July 2016
Updated Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices:
Washington's Learning Assistance Program (LAP)

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	●	96%		63%
Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, structured	●	94%		72%
Tutoring: By non-certificated adults, small-group, structured	●	77%		69%
Tutoring: By peers, cross-age[#]	◉	81%	Heterogeneity	NR
Tutoring: By peers, same-age and classwide[#]	◉	74%	Benefit-cost	62%
Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, non-structured	◉	70%	Benefit-cost	75%
Tutoring: Supplemental Educational Services (under Title I)	◉	58%	Benefit-cost	95%
Tutoring: By adults, for English language learner students	P	68%	Weight of evidence	91%
Tutoring: Supplemental computer-assisted instruction for struggling readers	P	58%	Weight of evidence	91%
Extended learning time				
"Double dose" classes	●	98%		91%
Out-of-school-time tutoring by adults	●	92%		75%
Summer learning programs: Academically focused	●	86%		85%
Summer book programs: One-year, with additional support	P	58%	Weight of evidence	77%
Summer book programs: One-year intervention	P	56%	Weight of evidence	86%
Summer book programs: Multi-year intervention	P		Single evaluation	95%
Professional development				
Teacher professional development: Use of data to guide instruction	●	98%		54%
Teacher professional development: Targeted	●	78%		96%
Teacher professional development: Online, targeted	◉	60%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	31%
Teacher professional development: Induction/mentoring	P	63%	Weight of evidence	92%
Professional Learning Communities	P		Research on outcomes of interest not yet available	
Teacher professional development: Not targeted	⊘	37%	Weight of evidence	51%
Educator professional development: Use of data to guide instruction ("train the trainers")	⊘	31%	Weight of evidence	46%
Consultant teachers				
Online coaching	●	86%		53%
Coaching	●	82%		53%
Coaching: Literacy Collaborative	◉	100%	Heterogeneity	29%
Coaching: Content-Focused Coaching	◉		Single evaluation	96%

● Evidence-based   ◉ Research-based   **P** Promising   ⊘ Produces null or poor outcomes   **NR** Not reported   See definitions and notes on page 4.

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

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)	◉	49%	Benefit-cost/mixed results	90%
Conjoint Behavioral Consultation	P		Single evaluation	25%
Parent and family engagement coordinators	P		Research on outcomes of interest not yet available	
Community partnerships				
Case management in schools	◉	96%	Mixed results	61%
Mentoring for students: School-based (taxpayer costs only)	◉	74%	Benefit-cost	73%
Mentoring for students: School-based (with volunteer costs)	◉	72%	Benefit-cost	73%
Mentoring for students: Community-based (taxpayer costs only)	◉	71%	Benefit-cost	78%
Mentoring for students: Community-based (with volunteer costs)	◉	66%	Benefit-cost	78%
PROSPER	◉	55%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	15%
Behavior support				
Positive Action	●	88%		63%
Other school-wide positive behavior programs	●	77%		72%
Good Behavior Game	◉	71%	Benefit-cost	56%
Behavioral Monitoring and Reinforcement Program (BMRP)	◉	63%	Benefit-cost	41%
First Step to Success	◉	53%	Benefit-cost	59%
Coping Power Program	◉	50%	Benefit-cost	80%
Second Step	◉	47%	Benefit-cost	55%
"Check-in" behavior interventions	◉	45%	Benefit-cost	72%
Fast Track prevention program	◉	0%	Benefit-cost	53%
Becoming a Man (BAM)	◉		Single evaluation	99%
Becoming a Man (BAM) with high-dosage tutoring	◉		Single evaluation	99%
Daily Behavior Report Cards	◉		Single evaluation	13%
Responsive Classroom	P	48%	Weight of evidence	57%
Curriculum-based Support Group (CBSG)	P		Single evaluation	90%

● Evidence-based   ◉ Research-based   **P** Promising   ⊘ Produces null or poor outcomes   **NR** Not reported   See definitions and notes on page 4.

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

Program/intervention	Level of evidence	Benefit-cost percentage	Reason program does not meet evidence-based criteria (see full definitions below)	Percent minority
Services for 8th, 11th & 12th grades				
Credit retrieval	P		Research on outcomes of interest not yet available	
Other				
Special literacy instruction for English language learner students	●	80%		98%
Academic Vocabulary Instruction	P		Single evaluation	NR
Transition Programs for Incoming Kindergarteners	P		Single evaluation	45%

● Evidence-based   ◉ Research-based   **P** Promising   ⊘ Produces null or poor outcomes   **NR** Not reported   See definitions and notes on page 4.

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

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 minorities. 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.

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: 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.

16-07-2201