

**June 2018**  
**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 evidence-based criteria (see full definitions below)	Percent minority
<b>Tutoring support</b>				
Tutoring: By certificated teachers, small-group, structured	●	96%		63%
Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, structured	●	94%		72%
Tutoring: By non-certificated adults, small-group, structured	●	78%		69%
Tutoring: By peers, cross-age <sup>#</sup>	⊙	81%	Heterogeneity	NR
Tutoring: By peers, same-age and classwide <sup>#</sup>	⊙	74%	Benefit-cost	62%
Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, non-structured	⊙	71%	Benefit-cost	75%
Tutoring: Supplemental Educational Services (under Title I)	⊙	58%	Benefit-cost	95%
Tutoring: By adults, for English language learner students	Null	69%	Weight of evidence	91%
Tutoring: Supplemental computer-assisted instruction for struggling readers	Null	58%	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	●	86%		85%
Summer book programs: One-year, with additional support	Null	57%	Weight of evidence	77%
Summer book programs: One-year intervention	Null	56%	Weight of evidence	86%
Summer book programs: Multi-year intervention	P		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	⊙	61%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	31%
Teacher professional development: Induction/mentoring	Null	64%	Weight of evidence	92%
Teacher professional development: Not targeted	Null	35%	Weight of evidence	51%
Educator professional development: Use of data to guide instruction ("train the trainers")	Null	31%	Weight of evidence	46%
Professional learning communities	P		No rigorous evaluation with outcome of interest	
<b>Consultant teachers</b>				
Consultant teachers: Online coaching	●	92%		53%
Consultant teachers: Coaching	●	81%		53%
Consultant teachers: Coaching: 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 page 4.

**Note:**

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

**June 2018**  
**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 evidence-based criteria (see full definitions below)	Percent minority
<b>Parent outreach</b>				
Parents as tutors with teacher oversight	⊙	56%	Benefit-cost	58%
Families and Schools Together (FAST)	Null	46%	Weight of evidence	83%
Conjoint behavioral consultation	Null	4%	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	⊙	96%	Mixed results	61%
Mentoring: School-based (taxpayer costs only) <sup>#</sup>	⊙	16%	Benefit-cost	74%
Mentoring: School-based (with volunteer costs) <sup>#</sup>	⊙	13%	Benefit-cost	74%
Mentoring: Community-based (taxpayer costs only) <sup>#</sup>	⊙	70%	Benefit-cost	68%
Mentoring: Community-based (with volunteer costs) <sup>#</sup>	⊙	64%	Benefit-cost	68%
PROSPER	⊙	59%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	15%
<b>Behavior support</b>				
Positive Action	●	87%		63%
Becoming a Man (BAM)	●	79%		98%
Mentoring: Community-based for children with disruptive behavior disorders	⊙	78%	Heterogeneity	7%
Mentoring: School-based by teachers or staff	⊙	74%	Benefit-cost	86%
Becoming a Man (BAM) with high-dosage tutoring	⊙		Single evaluation	99%
Good Behavior Game	⊙	70%	Benefit-cost	50%
School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS)	⊙	68%	Mixed results/Benefit-cost	50%
Behavioral Monitoring and Reinforcement Program (BMRP)	⊙	64%	Benefit-cost	41%
Coping Power Program	⊙	55%	Benefit-cost	80%
First Step to Success	⊙	53%	Benefit-cost	59%
"Check-in" behavior interventions	⊙	46%	Benefit-cost	72%
Second Step	⊙	30%	Benefit-cost	55%
Fast Track prevention program	⊙	0%	Benefit-cost	53%
Daily Behavior Report Cards	⊙		Single evaluation	13%
Caring School Community (formerly Child Development Project)	Null	61%	Weight of evidence	47%
Responsive Classroom	Null	49%	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 page 4.

**Note:**

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

**June 2018**  
**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 evidence-based criteria (see full definitions below)	Percent minority
<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	●	80%		98%
Growth mindset interventions	⊙	58%	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 page 4.

Note:

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

**June 2018**  
**Updated Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices:**  
**Washington's Learning Assistance Program**

---

**Definitions and Notes:**

---

**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, the state statute requires that a program has been tested on a "heterogeneous" population. We operationalize heterogeneity in two ways. First, the proportion of program participants belonging to ethnic/racial minority groups must be greater than or equal to the proportion of minority children aged 0 to 17 in Washington. From the 2010 Census, for children aged 0 through 17 in Washington, 68% were white and 32% were from minority backgrounds. Thus, if the weighted average of program participants in the outcome evaluations of the program is at least 32% ethnic/racial minority, then the program is considered to have been tested in 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 ( $p < 0.20$ ). 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. Programs whose evaluations 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 with outcome of interest:** 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:** To meet the evidence-based definition, results from a random effects meta-analysis ( $p$ -value  $< 0.20$ ) of multiple evaluations or one large multiple-site evaluation must indicate the practice achieves the desired outcome(s). To meet the research-based definition, one single-site evaluation must indicate the practice achieves the desired outcomes ( $p$ -value  $< 0.20$ ).

**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, according to a Monte Carlo simulation run by WSIPP.
- Null outcome(s):** If desired results from multiple evaluations are not statistically significant ( $p > 0.20$ ), a program is classified as "Null".
- 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."

18-06-2201