# 3. Tutoring

*a.* *Success for All*: This school-wide approach is designed to promote reading, writing and language arts skills for students. A key facet focuses on tutoring. Statistically significant (p=.05 or better) positive effects of Success for All (compared to controls) were found on every measure at every grade level, 1-5. For students in general, effect sizes averaged around a half standard deviation at all grade levels. Effects were somewhat higher than this for the Woodcock Word Attack scale in first and second grades, but in grades 3-5 effect sizes were more or less equivalent on all aspects of reading. Consistently, effect sizes for students in the lowest 25% of their grades were particularly positive, ranging from E'SS=+1.03 in first grade to E'SS=+1.68 in fourth grade. Again, cohort-level analyses found statistically significant differences favoring low achievers in Success for All on every measure at every grade level. A follow-up study of Baltimore schools found that positive program effects continued into grade 6 (E'SS=+0.54) and grade 7 (E'SS=+0.42), when students were in middle schools. Studies found that schools implementing all program components obtained better results (compared to controls) than did schools implementing the program to a moderate or minimal degree. Similarly, a strong relationship between ratings of implementation quality and student achievement gains compared to controls was found. Cooper, Slavin, & Madden (1998), in an interview study, found that high-quality implementations of Success for All depended on many factors, including district and principal support, participation in national and local networks, adequacy of resources, and genuine buy-in at the outset on the part of all teachers. A longitudinal study in Baltimore from 1987-1993 collected CTBS scores on the original five Success for All and control schools. On average, Success for All schools exceeded control schools at every grade level. The differences were statistically and educationally significant. By fifth grade, Success for All students were performing 75% of a grade equivalent ahead of controls (E'S=+0.45) on CTBS Total Reading scores (see Slavin, Madden, Dolan, Wasik, Ross, & Smith, 1994). An Arizona study (Ross, Nunnery, & Smith, 1996) compared Mexican-American English language learners in two urban Success for All schools to those in three schools using locally-developed Title I reform models and one using Reading Recovery. Two SES school strata were compared, one set with 81% of students in poverty and 50% Hispanic students and one with 53% of students in poverty and 27% Hispanic students. Success for All first graders scored higher than controls in both strata. Hispanic students in the high-poverty stratum averaged three months ahead of the controls (1.75 vs. 1.45). Hispanic students in the less impoverished stratum scored slightly above grade level (1.93), about one month ahead of controls (1.83). In the Success for All schools, first graders who had been assigned to special education were tutored one-to-one (by their special education teachers) and otherwise participated in the program in the same way as all other students. Special education students in Success for All were reading substantially better (E'S=+.77) than special education students in the comparison school (Ross et al., 1995). In addition, Smith et al. (1994) combined first grade reading data from special education students in Success for All and control schools in four districts: Memphis, Ft. Wayne (IN), Montgomery (AL), and Caldwell (ID). Success for All special education students scored substantially better than controls (mean E'S =+.59).

*For more information, see:*

Cooper, R., Slavin, R.E., & Madden N.A. (1998). Success for All: Improving the quality of implementation of whole-school change through the use of a national reform network. *Education and Urban Society, 30*, (3), 385-408.

Ross, S.M., Nunnery, J., & Smith, L.J. (1996). *Evaluation of Title I Reading Programs: Amphitheater Public Schools. Year 1: 1995-96.* Memphis: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., Smith, L.J. & Dianda, M. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 1*, 41-76.

Smith, L.J., Ross, S.M., & Casey, J.P. (1994). *Special education analyses for Success for All in four cities.* Memphis: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

*Website -- www.successforall.net*

*b. The Valued Youth Program (VYP).* VYP is a tutoring program designed to prevent school dropout among students who were not proficient in English. VYP pairs academically at-risk teenage tutors with younger children. The results of an evaluation of VYP indicate higher reading grades for the tutors than for a comparison group. The tutors also showed a reduced number of disciplinary referrals after participation in the program, while the rate for the comparison group increased. Tutors also showed gains on the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale and Quality of School Life Scale. A positive impact on student dropout rates also is reported.

*For more information, see:*

Supik, J. D. (1991). Partners for valued youth: The final report. *IDRA Newsletter*, 18, 1-4.

*For program information, contact:*

Linda Cantu, Program Director, Intercultural Development Research Association, 5835 Callaghan suite# 530, San Antonio, TX 78228-1190. (210)684-8180 / fax: (210)684-5389.

*For evaluation information, contact:*

Jose A. Cardenas, PhD, Intercultural Development Research Association, 5835 Callaghan suite# 350, San Antonio, TX 78228-1190.

*c. Memphis Partners Collaborative (MPC):* MPC was a Saturday program for at-risk 10th graders, which was held for six hours every Saturday (for 17 weeks) at several local college campuses. Approximately 40% of an average project day was devoted to academic enrichment, another 40% focused on job readiness and employability skills, and the remaining 20% focused on self-esteem building, problem solving skills, stress management, and health and drug counseling. Transportation, lunch, and daily rewards were offered to increase participation. For both the 1989-90 and the 1990-91 cohorts, appropriate baseline and follow-up data (one year after completing program) were collected from the program and comparison students. About 79% of MPC students were employed following completion of the program (most of those unemployed were underage). There was no employment data provided for the comparison group. MPC students had fewer absences compared to the control group. A trend for higher self-esteem at follow-up is reported, but not all data was available from the comparison group. The effect on rate of graduation depended on the type of student. MPC seemed to have a positive effect on over-age, black males; they were less likely than controls to drop out. Conversely, the program seemed to have a negative effect for over-age, black females; they dropped out at a higher rate than controls. However, the difference diminished over time. There were no significant effects of the MPC program on grade point average.

*For more information, see:*

Rossi, R. J. (1995). *Evaluation of projects funded by the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Program: Final evaluation report, Volume I: Findings and recommendations*. Prepared by: American Institutes for Research, P. O. Box 1113, Palo Alto, CA 94302.

*d. Brief Research Synthesis on Cross-Age Tutoring Programs and the Performance of At-Risk Youth as Tutors*: Cross-age tutoring is described as one of the most cost-effective strategies used to enhance the academic performance of struggling students. Among the positive benefits reported for the students being tutored are academic gains and improvements in communication skills, ability to identify long-range goals, self-confidence, and interpersonal skills. The tutors themselves are reported as performing better than control students on subjects being taught. Serving as tutors also is reported as increasing children's self-concept, improving relationships between peers, reducing absenteeism, and improving classroom behavior. At-risk youth who tutor receive higher reading grades, higher test scores overall, fewer disciplinary referrals, and fewer absences than a comparison group.

*For more information, see*:

Duckenfield, M. The performance of at-risk youth as tutors. National Dropout Prevention Center, College of Health, Education and Human Development, Clemson University, 205 Martin Street, Clemson, SC 29634-0726. (864) 656-2599, ndpc@clemson.edu. see: www.dropoutprevention.org/effstrat/performance.htm.

Cohen, P. A., Kuklik, J. A., & Kuklik, C-L. C. (1982). Educational outcomes of tutoring: A meta analysis of findings. *American Educational Research Journal*, 237-248.

Giesecke, D., Cartledge, G., & Gardner III, R. (1993). Low-achieving students as successful cross-age tutors. *Preventing School Failure, 37*, 34-43.

Martino, L. R. (1994). Peer tutoring classes for young adolescents: A cost-effective strategy. *Middle School Journal, 25*, 55-58.