate a per-student annual cost, we used average Washington State compensation costs (including benefits) for a K-8 teacher as reported by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, divided by the total number of students served.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant



The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in non-discounted dollars to simplify the “break-even” point from a budgeting perspective. If the dollars are negative (bars below \$0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach \$0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above \$0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects											
Outcomes measured	Treatment age	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis						Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)	
				First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated			ES	p-value
				ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age		
Test scores	7	14	1649	0.209	0.039	7	0.098	0.043	17	0.254	0.001

Meta-analysis is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An effect size (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

Adjusted effect sizes are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the first time ES is estimated and the second time ES is estimated. We also report the unadjusted effect size to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Fien, H., Santoro, L., Baker, S.K., Park, Y., Chard, D. J., Williams, S., & Haria, P. (2011). Enhancing teacher read alouds with small-group vocabulary instruction for students with low vocabulary in first-grade classrooms. *School Psychology Review, 40*(2), 307-318.
- Kerins, M.R., Trotter, D., & Schoenbrodt, L. (2010). Effects of a tier 2 intervention on literacy measures: Lessons learned. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy, 26*(3), 287-302.
- Lennon, J.E., & Slesinski, C. (1999). Early intervention in reading: Results of a screening and intervention program for kindergarten students. *School Psychology Review, 28*(3), 353-364.
- Mathes, P.G., Denton, C., Anthony, J., Francis, D., & Schatschneider, C. (2005). The effects of theoretically different instruction and student characteristics on the skills of struggling readers. *Reading Research Quarterly, 40*(2), 148-182.
- Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C.A., DeFord, D.E., Bryk, A.S., & Seltzer, M. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high-risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*(1), 9-39.
- Ransford-Kaldon, C.R., Flynt, E.S., Ross, C.L., Franceschini, L., Zoblotsky, T., Huang, Y., & Gallagher, B. (2010). *Implementation of effective intervention: An empirical study to evaluate the efficacy of Fountas & Pinnell’s Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) 2009-2010*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Education Policy.
- Rashotte, C.A., MacPhee, K., & Torgesen, J.K. (2001). The effectiveness of a group reading instruction program with poor readers in multiple grades. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 24*(2), 119-134.
- Rolfhus, E., Gersten, R., Clarke, B., Decker, L.E., Wilkins, C., & Dimino, J. (2012). *An Evaluation of Number Rockets: A tier-2 intervention for grade 1 students at risk for difficulties in mathematics* Final Report (NCEE 2012-4007). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute for Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Torgesen, J.K., Wagner, R.K., Rashotte, C.A., Herron, J., & Lindamood, P. (2010). Computer-assisted instruction to prevent early reading difficulties in students at risk for dyslexia: Outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Annals of Dyslexia, 60*(1), 40-56.
- Torgeson, J., Schirm, A., Castner, L., Vartivarian, S., Mansfield, W., Myers, D. . . Haan, C. (2007). National assessment of Title I final report: Volume II: Closing the reading gap: Findings from a randomized trial of four reading interventions for striving readers (NCEE 2008-4013). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

For further information, contact:
(360) 664-9800, institute@wsipp.wa.gov

Printed on 07-16-2019



Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.