A Utilization-Focused Evaluation of a Non-Profit Literacy Tutoring Program:

A Study Anchored in Instructional Design and Performance Technology

Linda M. Wiley

B.S., Friends University, 1989

M.A., Wichita State University, 1994

Submitted to the Faculty of the School of Education of Baker University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Instructional Design and Performance Technology

Regena M. Aye

Regena M. Aye, Ed.D.
Major Advisor

Wendy A. Gentry

Wendy A. Gentry, Ph.D.

Marcus Childress

Marcus Childress, Ph.D.

Date Defended: May 7, 2024

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the instructional design of a non-profit organization's literacy tutoring program using a Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) framework (Patton & Campbell-Patton, 2022) and the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring (Robinson et al., 2021). Program data and artifacts collected between September 2020 and December 2022 were evaluated with assessment criteria from the Tutoring Quality Improvement System (TQIS) Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics developed and validated by the National Student Support Accelerator (NSSA, 2023). As explained in this study's literature review, there is wide variation in how tutoring programs are organized and implemented. No single approach to tutoring has yet been determined as the best or only way to increase literacy skills and student achievement. The non-profit literacy tutoring organization featured in this study customized the instructional design of its program to meet the distinct needs of the children it serves. Despite the afterschool, once-a-week format over six, eight, or nine weeks and without direct integration with school curricula, this study revealed that such tutoring programs can still successfully align with research-informed design principles and quality standards.

Dedication

For my grandmothers, Marjory and Jenneda

Acknowledgments

Even though writing is an activity usually completed in solitude, writing a dissertation is a group effort. I could not have completed this journey without the guidance and support of a myriad of people. My sincerest thanks to Dr. Regena Aye, Dr. Wendy Gentry, and Dr. Marcus Childress for serving on my committee and reading numerous drafts of this work. Thank you to Dr. Kayla Supon Carter and Dr. Kyunghwa Cho for their thoughtful guidance and support. Thank you to the leaders and staff of the non-profit organization featured in this study. Thank you to Dr. Carly Robinson for granting permission to use her team's research and securing permission for the rubrics that are the cornerstone of this study. I am grateful to Dr. Barbara Lockee for her early advice and guidance and Dr. Pamela Vesely for her encouragement as I neared the end of this process. I also thank Dr. Rebecca Clark-Stallkamp for her thoughtful advice and feedback. I am especially grateful to Matt Connell for his sharp wit and our Dissertation Accountability Group members – John, Maurica, Rick, and Shawn – for helping me stay on track. I have been and continue to be blessed with the support and encouragement of my husband, Hugh, my sister, Annetta, and members of our extended family.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

The challenge of improving the literacy skills of low economic and culturally diverse children is something educators, policy leaders, educational publishers, and private corporations have grappled with for decades (Chall, 1989; Gough & Hillinger, 1980; Heller, 2022; Pondiscio, 2023; Preston, 2022). When these children struggle with learning to read, the problem is often multifaceted, driven by socioeconomic status, cultural nuances, the quality and type of early reading instruction, and parent and caregiver support. Numerous studies have explored the disparities in educational resources, lack of access to quality reading materials, systemic educational system restraints, and the parent's role in teaching a child to read (Boonk et al., 2018; Jaiswal & Choudhuri, 2017; Mather et al., 2001; Moats, 1994 & 2020). While cultural diversity in the classroom provides a rich source of varied perspectives and insights, it can also contribute to a child's language acquisition challenges due to language barriers and a lack of training for teachers to address specific learning needs (Delpit, 2012; Gay, 2018). As these diverse children navigate through the early elementary years, tailored interventions are vital in closing the literacy gap (Cavanaugh et al., 2004; Dietrichson et al., 2017).

Tutoring has increasingly been recognized as a critical strategy for addressing the literacy needs of children who face reading difficulties (Kortecamp & Peters, 2023; Kraft, 2015), a serious concern in the southeastern United States, where the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading test scores have historically been low (Barshay, 2019; Grissmer et al., 2023; NCES, 2019). The versatility of tutoring programs, ranging from in-school initiatives (Miles et al., 2019; Miller, 2003) to out-of-school efforts (Lee & Hawkins, 2008; Lindo et al., 2018), some funded by federal resources and others driven by non-profit volunteers, have

attempted to meet the specific needs of children from low economic backgrounds and diverse cultural settings. Two seminal studies released in 2020 and 2021 – a comprehensive meta-analysis (Nickow et al., 2020) and the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring (Robinson et al., 2021) – highlighted the effectiveness of tutoring as an instructional intervention and provided a framework for implementing quality tutoring programs. They emphasized the need for evidence-based, structured approaches that tailor tutoring programs to the unique learning needs of students and offer a targeted response to the multifaceted challenges of literacy instruction in diverse and underserved communities.

Background

In 2010, a non-profit organization in the southeastern United States created a tutoring program to address the literacy needs of young children in their area. The organization's mission is to "improve reading skills in low-income communities by providing one-to-one literacy tutoring, free books for home libraries, and an inspiring, high-energy learning environment" (Organization's website, n.d.). The organization's vision is to "be like school, but not like school" (Organization's manual for team leaders, 2022) and "interrupt the cycle of poverty by providing opportunities for children to develop advanced literacy skills that will improve their academic performance and increase long-term career prospects" (Organization's website, n.d.). To accomplish its mission and vision, the organization offers after-school and summer literacy tutoring to help kindergarten through fifth-grade children improve their reading skills. The children in the organization's literacy tutoring program are primarily from low-economic and culturally diverse households in a three-county area. Community volunteers ranging in age from 16 to 80 serve as tutors.

The organization’s after-school and summer literacy tutoring program offers three sessions per year: Fall, Winter/Spring, and Summer. Sessions run for six, eight, or nine weeks. The tutors receive three hours of in-person training to help them prepare for tutoring children before the start of each session. Tutors meet with children once per week for approximately 90 minutes. Each session's theme connects to children’s interests, often reflecting the history of the southeast region where the program resides. Weekly meetings start with a group welcome chant or theme song. Children then meet with their assigned tutor, eat a snack, and discuss the week's theme. Tutors select a book to read with the child during a 45-minute one-on-one reading time. Tutors and children take turns reading to each other. During this time, the tutor may incorporate phonics, decoding, and reading comprehension strategies. Toward the end of the individual time, tutors help the children craft speeches about what they read or other aspects of reading that are important to them. Children deliver the speeches to the entire group. The meeting ends with a group chant, and each child chooses a free book to take home.

In April 2020, COVID-19 lockdowns forced the organization to develop a virtual tutoring model so the program could continue despite in-person meeting restrictions. In January 2021, a virtual training component for tutors housed in a centralized learning management system was added, making on-demand training accessible online. In the spring of 2021, the organization returned to in-person tutoring sessions and continued with the virtual tutoring model. The organization offered in-person tutor training and virtual training for tutors who could not attend.

Statement of the Problem

In the fall of 2022, the non-profit literacy tutoring organization was presented with an opportunity to expand the program on a broader scale. Before moving forward, their leadership wanted to know how well their program aligned with the research on quality tutoring programs

and what improvements they could implement to improve the tutors' and children's experiences. From September 2020 through December 2022, the organization collected data on reading performance, attendance, tutor training completion, and archived documents related to curriculum and training materials used by children and tutors. They agreed to have their data and archived materials examined through the lens of the ten research-based Design Principles for Effective Tutoring (Robinson et al., 2021): curriculum, focus, delivery mode, scheduling, frequency, group size, prioritization, relationships, measurement, and personnel.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the instructional design of the non-profit organization’s literacy tutoring program using a Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) framework (Patton & Campbell-Patton, 2022) and the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring evidence-based framework (Robinson et al., 2021) as evidenced through artifacts collected between September 2020 and December 2022. The study utilized assessment criteria from the Tutoring Quality Improvement System (TQIS) Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics developed and validated by the National Student Support Accelerator (NSSA, 2023).

Significance of the Study

The current research study offered a unique opportunity to understand and potentially improve upon a real-world instructional environment, a common focus in Instructional Design and Performance Technology (IDPT) research studies. The study's findings provided practical value to the non-profit tutoring organization with specific, research-informed recommendations for improving the program's instructional design. The recommendations could potentially improve tutoring effectiveness and literacy skills among low-economic and culturally diverse children if implemented by the organization. Additionally, the research findings added to the

increasing array of tutoring studies, thus offering similar organizations insights on developing and implementing effective instructional design strategies in their programs.

Delimitations

Delimitations are "boundaries set by the researcher on the purpose and scope of the study" (Lunenberg & Irby, 2008, p. 134). Two key delimitations bound this study. First, the study was delimited to one tutoring program that served a three-county area in the southeastern United States. The second delimitation was that the study reviewed the non-profit organization's documents and materials stored in their online data repository between September 2020 and December 2022. No new quantitative or qualitative data was collected.

Assumptions

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) asserted, "Assumptions are postulates, premises, and propositions that are accepted as operational for purposes of the research" (p. 135). During this study, the primary assumption was that the data collected by the non-profit organization was accurate and representative of tutoring sessions conducted between September 2020 through December 2022. A second assumption was that the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring and the TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics were valid and reliable methods of measuring the quality of tutoring programs.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

RQ1

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children incorporate research-based practices

related to the **curriculum** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ2

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children related to the **curriculum** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ3

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children incorporate research-based practices related to the **focus** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ4

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's manual for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children related to the **focus** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ5

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records incorporate research-based practices related to the **delivery mode** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ6

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records related to the **delivery mode** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ7

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **scheduling** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ8

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records related to the **scheduling** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ9

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **frequency** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ10

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records related to the **frequency** principle for effective tutoring based on

their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ11

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **group size** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ12

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's attendance records related to the **group size** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ13

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors incorporate research-based practices related to the **prioritization** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ14

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors related to the **prioritization** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ15

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials,

manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms incorporate research-based practices related to the **relationships** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ16

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms related to the **relationships** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ17

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS® assessment and development of reading prescriptions, incorporate research-based practices related to the **measurement** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ18

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS® assessment and development of reading prescriptions, related to the **measurement** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ19

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements incorporate research-based practices related to the **personnel** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ20

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements related to the **personnel** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Definitions of Terms

Roberts and Hyatt (2019) underscored the importance of providing operational definitions for terms that have a "possibility of being misunderstood" within the context of a study (p. 111). For this current study, it was essential to create operational definitions for the key terms comprising the ten Design Principles for Effective Tutoring because the researchers did not explicitly define them (Robinson et al., 2021). Instead, they described the principles in terms of what they ideally looked like in practice. Therefore, unless otherwise cited, the following definitions were constructed to provide an operational view of each principle's essence and ideal application, as inferred from the design principles researchers' descriptions. This process of redefinition follows the guidance provided by Roberts and Hyatt (2019), who recommended creating operational definitions that align with how the terms are used in the study. Creswell and

Creswell (2018) emphasized the importance of grounding definitions in research literature rather than relying on everyday language. Following this guidance ensured that each term within the current study was accurately represented and reflected in its nuanced application, thus providing clarity and coherence. The terms are introduced here in Chapter 1 to establish a foundational understanding. They are reiterated in Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5 and contextualized within the discussion of the ten design principles.

Artifact

Artifacts are defined as **"**an object that has been intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose … with the possibility that [it] has several authors who contribute to its production" (Hilpinen, 2011).

Curriculum

Curriculum within the context of effective tutoring refers to using high-quality instructional materials aligned with classroom content, enabling tutors to reinforce and support classroom instruction.

Delivery Mode

Delivery Mode in effective tutoring refers to the methods through which tutoring is administered, both in-person and virtual modalities.

Focus

Focus within effective tutoring is characterized by the adaptability of the tutoring program across grade levels and subject areas.

Formative Assessment

"Assessment is formative when its primary purpose is to inform teaching and learning" (Brookhart, 2024, p. 5).

Frequency

Frequency (also known as dosage or high-dosage) in effective tutoring is defined as the regularity of sessions, whether in person or virtual modality.

Group Size

Group Size in effective tutoring is defined as the number of children per tutor.

Measurement

Measurement in the context of effective tutoring involves using data from ongoing formative assessments to tailor instruction to the child's specific literacy needs.

Meeting

A meeting is an individual tutoring event between the tutor and the child.

Personnel

Personnel in effective tutoring considers the background of the volunteers (college students, retired teachers, etc.) and the training they receive before, during, and after tutoring children.

Prioritization

Prioritization in effective tutoring considers the population of children who received the intervention as well as why and how the choice was made to target specific groups.

Reading Prescription

A reading prescription is a document created by a member of the non-profit organization's assessment team after a child completes a DIBELS assessment. The prescription interprets the assessment results and guides the tutor and caregiver in improving the child's reading skills.

Relationships

Relationships in effective tutoring are fostered by ensuring children have a consistent tutor over time, potentially leading to positive tutor-child relationships and a deeper understanding of children's learning needs.

Scheduling

Scheduling in effective tutoring refers to the timing of the intervention, either during the school day, after-school, or summer sessions.

Session

A session refers to the length of time the non-profit literacy tutoring organization's program was offered in the spring, summer, or fall (six, eight, or nine weeks).

Tutoring

Tutoring is defined as "instruction with one-to-one human interaction" (Frey & Reigeluth, 1986, p. 2).

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 presented the contextual backdrop of the non-profit tutoring organization central to the study, articulated the problem statement, delineated the purpose, described the significance of the study, and presented the guiding research questions. Chapter 2 explores the history of tutoring, the conceptualization of tutoring as an instructional technology and intervention, research supporting the U-FE framework, and the rationalization of using artifacts as the primary means of data analysis. The chapter reviews the literature specific to the ten Design Principles for Effective Tutoring: curriculum, focus, delivery mode, scheduling, frequency, group size, prioritization, relationships, measurement, and personnel. The literature review includes research specific to the southeastern region of the United States in which the

study was conducted to frame the principles within the context of the study, such as economic factors impacting student achievement, reading instruction pedagogy, and curriculum design. Chapter 3 describes the research design and methodology employed to conduct the current study and how the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring and TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics guided the evaluative criteria. Additionally, Chapter 3 details the data collection and analysis procedures and the limitations of the study. Chapter 4 presents the findings and recommendations from the data and artifact analysis exploring how the instructional design of the non-profit organization's literacy tutoring program aligns with the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring according to the TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics. Chapter 5 synthesizes the key findings and implications for action in the form of practical strategies to guide increased effectiveness and improvements for the instructional design of the non-profit organization's literacy tutoring program. Finally, Chapter 5 outlines recommendations for future research to support the continuous improvement of instructional design practices within the tutoring field.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Chapter 2 begins with a historical perspective on the evolution of tutoring. The chapter presents the conceptual and theoretical frameworks that support the study's design and explores the foundational research on the ten principles that guide effective tutoring programs, as identified in the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring (Robinson et al., 2021). The design principles provided a structure for assessing the instructional design practices of the non-profit organization's literacy tutoring program. When relevant, the review includes research that directly informed the instructional design of the organization's literacy tutoring program. Examining the research supporting the ten design principles and the research that influenced the development of the organization's literacy tutoring program is essential to understanding the alignment and efficacy of the organization's practices within the broader context of educational theory and research-informed instructional design strategies and practices.

Historical Perspective

The word tutor is derived from the Latin term *tueri*, meaning "one who protects, guards, and cares for," emphasizing a personal relationship between tutor and student (Rapoport et al., 1989, p. 16). The practice of tutoring has evolved through the ages. Ancient tutoring (356–323 BCE) focused on the elite who were gifted or privileged enough to receive a private education. Aristotle tutored Alexander the Great and taught him rhetoric, philosophy, and sciences (Tierney, 1942). In the Middle Ages (476–1453 AD), tutoring in monastic settings combined religious studies with classical education (Cordasco, 1976). The Renaissance period (14th–17th centuries) revived private tutoring for the European aristocracy, focusing on a curriculum that included politics, arts, sciences, and languages (Gordon & Gordon, 1990). Societal changes during the

Industrial Revolution (1760s–1840s) paved the way for a more democratized educational system, and accessible education for all social classes gradually led to more inclusive educational systems, no longer just for the elite (Mokyr, 2018). In the 20th and 21st centuries, tutoring was increasingly used to address educational disparities (Nelson-Royes, 2015), and in- and after-school literacy tutoring programs offered remedial and enrichment opportunities addressing diverse learning needs and promoting literacy development across various socio-economic groups (Gordon et al., 2007; Nickow et al., 2024).

Digital advances that emerged in the late 1990s and early 2000s helped fuel the growth of online learning and allowed students to receive support regardless of location (Harasim, 2000; Wicks, 2010). The global pivot to online learning during COVID-19 increased awareness and use of online tutoring to bolster student learning gains (Beach et al., 2021; Devers et al., 2020; Semingson et al., 2020). In July 2022, the U.S. government launched the National Partnership for Student Success (NPSS), a comprehensive three-year, $122 billion initiative aimed to improve student learning outcomes through high-quality tutoring, along with expanded learning opportunities through extensive summer learning and after-school programs (The White House, 2022). As tutoring methods have continuously adapted to meet the evolving needs of society, these historical developments highlight the enduring significance of tutoring in fostering student success.

Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks

Conceptual and theoretical frameworks are the "lens through which your research problem is viewed" (Roberts & Hyatt, 2019, p. 105). Theory "becomes a transformative perspective that shapes the types of questions asked, informs how data are collected and analyzed, and provides a call for action or change" (Creswell & Cresswell, 2018, p. 49). More

simply, “a conceptual framework is an argument about why the topic one wishes to study matters, and why the means proposed to study it are appropriate and rigorous” (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017, p. 5). The concept of tutoring as a form of instructional technology, the Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) framework, the rationalization for the use of artifacts as the primary means of data analysis, and the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring provided the necessary focus for defining the research problem, limiting the study's scope, and determining the structure for this literature review.

Conceptualizing Tutoring as a Form of Instructional Technology

Richey et al. (2001) defined the field of Instructional Design and Performance Technology (IDPT) as "the science and art of creating detailed specifications for the development, evaluation, and maintenance of situations which facilitate learning and performance" (p. 3). In 2019, a team of researchers defined tutoring as "one-on-one or small-group instructional programs" and conceptualized tutoring as "a form of education technology for improving student efficiency" (Nickow et al., 2020, p. 1). The systematic review and meta-analysis of 96 studies indicated that one-on-tutoring can have transformational power and versatility like no other intervention model or program. Tutoring is situated within the realm of IDPT because it facilitates learning and performance through a personalized approach and offers a means for the practical and impactful application of instructional design principles.

Rationale for the Use of the Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) Framework

Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) is "a comprehensive decision framework for designing and implementing an evaluation to fit a particular situation" that "aims to support effective action and engaged deliberation" (Patton & Campbell-Patton, 2022, p. 5). The inquiry framework includes U-FE questions to address the who, why, what, where, when, and how of the

program seeking change. In 2001, Stufflebeam (2001) conducted an independent review of 22 evaluation models and identified U-FE as one of nine that was the "strongest and most promising for continued use and development" (p. 80). The U-FE model has been the foundation for numerous doctoral dissertations in education and IDPT programs (Nelson, 2008; Powers, 2013; Quinlan, 2019) and research in various fields of study (Dobbins et al., 2020; Ramirez et al., 2022; Zamberg et al., 2020).

Rationale for the Use of the Artifacts as the Primary Means of Data Analysis

A typical Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) gathers data from multiple sources and methods, such as artifact reviews, interviews, and observations. This triangulation of data allows the researcher to construct a comprehensive understanding of an organization or program and guard against the accusation that a study's findings rely only on a single method, source, or researcher bias (Patton, 1990). Consistent with the triangulation approach, the TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics (NSSA, 2023) used as the evaluation criteria in this current study recommended reviewing three relevant evidence sources – artifacts, interviews, and observations. The rubrics provided "evidence look fors" to determine the level of alignment between these sources and the quality standards.

By design, the current study relied exclusively on artifact analysis to evaluate the non-profit literacy tutoring program's alignment with the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring as measured by the TQIS rubric's quality standards. For this current study, artifacts are defined as "an object that has been intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose … with the possibility that [it] has several authors who contribute to its production" (Hilpinen, 2011). Artifact analysis (also referred to as document analysis) "can help the researcher uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the research problem"

(Merriam, 1998, p. 118). Morgan (2022) asserted that document analysis is an underutilized approach "that allows researchers to have access to data that would otherwise take enormous effort and time to collect" (p. 67). Scott (1990) recommended assessing document sources through the lenses of authenticity (soundness and authorship), credibility (sincerity and accuracy), representativeness (survival and availability), and meaning (literal and interpretive understanding). Bowen (2009) advised researchers to review documents with a "critical eye" and not assume them to be "precise, accurate, or complete recordings of events that have occurred" (p. 33).

In Instructional Design and Performance Technology (IDPT) and Human Performance Technology (HPT), document analysis closely relates to content analysis and information management/governance. The International Society for Performance Improvement's HPT model integrates content analysis within four phases: performance analysis, cause analysis, intervention selection and design, and evaluation (Gilmore, 2006). In this context, document analysis allows researchers to review "information to make inferences about the past and current organizational and employee performance (Pershing, 2002, p. 36). Silber and Kearney (2006) suggested that human performance technology (HPT) practitioners learn about organizations by reviewing existing documentation to "understand their client's most pressing problems" and "make recommendations that address their key goals and objectives" (p. 56). ARMA International's Generally Accepted Recordkeeping Principles (2017) identified eight hallmarks of best practices for information governance, including accountability, transparency, integrity, protection, compliance, availability, retention, and disposition. Regarding accountability, they recommended that "a senior executive (or person of comparable authority) [should] oversee the information governance program" (p. 1).

In the case of the non-profit literacy tutoring organization in this current study, there was significant turnover in staff, with only a few remaining individuals having first-hand experience with the program from September 2020 to December 2022. This lack of staff continuity made gathering reliable first-hand information through interviews and observations difficult. The strategic choice to focus solely on artifact analysis was consistent with the U-FE framework and IDPT and HPT tenets because it ensured the current study was grounded in concrete evidence from the organization's archived documentation and allowed the findings and recommendations to provide insights into the quality of the tutoring program's instructional design practices, as well as suggesting pathways for improvements.

Rationale for the Use of the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring

In 2021, the EdResearch for Recovery Project created an evidenced-based framework of Design Principles for Effective Tutoring (Robinson et al.). The framework defined ten principles (characteristics and conditions) for evaluating tutoring models and programs: curriculum, focus, delivery mode, scheduling, frequency, group size, prioritization, relationships, measurement, and personnel. The non-profit tutoring organization possessed data and materials pertaining to each principle. This current study specifically examined how well the instructional design of the non-profit organization's literacy tutoring program artifacts incorporated the ten research-based principles outlined in the framework and used assessment criteria from the TQIS Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics (NSSA, 2023) to make recommendations for improvement.

Design Principle for Effective Tutoring: Curriculum

This study defines curriculum as the instructional materials used in a tutoring program to teach and reinforce literacy skills. The Design Principles for Effective Tutoring emphasize the importance of using high-quality instructional materials that align with classroom content

(Zimmer et al., 2010). The underlying rationale is that students will likely benefit more when tutoring sessions connect to their classroom grade-level instruction and not isolated learning instances. This alignment is crucial for reinforcing and supporting children's instruction during school. (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

Foundational Skills and Content Connection

Traditional remediation models often use simpler, previous grade-level materials to teach or re-teach missed skills in isolation. Research has found such remediation counterproductive, resulting in students falling further behind in their grade-level material (Dorn et al., 2020; Fryer & Howard-Noveck, 2020). Instead, a more effective strategy involves teaching missed foundational concepts and skills within the context of the content students are learning in class (Cohen et al., 1982; Gordon, 2009; Wasik & Slavin, 1993). With this approach, tutors play a significant role in helping struggling students catch up, alleviating some of the instructional pressure on classroom teachers by allowing them to maintain the pace of their instruction (Gibbs, n.d.).

The Phonemic Awareness, Phonics Instruction, and the Science of Reading

In 2000, the National Reading Panel (NRP) examined research on how children learned to read (Shriver, 2000). Their seminal report indicated that explicit instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension increased the likelihood of developing a child's reading ability. This assertion caused great debate among educational literacy experts, especially those who believed in using whole-language instructional models (Heller, 2022; Preston, 2022; Strauss, 2023). A 2022 meta-analysis further reinforced the effectiveness of phonemic awareness (PA) instruction, demonstrating its moderate effectiveness in improving PA outcomes for preschool through first-grade students (Rice et al.). This study

highlighted PA instructional strategies' versatility and broad applicability by showing that various instructors, including teachers, computer programs, and parents, are equally effective in teaching PA skills to at-risk and low-risk students. In the years since, educational policymakers, teacher education programs, and curriculum creators have emphasized using a scientific approach to reading instruction, often called the "science of reading" (Seidenberg, 2018), which includes direct instruction in PA and phonics.

Research Supporting the Non-Profit Organization's Literacy Tutoring Curriculum

The National Institute for Literacy asserted that "the road to becoming a reader begins the day a child is born and continues through third grade" (Armbruster et al., 2006, p. 1). The non-profit organization concurs with this view and has firmly grounded its curriculum in research focusing on increasing the literacy skills of low-economic and disadvantaged children of color. In contrast to the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring's recommendations for directly and intentionally connecting to classroom instruction, the non-profit organization in this study developed a free-standing curriculum that reflects the history of the southeast region of the United States where the program resides and aims to acknowledge the cultural realities that influence the lives of the children it serves (Non-profit organization's Executive Director personal communication, February 23, 2023).

Specifically, the organization references the work of Gloria Ladson-Billings, Geneva Gay, and Lisa Delpit. Ladson-Billings (1995) introduced the grounded theory of "culturally relevant pedagogy," which must meet three criteria: "an ability to develop students academically, a willingness to nurture and support cultural competence, and the development of a sociopolitical or critical consensus" (p. 483). Gay (2018) defined culturally responsive teaching as "using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically

diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant for them" (p. 36). Delpit's research (2012) explored the challenges children of color face in public schools and defined ten factors that foster excellence in urban classrooms. Among them, "recognize and build on children's strengths" and "honor and respect the children's home cultures" (p. xxi) are central to the design of the non-profit organization's literacy tutoring curriculum. The research of Ladson-Billings, Gay, and Delpit is infused into the curriculum manuals designed for each session and the training each tutor receives.

Design Principle for Effective Tutoring: Focus

The design principle of focus in tutoring highlights the effectiveness of tutoring across various grade levels, particularly emphasizing reading-focused tutoring for early grades. The substantial body of research studying early-grade literacy interventions is noteworthy. Among the 203 studies reviewed by the EdResearch for Recovery Project about the effects of tutoring programs on student learning, a significant majority (148 studies) assessed the impact on literacy development, primarily in elementary grades (Robinson & Loeb, 2021). This extensive research reinforces the effectiveness of reading-focused tutoring interventions, particularly for kindergarten and first graders (Cortes et al., 2023). Research on early literacy development indicates that foundational reading skills acquired in the initial years of schooling are crucial for a student's long-term academic success (Chall, 1989; Gough & Hillinger, 1980; Moats, 1994 & 2020; Petscher et al., 2020).

Design Principle for Effective Tutoring: Delivery Mode

The concept of delivery mode in tutoring programs, as described by the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring, includes in-person and online modalities. Historically, the bulk of research in this area has centered on in-person tutoring, recognized for its direct, hands-on

approach and personal interaction between tutors and students (Bayless et al., 2018; Elbaum et al., 2000; Shanahan, 1998; Wasik & Slavin, 1993). Evidence suggests that online, virtual tutoring can also be highly effective (Carlana & La Ferrara, 2021; Diaz, 2022; Gortazar et al., 2024; Hewitt, 2022). This emerging trend is particularly relevant given the recent COVID-19 pandemic and the increasing need for flexible learning environments (Brown, 2022; Carbonari et al., 2022; Golden, 2020). Virtual tutoring presents an opportunity for a more tailored matching process between students' specific needs and tutors' skill sets due to the expanded pool of tutors made available through online platforms, transcending geographical limitations (Sawchuk, 2022). Additionally, virtual tutoring can decrease overall program costs by offering flexibility in scheduling and reducing the need for "brick and mortar" facilities (Kraft et al., 2022).

Design Principle for Effective Tutoring: Scheduling

Scheduling refers to the time of day during which the tutoring occurs. Research supporting this design principle indicates tutoring interventions conducted during the school day have greater effectiveness. A meta-analysis found that these programs yielded approximately twice the learning gains of those conducted after school or during the summer (Nickow et al., 2020). Studies have indicated that scheduling tutoring sessions during the school day increases the likelihood of consistent student attendance, a factor in the effectiveness of educational programs (Elbaum et al., 2000; Ritter et al., 2009). Evidence suggests that tutoring programs operated outside of the school day by independent providers often face challenges such as poor attendance and a disconnect from a student's regular school experiences (Heinrich & Nisar, 2012; Heinrich et al., 2014). However, after-school programs can achieve positive academic gains if they establish clear goals learning goals and implement their tutoring models with fidelity (McCombs et al., 2017; NSSA, n.d.).

Design Principle for Effective Tutoring: Frequency

The design principle of frequency, also known as dosage or high-dosage, refers to the program's duration: the number of times per week and the number of minutes per session. Research suggests that high-dosage tutoring, typically involving three or more weekly sessions lasting about 30-60 minutes, yields substantial learning gains (Fryer & Howard-Noveck, 2020; Kortecamp & Peters, 2023; Nickow et al., 2020; U.S. Department of Education, 2021). This intensity allows for sustained engagement and repeated reinforcement of learning concepts, which cement knowledge and skills (Education Trust, 2021; Kraft, 2015). The most effective tutoring programs extend beyond ten weeks, usually spanning an entire school year, providing consistent and cumulative learning experiences and allowing students to build skills and comprehension (Hall & Burns, 2018). For younger students, particularly in elementary grades, shorter but more frequent sessions (e.g., 20 minutes, five times a week) can be beneficial because they accommodate developmental needs and attention spans (Gersten et al., 2020). Some studies have shown that once-a-week tutoring sessions are generally insufficient for generating meaningful educational gains because they do not provide the same level of continuity and reinforcement that more frequent sessions offer (Kortecamp & Peters, 2023), while others have shown that if the program focused on specific skills and strategies, gains were possible (Allen, 2015).

Vacation Academies

The Design Principles for Effective Tutoring specifically identify vacation academies as a tutoring strategy. Vacation academies typically operate as intensive, week-long programs focusing on a single subject in small groups, often during school breaks (Schueler et al., 2017). These programs have shown positive results, mainly when led by teachers who are experts in

developing students' literacy skills (Fashola, 1998; Guryan et al., 2023; Lauer et al., 2006). The key to maximizing the impact lies in the quality of instruction and the strategic design of the curriculum to make the most of the limited time available, ensuring each session delivers educational value to the students (Schueler, 2020b).

Design Principle for Effective Tutoring: Group Size

The design principle of group size in tutoring refers to the number of students tutors work with during an individual tutoring session. While tutoring does not necessarily have to be one-on-one, its effectiveness decreases as the group size increases beyond four students (Elbaum et al., 2000; King & Homan, 2003; Neitzel et al., 2021; Nickow et al., 2020). The Match Corps/Saga Education model of pairing one tutor with two students has improved student learning outcomes (Ander et al., 2016) and suggests that small group tutoring can be practical and cost-efficient when properly structured and implemented. Grouping students by skill level or language learner status can enhance the effectiveness of the tutoring session, allowing for more tailored instruction to address the specific needs of each group (Baker et al., 2000; Hock et al., 2001; Ritter et al., 2009).

The Positive Impact of One-on-One Tutoring

Despite the effectiveness of small group tutoring, one-on-one tutoring remains the most impactful approach, as indicated by the 2-Sigma Effect study (Bloom, 1984) based on the research of two of Benjamin Bloom's students (Anania, 1982; Burke, 1983). Their studies combined to demonstrate that when "using the standard deviation (sigma) of the control (conventional) class, it was typically found that the average student under tutoring was about two standard deviations above the average of the control class" (Bloom, 1984, p. 4). While this finding was significant, the 'problem' was that it was cost-prohibitive for schools to provide one-

on-one in-person instruction. In the ensuing decades, researchers have continued to study tutoring from various perspectives, with most concurring that one-on-one tutoring provides the greatest opportunity to target instruction for the specific needs of the child and increase academic achievement (Cohen et al., 1982; Juel, 1996; Lane et al., 2009; Wasik & Slavin, 1993).

Design Principle for Effective Tutoring: Prioritization

In this study, prioritization refers to an organization's philosophy about which children to serve and the strategies used to recruit and retain them. The design principle of prioritization addresses these critical decisions and acknowledges the benefits and challenges of different recruitment approaches. The prioritization process for non-profit organizations, particularly in the context of tutoring programs, is a complex and multifaceted task heavily influenced by available resources. Given that resources such as personnel, financial support, and suitable locations are often limited, organizations must make strategic decisions about whom they can effectively serve. Allison and Kaye (2003) recommended carefully evaluating the organization's capacity versus the needs of the community it aims to serve. Phills (2005) asserted that these are questions of logic – psychological, emotional, and economic – and answers should align the organization's mission and goals with its practical capabilities, ensuring the utilization of resources in the most effective and impactful way (De Vita et al., 2001).

In tutoring, prioritization is not just about selecting students based on their academic needs but must also consider the organization's ability to provide high-quality, sustainable services. Programs that focus specifically on lower-performing students provide necessary personalized instruction to those who need it most but risk creating a stigma where tutoring is perceived negatively, almost as a form of punishment (Drozd & Zembrzuska, 2013). Vacation academies positioned as a "special opportunity" rather than remediation can lead to high student

engagement (Schueler, 2020a). This approach, coupled with incentives like student prizes, recreational activities, and free books, can make the tutoring experience more appealing and productive (Morrow et al., 2017).

Design Principle for Effective Tutoring: Relationships

The design principle of relationships emphasizes the importance of consistent tutor-student pairings over time to foster positive relationships and a deeper understanding of a student's learning needs. This principle recommends stable tutor-student pairings throughout the program because they foster effective learning environments (Rothman & Henderson, 2011). Regular interactions between the tutor and student help identify the student's learning needs (Kraft et al., 2022). This consistency creates a space for students to feel understood and supported, enhancing their learning experience. Like the positive dynamics in teacher-student relationships, strong tutor-student relationships often correlate with improved academic, social, and motivational outcomes (Cortes et al., 2023). Positive, supportive relationships can foster a student's love for learning and improve their overall school experience, especially for those who may have previously struggled or felt disengaged in traditional educational settings (Raby, 2020).

Design Principle for Effective Tutoring: Measurement

In the context of this study, measurement is any assessment data the tutor uses to tailor instructional decisions based on an individual child's needs. As a design principle, measurement emphasizes the importance of using formal and informal (formative) assessments to tailor instruction (Morrow et al., 2017; Roe & Vukelich, 2001). Brookhart (2024) asserted that "assessment is formative when its primary purpose is to inform teaching and learning" (p. 5). Frequent formative assessments provide vital insights into student progress (Popham, 2008),

allowing tutors to customize their instruction in real time to address specific learning gaps or challenges (Invernizzi & Ouellette, 2001).

Assessment Options

Programs similar to the non-profit organization in this study administered individual reading assessments, most commonly the DIBELS: Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (Al Otaiba, 2005; Lindo et al., 2018; Nichols et al., 2018; Roehrig et al., 2008) and the TOWRE: Test of Word Reading Efficiency (Allor & McCathren, 2004; Erickson et al., 2023). Larger scale program evaluations administered sections of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (Ritter, 2009) and Woodcock Johnson Reading Mastery Test (Baker et al., 2006; Jenkins et al., 2004). Most programs used trained teachers or assessment experts to administer the tests. Researchers recommend that tutoring programs intentionally administer assessments, use the data to tailor instruction, and provide feedback to tutors to improve their teaching skills (Roe & Vukelich, 2001; Sheldon et al., 2010).

Design Principle for Effective Tutoring: Personnel

In this current study, personnel refers to the adults who tutor children. Peer-to-peer tutoring and computer-based tutoring (intelligent tutoring systems) are outside the study's scope. This design principle considers not only who the tutors are (their age and background) but also the type of training they receive before, during, and after tutoring children.

Diverse Tutors and Adequate Training

Inherent in the personnel design principle is acknowledging the distinct skills required for effective tutoring, which can differ from those needed for classroom teaching. Volunteer programs tend to recruit individuals with varying experience working with children and teaching literacy skills. Studies have shown a wide range of individuals, including college students (Allor

& McCatheren, 2004; Fitzgerald, 2001), pre-service teachers (Al Otaiba, 2005; Falk-Ross et al., 2017; Juel, 1996), AmeriCorps workers (Allen & Chavkin, 2004; Markovitz et al., 2014), working professionals (Guryan et al., 2023), and retirees (Wasik, 1998) can serve as successful tutors, provided they receive adequate training and ongoing support. Studies support the intentional recruitment of a diverse group of tutors who reflect the racial and ethnic backgrounds of the children they serve to promote inclusivity and provide children with role models they can identify with and relate to on a cultural level (Gershenson et al., 2022; Rodgers & Rodgers, 2023). Successful programs often involve intensive training, sometimes extending over weeks, and continuous support throughout the program (Invernizzi & Ouellette, 2001; Kitano & Lewis, 2007). This support includes access to structured materials and a well-defined curriculum (Sawchuk, 2022). While it is outside this study's scope, it is important to note the evidence suggesting tutoring programs that employ school-based coordinators to facilitate connections between tutors and the children's classroom teachers may achieve greater success (Heinrich et al., 2014).

Summary

Chapter 2's literature review explored the history of tutoring and the conceptual and theoretical frameworks supporting the study's design. Then, the review explored the foundational research regarding the ten principles of effective tutoring outlined in the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring within the context of its significance and application in tutoring programs. Additionally, research by educational scholars like Ladson-Billings, Gay, and Delpit provided additional context for understanding the instructional design methodology and strategies supporting the non-profit literacy tutoring organization’s curriculum.

Chapter 3

Methods

The purpose of the current study was to evaluate the instructional design practices of a non-profit organization's literacy tutoring program based in the southeastern United States using the Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) framework and evidence-based Design Principles for Effective Tutoring (Robinson et al., 2021) as its foundation. The study reviewed the organization’s literacy tutoring program data and artifacts from September 2020 to December 2022. The researcher aligned the tutoring program’s artifacts with the ten design principles and evaluated them against the validated assessment standards from the Tutoring Quality Improvement System (TQIS) Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics (NSSA, 2023).

Research Design

The current study employed a qualitative research approach, integrating the Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) framework (Patton & Campbell-Patton, 2022) to guide the systematic evaluation of a non-profit literacy tutoring organization's archived artifacts from September 2020 to December 2022. The U-FE research approach was chosen for its efficacy in investigating phenomena within their real-life context. This methodology enabled the researcher to critically evaluate the alignment of the literacy tutoring program's archived documentation with the research-informed Design Principles for Effective Tutoring as measured by criteria from the Tutoring Quality Improvement System’s (TQIS) Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics (NSSA, 2023). This approach was particularly suited for addressing the "why" and "how" questions central to the non-profit organization’s literacy tutoring program, allowing for an analysis of specific instructional design practices within the specified timeframe. The study's design allowed the researcher to capture the nuances and complexities inherent in instructional

design and performance technology (IDPT) as applied within the tutoring program and make recommendations for improving the experience for tutors and children based on the findings.

Setting

The study was situated within the operational context of a non-profit literacy tutoring program serving a socioeconomically and culturally diverse population of children in a three-county area in the southeastern United States. From September 2020 through December 2022, the program navigated a range of instructional formats, shifting from traditional in-person sessions to virtual platforms in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. During this time, the researcher provided technical support to the organization by creating a cloud-based learning management system that allowed the organization to train its volunteer tutors in a virtual environment. Understanding this dynamic environment was crucial for assessing the program's adherence to practical tutoring instructional design principles and its ability to adapt during a time of considerable educational transformation.

Sampling Procedures

Given the study's focus on the literacy tutoring program’s historical data and artifacts, traditional sampling procedures were not applicable. Instead, the study reviewed available data and artifacts relevant to the tutoring program's operations between September 2020 and December 2022. The participants in this study were the tutors and children whose data was collected between September 2020 and December 2022 and shared with the researcher. No new data was collected, and the researcher did not contact the tutors or children directly.

Instruments

The instruments for this study were the organization's existing literacy tutoring program data and artifact compilations, the ten Design Principles for Effective Tutoring, and the validated

standards rubrics from the Tutoring Quality Improvement System (TQIS). The Design Principles for Effective Tutoring (Robinson et al., 2021) include ten principles: curriculum, focus, delivery mode, scheduling, frequency, group size, prioritization, relationships, measurement, and personnel.

TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics

The TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics were designed by an advisory group of researchers and practitioners affiliated with Stanford University's National Student Support Accelerator (NSSA, 2023). These rubrics are frequently updated to reflect new information gathered from the field. With NSSA's permission, the researcher used the December 2023 rubrics as the evaluation tool for this study. The rubrics contain two key components: Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard and Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating). The rubrics "determine the level of alignment between the tutoring program's current practices and TQIS Standard" for these six elements: Tutor, Data Use, Instruction, Learning Integration, Safety, and Cohesion. Each element is divided into sub-elements. Element 1: Tutor considers tutor recruitment (1a), tutor pre-service training (1b), and tutor coaching and feedback (1c). Element 2: Data Use considers program effectiveness (2a), formative assessment (2b), and student progress measure (2c). Element 3: Instruction considers student grouping (3a), tutor consistency (3b), student-tutor relationship (3c), high-quality instructional materials (3d), lessons routines and structures (3e), instructional practices (3f), dosage (3g), and ratio (3h). Element 4: Learning Integration considers setting (4a), integration with school schedule (4b), curricular alignment (4c), school and teacher engagement (4d), caregiver agreement (4e), student enrollment and retention (4f). Element 5: Safety considers safety protocols (5a). Element 6: Cohesion considers program design (6a), leader role clarity (6b), leader professional

development (6c), and organizational culture (6d). Each sub-element has a specific, articulated quality standard and a list of relevant evidence sources (artifact reviews, interviews, and observations) the researcher may review when considering the degree of alignment with the quality standard. Quality Standards have five rating categories: fully aligned to the quality standard, mostly aligned to the quality standard, partially aligned to the quality standard, not yet aligned to the quality standard, and insufficient evidence. Each quality standard includes a set of Evidence Look Fors with criteria for determining the degree to which the artifacts, interviews, and observations align with the quality standard ratings: fully aligned to the quality standard, mostly aligned to the quality standard, partially aligned to the quality standard, not yet aligned to the quality standard, or insufficient evidence for evaluation.

Data Collection Procedures

On August 17, 2023, the non-profit organization's executive director signed a letter granting the researcher permission to access and analyze data and program materials from their archives for this current study. The letter expressly stated that the organization wished to remain anonymous in all documentation and doctoral publications resulting from this research. The letter is included in Appendix A in a redacted format to honor the organization's request for anonymity. An application to conduct this current research study was submitted to Baker University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) on March 27, 2024. The IRB approved the researcher's request on March 28, 2024. The application is included in Appendix B. The researcher completed Baker University's required IRB Human Research Protection Foundational Training (OHRP, 2023) on March 8, 2024.

Over several months, the non-profit organization's leadership team met with the researcher to determine what data and documents would be pertinent to the study from the

specified time frame. The organization provided the researcher access to data and artifacts in their centralized data repository. A spreadsheet was created with links to folders containing data and documentation pertinent to the study.

Description of the Non-Profit Literacy Tutoring Organization's Data Repository

The non-profit literacy tutoring organization housed its data in a centralized, online repository. The organization's leadership, staff, and selected site leaders had access to the repository. Leaders and staff had unique repositories tied to their individual profiles, which only they could access. For this current study, the researcher examined files from the organization's centralized repository. The top level of the central repository contained folders organized by topic (i.e., Summer 2022, Assessment Team Tools, Manuals, etc.) and over 75 individual files. Within the folders were subfolders and other associated materials. The repository contained a search feature that enabled users to search by keyword. Filters allowed users to refine the search by document type, people (document author), and modification date. The non-profit organization provided the researcher with a list of folders they believed would be pertinent to the study. Additionally, a spreadsheet was created for children with multiple DIBELS assessment data points between September 2020 and December 2022. Besides this guidance, the researcher conducted the review with minimal assistance from the non-profit organization's leadership team.

Description of Artifacts: Manuals, Study Guides, and Reading Prescriptions

The first four research questions analyzed the instructional design of three primary artifacts: manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children. Because of their foundational importance, they are explained in detail here to provide background and context. The non-profit literacy tutoring organization designed and produced its own manuals

used by team leaders and tutors and study guides used by tutors with children. A search of the organization's data repository for archived manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children from Fall 2020 through 2022 revealed these artifacts:

2019–2020

- Manual for team leaders
- Manual for tutors

2022

- Manual for team leaders
- Study guide for children–Spring 2022
- Study guide for children–Summer 2022
- Study guide for children–Fall 2022

Manuals for Team Leaders. Manuals for team leaders were designed to help organize and run a tutoring site. The researcher reviewed the 2019–2020 and 2022 versions of these manuals. They began with a greeting from the organization's Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and a list of contact information for staff and board members. The mission statement section included answers to questions about improving reading skills and the importance of serving children in low-income communities. Most notable in this section was that the program "should be like school, but not like school" and strive to be an inspiring, high-energy learning environment. The manuals covered necessary equipment, registration requirements (including ensuring parents sign forms), recruitment, and guidelines for securing and sharing registration forms with the organization's leadership. Information on how to set up and maintain on-site libraries, how to help tutors determine a child's independent, instructional, and frustration reading (Lexile) levels, and books according to Lexile level were also included. Procedures were outlined for conducting

snack time, the final meeting celebration day, permission slips for external field trips, and monthly expense reports. Expectations for evaluating tutors and observation forms with “look for” criteria were included. The manuals explained leadership certification requirements and the leadership team's criteria for evaluating the site during unannounced visits. The final pages explained fire safety plans and gift card policies. The final section of the 2019 manual explained how to take attendance and access the master files in the organization’s online data repository. In the 2022 manual, the attendance section appeared toward the beginning and included job descriptions for Team Leaders.

Manuals for Tutors. Manuals for tutors were designed to be used during in-person tutor training and referenced during tutoring sessions. The researcher reviewed the 2019–2020 version. The manual began with the non-profit literacy tutoring organization’s mission and copyright statements. Contact information for staff and board members included titles, email addresses, and phone numbers. The admission policy clearly stated that each site location was limited to 20 children, grades K–5. Previous participants were accepted first. Others were accepted on a first-application, first-acceptance basis, and waiting lists were maintained. The manual outlined the organization’s purpose and what was provided to children during tutoring (one trained tutor, a nutritious snack, a free book, etc.). The program’s rules were explained. Noteworthy here was the statement that parents were expected to transport their children to and from the tutoring location. Guidelines for tutoring provided expectations for training before the first meeting. A lesson plan included specific times for activities during the 90-minute session. Tutor tips such as reader response questions, getting to know the child’s interests, and contacting the parent at least once during the session were provided. Notable here was the suggestion of

keeping a record of all books read, dates, total pages, likes, and dislikes. The manual ended with tips for supporting the organization through fundraising and fire safety rules.

Study Guides for Children. Study guides for children were designed to be the guiding curriculum all sites followed during tutoring sessions. The researcher reviewed the spring, summer, and fall 2022 versions of these study guides. Themes were chosen, and the non-profit organization's leadership team developed activities. The themes during these sessions focused on social-emotional development, developing financial literacy skills, learning about world geography through famous locations, and college and career readiness. Each study guide followed a predictable design, which included the weekly meeting outline, descriptions of emergent, beginning, and fluent readers, and song lyrics specific to the session's theme. Interest inventories captured the children's likes and dislikes. Next, one page was designed for each week of the session. These pages provided goal-setting tips, suggested reading goals for each grade level, and reminders to take home a free book. These pages ended with a section for children to plan what they would say during the weekly speech toward the end of the meeting. Some study guides contained examples of how to write letters and a chart for keeping a reading list. Children took the study guide home at the end of the tutoring session.

Reading Prescriptions. RQs 17 and 18 considered the effectiveness of the instructional design of the tutoring program's assessment practices, including administering the DIBELS assessment (University of Oregon, 2018) and developing reading prescriptions. Reading prescriptions were documents created by a member of the non-profit organization's assessment team for each child after the administration of the DIBELS assessment. The prescriptions were designed to interpret the assessment results and provide the tutor and caregiver with strategies for helping improve a child's reading skills.

Data Analysis and Synthesis

After an initial review of the organization's archived data and documentation, the researcher aligned the artifacts to each design principle and the corresponding TQIS criteria in the validated Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics. For RQs 1 and 2, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children were aligned to the Curriculum Principle and TQIS Rubric Elements 3d: High-quality Instructional Materials; 3e: Lessons Routines and Structures, and 3f: Instructional Practices. For RQs 3 and 4, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children were aligned to the Focus Principle and TQIS Rubric Element 6a: Program Design. For RQs 5 and 6, session records were aligned to the Delivery Mode Principle and TQIS Rubric Element 4a: Setting. For RQs 7 and 8, session and attendance records were aligned to the Scheduling Principle and TQIS Rubric Element 4a: Setting. For RQs 9 and 10, session and attendance records were aligned to the Frequency Principle and TQIS Rubric Element 3g: Dosage. For RQs 11 and 12, attendance records were aligned to the Group Size Principle and TQIS Rubric Element 3h: Ratio. For RQs 13 and 14, session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors were aligned to the Prioritization Principle and TQIS Rubric Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention. For RQs 15 and 16, session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreements forms were aligned with the Relationships Principle and TQIS Elements 3b: Tutor Consistency, 3c: Student-Tutor Relationships, and 4e: Caregiver Engagement. For RQs 17 and 18, the non-profit organization’s assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS assessment and development of reading prescriptions, were aligned to the Measurement Principle and TQIS Rubric Elements 2b: Formative Assessment and 2c: Student Progress Measure. For RQs 19 and 20, job

descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organizational charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements were aligned to the Personnel Principle and TQIS Rubric Elements 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection, 1b: Pre-service Training, 6b: Leader Role Clarity, and 6d: Organizational Culture. These alignments are represented in Table 1.

Table 1

Alignment of RQs with Artifacts, Design Principles, and TQIS Rubric Criteria

RQ	Organization's Artifacts	Design Principle	TQIS Rubric's Criteria
RQ1 RQ2	Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors Study Guides for Children	Curriculum	Element 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials Element 3e: Lessons Routines and Structures Element 3f: Instructional Practices
RQ3 RQ4	Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors Study Guides for Children	Focus	Element 6a: Program Design
RQ5 RQ6	Session Records	Delivery Mode	Element 4a: Setting
RQ7 RQ8	Session Records Attendance Records	Scheduling	Element 4a: Setting
RQ9 RQ10	Session Records Attendance Records	Frequency	Element 3g: Dosage
RQ11 RQ12	Attendance Records	Group Size	Element 3h: Ratio
RQ13 RQ14	Session Records Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors	Prioritization	Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention
RQ15 RQ16	Session Records Attendance Records Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors	Relationships	Element 3b: Tutor Consistency Element 3c: Student-Tutor Relationships Element 4e: Caregiver Engagement

	Tutor Training Materials Manuals for Parents/ Guardians Caregiver Agreement Forms		
RQ17 RQ18	Assessment Practices including DIBELS Administration Reading Prescriptions	Measurement	Element 2b: Formative Assessment Element 2c: Student Progress Measure
RQ19 RQ20	Job Descriptions Manuals for Tutors Tutor Training Materials Organization Charts Manuals for Team Leaders Mission and Vision Statements	Personnel	Element 1a: Tutor Recruitment/ Selection Element 1b: Pre-service Training Element 6b: Leader Role Clarity Element 6d: Organizational Culture

This quality standard from the TQIS rubric was not evaluated because it was not expressly addressed within the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring:

- Element 5a: Safety Protocols

These quality standards from the TQIS rubrics were not evaluated because the non-profit tutoring organization did not supply artifacts for analysis or were outside the scope of the study:

- Element 1c: Tutor Coaching and Feedback
- Element 2a: Program Effectiveness and Improvement
- Element 6a: Program Design – elements related to the non-profit organization's budget were not analyzed.
- Element 6c: Leader Professional Development

These quality standards from the TQIS rubrics were not evaluated because the non-profit organization's literacy tutoring program was not designed to be integrated with a school's classroom instruction or work directly with classroom teachers:

- Element 3a: Student Grouping
- Element 4b: Integration with School Schedule
- Element 4c: Curricular Alignment
- Element 4d: Student and Teacher Engagement

The researcher then used the TQIS rubric's Descriptions of Ratings for Quality Standard and Evidence of Look Fors criteria to evaluate the level to which the instructional design of the tutoring program's artifacts provided by the non-profit organization adhered to the design principle and corresponding evaluative criteria according to these ratings: fully aligned to the quality standard, mostly aligned to the quality standard, partially aligned to the quality standard, not yet aligned to quality standard, or insufficient evidence. The researcher made specific recommendations for improving the program's instructional design based on the findings. Appendix C contains the sections of the TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics (NSSA, 2023) used in this study.

Twenty research questions guided the data and artifact analysis. Each research question is listed with its corresponding alignment and analysis procedure. The wording of the evaluation criteria in the sections following each research question comes directly from the TQIS rubric (NSSA, 2023) with minor modifications for clarity of meaning.

RQ1

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children incorporate research-based practices related to the **curriculum** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ1, which is related to the curriculum principle for effective tutoring, the organization's program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Elements 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials, 3e: Lessons Routines and Structures, and 3f: Instructional Practices. Curriculum within the context of effective tutoring refers to using high-quality instructional materials aligned with classroom content, enabling tutors to reinforce and support classroom instruction.

The Quality Standard for Element 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials is defined as "the tutoring program uses high-quality instructional materials that are user-friendly, rigorous, and is research-based" (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3d can be measured through artifact review, interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted.

The Quality Standard for Element 3e: Lesson Routines and Structures is defined as "the program has consistent lesson structure, set instructional routines, and standard procedures to maximize learning, tutor-specific modifications are intentional and informed by student needs" (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3e can be measured through artifact review, interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted.

The Quality Standard for Element 3f: Instructional Practices is defined as “tutors receive explicit training, modeling, and coaching related to the use of effective instructional strategies (e.g., strong questioning, lesson pacing, and modeling)” (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3f can be measured through artifacts, interviews, or direct observation to confirm the level of alignment with the quality standard. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted.

RQ2

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children related to the **curriculum** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ2, which is related to the curriculum principle for effective tutoring, the researcher made recommendations based on the findings of RQ1 and the Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors in TQIS Rubric Elements 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials, 3e: Lessons Routines and Structures, and 3f: Instructional Practices.

RQ3

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children incorporate research-based practices related to the **focus** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ3, which is related to the focus principle for effective tutoring, the organization's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Elements 6a: Program Design. Focus within effective tutoring is characterized by the adaptability of the tutoring program across grade levels and subject areas.

The Quality Standard for Element 6a: Program Design is defined as "the tutoring program is designed to successfully meet the needs of the community it serves" (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Elements 6a can be measured through artifact reviews and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. The researcher did not review the non-profit organization's budget, and no interviews were conducted.

RQ4

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children related to the **focus** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ4, which is related to the **focus** principle for effective tutoring, the researcher made recommendations based on the findings of RQ3 and the Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors in TQIS Rubric Element 6a: Dosage.

RQ5

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records incorporate research-based practices related to the **delivery mode** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ5, which is related to the delivery mode principle for effective tutoring, the organization's session records were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Element 4a: Setting. Delivery Mode in effective tutoring refers to the methods through which training is administered, both in-person and virtual modalities.

The Quality Standard for Element 4a is defined as "the tutoring program occurs during the school day" (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 4a can be measured through artifacts and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of session records to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted.

RQ6

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records related to the **delivery mode** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ6, which is related to the **delivery mode** principle for effective tutoring, the researcher made recommendations based on the findings of RQ5 and the Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors in TQIS Rubric Element 4a: Setting.

RQ7

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **scheduling** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ7, which is related to the scheduling principle for effective tutoring, the organization's session and attendance records were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric

Element 4a: Setting. Scheduling in effective tutoring refers to the timing of the intervention, either during the school day, after-school, or summer sessions.

The Quality Standard for Element 4a is defined as “the tutoring program occurs during the school day” (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 4a can be measured through artifacts and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of session and attendance records to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted.

RQ8

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records related to the **scheduling** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ8, which is related to the scheduling principle for effective tutoring, the researcher made recommendations based on the findings of RQ7 and the Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors in TQIS Rubric Element 4a: Setting.

RQ9

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **frequency** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ9, which is related to the frequency principle for effective tutoring, the organization’s session and attendance records were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric

Element 3g: Dosage. Frequency, also known as dosage or high-dosage, in effective tutoring is defined as the regularity of sessions, whether in person or virtual modality.

The Quality Standard for Element 3g: Dosage is defined as “the tutoring program provides each student with at least three 30-minute tutoring sessions per week for a predetermined amount of time” (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3g can be measured through artifact reviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of session and attendance records to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard.

RQ10

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records related to the **frequency** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ10, which is related to the frequency principle for effective tutoring, the researcher made recommendations based on the findings of RQ9 and the Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors in TQIS Rubric Element 3g: Dosage.

RQ11

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **group size** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ11, which is related to the group size principle for effective tutoring, the organization’s attendance records were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Element 3h: Ratio. Group Size in effective tutoring is defined as the number of students per tutor.

The Quality Standard for Element 3h: Ratio is defined as “the ratio of student to tutors in the program does not exceed 4:1” (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3h can be measured through artifact reviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of attendance records to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard.

RQ12

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's attendance records related to the **group size** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ12, which is related to the group size principle for effective tutoring, the researcher made recommendations based on the findings of RQ11 and the Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors in TQIS Rubric Element 3h: Ratio.

RQ13

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors incorporate research-based practices related to the **prioritization** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ13, which is related to the prioritization principle for effective tutoring, the organization’s session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention. Prioritization in effective tutoring considers the population of students who received the intervention and how the choice was made to target that specific group.

The Quality Standard for Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention is defined as "the tutoring program has a defined approach to enrolling and retaining students; particular attention is paid to reducing barriers to participation" (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 4f can be measured through artifact reviews and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted.

RQ14

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors related to the **prioritization** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ14, which is related to the prioritization principle for effective tutoring, the researcher made recommendations based on the findings of RQ13 and the Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors in TQIS Rubric Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention.

RQ15

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms incorporate research-based practices related to the **relationships** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ15, which is related to the relationships principle for effective tutoring, the organization's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Elements 3b: Tutor Consistency, 3c: Student-Tutor Relationships, and 4e: Caregiver Engagement. Relationships in effective tutoring are fostered by ensuring children have a consistent tutor over time, possibly leading to positive tutor-child relationships and a deeper understanding of children's learning needs.

The Quality Standard for Element 3b: Tutor Consistency is defined as "students receive consistent tutoring from the same tutor; any adjustments to groupings occur sparingly and strategically" (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3b can be measured through artifact review and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of session and attendance records to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No additional interviews were conducted.

The Quality Standard for Element 3c: Student-tutor relationship is defined as "the tutoring program has an intentional strategy and supporting systems to build strong, positive relationships between students and tutors" (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3c can be measured through artifact review, interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and tutor training materials to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No additional interviews or observations were conducted.

The Quality Standard for Element 4e: Caregiver Engagement is defined as “the tutoring program ensures regular engagement with caregivers and updates on student's progress” (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 4e can be measured through artifact review and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted.

RQ16

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms related to the **relationships** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ16, which is related to the relationships principle for effective tutoring, the researcher made recommendations based on the findings of RQ15 and the Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors in TQIS Rubric Elements 3b: Tutor Consistency, 3c: Student-Tutor Relationships, and 4e: Caregiver Engagement.

RQ17

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS® assessment and development of reading prescriptions, incorporate research-based practices related to the **measurement** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ17, which is related to the measurement principle for effective tutoring, the organization's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS assessment and development of reading prescriptions, were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Elements 2b: Formative Assessment and 2c: Student Progress Measure. Measurement in the context of effective tutoring involves using data and ongoing informal assessments, allowing tutors to tailor their instruction more effectively to an individual child's needs.

The Quality Standard for Element 2b: Formative Assessment is defined as "the tutoring program provides tutors with support to collect, analyze, and use formative assessment data to inform the design of future sessions" (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 2b can be measured through artifact reviews, interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of student assessment data, including DIBELS scores and reading prescriptions, to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted.

The Quality Standard for Element 2c: Student Progress Measure is defined as" the tutoring program has a system for measuring individual student progress over time and responding to those results; measures of progress include academic growth and adaptive indicators (i.e., student engagement; student confidence)" (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 2c can be measured through artifact reviews, interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of student assessment data, including DIBELS scores and reading prescriptions, to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No additional interviews or observations were conducted.

RQ18

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS® assessment and development of reading prescriptions, related to the **measurement** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ18, which is related to the measurement principle for effective tutoring, the researcher made recommendations based on the findings of RQ17 and the Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors in TQIS Rubric Elements 2b: Formative Assessment and 2c: Student Progress Measure.

RQ19

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements incorporate research-based practices related to the **personnel** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ19, which is related to the personnel principle for effective tutoring, the organization's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements were aligned with the TQIS Rubric Elements 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection, 1b: Preservice-Training, 6a: Program Design, and 6d Organizational Culture. Personnel in effective tutoring considers the background of the volunteers (college students, retired teachers, etc.) and the training they receive before, during, and after tutoring children.

The Quality Standard for Element 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection is defined as “a clear recruitment and selection process that results in tutors with the skills and mindsets necessary to be successful in that program” (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 1a can be measured through artifact review, interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of job descriptions, manuals for tutors, and tutor training materials to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No additional interviews or observations were conducted.

The Quality Standard for Element 1b: Preservice-Training is defined as “the tutoring program provides high-quality onboarding and training tailored to the program context” (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 1b can be measured through artifact review and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of manuals for tutors and tutor training materials to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted.

The Quality Standard for Element 6b: Leader Role Clarity is “the tutoring program has clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the leadership team, with particular attention to clearly defining tutor coaching responsibilities” (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 6b can be measured through artifact review and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of job descriptions, organization charts, and manuals for team leaders to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted.

The Quality Standard for Element 6d: Organizational Culture is defined as “the tutoring program has a defined mission, vision, and set of organizational goals; these guiding documents are aligned with a broader context and well understood by stakeholders” (NSSA, 2023). According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 6d can be measured through artifact reviews and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of mission and vision statements to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted.

RQ20

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements related to the **personnel** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ20, which is related to the personnel principle for effective tutoring, the researcher made recommendations based on the findings of RQ19 and the Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors in TQIS Rubric Elements 1a: Tutor Recruitment and Selection, 1b: Pre-service Training, 6b: Leader Role Clarity, and 6d: Organizational Culture.

Reliability and Trustworthiness

Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) supported the study's reliability and trustworthiness by providing a clear and purposeful framework for evaluation. Using the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring and the TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics as the evaluative standards further reinforced reliability and trustworthiness. The organization's retrospective data and artifacts anchored the study's findings, ensuring the

conclusions and recommendations had a factual basis. The findings were reviewed by the university's research analyst and a third-chair committee member with no ties to the non-profit literacy tutoring organization to ensure their validity and reliability and mitigate unintentional bias.

Researcher's Role

Operating within the U-FE framework, the researcher's role in the study was to objectively evaluate the non-profit organization's literacy tutoring program artifacts against the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring and generate actionable recommendations. It is important to note that from September 2020 through December 2022, the researcher provided technical support to the organization by creating a cloud-based learning management system to deliver tutoring training and assistance in developing the learning paths the tutors completed. For this current study, the researcher attempted to maintain an unbiased perspective throughout the analysis by focusing on the utility of the findings for programmatic improvement. The researcher was committed to upholding ethical standards, ensuring that the evaluation would benefit and apply to the non-profit organization's mission and objectives.

Deliberate and reflective practices were adopted to mitigate researcher bias and ensure that interpretations of data were grounded in empirical evidence rather than personal beliefs. However, it is essential to note that the researcher's perspective inevitably shaped the research process and analysis. The researcher critically evaluated the non-profit organization's methods of collecting data to address potential data collection bias. The study acknowledged that intrinsic organizational interests may have influenced the data toward positive outcomes. Therefore, the study aimed to mitigate this bias using the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring and the TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics. Confirmation bias was counteracted

by rigorously adhering to the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring framework and actively seeking disconfirming evidence within the data and artifacts. The study prioritized balanced reporting by emphasizing the successes and challenges encountered by the tutoring program. This approach aimed to mitigate any reporting biases that may have been intrinsic to the research design.

Limitations

Limitations in research studies are “factors that may have an effect on the interpretation of the findings or generalizability of the results” (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 133). The current study was subject to several limitations. First, the study was limited to one tutoring program in a three-county area in the southeastern United States. As such, the findings may not apply to other regions with different socioeconomic and cultural dynamics, which means that broader application to dissimilar tutoring programs with different operational frameworks was limited. Second, the study focused on children from low-economic and culturally diverse backgrounds, which restricted the generalizability of the results to populations outside of this demographic. Third, the study was limited to the non-profit organization’s archived data from September 2020 through December 2022, providing a unique socio-educational context that included the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. No new quantitative or qualitative data was collected. The retrospective design of the current study inherently constrained the analysis of the organization's pre-existing data to the timeframe. It precluded the collection of more current quantitative and qualitative insights that could have revealed a deeper understanding of the program's instructional design. Fourth, the design of the current study relied on the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring, which may have unintentionally omitted other potentially influential factors in tutoring efficacy or tutor perceptions of the program's instructional design. Finally, the

researcher recognized the existence of sample bias as tutors' and children's data were drawn solely from the organization's volunteer literacy tutoring program. Therefore, the study findings may not fully represent the broader population of tutors and children in comparable socioeconomic contexts and may limit the generalizability of the study's findings to a more general population.

Summary

Chapter 3 described the data analysis procedures for the current study and the methodological framework, guided by the Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) framework. The framework facilitated a comprehensive review and comparison of the non-profit organization's archival data against the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring and the TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics. The chapter recognized the study's inherent limitations, particularly the reliance on retrospective data and artifacts while reaffirming the commitment to an objective evaluation. Chapter 3 also outlined and explained the methodology for providing actionable recommendations to improve the instructional design practices of the non-profit organization's literacy tutoring program.

Chapter 4

Results

Chapter 4 presents the current study's findings and recommendations. The purpose of this study was to evaluate a non-profit literacy tutoring program's instructional design practices using a Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) framework (Patton & Campbell-Patton, 2022). The Design Principles for Effective Tutoring (Robinson et al., 2021) served as the study's research approach. The chapter is organized by the study's 20 research questions, the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring, and associated artifacts. Findings and recommendations for improving the literacy tutoring program's instructional design practices are based on evidence-based criteria from the Tutoring Quality Improvement System's (TQIS) Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics (NSSA, 2023). Rubric language is indicated in quotation marks.

Findings and Recommendations

RQ1

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children incorporate research-based practices related to the **curriculum** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ1, which is related to the curriculum principle for effective tutoring, the organization's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Elements 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials, 3e: Lessons Routines and Structures, and 3f: Instructional Practices. Curriculum within the context of effective tutoring refers to using high-quality instructional materials aligned with classroom content, enabling tutors to reinforce and support classroom instruction.

TQIS Element 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials. The Quality Standard for Element 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials is defined as "the tutoring program uses high-quality instructional materials that are user-friendly, rigorous, and is research-based." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3d, the program must have "a defined set of user-friendly instructional materials that are standards-aligned, based on learning science. The materials must be user-friendly for tutors, and include suggestions for differentiation, be aligned to formative assessments, and be culturally responsive." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must have "a defined set of instructional materials that are mostly user-friendly and standards-aligned, based on learning science, be mostly user-friendly and culturally responsive with some areas of improvement." To partially align with the quality standard, the program must have "a defined set of instructional materials that are mostly standards-aligned and based on learning science but have significant areas for improvement with regards to user-friendliness and/or cultural responsiveness." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if they do not have "a defined set of instructional materials (i.e., relies on tutor developed materials) or the materials used are inappropriate (i.e., not standards-aligned, not based in learning science."

TQIS Element 3d Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3d can be measured through artifact review (sample instructional materials), interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children to determine the extent to which they aligned with the quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3d, the artifacts must "confirm that instructional materials are standards-aligned,

based in learning science, user-friendly (including formative assessment), and culturally responsive." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that instructional materials are standards-aligned and based in learning science. They are mostly user-friendly (including formative assessment) and culturally responsive, with some minor areas for improvement." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that instructional materials are mostly standards-aligned and based in learning science. The materials have areas for improvement in user-friendliness and/or cultural responsiveness." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if the "artifacts confirm that instructional materials are not standards-aligned, based in learning science, user-friendly (including formative assessment), or culturally responsive."

Findings for TQIS Element 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials – Mostly Aligned. A review of the organization's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children found them to be mostly aligned with Quality Standard 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials. The program's manuals for tutors and study guides for children contained clearly defined instructional materials based on learning science and were culturally responsive. The manuals were user-friendly and included suggestions for instructional strategies. The study guides encouraged tutors to help each child set a reading goal for the entire session. However, to be fully aligned with the quality standard, the materials within the manuals must be standards-aligned and include suggestions for formative assessments. The researcher found no evidence of alignment to state standards, specific learning outcomes (i.e., as a result of this lesson, the child will be able to…), or formative assessment materials within the manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, or study guides for children.

TQIS Element 3e: Lesson Routines and Structures. The Quality Standard for Element 3e: Lesson Routines and Structures is defined as "the program has consistent lesson structure, set instructional routines, and standard procedures to maximize learning, tutor-specific modifications are intentional and informed by student needs." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3e, the program must have "a clearly defined lesson structure and routines that are aligned to learning science and are developmentally appropriate. Tutors must receive explicit training and ongoing support to execute the lessons with fidelity. Tutoring sessions must consistently have effective structure and routines throughout that are tailored to students' needs." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must have "a clearly defined lesson structure and routines aligned to learning science and be developmentally appropriate. Tutors receive training and support, but opportunities exist for improvement. Tutoring sessions have mostly effective structure and routines but there are opportunities to better tailor them to meet students' needs." To partially align with the quality standard, the program must have "a clearly defined lesson structure and routines that are aligned with learning science and developmentally appropriate, but tutors do not receive adequate training to implement the structures with fidelity. The effectiveness of the tutoring sessions' structure is mixed or only partially effective, with significant areas for improvement." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if they do not "have a defined set of effective instructional strategies or clear, observable structures."

TQIS Element 3e Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3e can be measured through artifact review (tutoring session lesson structure and expectations), interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of manuals for team

leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children to determine the extent to which they aligned with the quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3e, the artifacts must "confirm that there are codified expectations for the structure and contents of a tutoring lesson. These expectations are aligned to evidence-based practices, responsive to student backgrounds, and developmentally appropriate." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that there are codified expectations for the structure and contents of a tutoring lesson. These expectations are aligned with evidence-based practices, responsive to student backgrounds, and developmentally appropriate." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that there are codified expectations for the structure and contents of a tutoring lesson. These expectations are aligned with evidence-based practices, responsive to student backgrounds, and developmentally appropriate." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned with the quality standard if the "artifacts reveal no set structure for tutoring sessions."

Findings for TQIS Element 3e: Lesson Routines and Structures – Fully Aligned.

A review of the organization's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children found them to be fully aligned with Quality Standard 3e: Lesson Routines and Structures. The manuals and study guides contained clearly defined structures for organizing the tutoring sessions and a minute-by-minute outline of what would occur during each tutoring meeting. These structures and routines were aligned to best practices in learning science and are age- and developmentally appropriate. Evidence showed that these structures and routines were conveyed to tutors through explicit training onsite and online.

TQIS Element 3f: Instructional Practices. The Quality Standard for Element 3f: Instructional Practices is defined as "tutors receive explicit training, modeling, and coaching

related to the use of effective instructional strategies (e.g., strong questioning, lesson pacing, and modeling). To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3f, the program must have "a clearly defined set of research or evidence-based instructional practices. Tutors receive explicit training and ongoing support to plan for and implement these strategies. Research-based instructional strategies are consistently utilized by tutors during sessions." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must have "a clearly defined set of research or evidence-based instructional strategies. Tutors receive training and support, but opportunities exist for improvement within that support. Instructional strategies used by tutors are mostly aligned to best practices, with some areas of improvement." To partially align with the quality standard, the program must have "a set of instructional strategies, but they are only partially research or evidence-based. Tutors do not receive adequate training and/or ongoing support to implement these strategies with fidelity. Instructional strategies used by tutors are only somewhat aligned with research or evidence, with significant areas for improvement." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if they do not "yet have a defined set of effective instructional strategies. Instructional strategies employed by tutors are inconsistent and/or not aligned with research and/or evidence."

TQIS Element 3f: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3f can be measured through artifact review (summary of instructional practices), interviews, or direct observation. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children to determine the extent to which they aligned with quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3f, the artifacts must "confirm that the tutoring program has a

standardized set of research and/or evidence-based instructional practices that tutors are expected to utilize throughout the session." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that the tutoring program has a standardized set of research and/or evidence-based instructional practices that tutors are expected to utilize throughout the session." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that the tutoring program has a standardized set of instructional practices that tutors are expected to utilize throughout the session. The strategies are only somewhat research and/or evidence-based." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if the "artifacts reveal that the tutoring program does not yet have a standardized set of research and/or evidence-based instructional practices that tutors are expected to utilize throughout the session."

Findings for TQIS Element 3f: Instructional Practices – Fully Aligned. A review of the organization's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children found them to be fully aligned with Quality Standard 3f: Instructional Practices. The artifacts confirmed that the manuals and study guides were standardized from session to session and included research- and evidence-based instructional practices for tutors to use with each child.

RQ2

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children related to the **curriculum** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Recommendations for RQ2. A review of the manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children found them to be fully aligned with the Quality Standards for Elements 3e: Lesson Routines and Structures and 3f: Instructional Practices. The artifacts

were found to be mostly aligned to the Quality Standard for Element 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials because they lacked explicit alignment to standards and formative assessments. To become fully aligned, the organization could include a section in the manuals that addresses state and grade level reading standards and learner expectations for Kindergarten through Grade 5. This addition would provide team leaders and tutors insight into the literacy benchmarks children are expected to achieve by the end of each grade. Regarding formative assessments, it could be argued that the speeches children give at the end of each meeting are a type of formative assessment. Additional assessments such as quick quizzes on letter or vowel sounds, capturing the child's fluency rating while reading aloud, asking informal comprehension questions, and recording the child's replies would bring the materials into the fully aligned category.

RQ3

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children incorporate research-based practices related to the **focus** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ3, which is related to the focus principle for effective tutoring, the organization's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Elements 6a: Program Design. Focus within effective tutoring is characterized by the adaptability of the tutoring program across grade levels and subject areas.

TQIS Element 6a: Program Design. The Quality Standard for Element 6a: Program Design is defined as "the tutoring program is designed to successfully meet the needs of the community it serves." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 6a, the design of the

tutoring program must be “informed by the needs of the community it serves, have a clear theory of action, which is well understood by stakeholders, and the program’s budget is well-aligned to the overall vision.” To mostly align with the quality standard, the design of the tutoring program must be “informed by the needs of the community it serves and have a theory of action, but there are minor opportunities to increase clarity or understanding among stakeholders, and the budget is aligned to the design but minor areas for improvement exist.” To partially align with the quality standard, the design of the tutoring program may be “only somewhat aligned to community needs, with opportunities for further tailoring to the local context. The program has a theory of action, but there are significant opportunities to increase clarity or understanding among stakeholders. Overall, the program’s budget is aligned with the design, but significant areas for improvement exist.” Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if “there is a significant disconnect between the design of the tutoring program and the needs of the community it serves, it does not have a theory of action, or it is not clear how the program model and budget are aligned to broader program vision.”

TQIS Element 6a: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Elements 6a can be measured through artifact review (program description and theory of action) and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. The researcher did not review the non-profit organization’s budget, and no interviews were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 6a, the artifacts must “provide a clear summary of the connection between program design and community needs. Artifacts provide a clear theory of action for the tutoring program.” To mostly align with the

quality standard, the “artifacts provide a clear summary of the connection between program design and community needs. Artifacts provide a clear theory of action for the tutoring program’s improvement.” To partially align with the quality standard, the “artifacts may or may not reveal a connection between program design and community needs. Opportunities for further tailoring to local context may exist. Artifacts provide a theory of action for the tutoring program, but room for improvement may exist.” Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if the “artifacts reveal a disconnect between program design and community needs. Artifacts reveal that the program does not yet have a defined theory of action or value proposition.”

Findings for TQIS Element 6a: Program Design – Fully Aligned. A review of the organization’s manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children found them to be fully aligned with the Quality Standard for Element 6a: Program Design. The artifacts connected the tutoring program to the families they served and the larger community. The manuals included explicit information on the program’s overarching mission and vision and how they tied to tutors' actions while tutoring children. The study guides reflected the interests and needs of the children in the program.

RQ4

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children related to the **focus** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Recommendations for RQ4. A review of the manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children found them to be fully aligned with Quality Standard 6a: Program Design. No recommendations were needed.

RQ5

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records incorporate research-based practices related to the **delivery mode** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ5, which is related to the delivery mode principle for effective tutoring, the organization's session records were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Element 4a: Setting. Delivery Mode in effective tutoring refers to the methods through which training is administered, both in-person and virtual modalities.

TQIS Element 4a: Setting. The Quality Standard for Element 4a is defined as "the tutoring program occurs during the school day." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 4a, the tutoring program must "occur during the school day." To mostly align with the quality standard, the tutoring program may "occur immediately before or after school, and the program ensures there are systems in place to enable all identified students to participate, including transportation, parental communication, and incentives." To partially align with the quality standard, the program may "occur immediately before or after school, but the program does not ensure systems are in place to enable all students to participate." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if they "do not occur during the school day or immediately before or after school, and the time and location present significant barriers to student participation."

TQIS Element 4a: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 4a can be measured through artifact review (tutoring schedule) and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of session records to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 4a, the artifacts must "confirm that the tutoring program takes place during school." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that the tutoring program takes place immediately before or after school." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that the tutoring program takes place immediately before or after school." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if the artifacts "reveal that the tutoring program does not occur before, during, or after school."

Findings for TQIS Element 4a: Setting – Mostly Aligned. A review of the organization's session records found them to be mostly aligned with Quality Standard 4a: Setting. The records from September 2020 through December 2022 indicated that tutoring sessions occurred after the school day. While the tutoring sites varied, they tended to be in central locations within each county. Transportation to and from the tutoring sites was not provided, but the sites were located near where children attended school during the day. For online tutoring during and post-COVID, no combined records were found.

RQ6

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records related to the **delivery mode** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Recommendations for RQ6. A review of the organization's session records found them to be mostly aligned with Quality Standard 4a: Setting. Given that the non-profit literacy tutoring organization is designed to be an after-school and summer program, it is impossible to fully align with the TQIS quality criteria for Element 4a. However, the design of the session records in the organization's central repository could be improved. The discrete and inconsistent folder structure made it difficult for an external reviewer to determine where the tutoring sessions were located and when meetings were conducted. No combined records were found for online tutoring during and post-COVID, making it difficult to summarize the tutoring that occurred during and after the pandemic. A one- to two-page summary immediately after each session ends would provide a historical record of what occurred. Details would need to include the site locations, dates, and times for when tutoring sessions occurred.

RQ7

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **scheduling** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ7, which is related to the scheduling principle for effective tutoring, the organization's session and attendance records were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Element 4a: Setting. Scheduling in effective tutoring refers to the timing of the intervention, either during the school day, after-school, or summer sessions.

TQIS Element 4a: Setting. The Quality Standard for Element 4a is defined as "the tutoring program occurs during the school day." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 4a, the tutoring program must occur "during the school day." To mostly align with the

quality standard, the tutoring program can occur "immediately before or after school, and the program ensures there are systems in place to enable all identified students to participate, including transportation, parental communication, and incentives." To partially align with the quality standard, the program can "occur immediately before or after school, but the program does not ensure systems are in place to enable all students to participate." Programs not yet aligned with the quality standard do "not occur during the school day or immediately before or after school, and the time and location present significant barriers to student participation."

TQIS Element 4a: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 4a can be measured through artifact review (tutoring schedule) and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of session and attendance records to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 4a, the artifacts must "confirm that the tutoring program takes place during school." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that the tutoring program takes place immediately before or after school." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that the tutoring program takes place immediately before or after school." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if the "artifacts reveal that the tutoring program does not occur before, during, or after school."

Findings for TQIS Element 4a: Setting – Mostly Aligned. A review of the organization's session and attendance records found them to be mostly aligned with Quality Standard 4a: Setting. The records from September 2020 through December 2022 indicated tutoring sessions occurred after the school day.

RQ8

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records related to the **scheduling** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Recommendations for RQ8. A review of the organization's session and attendance records found them to be mostly aligned with Quality Standard 4a: Setting. The recommendations for RQ8 are identical to RQ6. Given that the non-profit literacy tutoring program is designed to be an after-school and summer program, it is impossible to fully align with the TQIS quality criteria for Element 4a. However, the design of the session and attendance records in the organization's central repository could be improved by creating post-session summaries to provide a historical record of the event.

RQ9

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **frequency** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ9, which is related to the frequency principle for effective tutoring, the organization's session and attendance records were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Element 3g: Dosage. Frequency, also known as dosage or high-dosage, in effective tutoring is defined as the regularity of sessions, whether in person or virtual modality.

TQIS Element 3g: Dosage. The Quality Standard for Element 3g: Dosage is defined as "the tutoring program provides each student with at least three 30-minute tutoring sessions per

week for a predetermined amount of time." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3g, the program must provide "each student with at least three 30-minute tutoring sessions per week for a predetermined amount of time (i.e., 40 hours, 10 weeks, fall semester)." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must provide "each student with at least two 30-minute tutoring sessions per week and a predetermined timeline." To partially align with the quality standard, the program must provide "each student with one 30-minute tutoring session per week. There is no clear, predetermined timeline. Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "the tutoring program does not have a clear schedule and/or meet the recommended dosage requirements."

TQIS Element 3g: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3g can be measured through artifact reviews (tutoring schedule). The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of session and attendance records to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3g, the artifacts must "confirm there is a consistent tutoring schedule that meets the threshold of occurring at least three times per week from 30-60 minutes per session (depending on student age, developmental needs, and subject area). The program also runs for a predetermined amount of time." Criteria for mostly and partially aligned do not apply to this element. Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if the "artifact(s) reveal that there is not a consistent tutoring schedule or that the schedule does not meet the recommended threshold."

Findings for TQIS Element 3g: Dosage – Mostly Aligned. A review of the organization's session and attendance records found them to be mostly aligned with Quality Standard 3g: Dosage. Even though there are no set criteria for the mostly aligned category, the

researcher found the mostly aligned designation best described the degree to which the program aligned. The session and attendance records confirmed there was a consistent tutoring schedule for sessions conducted in person. During each six, eight, or nine-week session, sites met once per week on the same day and time. For virtual tutoring, schedules were set by the tutor and the child (or child's caregiver). No report was found that captured the exact tutoring schedule for children who tutored online during this period.

RQ10

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records related to the **frequency** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Recommendations for RQ10. A review of the organization's session and attendance records found them to be mostly aligned with Quality Standard 3g: Dosage. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3g, programs must offer tutoring three times per week. The non-profit literacy tutoring organization's program is designed to meet with children once per week. Given that the tutors are volunteers, tutoring more than once per week may not be possible. However, a few virtual tutoring artifacts appeared to indicate that tutors met with children more than once per week, but how often this happened is unclear because no formal documentation captured this information. A recommendation would be to create a centralized system that records the dates of individual tutoring meetings and generates reports of tutors' time with children each week.

RQ11

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **group size** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ11, which is related to the group size principle for effective tutoring, the organization's attendance records were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Element 3h: Ratio. Group Size in effective tutoring is defined as the number of students per tutor.

TQIS Element 3h: Ratio. The Quality Standard for Element 3h: Ratio is defined as "the ratio of student to tutors in the program does not exceed 4:1" (NSSA, 2023). To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3h, "the ratio of students to tutors in the program does not exceed 4:1." Criteria for mostly and partially aligned do not apply to this element. Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "the ratio of students to tutors in the program is greater than 4:1."

TQIS Element 3h: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3h can be measured through artifact review (student-tutor assignments). The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of session and attendance records to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3h, the artifacts must "confirm a staffing plan with a student-tutor ratio that does not exceed 4:1." Criteria for mostly and partially aligned do not apply to this element. Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "the artifacts confirm a staffing plan with a student-tutor ratio that exceeds 4:1."

Findings for TQIS Element 3h: Ratio – Fully Aligned. A review of the organization's attendance records found them to be fully aligned with Quality Standard 3h: Ratio. The records indicated most sites matched one tutor with one scholar–however, some records contained only a list of tutors and a separate list of children. Given the description of the program's mission and guidelines in the manuals for team leaders, it could be assumed that one-to-one tutoring occurred during all sessions and locations. While no cumulative records were found, one-to-one tutoring was inherent in the instructional design of the virtual tutoring sessions.

RQ12

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's attendance records related to the **group size** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Recommendations for RQ12. A review of the program's attendance records found them to be fully aligned with Quality Standards for Elements 3h: Ratio. However, determining this degree of alignment was challenging due to how the attendance data was organized in the centralized online repository. To confirm alignment, the researcher clicked first on the session folder and then into the various subfolders to view attendance documentation. The documents were inconsistent in format – Excel, Word, hand-written scanned files, and images of printed documents. To make viewing and tracking attendance easier: 1. Add high-level attendance information to a post-session summary for each tutoring site (consistent with the recommendation made in RQ6), and 2. Create a centralized system that records the dates of tutors' and children's weekly attendance (consistent with the recommendation made in RQ10).

RQ13

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors incorporate research-based practices related to the **prioritization** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ13, which is related to the prioritization principle for effective tutoring, the organization's session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention. Prioritization in effective tutoring considers the population of students who received the intervention and how the choice was made to target that specific group.

TQIS Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention. The Quality Standard for Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention is defined as "the tutoring program has a defined approach to enrolling and retaining students; particular attention is paid to reducing barriers to participation." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 4f, the program must have a "clear approach for enrolling and retaining students. The strategy prioritizes students who need tutoring the most. The program has an intentional practice of reflecting on and addressing barriers to student participation (i.e., transportation, meals, engagement, etc.)." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must have a "clear approach for enrolling and retaining students. Efforts to reduce barriers exist but are not yet systematic or aligned to research and/or evidence-based practices." To partially align with the quality standard, the program must have "an approach for enrolling students but has not yet codified a strategy to retain students. Barriers to participation may go unaddressed." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the

quality standard if "no strategic approach to enrolling or retaining students or significant barriers to participation exist and are unaddressed."

TQIS Element 4f: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 4f can be measured through artifact reviews (enrollment and retention plan and data) and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 4f, the "artifacts must reveal that the program has a clear plan for enrolling and retaining students, including regular practice of collecting data on enrollment trends for the program." To mostly align with the quality standard, the "artifacts must reveal that the program has a clear plan for enrolling and retaining students, including a practice of collecting data on enrollment trends for the program." To partially align with the quality standard, the "artifacts must reveal that the program has a plan for enrolling students but does not yet collect data on trends for enrollment in the program." Tutoring programs are not yet aligned with the quality standard if "artifacts do not reveal a clear plan for enrolling or retaining students."

Findings for TQIS Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention – Partially Aligned. The organization's session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors were found to be partially aligned with Quality Standard 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention. The records and manuals revealed a clear and detailed process for recruiting tutors and children. Less clear was the process for ensuring their retention from session to session. Session records showed that many children attended more than one session. The exact number was difficult to quantify due to

how the documents were stored. No evidence was found that captured enrollment and retention trends from September 2020 through December 2022.

RQ14

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors related to the **prioritization** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Recommendations for RQ14. A review of the organization's session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors found them to be partially aligned with the Quality Standard for Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention. To fully align with the quality standard, the artifacts must reveal a clear plan for retaining students and enrollment trends from session to session. Consistent with the recommendation in RQ6, adding high-level attendance information to a post-session summary would record the total number of children at each site and the number of those who returned for additional sessions. As with the recommendation made in RQ10, a centralized system to record weekly attendance would enable the leadership team to generate reports showing enrollment trends and retention rates.

RQ15

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms incorporate research-based practices related to the **relationships** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ15, which is related to the relationships principle for effective tutoring, the organization's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Elements 3b: Tutor Consistency, 3c: Student-Tutor Relationships, and 4e: Caregiver Engagement. Relationships in effective tutoring are fostered by ensuring students have a consistent tutor over time, potentially leading to positive tutor-student relationships and a deeper understanding of students' learning needs.

TQIS Element 3b: Tutor Consistency. The Quality Standard for Element 3b: Tutor Consistency is defined as "students receive consistent tutoring from the same tutor; any adjustments to groupings occur sparingly and strategically." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3b, "the program's approach to staffing ensures that students meet consistently with the same tutor for an extended period of time. Any adjustments to tutor-student pairings are made strategically, based on data, and clearly communicated to all relevant stakeholders." Criteria for mostly and partially aligned do not apply to this element. Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "students do not receive tutoring from a consistent tutor."

TQIS Element 3b: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3b can be measured through artifact review (student-tutor assignments) and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of session and attendance records to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3b, the "artifacts must confirm a staffing plan that ensures students meet consistently with the same tutor. Artifacts confirm that adjustments to staffing

plans are made sparingly and strategically, with any changes being communicated clearly to all relevant stakeholders." Criteria for mostly and partially aligned do not apply to this element. Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if artifacts reveal that consistent student-tutor pairings do not exist.

Findings for TQIS Element 3b: Tutor Consistency – Mostly Aligned. A review of the organization's session and attendance records found them to be mostly aligned with Quality Standard 3b: Tutor Consistency. As was found in RQ9, the records indicated most sites matched one tutor with one scholar. However, some records contained one list of tutors and a separate list of children. No artifacts stated the rationale for matching tutors and children or, if changes in tutoring assignments were made, why the change was made.

TQIS Element 3c: Student-tutor Relationship. The Quality Standard for Element 3c: Student-tutor relationship is defined as "the tutoring program has an intentional strategy and supporting systems to build strong, positive relationships between students and tutors." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3c, the program must have "a clear, shared commitment to building strong, positive relationships between students and tutors. This commitment is reinforced by explicit training and coaching for tutors in strategies to build relationships with students, foster high expectations, and encourage a growth mindset. There is also a system in place for monitoring and responding to ongoing student-tutor relationship dynamics." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must have "a clear, shared commitment to building strong, positive relationships between students and tutors. The commitment is reinforced by some training intended to support tutors in building positive relationships with students, foster high expectations, and encourage a growth mindset. Minor areas for improvement in these supports may be identified, including a need to increase the

monitoring of ongoing relationship dynamics." To partially align with the quality standard, the program must have "a commitment to building strong, positive relationships between students and tutors. However, this commitment may only exist in theory but not be visible in action. Training and support for student-tutor relationships are in the early stages of development or planning but have not been actualized and/or are not informed by research and/or evidence-based practices." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "the tutoring program does not have a commitment to building strong student-tutor relationships or if there are no supporting systems in place to help tutors achieve positive relationships with students."

TQIS Element 3c: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 3c can be measured through artifact review (training materials and survey data), interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and tutor training materials to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 3c, the artifacts must "demonstrate that the program has a commitment to relationship building. Explicit coaching on relationship-building strategies for tutors exists in training materials. Artifacts reveal that the program has an ongoing system (surveys, observations, etc.) for monitoring positive relationships and responding to that data." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "demonstrate that the program has a commitment to relationship building. Some related training is available for tutors, with opportunities for improvement. Artifacts reveal that there may or may not be an ongoing system for monitoring positive relationships and responding to that data." To partially align with the

quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm a high-level commitment to relationship building. Related training on strategies for tutors is limited and/or not aligned with research or evidence-based practices. Artifacts likely reveal no ongoing system for monitoring positive relationships or responding to that data." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "artifacts reveal that the program does not emphasize the importance of relationship-building between tutors and students. Related training materials do not exist."

Findings for TQIS Element 3c: Student-tutor Relationship – Fully Aligned. A review of the organization's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and tutor training materials found them to be fully aligned with Quality Standard 3c: Student-tutor Relationship. The manuals and training materials demonstrated a commitment to helping tutors build relationships with the children they tutor. Onsite and online training materials from this period focused on strategies for tutors and coaching tips for team leaders to build and reinforce relationships between tutors and children.

TQIS Element 4e: Caregiver Engagement. The Quality Standard for Element 4e: Caregiver Engagement is defined as "the tutoring program ensures regular engagement with caregivers and updates on student's progress." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 4e, the program must "regularly engage with caregivers to communicate progress in a language and format that is accessible to them. Stakeholders perceive that this collaboration is highly effective." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must "engage with caregivers and communicate progress in a language and format that is accessible to them. Minor areas to improve the frequency or effectiveness of this collaboration exist. Stakeholders perceive the collaboration to be effective and identify minor areas for improvement." To partially align with the quality standard, the program must "sometimes engage with caregivers to communicate

progress in an accessible format. Significant opportunities to improve the frequency or accessibility of this collaboration exist. Stakeholders reveal that there are significant opportunities to improve this collaboration." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "the tutoring program makes no effort to engage with caregivers or provide updates on student progress."

TQIS Element 4e: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 4e can be measured through artifact review (caregiver engagement plan and communications) and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No additional interviews were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 4e, the artifacts must "confirm that there is a strategy in place for regular collaboration and communication that accommodates language and communication preferences/needs." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that there is a strategy in place for regular collaboration and communication that accommodates language and communication preferences/needs. Minor areas for improvement may be observed." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that there is a strategy in place for regular collaboration and communication. Attempts to accommodate language and communication preferences/needs are not yet present. Significant areas for improvement may be observed." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if artifacts reveal no strategy for collaboration or communication.

Findings for TQIS Element 4e: Caregiver Engagement – Partially Aligned. A review of the organization's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals

for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms found them to be partially aligned with Quality Standard 4e: Caregiver Engagement. A review of the artifacts revealed two manuals for parents/guardians and a caregiver agreement form that appeared to have been used for children tutoring online. They appeared to be available only in English. Manuals for team leaders and manuals for tutors encouraged caregiver communication but did not specify an exact procedure, and no communication records were found. It was difficult to determine what, if any, regular written communication occurred between site leaders, tutors, and caregivers from September 2020 through December 2022.

RQ16

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms related to the **relationships** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Recommendations for RQ16. A review of the organization's session and attendance records found them to be mostly aligned with the quality standards for Element 3b Tutor Consistency because there was some evidence of sustained one-to-one matching of tutors and children. The organization needs to document how these matches are made to be fully aligned with the quality standard. If the organization created a centralized attendance system, this type of documentation could become a required component.

Manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms were found to be fully aligned with the quality

standard for Element 3c: Student-Tutor Relationships because they clearly showed a commitment to building solid relationships between tutors and children.

Manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms were found to be partially aligned with Quality Standards for Element 4e: Caregiver Engagement because there was no evidence of offering materials in languages other than English or weekly communication with caregivers. To be fully aligned, the organization must commit to developing caregiver materials in additional languages. The manuals for team leaders and manuals for tutors indicated that tutors should communicate weekly with parents. However, there were no artifacts that captured this type of communication. A possible solution would be for the organization to create a weekly letter with standard language that tutors could customize and send home with the child at the end of each meeting. The standard letter could be placed in the child's file as evidence of the communication, or a picture could be taken of the letter and then saved into the child's online folder.

RQ17

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS® assessment and development of reading prescriptions, incorporate research-based practices related to the **measurement** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ17, which is related to the measurement principle for effective tutoring, the organization's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS assessment and development of reading prescriptions, were evaluated according to the TQIS Rubric Elements 2b: Formative Assessment and 2c: Student Progress Measure. Measurement in the context of

effective tutoring involves using data from ongoing formative assessments to tailor instruction to the child's specific literacy needs.

TQIS Element 2b: Formative Assessment. The Quality Standard for Element 2b: Formative Assessment is defined as "the tutoring program provides tutors with support to collect, analyze, and use formative assessment data to inform the design of future sessions." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 2b, the program must use "formative assessments that provide tutors with the data needed to drive quality instruction and provide clear expectations on how to embed formative assessments into instruction. Systems exist to support tutors with collecting, analyzing, and responding to formative assessments (including analyzing data across student groups)." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must use "formative assessments that provide tutors with the data needed to drive quality instruction with clear expectations on how to embed formative assessments into instruction. Systems to support tutors with effective use of formative assessment are present, but opportunities for improvement exist, including analyzing data across student groups." To partially align with the quality standard, the program must have "formative assessments, but there is an opportunity to better align those assessments to instruction. Expectations on how to embed formative assessment into instruction lack clarity. Systems to support tutors with effective use of formative assessment are not fully developed or have significant opportunities for improvement." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "no formative assessments, aligned expectations, or supporting structures are currently present in the tutoring program."

TQIS Element 2b: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 2b can be measured through artifact review (list of formative assessments, formative assessment results, formative assessment

expectations for tutors, and data protocols), interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of student assessment data, including DIBELS scores and reading prescriptions, to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 2b, the artifacts must "confirm the tutoring program has a suite of formative assessments aligned to the instructional model. Artifacts confirm that there are clearly defined expectations for tutors on how and when to embed formative assessments into tutoring sessions. Artifacts confirm that there are structures (including protocols and set meeting times) to support tutors with collecting, analyzing, and responding to formative data. These processes emphasize the importance of analyzing data across student subgroups to ensure equitable instruction." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm the tutoring program has a suite of formative assessments aligned with the instructional model. Artifacts confirm that there are clearly defined expectations for tutors on how and when to embed formative assessments into tutoring sessions. Artifacts confirm that there are structures (including protocols and set meeting times) to support tutors with collecting, analyzing, and responding to formative data. Some opportunities for improvement in these processes exist, potentially including attention to subgroup performance." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm the tutoring program has a suite of formative assessments, but alignment to the instructional model is unclear. Artifacts reveal that high-level expectations around the use of formative assessments are present but are unclear and/or leave too much up to tutor autonomy. Artifacts reveal that structures intended to support tutors with the use of formative assessment are underdeveloped." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned with the quality standard if the "artifacts confirm that the tutoring program does not have standardized formative

assessments. Artifacts reveal that there are no set expectations around the use of formative assessment for tutors. Artifacts reveal that there are no systems or supports for supporting tutors with formative assessments."

Findings for TQIS Element 2b: Formative Assessment – Mostly Aligned. A review of the organization's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS assessment and development of reading prescriptions, found them to be mostly aligned with the Quality Standard for Element 2b: Formative Assessment. The artifacts showed intentional plans for administering the DIBELS assessment to measure children's reading levels once per session. Assessment team members used the results to create reading prescriptions for children to tailor instruction and guide the tutor and caregiver in improving each child's reading skills.

TQIS Element 2c: Student Progress Measure. The Quality Standard for Element 2c: Student Progress Measure is defined as" the tutoring program has a system for measuring individual student progress over time and responding to those results; measures of progress include academic growth and adaptive indicators (i.e., student engagement; student confidence)." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 2c, the program must "identify academic and non-academic progress goals for all students and have a defined timeline for measuring progress against these goals. Systems and structures must exist for setting goals, collecting data, and responding to that information. These systems actively involve students and caregivers in measuring student progress." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must "identify academic and non-academic progress goals for all students and have a defined timeline for measuring progress against these goals. Systems and structures exist for setting goals, collecting data, and responding to that information. These systems may have room for improvement in how they actively involve students and caregivers in measuring student

progress." To partially align with the quality standard, the program must "have some defined academic goals for student progress but may not yet include specific non-academic measures. There is a high-level plan for measuring progress, but it lacks specific dates. Structures for progress monitoring exist at a high level but are significantly underdeveloped." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if they "do not have a defined way to measure individual student progress and there is no set timeline for collecting progress data or supporting structures to measure student progress."

TQIS Element 2c: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 2c can be measured through artifact review (student goal-setting documents and student progress data), interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of student assessment data, including DIBELS scores and reading prescriptions, to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 2c, the artifacts must "confirm that there are clear protocols and processes for setting student goals and then collecting, analyzing, and responding to progress against these goals. There is a regular practice of analyzing data across subgroups. Opportunities for student and caregiver engagement are clearly identified in the process. Artifacts confirm a set timeline for measuring and reporting progress against individual student goals. Artifacts confirm that there are clear protocols and processes in place for setting student goals and then collecting, analyzing, and responding to progress against these goals. There is a regular practice of analyzing data across subgroups. Minor opportunities for improvement and/or increased need for caregiver/student involvement may be noted. Artifacts confirm a set timeline for measuring and reporting progress against individual student goals." To

mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that there are clear protocols and processes in place for setting student goals and then collecting, analyzing, and responding to progress against these goals. There is a regular practice of analyzing data across subgroups. Minor opportunities for improvement and/or increased need for caregiver/student involvement may be noted. Artifacts confirm a set timeline for measuring and reporting progress against individual student goals." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm a high-level goal setting for each individual student. Supporting systems are informal and/or underdeveloped (including subgroup analysis). Non-academic goal setting may not yet be in place. Artifacts confirm a high-level timeline for measuring student progress, but specificity and consistency may be lacking." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "the artifacts reveal no formal process of goal setting in place at all. Artifacts reveal no set timeline for measuring student progress against individual goals."

Findings for TQIS Element 2c: Student Progress Measure – Partially Aligned.

A review of the organization's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS assessment and development of reading prescriptions, found them to be partially aligned with the Quality Standard for Element 2c: Student Progress Measure. As with Element 2b, the artifacts showed intentional plans for administering the DIBELS assessment to measure children's reading levels once per session and developing reading prescriptions based on that assessment. The reading prescriptions included recommendations for tutors and parents for what they could do to help develop children's literacy skills.

RQ18

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS® assessment and development

of reading prescriptions, related to the **measurement** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Recommendations for RQ18. A review of the tutoring program's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS assessment and development of reading prescriptions, found them to be mostly aligned with the quality standard for Element 2b: Formative Assessment and partially aligned with the quality standard for Element 2c: Student Progress Measure. To be fully aligned with these quality standards, tutoring programs must have protocols in place to develop, collect, and analyze formative assessment data, use the results to make instructional decisions for individual children, and regularly analyze data across subgroups of children. While the artifacts indicated the program's commitment to administering formative assessments and sharing data-informed recommendations with caregivers, the organization and storage of these artifacts made it difficult to determine by whom the assessments were administered, which children were assessed, and how frequently the assessments had been given. A spreadsheet attempted to quantify the number of children who were assessed with DIBELS or had reading prescriptions created for them between September 2020 and December 2022. The spreadsheet indicated that 28 students had two or more test administrations or reading prescriptions. But, upon closer analysis, the data was problematic for several reasons: many test administrations were too close together (a month or less apart), DIBELS score sheets weren't available for most children to help align the test score with the reading prescription, reading prescriptions did not delineate between the child's actual grade level and the level of the DIBELS assessment score, and no comprehensive records were found for matching children with those who administered the DIBELS Assessment. Four recommendations: 1. The DIBELS

assessment score sheets should be kept within the child's online record; 2. The score sheets should indicate the date and by whom the assessment was administered, the child's age, current grade, level of the assessment, the assessment score, and any other anecdotal comments used to create the reading prescription; 3. The corresponding reading prescription should contain the same information so that the two data points can be easily connected. 4. As with previous recommendations, a centralized system that captures attendance could also be used to track assessment data and compare results among subgroups.

RQ19

How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements incorporate research-based practices related to the **personnel** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

For RQ19, which is related to the personnel principle for effective tutoring, the organization's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements were aligned with the TQIS Rubric Elements 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection, 1b: Preservice-Training, 6b: Leader Role Clarity, and 6d: Organizational Culture. Personnel in effective tutoring considers the background of the volunteers (college students, retired teachers, etc.) and the training they receive before, during, and after tutoring children.

TQIS Element 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection. The Quality Standard for Element 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection is defined as "a clear recruitment and selection process that results in tutors with the skills and mindsets necessary to be successful in that program." To fully align

with the quality standard for Element 1a, the program must have “a clear, comprehensive recruitment and selection process that results in tutors with the skills and mindsets necessary to be successful in that program. The process results in a diverse set of tutors who are representative of the students served. The process is well-documented and understood by stakeholders throughout the organization.” To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must have “a recruitment and selection process that has been defined but may not be completely documented or fully understood throughout the organization. Minor areas for improvement may be noted, but overall, the process results in a diverse set of tutors with the skills and mindsets necessary for success.” To partially align with the quality standard, the program has “a high-level recruitment process, but the details are not clear and/or there is significant room to improve recruitment effectiveness. The recruitment process does not yet result in a complete, diverse tutoring corps with the skills and mindsets to be successful.” Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if “the recruitment process is undefined or unclear. The program does not successfully recruit enough tutors to meet program demand. Significant vacancies, lack of representation, or skill gaps exist.”

TQIS Element 1a: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS’s rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 1a can be measured through artifact review (recruitment plan, tutor job description, recruitment timeline and metrics, interview process documents), interviews, and observations. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization’s artifacts in the form of job descriptions, manuals for tutors, and tutor training materials to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews or observations were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 1a, the artifacts must “confirm a clear tutor job description, free from biased language and tailored to the

program's context and model. An artifact confirms that there is a set recruitment process and timeline, including clear metrics and set deadlines. An artifact confirms that the program has a defined set of attributes necessary for tutors to be effective in their program. The interview process is intentionally designed to assess those attributes." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that there is a clear tutor job description, free from biased language. Opportunities to further tailor the description may exist. An artifact confirms that there is a set recruitment process and timeline, including either clear deadlines or metrics." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that there is a tutor job description; specificity in the description is lacking. An artifact confirms that there is a recruitment process. Specific metrics and deadlines are lacking. Attributes necessary for tutors to be successful may be implicitly understood but not yet codified. There is no evidence that the interview process is designed to assess any particular attributes." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if the "artifacts reveal no tutor job description available or no set recruitment timeline or process. The program does not have a shared set of attributes for tutors, documented or otherwise. There is no documented interview process."

Findings for TQIS Element 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection – Partially Aligned. A review of the organization's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, and tutor training materials found them to be partially aligned with the Quality Standard for Element 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection. No explicit job description was found for tutors. However, the artifacts indicated there was a process for recruiting volunteers. Applications could be filled out online or, if at an event, on paper. Volunteers were recruited and screened on a rolling basis.

TQIS Element 1b: Pre-service Training. The Quality Standard for Element 1b: Pre-service Training is defined as "the tutoring program provides high-quality onboarding and

training tailored to the program context." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 1b, the program's "onboarding and training process fully prepares tutors for success in all aspects of their role, including program expectations, instruction, relationship-building, and SEL support. The training program addresses equity in a way that is research and/or evidence-based AND consistently embedded throughout training." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program's "onboarding and training process prepares tutors for most aspects of their role, with an opportunity to better cover one to two areas of the role. Attempts to embed equity are present and grounded in research or evidence-based practices." To partially align with the quality standard, the program's "onboarding and training process focuses on basic elements of the role, such as program expectations and organizational structure. There is an opportunity to better cover topics such as equity, SEL, and supporting all learners." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "there is no onboarding and training process and/or tutors are not prepared for their role."

TQIS Element 1b: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 1b can be measured through artifact review (summary of tutor role, onboarding scope and sequence, and pre-service training materials) and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of manuals for tutors and tutoring training materials to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 1b, the artifacts must "confirm the existence of clear, cohesive, and specific tutor expectations tailored to the program's context. Artifacts confirm that an intentional series of onboarding sessions covers general role expectations, research and/or evidence-based instructional strategies, relationship building, the tutor's role in social-emotional learning,

strategies for meeting the needs of diverse learners (including ELL and SPED students), and cultural competence. Training materials are clear and engaging." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm slight adjustments to tutor expectations will result in increased clarity, cohesion, and/or specificity tailored to the program context. Artifacts confirm an intentional series of onboarding sessions that cover general role expectations, instructional strategies, relationship building, the tutor's role in social-emotional learning, strategies for meeting the needs of diverse learners (including ELL and SPED students), and cultural competence. Minor opportunities for improving clarity in training materials or engagement may exist." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that tutor expectations lack clarity, cohesion and/or specificity. Artifacts confirm an intentional series of onboarding sessions that cover general role expectations, research and/or evidence-based instructional strategies, and relationship building. Significant opportunities for improving clarity in training materials or engagement exist. Artifact review suggests that onboarding sessions do not adequately address the tutor's role in social-emotional learning, strategies to support all learners (including ELL and SPED students), or equity practices and culturally responsive practices." Tutoring programs are considered not aligned to the quality standard if the "artifacts confirm that tutor expectations are not yet codified. The artifact review confirms that onboarding sessions are ad hoc or nonexistent."

Findings for TQIS Element 1b: Pre-service Training – Fully Aligned. A review of the manuals for tutors and tutor training materials found them to be fully aligned with the Quality Standard for Element 1b: Pre-Service Training. The artifacts showed clear expectations for tutors, scheduled training sessions with set agendas and training materials, and virtual training materials for those unable to attend in-person training or work with children in a virtual

environment. Training materials addressed diverse learners' needs, were designed to be culturally relevant, and were clear and engaging.

TQIS Element 6b: Leader Role Clarity. The Quality Standard for Element 6b: Leader Role Clarity is "the tutoring program has clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the leadership team, with particular attention to clearly defining tutor coaching responsibilities." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 6b, the "roles and responsibilities of the leadership team are clearly defined, including clear job descriptions, a defined reporting structure, and a performance management system." To mostly align with the quality standard, the "roles and responsibilities of the leadership team are mostly clearly defined. Reporting structures and performance management systems are in place, with minor areas for improvement noted." To partially align with the quality standard, the "roles and responsibilities of the leadership team are defined, but significant opportunities for improved clarity exist. Reporting structures and performance management systems exist but need significant improvement." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "roles and responsibilities for the leadership team are undefined or unclear. The program does not yet have clear reporting structures or a performance management system for leaders."

TQIS Element 6b: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 6b can be measured through artifact review (leader job descriptions, organizational chart, performance management system) and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of job descriptions, organization charts, and manuals for team leaders to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 6a, the artifacts must "confirm that there are job descriptions,

organizational charts, and performance management systems in place for all members of the leadership team." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that there are job descriptions, organizational charts, and performance management systems in place for all members of the leadership team. Minor areas for improvement may be noted." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that there are job descriptions, organizational charts, and performance management systems in place for all members of the leadership team. Significant areas for improvement may be noted." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if the "artifacts reveal a lack of clear roles and responsibilities, no organization chart that outlines reporting structures, and no performance management system for promoting or addressing performance issues with program leaders."

Findings for TQIS Element 6b: Leader Role Clarity – Fully Aligned. A review of the organization's job descriptions, organization charts, and manuals for team leaders found them to be fully aligned with the Quality Standard for Element 6b: Leader Role Clarity. The artifacts confirmed there were job descriptions for each leadership role, organizational charts, and performance management systems for evaluating team leaders and tutor performance.

TQIS Standard 6d: Organizational Culture. The Quality Standard for Element 6d: Organizational Culture is defined as "the tutoring program has a defined mission, vision, and set of organizational goals; these guiding documents are aligned with a broader context and well understood by stakeholders." To fully align with the quality standard for Element 6d, the program must have "a defined mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. These guiding components are well understood by stakeholders, and there is a system for regularly updating stakeholders about organizational progress." To mostly align with the quality standard, the program must have "a defined mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. Stakeholders are

aware of the high-level goals, but there is not yet a process for updating them on organizational progress." To partially align with the quality standard, the program must have "at least two of the following: a defined mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. Stakeholder awareness of these components is low, and there is not yet a process for updating them on organizational progress." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if the tutoring program does not yet have a mission, vision, or set of organizational goals.

TQIS Element 6d: Evidence Look Fors. According to the TQIS's rubric Evidence Looks Fors, the quality standards and rating criteria for Element 6d can be measured through artifact review (mission, vision, organization goals, and sample communication regarding organizational progress) and interviews. The researcher reviewed the non-profit organization's artifacts in the form of mission and vision statements to determine the extent to which they met the quality standard. No interviews were conducted. To fully align with the quality standard for Element 6d, the artifacts must "confirm that the program has a codified mission, vision, and set of organizational goals and there are regular processes for updating stakeholders about high-level organizational progress." To mostly align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that the program has a codified mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. Artifacts reveal that there is not yet a standard process for updating stakeholders about organizational progress. These updates appear to occur in an ad hoc or informal fashion." To partially align with the quality standard, the artifacts must "confirm that the program has at least two of the following: a codified mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. Artifacts reveal that there is not yet a process for updating stakeholders about organizational progress. Updates do not occur." Tutoring programs are considered not yet aligned to the quality standard if "an artifact review

reveals that the tutoring program does not yet have a mission, vision, or set of organizational goals."

Findings for TQIS Element 6d: Organizational Culture – Fully Aligned. A review of the organization's mission and vision statements found them to be fully aligned with the Quality Standard for Element 6d: Organizational Culture. The artifacts confirmed the organization had clearly stated mission and vision statements. They were posted on the organization's website, listed in staff manuals, manuals for team leaders and tutors, and referenced in tutor training materials.

RQ20

What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements related to the **personnel** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Recommendations for RQ20. A review of the tutoring program's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements found them to be partially aligned with the quality standard for Element 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection and fully aligned with the quality standards for Elements 1b: Pre-service Training, 6b: Leader Role Clarity, and 6d: Organizational Culture. To be fully aligned with the quality standard for Element 1a, a formal job description must be created for volunteer tutors, and a more formalized recruitment process with timelines and metrics needs to be developed and documented.

Table 2 summarizes the rubric ratings representing the degree to which the organization's artifacts aligned with each design principle evaluated by TQIS Rubric criteria.

Table 2

RQs, Artifacts, Design Principles, Rubric Criteria, and Rubric Ratings

RQ	Organization's Artifacts	Design Principle	TQIS Rubric's Criteria	Rubric Rating
RQ1	Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors Study Guides for Children	Curriculum	Element 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials	Mostly Aligned
	Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors Study Guides for Children		Element 3e: Lessons Routines and Structures	Fully Aligned
	Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors Study Guides for Children		Element 3f: Instructional Practices	Fully Aligned
RQ3	Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors Study Guides for Children	Focus	Element 6a: Program Design	Fully Aligned
RQ5	Session Records	Delivery Mode	Element 4a: Setting	Mostly Aligned
RQ7	Session Records Attendance Records	Scheduling	Element 4a: Setting	Mostly Aligned
RQ9	Session Records Attendance Records	Frequency	Element 3g: Dosage	Mostly Aligned
RQ11	Attendance Records	Group Size	Element 3h: Ratio	Fully Aligned

RQ13	Session Records Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors	Prioritization	Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention	Partially Aligned
RQ15	Session Records Attendance Records	Relationships	Element 3b: Tutor Consistency	Mostly Aligned
	Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors Tutor Training Materials		Element 3c: Student-Tutor Relationships	Fully Aligned
	Manuals for Team Leaders Manuals for Tutors Manuals for Parents/ Guardians Caregiver Agreement Forms		Element 4e: Caregiver Engagement	Partially Aligned
RQ17	Assessment Practices (including DIBELS administration) Reading Prescriptions	Measurement	Element 2b: Formative Assessment	Mostly Aligned
	Assessment Practices (including DIBELS administration) Reading Prescriptions		Element 2c: Student Progress Measure	Partially Aligned
RQ19	Job Descriptions Manuals for Tutors Tutor Training Materials	Personnel	Element 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection	Partially Aligned
	Manuals for Tutors Tutor Training Materials		Element 1b: Pre-service Training	Fully Aligned
	Job Descriptions Organization Charts Manuals for Team Leaders		Element 6b: Leader Role Clarity	Fully Aligned
	Mission and Vision Statements		Element 6d: Organizational Culture	Fully Aligned

Summary

Chapter 4 presented findings and recommendations for the study's 20 research questions using the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring and associated artifacts. Findings and recommendations for improving the instructional design of the tutoring program's practices were based on the Tutoring Quality Improvement System (TQIS) evidence-based rubric criteria.

Chapter 5

Interpretation and Recommendations

Study Summary

Chapter 5 begins with an overview of the problem and reviews the study's purpose statement, research questions, and methodology. Major findings are discussed and connected to the literature review, as explored in Chapter 2. The discussion includes implications for action and recommendations for future research.

Overview of the Problem

A non-profit literacy tutoring organization in the southeastern United States wanted to know how well their program aligned with the research on quality tutoring programs so they could improve the experience for their tutors and children. They agreed to have data and artifacts collected between September 2020 and December 2022 examined through the lens of the ten research-based Design Principles for Effective Tutoring (Robinson et al., 2021). These principles included curriculum, focus, delivery mode, scheduling, frequency, group size, prioritization, relationships, measurement, and personnel.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the instructional design of a non-profit organization's literacy tutoring program using a Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) framework (Patton & Campbell-Patton, 2022) and the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring evidence-based framework (Robinson et al., 2021) as evidenced through artifacts collected between September 2020 and December 2022. The study utilized assessment criteria from the Tutoring Quality Improvement System (TQIS) Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics developed

and validated by the National Student Support Accelerator (NSSA, 2023). Twenty research questions guided this study:

RQ1. How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children incorporate research-based practices related to the **curriculum** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ2. What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children related to the **curriculum** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ3. How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children incorporate research-based practices related to the **focus** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ4. What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children related to the **focus** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ5. How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records incorporate research-based practices related to the **delivery mode** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ6. What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records related to the **delivery mode** principle for effective tutoring based on

their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ7. How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **scheduling** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ8. What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records related to the **scheduling** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ9. How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **frequency** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ10. What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records related to the **frequency** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ11. How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's attendance records incorporate research-based practices related to the **group size** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ12. What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's attendance records related to the **group size** principle for effective tutoring based on

their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ13. How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors incorporate research-based practices related to the **prioritization** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ14. What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors related to the **prioritization** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ15. How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms incorporate research-based practices related to the **relationships** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ16. What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms related to the **relationships** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ17. How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS® assessment and development of reading prescriptions, incorporate research-based practices related to the **measurement** principle for

effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ18. What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's assessment team practices, including the administration of the DIBELS® assessment and development of reading prescriptions, related to the **measurement** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ19. How effectively does the instructional design of the tutoring program's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements incorporate research-based practices related to the **personnel** principle for effective tutoring, as measured by the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

RQ20. What recommendations can improve the instructional design of the tutoring program's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements related to the **personnel** principle for effective tutoring based on their degree of alignment with the TQIS rubric's Quality Standards and Evidence Look Fors criteria?

Review of the Methodology

The study used the Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) framework and evidence-based Design Principles for Effective Tutoring (Robinson et al., 2021) as its foundational methodology. The researcher aligned the organization's archived documentation and data collected between September 2020 and December 2022 with the ten design principles. Then, the artifacts were evaluated against the validated assessment criteria defined in the TQIS Quality

Standard Alignment Rubrics (NSSA, 2023) to determine the degree to which the organization's instructional design practices aligned with research-informed instructional design practices.

Major Findings and Recommendations

For RQs 1 and 2, which are related to the Curriculum Principle for Effective Tutoring, a review of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children found them to be fully aligned with TQIS Rubric Quality Standard Elements 3e: Lesson Routines and Structures and 3f: Instructional Practices. The manuals were found to be mostly aligned with TQIS Rubric Quality Standard 3d: High-Quality Instructional Materials because they lacked explicit alignment to state and grade-level reading standards and ongoing formative assessments. Recommendations for improving the instructional design of these materials focused on integrating state and grade-level reading outcomes and formative assessments.

For RQs 3 and 4, which are related to the Focus Principle for Effective Tutoring, a review of the tutoring program's manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, and study guides for children found them to be fully aligned with the TQIS Rubric Quality Standard Element 6a: Program Design. No recommendations were made.

For RQs 5 and 6, which are related to the Delivery Mode Principle for Effective Tutoring, a review of the tutoring program's session records found them to be mostly aligned with TQIS Rubric Quality Standard Element 4a: Setting. Recommendations for improving the instructional design of these records suggested creating post-session summary reports to capture a historical record of each session.

For RQs 7 and 8, which are related to the Frequency Principle for Effective Tutoring, a review of the tutoring program's session and attendance records found them to be mostly aligned

with TQIS Quality Standard Element 4a: Setting. Recommendations for improving the instructional design of these records suggested creating post-session summary reports to capture a historical record of each session.

For RQs 9 and 10, which are related to the Group Size Principle for Effective Tutoring, a review of the tutoring program's session and attendance records found them to be mostly aligned with TQIS Quality Standard Element 3g: Dosage. The recommendation for improving the instructional design of these records was to create a centralized system to collect and record the dates of individual tutor meetings and generate reports of the time tutors spend with children each week.

For RQs 11 and 12, which are related to the Relationships Principle for Effective Tutoring, a review of the tutoring program's attendance records found them to be fully aligned with TQIS Quality Standard Element 3h: Ratio. Recommendations for improving the instructional design of these records were to write post-session summaries to capture a historical record of each session and to create a centralized system that records attendance dates.

For RQs 13 and 14, which are related to the Scheduling Principle for Effective Tutoring, a review of the tutoring program's session records, manuals for team leaders, and manuals for tutors found them to be partially aligned with TQIS Quality Standard Element 4f: Student Enrollment and Retention. Recommendations for improving the instructional design of these records and materials focused on adding high-level attendance information to a post-session summary that would capture the total number of children at each site, the number of those who returned for additional sessions, with whom they tutored, and creating a centralized system to record attendance each week which would enable the leadership team to generate reports showing enrollment trends and retention rates.

For RQs 15 and 16, which are related to the Prioritization Principle for Effective Tutoring, a review of the tutoring program's session and attendance records, manuals for team leaders, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, manuals for parents/guardians, and caregiver agreement forms found them to be mostly aligned with TQIS Rubric Quality Standard Element 3b: Tutor Consistency, fully aligned with Element 3c: Student-Tutor Relationships, and partially aligned with Element 4e: Caregiver Engagement. Recommendations for improving the instructional design of these records and materials focused on creating a centralized attendance system, offering caregiver communication in additional languages, and creating a centralized system that records communication with caregivers.

For RQs 17 and 18, which are related to the Measurement Principle for Effective Tutoring, a review of the tutoring program's assessment practices, including the administration of the DIBELS assessment and development of reading prescriptions, found them to be mostly aligned with the TQIS Rubric Quality Standard Element 2b: Formative Assessment and partially aligned with Element 2c: Student Progress Measure. Recommendations for improving the instructional design of these materials focused on how the children's DIBELS score sheets and reading prescriptions are archived in the organization's records and creating a centralized system to house each child's assessment data. Score sheets and reading prescriptions should reflect complete and accurate information about each child and the assessment team member who administered the assessment and created the reading prescription.

For RQs 19 and 20, which are related to the Personnel Principle for Effective Tutoring, a review of the tutoring program's job descriptions, manuals for tutors, tutor training materials, organization charts, manuals for team leaders, and mission and vision statements found them to be partially aligned with TQIS Rubic Quality Standard Element 1a: Tutor Recruitment/Selection

and fully aligned with Elements 1b: Pre-service Training, 6b: Leader Role Clarity, and 6d Organizational Culture. Recommendations for improving the instructional design of the tutor recruitment materials focused on creating a formal job description for volunteer tutors.

Findings Related to the Literature

Curriculum and Focus Principles for Effective Tutoring. The non-profit literacy tutoring organization's curriculum design deviates from the Design Principles for Effective Tutoring recommendation that content be aligned with school and classroom instruction (NSSA, 2023). The non-profit organization's approach is rooted in culturally relevant pedagogy and research, as reflected in the works of Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995), Geneva Gay (2018), and Lisa Delpit (2012). The curriculum was designed to encourage literacy development by nurturing the child's sense of belonging and helping them find their "voice" in topics relevant to their culture. This approach underscores a different, yet equally significant, pathway to achieving literacy goals, particularly with children from low economic and culturally diverse families.

Delivery Mode, Scheduling, and Frequency Principles for Effective Tutoring. The non-profit literacy tutoring organization's in-person and online tutoring approach aligns with emerging trends and research (Brown, 2022; Carbonari et al., 2022; Carlana & La Ferrara, 2021; Diaz, 2022; Golden, 2020; Hewitt, 2022). By embracing both modalities, the organization has positioned itself to provide flexible options, making it more accessible to a broader range of children. Additionally, by design, the non-profit organization deviates from the research-based recommendation of conducting tutoring during the school day (NSSA, 2023). This decision reflects the organization's philosophy of differentiating the tutoring experience from the regular school environment. This approach helps children who may have negative experiences with school rekindle their interest and enthusiasm for learning (Drozd & Zembrzuska, 2013). The

non-profit organization's model is similar to the research on vacation academies (Fashola, 1998; Guryan et al., 2023; Lauer et al., 2006; Schueler et al., 2017), which has shown positive results when conducted by experienced tutors and implemented with fidelity (McCombs et al., 2017; NSSA, n.d.).

Group Size and Prioritization Principles for Effective Tutoring. The non-profit literacy tutoring organization's goal of providing one-to-one tutoring aligns with the findings of Bloom's 2-Sigma Effect study (1984) and subsequent research studies (Elbaum et al., 2000; King & Homan, 2003; Neitzel et al., 2021; Nickow et al., 2020) thus ensuring every child receives personalized attention and instruction tailored to their specific learning needs. Even though this model is more resource intensive, by prioritizing the depth and impact of the learning experience over broader accessibility, the organization has shown its commitment to quality and effectiveness in tutoring. Primarily serving children from low-economic and disadvantaged backgrounds, the program inherently focuses on children who may benefit most from additional support. However, the program adopts a more universal approach by being open to any parent or caregiver's request for tutoring, regardless of economic background. This inclusivity can help mitigate the stigma associated with tutoring, framing it as a positive opportunity rather than a remedial measure (Drozd & Zembrzuska, 2013; Raby, 2020).

Relationships, Measurement, and Personnel Principles for Effective Tutoring. As evidenced in the literature, relationship-driven tutoring programs can successfully focus on literacy development while at the same time prioritizing building trusting and caring relationships between tutors and children (Kraft et al., 2022; Rothman & Henderson, 2011). This positive impact contributes to children's social and emotional well-being. The non-profit literacy tutoring organization's commitment to ensuring children remain with the same tutor for an entire

session and subsequent sessions fosters a stable and nurturing environment and trust between the tutor and child.

In terms of measurement, the non-profit organization's use of the DIBELS assessment (University of Oregon, 2018) exemplifies its commitment to using assessment information to make instructional decisions. DIBELS is commonly used in schools and tutoring programs (Al Otaiba, 2005; Lindo et al., 2018; Nichols et al., 2018; Roehrig et al., 2008), so using this test is helpful because it brings credibility to the organization's assessment strategy. The transition from a standardized assessment to a personalized reading prescription effectively applies formative assessment practices (Brookhart, 2024; Popham, 2008) and data-driven instruction, enabling tutors to focus on areas where each child requires the most support, enhancing overall tutoring effectiveness (Invernizzi & Ouellette, 2001; Morrow et al., 2017; Roe & Vukelich, 2001).

Personnel are the heart of every organization. The non-profit literacy tutoring organization recruits a diverse group of volunteer tutors, many of whom are former teachers, while others come from health care, law, and business fields, with intentional efforts to find tutors who reflect the children’s racial and ethnic backgrounds. The literature supports this approach to tutor recruitment (Al Otaiba, 2005; Allor & McCatheren, 2004; Falk-Ross et al., 2017; Fitzgerald, 2001; Gershenson et al., 2022; Guryan et al., 2023; Juel, 1996; Rodgers & Rodgers, 2023; Wasik, 1998). What matters most is the training and support tutors are given throughout the tutoring experience, which is underscored by literature indicating the importance of ensuring volunteer tutors are well-trained and prepared for the experience of working with children (Invernizzi & Ouellette, 2001; Kitano & Lewis, 2007).

Conclusions

Implications for Action

The current study was predicated on the non-profit literacy tutoring organization's desire to expand its program to a broader area–potentially nationwide. The study's recommendations highlighted issues with how the non-profit organization's data and materials were archived, making it difficult to determine the degree to which the artifacts aligned with the TQIS Rubric Quality Standards. Moreover, in the case of assessment data (DIBELS scores and reading prescriptions), the lack of data points made quantitative analysis impossible. If the organization is committed to expanding its reach, it must effectively demonstrate how its instructional design links to measurable improvements in children's literacy skills. For these reasons, the following recommendations are made:

1. Centralized System for Data Management. Create a centralized system for collecting and organizing session and attendance records, individual children's DIBELS assessment scores and reading prescriptions, caregiver communication, and other relevant materials specific to each session and the program in general. This system would streamline the operational aspects of collecting the organization's data, allowing for more robust historical documentation. A systematic approach to storing and organizing data and materials will enable the organization to identify trends, measure progress against objectives, and tailor interventions to meet the needs of the tutors and children they serve.
2. Staff Member Dedicated to Data Management and Oversight. Create a full-time, paid staff position to oversee the maintenance of the automated system, data collection, and reporting. This person would ensure data integrity and consistency in collecting

and organizing data and artifacts by facilitating and managing the centralized system, thereby contributing to the tutoring program's overall effectiveness.

An organization's ability to collect and retain data and artifacts is essential to its operations (i.e., session and attendance records, children's DIBELS assessment scores and reading prescriptions, and other historical artifacts). A centralized system for data management will allow for better historical documentation and data analysis, facilitating a clearer understanding of program impacts and areas needing improvement. This recommendation aligns with the Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) framework (Patton & Campbell-Patton, 2022) and IDPT and HPT tenets that emphasize the importance of using data to inform program design and effectiveness (Gilmore, 2006; Pershing, 2002).

Additionally, the recommendation to hire a dedicated staff member for data management and oversight underscores the importance of maintaining data integrity to enable future systematic evaluations of tutoring practices. This recommendation aligns with ARMA International's Generally Accepted Recordkeeping Principles (2017). Their Accountability hallmark recommends that organizations designate a person to oversee the organization's information. This person's priority will be to ensure that the organization uses its data effectively to inform decisions and enhance the educational outcomes of the children it serves. Both recommendations are crucial to ensuring that the non-profit literacy tutoring organization can effectively expand its operations and improve its services on a larger scale.

Recommendations for Future Research

The current study relied on the analysis of artifacts from September 2020 through December 2022 within a Utilization-Focused Evaluation (UFE) framework. Given this constraint, it was impossible to triangulate data from interviews and observations with archived

artifacts, which might have provided a more comprehensive evaluation of the tutoring program. Future research could expand on the current study's findings by:

- Incorporating Stakeholder Interviews and Observations: Future studies could consider interviewing current and former staff members, tutors, children, and caregivers to gather insights into the program's impact, strengths, and challenges. These firsthand accounts could offer valuable context and depth to the findings derived from artifact analysis alone. Additionally, observations of tutoring sessions, both in-person and virtual, could provide insights into instructional practices and tutor-child interactions and relationships.
- Examining the Tutor-Child Relationship Dynamic: Future qualitative research could explore the one-on-one relationship between tutors and children that occurs during a tutoring session. By studying factors such as the quality of interaction, rapport and trust, and personalized instructional strategies, the study could provide insight into how relationships contribute to or hinder a child’s literacy development. The results could identify best practices and potential areas for improvement in fostering effective, supportive tutor-child relationships.

These recommendations for future research build on the current study's findings and address its limitations by expanding the scope of the research to gather data, leading to a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the tutoring program's effectiveness and areas for improvement.

Concluding Remarks

It has been forty years since Bloom's 2-Sigma study (1984) was published. Since then, even with theoretical perspectives guiding the development of tutoring programs, there has been no definitive answer to the question of how and why tutoring works. As delineated in this study's

literature review, there is wide variation in how tutoring programs are organized and implemented. No single approach to tutoring has yet been determined as the best or only way to increase literacy skills and student achievement. The non-profit literacy tutoring organization featured in this study customized the instructional design of its program to meet the distinct needs of the children it serves. Despite the afterschool, once-a-week format over six, eight, or nine weeks and without direct integration with school curricula, this study revealed that such tutoring programs can still align with research-based design principles and quality standards. Moreover, the efficacy of this approach, even in the absence of formal school collaboration, indicates that tutoring interventions such as the one offered by the non-profit literacy tutoring organization featured in this study can bridge educational divides and promote literacy success.

References

Al Otaiba, S. (2005). How effective is code-based reading tutoring in English for English learners and pre-service teacher-tutors? *Remedial and Special Education, 26*(4), 245–254. https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325050260040

Allen, A., & Chavkin, N. F. (2004). New evidence that tutoring with community volunteers can help middle school students improve their academic achievement. *School Community Journal, 14*(2), 7–18. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ794820.pdf

Allen, B. (2015). After-school tutoring increased academic performance. *Journal of Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship, 2*(3), Article 1.

Allison, M., & Kaye, J. (2003). *Strategic planning for non-profit organizations: A practical guide and workbook* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Allor, J., & McCathren, R. (2004). The efficacy of an early literacy tutoring program implemented by college students. *Learning Disabilities Practice, 19*(2), 116–129. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2004.00095.x

Anania, J. (1982). *The effects of quality of instruction on the cognitive and affective learning of students.* (Publication No. T-28171) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Ander, R., Guryan, J., & Ludwig, J. (2016). *Improving academic outcomes for disadvantaged students: Scaling up individualized tutorials.* Policy Proposal 2016-02. The Hamilton Project: Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Full-Paper-1.pdf

Armbruster, B. B., Lehr, F., Osborn, J. (2006). *A child becomes a reader: Proven ideas from research for parents* (3rd ed.). National Institute for Literacy. https://www.nichd.nih.gov/sites/default/files/publications/pubs/documents/readingk-3.pdf

ARMA International. (2017). *Generally accepted recordkeeping principles.* https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.arma.org/resource/resmgr/files/Learn/2017_Generally_Accepted_Reco.pdf

Baker, J. D., Rieg, S. A., & Clendaniel, T. (2006). An investigation of an after school math tutoring program: University tutors + elementary students = successful partnership. *Education, 127*(2), 287–293.

Baker, S., Gersten, R., & Keating, T. (2000). When less may be more: A 2-year longitudinal evaluation of a volunteer tutoring program requiring minimal training. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*(4), 494–519. https://www.jstor.org/stable/748095

Barshay, J. (2019, October 30). *U.S. education achievement slides backwards.* The Hechinger Report. https://hechingerreport.org/u-s-education-achievement-slides-backwards/

Bayless, S.D., Jenson, J. M., Richmond, M. K., Pampel, F. C., Cook, M., & Calhoun, M. (2018). Effects of an after-school literacy intervention on the reading skills of children in public housing communities. *Child Youth Care Forum, 47*, 537–561. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-018-9442-5

Beach, K. D., Washburn, E. K., Gesel, S. A., & Williams, P. (2021). Pivoting an elementary summer reading intervention to a virtual context in response to COVID-19: An examination of program transformation and outcomes. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 26*(2), 112–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2021.1906250

Bloom, B. S. (1984). The 2 sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as

effective as one-on-one tutoring. *Educational Researcher, 13*(6), 4–16. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1175554

Boonk, L., Hieronymus, J. M. G., Ritzen, H., & Brand-Gruwel, S. (2018). A review of the relationship between parent involvement indicators and academic achievement. *Educational Research Review, 24*, 10–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.001

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Brookhart, S. M. (2024). *Classroom assessment essentials.* ASCD.

Brown, C. S. (2022). Remote family engagement through virtual tutoring: An emergency response to support children, families, and students. *Journal on Education in Emergencies, 8*(3), 229–244. https://doi.org/10.33682/an7j-4v2y

Burke, A. J. (1983*). Students' potential for learning contrasted under tutorial and group approaches to instruction.* (Publication No. T-28810) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Carbonari, M. V., Davison, M., DeArmond, M., Dewey, D., Dizon-Ross, E., Goldhaber, D., Hashim, A. K., Kane, T. J., McEachin, A., Morton, E., Patterson, T., & Staiger, D. O. (2022). *The challenges of implementing academic COVID recovery interventions: Evidence from the road to recovery project.* CALDER Working Paper No. 275 - 1222. https://cepr.harvard.edu/sites/hwpi.harvard.edu/files/cepr/files/the_challenges_of_implementing_academic_covid_recovery.pdf?m=1677190353

Carlana, M. & La Ferrara, E. (2021). *Apart but connected: Online tutoring and student outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic.* IZA Institute of Labor Economics. https://docs.iza.org/dp14094.pdf

Cavanaugh, C. L., Kim, A., Wanzek, J., & Vaughn, S. (2004). Kindergarten reading interventions for at-risk students: Twenty years of research. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 2*(1), 9–21. https://digilander.libero.it/adriauno/metareadatrisk04.pdf

Chall, J. S. (1989). Learning to read: The great debate 20 years later. *Phi Delta Kappa International, 70*(7), 521–538. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20403953

Cohen, P. A., Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. C. (1982). Educational outcomes of tutoring: A meta-analysis of findings. *American Educational Research Journal, 19*(2), 237–248. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1162567

Cordasco, F. (1976). *A brief history of education: A handbook of information on Greek, Roman, medieval, renaissance, and modern educational practice.* Littlefield, Adams & Company.

Cortes, K., Kortecamp, K., Loeb, S., & Robinson, C. D. (2023). *A scalable approach to high-impact tutoring for young readers: Results of a randomized controlled trial.* National Student Support Accelerator. https://studentsupportaccelerator.org/sites/default/files/Scalable%20Approach%20to%20High-Impact%20Tutoring.pdf

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.

De Vita, C. J., Fleming, C., & Twombly, E. C. (2001). Building non-profit capacity: A framework for addressing the problem. In C. J. De Vita & C. Fleming (Eds.), *Building capacity in non-profit organizations* (pp. 5–30). Urban Institute.

Delpit, L. (2012). "Will it help the sheep?": Why educate? *About Campus*, *17*(3), 2–9. https://doi.org/10.1002/aca.21080

Devers, C. J., Devers, E. E., Miller, P. D., & Alayan, A. (2020). Tutoring in online environments: A topic for professional development. In R. E. Ferdig, E. Baumgartner, R. Hartshorne, R.

Kaplan-Rakowski, & C. Mouza (Eds.), *Teaching, technology, and teacher education during the COVID-19 pandemic: Stories from the field* (pp. 561–564). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). https://www.learntechlib.org/p/216903/

Diaz, J. (2022). K-12 virtual tutoring: An equitable pandemic-era service worth continuing. *OLA Quarterly, 27*(2), 5–10. https://doi.org/10.5399/osu/1093-7374.27.02.3

Dietrichson, J., Bog, M., Filges, T., & Jorgenson, A. K. (2017). Academic interventions for elementary and middle school students with low socioeconomic status: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 87*(2), 243–282. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316687036

Dobbins, C. E., Gibson, K. E., & Lamm, A. J. (2020). Promoting environmental communication and policy formation: A utilization-focused evaluation approach. *Environmental Communication, 15*(7), 857–869. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2021.1938629

Dorn, E., Hancock, B., Sarakatsannis, J., & Viruleg, E. (2020). *COVID-19 and learning loss - disparities grow and help students.* McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-and-social-sector/our-insights/covid-19-and-learning-loss-disparities-grow-and-students-need-help

Drozd, E., & Zembrzuska, A. (2013). School tutoring as a concept and a support method in student development. *Forum Oświatowe, 2*(49), 167–175. http://forumoswiatowe.pl/index.php/czasopismo/article/view/81

Education Trust. (2021). *Strategies to resolve unfinished learning*. https://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/The-Importance-of-Strong-Relationships-as-a-Strategy-to-Solve-Unfinished-Learning-March-2021.pdf

Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(4), 605–619. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.92.4.605

Erickson, A. H., Jacob, R. T., & Asher, C. (2023). *An evaluation of the reading partners tutoring program*. Center for Open Science. https://osf.io/w9uyd

Falk-Ross, F., Dealy, A., Porcelli, J., Hammond, J., & Evans, B. (2017). After-school programs for bilingual students: Pre-service teachers' perspectives and students' achievement. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 33*(4), 335–347. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2017.1324827

Fashola, O. S. (1998). *Review of extended-day and after-school programs and their effectiveness.* Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk. Report No. 24. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED424343.pdf

Fitzgerald, J. (2001). Can minimally trained college student volunteers help young at-risk children to read better? *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(1), 28–47. https://www.jstor.org/stable/748126

Frey, L. A., & Reigeluth, C. M. (1986). Instructional models for tutoring: A review. *Journal of Instructional Development, 9*(1), 2–8. https://www.jstor.org/stable/30220802

Fryer, R. G., & Howard-Noveck, M. (2020). High-dosage tutoring and reading achievement: Evidence from New York City. *Journal of Labor Economics, 38*(2), 421–452. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/705882?journalCode=jole

Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Gershenson, S., Hart, C., Hyman, J., Lindsay, C., & Papageorge, N. W. (2022). The long-run impacts of same-race teachers. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 14*(4), 300–342. https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20190573

Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Newman-Gonchar, R., Dimino, J., & Jayanthi, M. (2020). Meta-analysis of the impact of reading interventions for students in the primary grades. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 13*(2), 401–427. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2019.1689591

Gibbs, S. (n.d.). *Effective tutoring: Assembling the pieces. Information for Educators.* McGraw-Hill/SRA. http://ecommerce-prod.mheducation.com.s3.amazonaws.com/unitas/school/program/early-reading-tutor/ert-research-effective-tutoring.pdf

Gilmore, E. R. (2006). Using content analysis in human performance technology. In J. A. Pershing (Ed.), *Handbook of human performance technology* (3rd ed., pp. 819–836). Pfeiffer.

Golden, E. (2020, September 5). *Industrious Minnesota students create virtual tutoring services to give back in the pandemic.* Star Tribune. https://www.startribune.com/industrious-minnesota-students-create-virtual-tutoring-services-to-give-back-in-the-pandemic/572321132/

Gordon, E. E. (2009). 5 ways to improve tutoring programs. *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(6), 440–445. https://doi.org/10.1177/00317217090900061

Gordon, E. E., & Gordon, E. H. (1990). *Centuries of tutoring: A history of alternative education in America and western Europe.* University Press of America.

Gordon, E. E., Morgan, R. R., O'Malley, C. J., & Ponticell, J. (2007). *The tutoring revolution: Applying research for best practices, policy implications, and student achievement.* Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Gortazar, L., Hupkau, C., & Roldan-Mones, A. (2024). Online tutoring works: Experimental evidence from a program with vulnerable children. *Journal of Public Economics, 232*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2024.105082

Gough, P. B., & Hillinger, M. L. (1980). Learning to read: An unnatural act. *Bulletin of the Orton Society, 30*, 179–196. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23769975

Grissmer, D., Buddin, R., Berends, M., Willingham, D., DeCoster, J., Duran, C., Hulleman, C., Murrah, W., & Evans, T. (2023). *A kindergarten lottery evaluation of core knowledge charter schools: Should building general knowledge have a central role in educational and social science research and policy?* EdWorkingPaper No. 23-755. Annenberg Institute at Brown University. https://doi.org/10.26300/nsbq-hb21

Guryan, J., Ludwig, J., Bhatt, M. P., Cook, P. J., Davis, J. M. V., Dodge, K., Farkas, G., Fryer Jr., R. G., Mayer, S., Pollack, H., & Steinberg, L. (2023). Not too late: Improving academic outcomes among adolescents. *American Economic Review, 113*(3), 738–765. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20210434

Hall, M. S., & Burns, M. K. (2018). Meta-analysis of targeted small-group reading interventions. *Journal of School Psychology, 66*, 54–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.11.002

Harasim, L. (2000). Shift happens: Online education as a new paradigm in learning. *The Internet and Higher Education, 3*(1–2). https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00032-4

Heinrich, C. J., Burch, P., Good, A., Acosta, R., Chen, H., Dillender, M., Kirshbaum, C., Nisar, H., & Stewart, M. (2014). Improving the implementation and effectiveness of out-of-

school time tutoring. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 33*(2), 471–494. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21745

Heinrich, C. J., & Nisar, H. (2012). The efficacy of private sector providers in improving public educational outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(5), https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213486334

Heller, R. (2022). *Enough already with the reading wars*. Kappan. https://kappanonline.org/reading-wars-heller/

Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement.* https://sedl.org/connections/resources/evidence.pdf

Hewitt, K. (2022, May 28). *Peel board rolling out free virtual tutoring for students.* Brampton Guardian. https://www.bramptonguardian.com/news/peel-board-rolling-out-free-virtual-tutoring-for-students/article_22160a24-130b-5ad2-b7a9-e14bc59abf26.html

Hilpinen, R. (2011). *Artifact*. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/artifact/

Hock, M. F., Pulvers, K. A., Deshler, D. D., & Schumaker, J. B. (2001). The effects of an after-school tutoring program on the academic performance of at risk students and students with LD. *Remedial and special education, 22*(3), 172–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193250102200305

Invernizzi, M., & Ouellette, M. (2001). *Improving children's reading ability through volunteer reading tutoring programs.* National Governors' Association Info Brief. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED458570

Jaiswal, S. K., & Choudhuri, R. (2017). A review of the relationship between parent involvement and students' academic performance. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 4*(3), 110–123. https://doi.org/10.25215/0403.052

Jenkins, J. R., Peyton, J. A., Sanders, E. A., & Vadasy, P. F. (2004). Effects of reading decodable texts in supplemental first-grade tutoring. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 8*(1), 53–85. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532799xssr0801_4

Juel, C. (1996). What makes literacy tutoring effective? *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*(3), 268–289. https://www.jstor.org/stable/748277

King, J. R., & Homan, S. R. (2003). Early intervention in literacy: An in-class model for teachers. *Reading Research and Instruction, 42*(3), 32–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388070309558389

Kitano, M. K., & Lewis, R. B. (2007). Examining the relationships between reading achievement and tutoring duration and content for gifted culturally and linguistically diverse students from low-income backgrounds. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 30*(3), 295–325. https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320703000302

Kortecamp, K., & Peters, M. L. (2023). The impact of a high-dosage tutoring program on reading achievement of beginning readers: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2023.2179056

Kraft, M. A. (2015). How to make additional time matter: Integrating individualized tutorials into an extended day. *Education Finance and Policy, 10*(1), 81–116. https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00152

Kraft, M. A., List, J. A., Livingston, J. A., & Sadoff, S. (2022). *Online tutoring by college volunteers: Experimental evidence from a pilot program.* Ideas: Framed Field Experiments 00746. https://ideas.repec.org/p/feb/framed/00746.html

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491. https://doi.org/10.2307/1163320

Lane, H. B., Pullen, P. C., Hudson, R. F., & Konold, T. R. (2009). Identifying essential instructional components of literacy tutoring for struggling beginning readers. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 48*, 277–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388070902875173

Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Apthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glen, M. L. (2006). Out-of-school-time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(2), 275–313. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3700591

Lee, S. J., & Hawkins, M. R. (2008). "Family is here": Learning in community-based after-school programs. *Theory Into Practice, 47*, 51–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840701764763

Lindo, E. J., Weiser, B., Cheatham, J. P., & Allor, J. H. (2018). Benefits of structured after-school literacy tutoring by university students for struggling elementary readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 34*(2), 117–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2017.1357156

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences.* Corwin Press.

Markovitz, C. E., Hernandez, M. W., Hedberg, E. C., & Silberglitt, B. (2014). Impact evaluation of the Minnesota reading corps K-3 program. *The Corporation for National and Community Service.* https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED560018.pdf

Mather, N., Bos, C., & Babur, N. (2001). Perceptions and knowledge of pre-service and inservice teachers about early literacy instruction. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34*(5), 472–482. https://doi.org/10.1177/002221940103400508

McCombs, J. S., Whitaker, A. A., & Yoo, P. Y. (2017). *The value of out-of-school time programs.* Rand Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE267.html

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* Jossey-Bass.

Miles, K. P., Lauterbach, M. D., Murano, D. M., & Dembek, G. A. (2019). Reading rescue: A follow-up on the effectiveness of an intervention for struggling readers. *The Journal of Educational Research, 112*(2), 255–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2018.1514358

Miller, S. D. (2003). Partners-in-reading: Using classroom assistants to provide tutorial assistance to struggling first-grade readers. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 8*(3), 333–349. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327671ESPR0803_3

Moats, L. C. (1994). The missing foundation in teacher education: Knowledge of the structure of spoken and written language. *Annals of Dyslexia, 44*, 81–102. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23769686

Moats, L. C. (2020). *Teaching reading is rocket science, 2020: What expert teachers for reading should know and be able to do.* American Federation of Teachers. https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/moats.pdf

Mokyr, J. (2018). Bottom-up or top-down? The origins of the industrial revolution. *Journal of Institutional Economics, 14*(6), 1003–1024. https://doi.org/10.1017/S174413741700042X

Morgan, H. (2022). Conducting a qualitative document analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 27*(1), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5044

Morrow, L., Dougherty, S. M., Kunz, K., & Hall, M. (2017). Rutgers reading club: An after school program to motivated and enhance literacy for struggling readers. *Michigan Reading Journal, 49*(3) Article 11. 49–52. https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mrj/vol49/iss3/11

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2019). *The nation's report card*. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/

National Student Support Accelerator (NSSA). (n.d.). *High-impact tutoring: Out-of-school time playbook*. https://studentsupportaccelerator.org/ost-playbook

National Student Support Accelerator (NSSA). (2023). *Tutoring quality improvement system quality standards.* https://studentsupportaccelerator.org/sites/default/files/TQIS%20Quality%20Standards.pdf

Neitzel, A. J., Lake, C., Pellegrini, M., & Slavin, R. E. (2021). A synthesis of quantitative research on programs for struggling readers in elementary schools. *Reading Research Quarterly, 57*(1), 149–179. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.379

Nelson, L. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation of the program evaluation process of a Missouri school district.* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Nelson-Royes, A. M. (2015). *Why tutoring? A way to achieve success in school.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Nichols, J. D., Kim, I., & Nichols, G. W. (2018). The effect of parent and community volunteerism on early literacy development. *Educational Review, 72*(4), 411–426. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2018.1530638

Nickow, A. J., Oreopoulos, P., & Quan, V. (2020). *The impressive effects of tutoring on PreK-12 learning: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the experimental evidence*. (EdWorking Paper: 20-267). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. https://doi.org/10.26300/eh0c-pc52

Nickow, A. J., Oreopoulos, P., & Quan, V. (2024). The promise of tutoring for PreK-12 learning: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *American Educational Research Journal, 61*(1), 74–107. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312231208

Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) (2023, November 23). *Human research protection foundational training.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/education-and-outreach/human-research-protection-training/human-research-protection-foundational-training/index.html

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Patton, M. Q., & Campbell-Patton, C. E. (2022). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (5th ed.). Sage.

Pershing, J. L. (2002). Using document analysis in analyzing and evaluating performance. *Performance Improvement 41*(1), 36–42. https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.4140410108

Petscher Y., Cabell S. Q., Catts H. W., Compton D. L., Foorman B. R., Hart S. A., & Wagner R. K. (2020). How the science of reading informs 21st-century education. *Reading Research Quarterly, 55*(S1). https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.352

Phills, J. A. (2005). *Integrating mission and strategy for non-profit organizations.* Oxford University Press.

Pondiscio, R. (2023). *At long last, E. D. Hirsch, Jr. gets his due: New research shows big benefits from Core Knowledge.* Fordham Institute. https://fordhaminstitute.org/national/commentary/long-last-ed-hirsch-jr-gets-his-due-new-research-shows-big-benefits-core#

Popham, W. J. (2008). *Transformative Assessment.* ASCD.

Powers, S. (2013). *A utilization-focused evaluation of the pathways to reading program.* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Preston, T. (2022). A chronicle of Kappan's coverage of the reading wars. *Kappan, 103*(8), 5–7. https://kappanonline.org/kappans-coverage-reading-wars-preston/

Quinlan, J. K. (2019). *Exploring language learning through the lens of online speaking labs.* [Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Raby, A. (2020). Student voice in personal tutoring. *Frontiers in Education, 5*, Article 120. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00120

Ramirez, R., Neudoeffer, C., & Salomons, M. (2022). How did conservation go to scale? A case study in utilization-focused evaluation. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation, 18*(42). https://doi.org/10.56645/jmde.v18i42.703

Rapoport., T., Yair, G., & Kahane, R. (1989). Tutorial relations: The dynamics of social contract and personal trust. *Interchange, 20*, 14–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01808328

Ravitch, S. M., & Riggan M. (2017). *Reason & rigor: How conceptual frameworks guide research* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Rice, M., Erbeli, F., Thompson, C. G., Sallese, M. R., & Fogarty, M. (2022). Phonemic awareness: A meta-analysis for planning effective instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 57*(4), 1259–1289. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.473

Richey, R. C., Klein, J. D., & Tracey, M. W. (2001). *The instructional design knowledge base.* Routledge.

Ritter, G. W., Barnett, J. H., Denny, G. S., & Albin, G. R. (2009). The effectiveness of volunteer tutoring programs for elementary and middle school students: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(1), 3–38. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325690

Roberts, C., & Hyatt, L. (2019). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation* (3rd ed.). Corwin.

Robinson, C. D., Kraft, M. A., Loeb, S., & Schueler, B. E. (2021). *Student learning with high-dosage tutoring.* EdResearch for Recovery Design Principles Series. https://annenberg.brown.edu/sites/default/files/EdResearch_for_Recovery_Design_Principles_1.pdf

Robinson, C. D., & Loeb, S. (2021). *High-impact tutoring: State of the research and priorities for future learning.* (EdWorkingPaper: 21-384). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. https://doi.org/10.26300/qf76-rj21

Rodgers, B. J., & Rodgers, D. J. (2023). The need for black male mentors. *Kappan, 104*(7), 25–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/00317217231168259

Roe, M. F., & Vukelich, C. (2001). Understanding the gap between an AmericaReads program and the tutoring sessions: The nesting of challenges. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 16*(1), 39–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/02568540109594973

Roehrig, A. D., Duggar, S. W., Moats, L., Glover, M., & Mincey, B. (2008). When teachers work to use progress monitoring data to inform literacy instruction: Identifying potential supports and challenges. *Remedial and Special Education, 29*(6), 364–382. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932507314021

Rothman, T., & Henderson, M. (2011). Do school-based tutoring programs significantly improve student performance on standardized tests? *Research in Middle Level Education Online, 34*(6), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/19404476.2011.11462079

Sawchuk, S. (2022). Can online tutoring help schools dig out of a pandemic learning hole? *Education Week, 41*(21), 14. https://www.edweek.org/leadership/can-online-tutoring-work-results-are-promising-but-preliminary/2022/01#:~:text=Using%20college%20students%20to%20tutor,likely%20would%20produce%20better%20results.

Schueler, B. E. (2020a). Making the most of school vacation: A field experiment of small group math instruction. *Education Finance and Policy, 15*(2), 310–331. https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00269

Schueler, B. E. (2020b). *Summer "vacation academies" can narrow coronavirus learning gaps.* Education Next. https://www.educationnext.org/summer-vacation-academies-narrow-coronavirus-learning-gaps-springfield/

Schueler, B. E., Goodman, J. S., & Deming, D. J. (2017). Can states take over and turn around school districts? Evidence from Lawrence, Massachusetts. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 39*(2), 311–332. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373716685

Scott, J. (1990). *A matter of record: Documentary sources in social research.* Polity Press.

Seidenberg, M. (2018). *Language at the speed of sight: How we read, why so many can't, and what can be done about it.* Basic Books.

Semingson, P., Owens, D., & Kerns, W. (2020). “Connected” literacies: Virtual storybook reading and digital writing during the COVID-19 pandemic. In R. E. Ferdig, E. Baumgartner, R. Hartshorne, R. Kaplan-Rakowski, & C. Mouza (Eds.), *Teaching, technology, and teacher education during the COVID-19 pandemic: Stories from the field* (pp. 85–88). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).

Shanahan, T. (1998). On the effectiveness and limitations of tutoring in reading. In P. D. Pearson & A. Iran-Nejad (Eds.), *Review of Research in Education* (pp. 217–234). American Educational Research Association.

Sheldon, J., Arbreton, A., Hopkins, L., & Grossman, J. B. (2010). Investing in success: Key strategies for building quality in after-school programs. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 45*, 394–404. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-010-9296-y

Shriver, E. K. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read: Reports of the subgroups* (NIH Pub No. 00-4754). National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/report

Silber, K. H., & Kearny, L. (2006). Business perspectives for performance technologists. In J. A. Pershing (Ed.), *Handbook of human performance technology* (3rd ed., pp. 55–92). Pfeiffer.

Strauss, V. (2023, May 23). *On the latest obsession with phonics.* The Washington Post.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). Evaluation models. *New Directions for Evaluation, 2001*(89), 7–98. https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.3

The White House. (2022, July 5). *Fact sheet: Biden-Harris administration launches national effort to support student success.* https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/07/05/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-launches-national-effort-to-support-student-success/

Tierney, M. (1942). Aristotle and Alexander the Great. *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review, 31*(122), 221–228. https://www.jstor.org/stable/30098049

University of Oregon. (2018). *8th Edition of Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS®).* University of Oregon. http://dibels.uoregon.edu/

U.S. Department of Education (2021). *Frequently asked questions: Elementary and secondary school emergency relief programs; Governor's emergency education relief programs.* https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/05/ESSER.GEER_.FAQs_5.26.21_745AM_FINALb0cd6833f6f46e03ba2d97d30aff953260028045f9ef3b18ea602db4b32b1d99.pdf

Wasik, B. (1998). Using volunteers as reading tutors: Guidelines for successful practices. *The Reading Teacher, 51*(7), 562–570. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20201962

Wasik, B., & Slavin, R. E. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28*(3), 178–200. https://doi.org/10.2307/747888

Wicks, M. (2010). *A national primer on K-12 online learning: Version 2.* International Association for K-12 Online Learning. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED514892.pdf

Zamberg, I., Manzano, S., Posfay-Barbe, K., Windisch, O., Agoritsas, T., Schiffer, E. (2020). A mobile health platform to disseminate validated institutional measurements during the COVID-19 outbreak: Utilization-focused evaluation study. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance 6*(2). https://doi.org/10.2196/18668

Zimmer, R., Hamilton, L., & Christina, R. (2010). After-school tutoring in the context of No Child Left Behind: Effectiveness of two programs in the Pittsburg Public Schools. *Economics of Education Review, 29*(1), 18–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.02.005

Appendices

Appendix A. Non-profit Organization Permission Letter

[redacted]

August 17, 2023

Linda M. Wiley
Baker University
618 Eighth Street
Baldwin City, KS 66066

RE: Permission to Use Data for Doctoral Dissertation Research

Dear Linda,

This letter is in reference to your request to utilize data held by our organization for your doctoral dissertation research. We are pleased to support your academic endeavors and are willing to grant you access to the data pertinent to your study.

The data we will provide is confined to Fall 2020 through Fall 2022 and represents the full extent of the data shared with you. The data includes Dibels test scores, attendance records, tutor training records, informal tutor and student surveys, and curriculum materials. This data is to be used exclusively for your doctoral dissertation. Any use of the data for other research studies or publications is prohibited without express written permission from our organization.

Our organization wishes to remain anonymous in all documentation and doctoral publications resulting from your research. By accepting the use of our data, you agree to adhere to these conditions and to ensure that the data is used in a manner that respects the confidentiality and anonymity of our staff, tutors, and the children we serve.

We trust that your research will be conducted with the highest degree of integrity and that all findings derived from our data will contribute value to the academic community. We commend your commitment to advancing knowledge in your field and fully support your research project. We wish you the utmost success in your doctoral pursuits.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Executive Director

[redacted]

Appendix B. IRB Approval Form

BAKER UNIVERSITY

IRB Request

Date 3/21/2024

IRB Protocol Number _____
(IRB use only)

I. Research Investigator(s) (students must list faculty sponsor)

Department(s) Instructional Design & Performacne Technology

	Name	Signature	
1.	Linda M. Wiley	Linda M. Wiley Digitally signed by Linda M. Wiley Date: 2024.03.21 10:11:45 -04'00'	Principal Investigator
2.	Dr. Regena Aye	Regena M. Aye	☑ Check if faculty sponsor
3.	Dr. Kyunghwa Cho	Digitally signed by Kyunghwa Cho Date: 2024.03.27 12:26:08 -05'00'	☐ Check if faculty sponsor
4.	_____	_____	☐ Check if faculty sponsor

Principal investigator contact information

Phone [redacted]

Email

Address

Note: When submitting your finalized, signed form to the IRB, please ensure that you cc all investigators and faculty sponsors using their official Baker University (or respective organization's) email addresses.

Faculty sponsor contact information

Phone _____

Email _____

Expected Category of Review: ☑ Exempt ☐ Expedited ☐ Full ☐ Renewal

II. Protocol Title

A Utilization-Focused Evaluation of a Non-Profit Literacy Program:

A Study Anchored in Instructional Design and Performance Technology

III. Summary:

The following questions must be answered. Be specific about exactly what participants will experience and about the protections that have been included to safeguard participants from harm.

A. In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

The purpose of the current study is to evaluate the instructional design of a non-profit's literacy tutoring program using a Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) methodology (Patton & Campbell-Patton, 2022). The study will explore, describe, and assess the instructional design of the tutoring program's archived material collected between September 2020 and December 2022.

B. Briefly describe each condition, manipulation, or archival data set to be included within the study.

The archived materials include tutor manuals, theme books, session and attendance records, student assessment data, tutor training completion records and post-training surveys, job descriptions, and mission and vision statements collected between September 2020 and December 2022.

IV. Protocol Details

A. What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.

The U-FE Framework and Design Principles for Effective Tutoring evidence-based framework (Robinson et al., 2021) serve as the study's research approach. The study utilizes assessment criteria from the Tutoring Quality Improvement System (TQIS) Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics developed and validated by the National Student Support Accelerator (NSSA, in press). The Design Principles and TQIS Rubrics are attached to this request.

B. Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical, or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

The study will use archival data; therefore, the subjects will not encounter any psychological, social, physical, or legal risk.

C. Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.

The study will use archival data; therefore, the subjects will not encounter any stress.

D. Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

The study will use archival data; therefore, the subjects will not be deceived or misled in any way.

E. Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

No information will be requested directly from subjects. Only archived materials are being reviewed. The non-profit tutoring program wishes to remain anonymous. Specific site locations and student data will be coded so as to protect their identity (i.e., site location a, site location b, student 1, student 2, etc.)

F. Will the subjects be presented with materials which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

The study will use archival data; therefore, no materials will be presented to subjects.

G. Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

The study will use archival data; therefore, no time will be demaded of any subject.

H. Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

The study will use archival data; therefore, no subjects will be solicited or contacted for this study.

I. What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

The study will use archival data; therefore, no subjects will be solicited or contacted for this study.

J. How will you insure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

The non-profit organization's Executive Director has provided a letter granting permission to conduct the study. The letter expressly states they wish to remain anonymous The letter is included with this application.

K. Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

Data shared from the non-profit organization's archives will remain in their secure archive. The identities of the non-profit organization's name, site locations, employees, volunteer tutors, and students will be protected.

L. Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer? If so, explain.

The study will use archival data; therefore, this question does not apply to this current study.

M. What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data? Where will it be stored? How long will it be stored? What will be done with the data after the study is completed?

The archived data resides in the non-profit tutoring program's centralized data repository (Google Drive). The data will be analyzed within this repository and remain with the organization after the study is complete.

N. If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?

There are no known risks involved in this study.

O. Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.

Yes, the study will use archived materials that are stored in the non-profit organization's centralized data repository (Google Drive). The materials that will be reviewed are tutor manuals, theme books, session and attendance records, student assessment data, tutor training completion records and post-training surveys, job descriptions, and mission and vision statements.

Appendix C. TQIS Validated Assessment Quality Standard Alignment Rubrics (NSSA, 2023)

These rubrics were designed for use by Technical Assistance Providers during a Validated Review Process to determine the level of alignment between a tutoring program's current practices and TQIS Quality Standards. They were provided to the researcher for use in this current study.

Only the portions used for this study are included in this appendix. The full validated assessment rubrics are available upon request by contacting info@studentsupportaccelerator.org.

Element 1: Tutor

1a. Tutor Recruitment + Selection

Element	**Tutor**				
Quality Standard	**Tutor Recruitment + Selection:** There is a clear recruitment and selection process that results in tutors with the skills and mindsets necessary to be successful in that program.				
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Recruitment Plan, Tutor Job Description, Recruitment Timeline + Metrics, Interview Process Documents				
Descriptions of Ratings for Quality Standard					
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**	
There is a clear, comprehensive recruitment and selection process that results in tutors with the skills and mindsets necessary to be successful in that program. The process results in a diverse set of tutors who are representative of the students served. The process is well-documented and understood by stakeholders throughout the organization.	A recruitment and selection process has been defined, but may not be completely documented or fully understood throughout the organization. Minor areas for improvement may be noted, but overall the process results in a diverse set of tutors with the skills and mindsets necessary for success.	A high-level recruitment process exists, but the details are not clear and/or there is significant room to improve recruitment effectiveness. The recruitment process does not yet result in a complete, diverse tutoring corps with the skills and mindsets to be successful.	The recruitment process is undefined or unclear. The program does not successfully recruit enough tutors to meet program demand. Significant vacancies, lack of representation or skill gaps exist.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.	
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)					

Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard	Partially Aligned to Quality Standard	Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard	Insufficient Evidence
An artifact confirms that there is a clear tutor job description, free from biased language and tailored to the program's context and model. An artifact confirms that there is a set recruitment process and timeline, including clear metrics and set deadlines. An artifact confirms that the program has a defined set of attributes necessary for tutors to be effective in their program.	An artifact confirms that there is a clear tutor job description, free from biased language. Opportunities to further tailor the description may exist. An artifact confirms that there is a set recruitment process and timeline, including *either* clear deadlines *or* metrics.	An artifact confirms that there is a tutor job description; specificity in the description is lacking. An artifact confirms that there is a recruitment process. Specific metrics *and* deadlines are lacking. Attributes necessary for tutors to be successful may be implicitly understood, but not yet codified. There is no evidence that the interview process is designed to assess any particular attributes. .	There is no tutor job description available. There is no set recruitment timeline or process. The program does not have a shared set of attributes for tutors, documented or otherwise. There is no documented interview process.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

1b. Tutor Preservice Training

Element	Tutor
Quality Standard	**Tutor Preservice Training:** The tutoring program provides high-quality onboarding and training, tailored to program context.
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Summary of Tutor Role, Onboarding Scope + Sequence, Pre Service Training Materials

Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard

Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard	Partially Aligned to Quality Standard	Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard	Insufficient Evidence
The onboarding and training process fully prepares tutors for success in all aspects of their role, including program expectations, instruction,	The onboarding and training process prepares tutors for *most* of the aspects of their role, with an opportunity to better cover 1-2 areas of the role.	The onboarding and training process focuses on basic elements of the role, such as program expectations, organizational structure.	There is no onboarding and training process and/or tutors are not prepared for their role.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.

relationship-building and SEL support. The training program addresses equity in a way that is research and/or evidence based AND consistently embedded throughout training.	Attempts to embed equity are present and grounded in research or evidence based practices.	There is an opportunity to better cover topics such as equity, SEL, and supporting all learners.		
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifacts confirm there is a clear, cohesive, and specific set of tutor expectations tailored to program context. Artifacts confirms that an intentional series of onboarding sessions cover general role expectations, research and/or evidence based instructional strategies, relationship building, the tutor's role in social emotional learning, strategies for meeting the needs of diverse learners (including ELL and SPED students), and cultural competence. Training materials are clear and engaging.	Artifacts confirm slight adjustments to tutor expectations will result in increased clarity, cohesion, and/or specificity tailored to program context. Artifacts confirm an intentional series of onboarding sessions that cover general role expectations, instructional strategies, relationship building, the tutor's role in social emotional learning, strategies for meeting the needs of diverse learners (including ELL and SPED students), and cultural competence. Minor opportunities for improving clarity in training materials or engagement may exist.	Artifact(s) confirms that tutor expectations lack clarity, cohesion and/or specificity. Artifacts confirm an intentional series of onboarding sessions that cover general role expectations, research and/or evidence based instructional strategies, and relationship building. Significant opportunities for improving clarity in training materials or engagement exist. Artifact review suggests that onboarding sessions do not adequately address the tutor's role in social emotional learning, strategies to support all learners (including ELL and SPED students), or equity practices and culturally responsive practices.	Artifact(s) review confirms that tutor expectations are not yet codified. The artifact review confirms that onboarding sessions are ad hoc or nonexistent.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted e for review.

Element 2: Data Use

2b. Formative Assessment

Element	**Data Use**
Quality Standard	**Formative Assessment:** The tutoring program provides tutors with support to collect, analyze, and use formative assessment data to inform design of future sessions.
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** List of formative assessments, formative assessment results, formative assessment expectations for tutors, data protocols

Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard

Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
The tutoring program uses formative assessments that provide tutors with the data needed to drive quality instruction. There are clear expectations on how to embed formative assessments into instruction. Systems exist to support tutors with collecting, analyzing, and responding to formative assessment (including analyzing data across student groups).	The tutoring program uses formative assessments that provide tutors with the data needed to drive quality instruction. There are clear expectations on how to embed formative assessments into instruction. Systems to support tutors with effective use of formative assessment are present, but opportunities for improvement exist including analyzing data across student groups.	The tutoring program has formative assessments, but there is an opportunity to better align those assessments to instruction. Expectations on how to embed formative assessment into instruction lack clarity. Systems to support tutors with effective use of formative assessment are not fully developed and/or have significant opportunities for improvement.	No formative assessments, aligned expectations, or supporting structures are currently present in the tutoring program.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.

Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)

Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm the tutoring program has a suite of	Artifact(s) confirm the tutoring program has a suite of	Artifact(s) confirm the tutoring program has a suite of formative assessments but	Artifact(s) confirm that the tutoring program does not have	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

formative assessments aligned to the instructional model. Artifact(s) confirm that there are clearly defined expectations for tutors on how and when to embed formative assessments into tutoring sessions. Artifact(s) confirm that there are structures (including protocols and set meeting times) to support tutors with collecting, analyzing, and responding to formative data. These processes emphasize the importance of analyzing data across student subgroups to ensure equitable instruction.	formative assessments aligned to the instructional model. Artifact(s) confirm that there are clearly defined expectations for tutors on how and when to effectively embed formative assessments into tutoring sessions. Artifact(s) confirm that there are structures (including protocols and set meeting times) to support tutors with collecting, analyzing, and responding to formative data. Some opportunities for improvement in these processes exist, potentially including attention to subgroup performance.	alignment to the instructional model is unclear. Artifact(s) reveal that high level expectations around the use of formative assessments are present, but are unclear and/or leave too much up to tutor autonomy. Artifact(s) reveal that structures intended to support tutors with the use of formative assessment are underdeveloped.	standardized formative assessments. Artifact(s) reveal that there are no set expectations around the use of formative assessment for tutors. Artifact(s) reveal that there are no systems or supports for supporting tutors with the use of formative assessment.	

2c. Student Progress Measure

Element	**Data Use**			
Quality Standard	**Student Progress Measure:** The tutoring program has a system for measuring individual student progress over time and responding to those results; measures of progress include both academic growth and adaptive indicators (i.e. student engagement; student confidence).			
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Student Goal Setting Documents, Student Progress Data			
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**

The tutoring program has identified academic *and* non-academic progress goals for all students. There is a defined timeline for measuring progress against these goals. Systems and structures exist for setting goals, collecting data, and responding to that information. These systems actively involve students and caregivers in measuring student progress.	The tutoring program has identified academic *and* non-academic progress goals for all students. There is a defined timeline for measuring progress against these goals. Systems and structures exist for setting goals, collecting data, and responding to that information. These systems may have room for improvement in how they actively involve students and caregivers in measuring student progress.	The tutoring program has some defined academic goals for student progress, but does not yet include specific non-academic measures. There is a high-level plan for measuring progress, but it lacks specific dates. Structures for progress monitoring exist at a high level, but are significantly underdeveloped.	The tutoring program does not have a defined way to measure individual student progress. There is no set timeline for collecting progress data or supporting structures to measure student progress.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm that there are clear protocols and processes in place for setting student goals, then collecting, analyzing, and responding to progress against these goals. There is a regular practice of analyzing data across subgroups. Opportunities for student and caregiver engagement are clearly identified in the process. Artifact(s) confirm a set timeline for measuring and	Artifact(s) confirm that there are clear protocols and processes in place for setting student goals, then collecting, analyzing, and responding to progress against these goals. There is a regular practice of analyzing data across subgroups. Minor opportunities for improvement and/or increased need for caregiver/student involvement may be noted. Artifact(s) confirm a set timeline for measuring and	Artifact(s) confirm a high-level goal setting for each individual student. Supporting systems are informal and/or underdeveloped (including subgroup analysis). Non-academic goal-setting may not yet be in place. Artifact(s) confirm a high level timeline for measuring student progress, but specificity and consistency may be lacking.	Artifact(s) reveal no formal process of goal setting in place at all. Artifact(s) reveal that there is no set timeline for measuring student progress against individual goals.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

reporting progress against individual student goals.	reporting progress against individual student goals.			

Element 3: Instruction

3b. Tutor Consistency

Element	**Instruction**			
Quality Standard	**Tutor Consistency:** Students receive consistent tutoring from the same tutor; any adjustments to groupings occur sparingly and strategically.			
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Student-tutor assignments			
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
The program's approach to staffing ensures that students meet consistently with the same tutor for an extended period of time. Any adjustments to tutor-student pairings are made strategically, based on data, and clearly communicated to all relevant stakeholders.	*N/A - This rating is not applicable for this standard.*	*N/A - This rating is not applicable for this standard.*	Students do not receive tutoring from a consistent tutor.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm a staffing plan that ensures students meet consistently with the same tutor.	N/A	N/A	Artifact(s) reveal that consistent student-tutor pairings do not exist.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

Artifact(s) confirm that adjustments to staffing plans are made sparingly and strategically, with any changes being communicated clearly to all relevant stakeholders.				

3c. Student-tutor relationship

Element	**Instruction**			
Quality Standard	**Student-tutor relationship:** The tutoring program has an intentional strategy and supporting systems to build strong, positive relationships between students and tutors.			
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Training Materials, Survey Data			
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
The tutoring program has a clear, shared commitment to building strong, positive relationships between students and tutors. This commitment is reinforced by explicit training and coaching for tutors in strategies to build relationships with students, foster high expectations and encourage a growth mindset. There is also a system in place for monitoring and responding to ongoing student-tutor relationship dynamics.	The tutoring program has a clear, shared commitment to building strong, positive relationships between students and tutors The commitment is reinforced by *some* training that is intended to support tutors in building positive relationships with students, foster high expectations and encourage a growth mindset. Minor areas for improvement in these supports may be identified, including a need to increase the	The tutoring program has commitment to building strong, positive relationships between students and tutors. However, this commitment may only exist in theory, but not visible in action. Training and supports for student-tutor relationships are in the early stages of development or planning but have not been actualized and/or are not informed by research and/or evidence based practices.	The tutoring program does not have a commitment to building strong student-tutor relationships. There are no supporting systems in place to help tutors achieve positive relationships with students.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.

	monitoring of ongoing relationship dynamics.			
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) demonstrate that the program has a commitment to relationship building. Explicit coaching on relationship-building strategies for tutors exists in training materials. Artifact(s) reveal that the program has an ongoing system (surveys, observations, etc) for monitoring positive relationships and responding to that data.	Artifact(s) demonstrate that the program has a commitment to relationship building. Some related training is available for tutors, with opportunities for improvement. Artifact(s) reveal that there may or may not be an ongoing system for monitoring positive relationships and responding to that data..	Artifact(s) confirm a high level commitment to relationship building. Related training on strategies for tutors is limited and/or not aligned to research or evidence based practices. Artifact(s) likely reveal no ongoing system for monitoring positive relationships or responding to that data.	Artifact(s) reveal that the program does not emphasize the importance of relationship building between tutors and students. Related training materials do not exist.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

3d. High Quality Instructional Materials

Element	**Instruction**
Quality Standard	**High Quality Instructional Materials:** The tutoring program uses high-quality instructional materials that are user-friendly, rigorous and research-based.
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Sample Instructional Materials

Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard:**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
The tutoring program has a defined set of instructional materials that are standards-	The tutoring program has a defined set of instructional materials that are standards-	The tutoring program has a defined set of instructional materials that are mostly	The tutoring program does not have a defined set of instructional materials (i.e.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.

aligned and based on learning science. The materials are user-friendly for tutors, and include suggestions for differentiation and aligned formative assessments. The materials are culturally responsive.	aligned and based on learning science. The materials are mostly user-friendly and culturally responsive, with some areas for improvement.	standards-aligned and based on learning science. The materials have significant areas for improvement with regards to user-friendliness and/or cultural responsiveness.	relies on tutor developed materials). *or* The materials used are entirely inappropriate (i.e. not standards aligned, not based in learning science).	
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm that instructional materials are standards-aligned, based in learning science, user friendly (including formative assessment), *and* culturally responsive.	Artifact(s) confirm that instructional materials are standards-aligned and based in learning science. They are *mostly* user friendly (including formative assessment) and culturally responsive, with some minor areas for improvement.	Artifact(s) confirm that instructional materials are mostly standards-aligned and based in learning science. The materials have areas for improvement in user-friendliness and/or cultural responsiveness.	Artifact(s) confirm that instructional materials are **NOT** standards-aligned, based in learning science, user friendly (including formative assessment), *or* culturally responsive.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

3e. Lesson Routines + Structures

Element	**Instruction**			
Quality Standard	**Lesson Routines + Structures:** The program has consistent lesson structure, set instructional routines, and standard procedures to maximize learning; tutor-specific modifications are intentional and informed by student needs.			
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Tutoring Session Lesson Structure + Expectations			
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**

The tutoring program has a clearly defined lesson structure and routines that are aligned to learning science and developmentally appropriate. Tutors receive explicit training and ongoing support to execute the lesson structure with fidelity. Tutoring sessions have consistently effective structure and routines throughout, tailored to students' needs.	The tutoring program has a clearly defined lesson structure and routines that are aligned to learning science and developmentally appropriate. Tutors receive training and support to implement the lesson structure, but opportunities exist for improvement within that support. Tutoring sessions have mostly effective structure and routines throughout, with opportunities to better tailor to meet students' needs.	The tutoring program has a clearly defined lesson structure and routines that are aligned to learning science and developmentally appropriate, but tutors do not receive adequate training and/or ongoing support to implement these structures with fidelity. The effectiveness of tutoring sessions' structure is mixed or only partially effective, with significant areas for improvement.	The tutoring program does not yet have a defined set of effective instructional strategies. Tutoring sessions have no clear or observable structure.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm that there are codified expectations for the structure and contents of a tutoring lesson. These expectations are aligned to evidence-based practices, responsive to student backgrounds, and developmentally appropriate.	Artifact(s) confirm that there are codified expectations for the structure and contents of a tutoring lesson. These expectations are aligned to evidence-based practices, responsive to student backgrounds and developmentally appropriate.	Artifact(s) confirm that there are codified expectations for the structure and contents of a tutoring lesson. These expectations are aligned to evidence-based practices, responsive to student backgrounds and developmentally appropriate.	Artifact(s) reveal that there is no set structure for tutoring sessions.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

3f. Instructional Practices

Element	**Instruction**
Quality Standard	**Instructional Practices:** Tutors receive explicit training, modeling, and coaching related to the use of effective instructional strategies (e.g. strong questioning, lesson pacing, and modeling).

Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Summary of Instructional Practices			
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
The tutoring program has a clearly defined set of research and/or evidence based instructional practices. Tutors receive explicit training and ongoing support to plan for and implement these strategies. Research-based instructional strategies are consistently utilized by tutors during sessions.	The tutoring program has a clearly defined set of research and/or evidence base instructional strategies. Tutors receive training and support to implement these strategies, but opportunities exist for improvement within that support. Instructional strategies used by tutors are mostly aligned to best practice, with some areas for improvement.	The tutoring program has a set of instructional strategies, but they are only partially research and/or evidence based. Tutors do not receive adequate training and/or ongoing support to implement these strategies with fidelity. Instructional strategies used by tutors are only somewhat aligned to research and/or evidence, with significant areas for improvement.	The tutoring program does not yet have a defined set of effective instructional strategies. Instructional strategies employed by tutors are inconsistent and/or not aligned to research and/or evidence.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm that the tutoring program has a standardized set of research and/or evidence based instructional practices that tutors are expected to utilize throughout the session.	Artifact(s) confirm that the tutoring program has a standardized set of research and/or evidence based instructional practices that tutors are expected to utilize throughout the session.	Artifact(s) confirm that the tutoring program has a standardized set of instructional practices that tutors are expected to utilize throughout the session. The strategies are only somewhat research and/or evidence based.	Artifact(s) reveal that the tutoring program does not yet have a standardized set of research and/or evidence based instructional practices that tutors are expected to utilize throughout the session.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

3g. Dosage

Element	**Instruction**			
Quality Standard	**Dosage:** The tutoring program provides each student with at least three 30-minute tutoring sessions per week for a predetermined amount of time.			
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Tutoring Schedule			
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
The tutoring program provides each student with at least three 30-minute tutoring sessions per week for a predetermined amount of time (i.e. 40 hours, 10 weeks, fall semester).	The tutoring program provides each student with at least two 30-minute tutoring sessions per week and a predetermined timeline.	The tutoring program provides each student with one 30-minute tutoring session per week. There is no clear predetermined timeline.	The tutoring program does not have a clear schedule and/or meet the recommended dosage requirements.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm that there is a consistent tutoring schedule that meets the threshold of occurring at least 3 times per week from 30-60 minutes per session (depending on student age, developmental needs, and subject area). The program also runs for a predetermined amount of time.	N/A	N/A	Artifact(s) reveal that there is not a consistent tutoring schedule *or* that the schedule does not meet the recommended threshold.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

3h. Ratio

Element	**Instruction**			
Quality Standard	**Ratio:** The ratio of student to tutors in the program does not exceed 4:1.			
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Student-Tutor Assignments			
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
The ratio of students to tutors in the program does not exceed 4:1.	*N/A - This rating is not applicable for this standard.*	*N/A - This rating is not applicable for this standard.*	The ratio of students to tutors in the program is greater than 4:1.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm a staffing plan with a student-tutor ratio that does not exceed 4:1.	N/A	N/A	Artifact(s) confirm a staffing plan with a student-tutor ratio that exceeds 4:1.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

Element 4: Learning Integration

4a. Setting

Element	**Learning Integration**
Quality Standard	**Setting:** The tutoring program occurs during the school day.
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Tutoring Schedule
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard	

Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard	Partially Aligned to Quality Standard	Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard	Insufficient Evidence
The tutoring program occurs during the school day.	The tutoring program occurs immediately before or after school. The program ensures systems to enable all identified students to participate including transportation, meals, parental communication systems, and incentives.	The tutoring program occurs immediately before or after school. However, the program does not yet ensure systems to enable all identified students to participate including transportation, meals, parental communication systems, and incentives.	The tutoring program does not occur during the school day or immediately before or after school. The time and location presents significant barriers to student participation.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm that the tutoring program takes place during school (see tutoring schedule).	Artifact(s) confirm that the tutoring program takes place immediately before or after school (see tutoring schedule). Interviews confirm that the tutoring program occurs immediately before or after school.	Artifact(s) confirm that the tutoring program takes place immediately before or after school (see tutoring schedule). Interviews confirm that the tutoring program occurs immediately before or after school.	Artifact(s) reveal that the tutoring program does not occur before, during, or after school.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

4e. Caregiver Engagement

Element	Learning Integration
Quality Standard	**Caregiver Engagement:** The tutoring program ensures regular engagement with caregivers and updates on student's progress.
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Caregiver Engagement Plan; Caregiver Communications
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard	
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
The tutoring program regularly engages with caregivers to	The tutoring program engages with caregivers and	The tutoring program sometimes engages with	The tutoring program makes no effort to engage with caregivers	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.

communicate progress in a language and format that is accessible to them. Stakeholders perceive that this collaboration is highly effective.	communicates progress in a language and format that is accessible to them. Minor areas to improve frequency or effectiveness of this collaboration exist. Stakeholders perceive the collaboration to be effective, and identify minor areas for improvement.	caregivers to communicate progress in an accessible format. Significant opportunities to improve frequency or accessibility of this collaboration exist. Stakeholders reveal that there are significant opportunities to improve this collaboration.	or provide updates on student progress.	
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm that there is a strategy in place for regular collaboration and communication that accommodates language and communication preferences/needs.	Artifact(s) confirm that there is a strategy in place for regular collaboration and communication that accommodates language and communication preferences/needs. Minor areas for improvement may be observed.	Artifact(s) confirm that there is a strategy in place for regular collaboration and communication. Attempts to accommodate language and communication preferences/needs are not yet present. Significant areas for improvement may be observed.	Artifact(s) reveal that there is no strategy for collaboration or communication.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

4f. Student Enrollment and Retention

Element	**Learning Integration**
Quality Standard	**Student Enrollment and Retention:** The tutoring program has a defined approach to enroll and retain students; particular attention is paid to reducing barriers to participation.
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Enrollment and retention plan, enrollment and retention data
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard	

Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard	Partially Aligned to Quality Standard	Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard	Insufficient Evidence
The tutoring program has a clear approach for enrolling and retaining students. The strategy prioritizes students who need tutoring the most. The program has an intentional practice of reflecting on and addressing barriers to student participation (i.e. transportation, meals, engagement etc).	The tutoring program has a clear approach for enrolling and retaining students. Efforts to reduce barriers exist, but are not yet systematic or aligned to research and/or evidence based practices.	The tutoring program has an approach for enrolling students, but has not yet codified a strategy to retain students. Barriers to participation may go unaddressed.	The tutoring program has no strategic approach to enrolling or retaining students. Significant barriers to participation exist and are unaddressed.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) reveal that the program has a clear plan for enrolling and retaining students, including a regular practice of collecting data on enrollment trends for the program.	Artifact(s) reveal that the program has a clear plan for enrolling and retaining students, including a practice of collecting data on enrollment trends for the program.	Artifact(s) reveal that the program has a plan for enrolling students, but does not yet collect data on trends for enrollment in the program.	Artifact(s) confirm that there is no clear plan for enrolling or retaining students in the program.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

Element 6: Cohesion

6a. Program Design

Element	Cohesion
Quality Standard	**Program Design:** The tutoring program is designed to successfully meet the needs of the community it serves.
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Program description, Theory of Action
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard	

Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard	Partially Aligned to Quality Standard	Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard	Insufficient Evidence
The design of the tutoring program is informed by the needs of the community it serves. The program has a clear theory of action, which is well understood by stakeholders. The program budget is well-aligned to the overall vision.	The design of the tutoring program is informed by the needs of the community it serves. The program has a theory of action, but there are minor opportunities to increase clarity or understanding among stakeholders. Overall, the budget is aligned to the design but minor areas for improvement exist.	The design of the tutoring program is only somewhat aligned to community needs, with opportunities for further tailoring to local context. The program has a theory of action, but there are significant opportunities to increase clarity or understanding among stakeholders. Overall, the program budget is aligned to the design but significant areas for improvement exist.	There is a significant disconnect between the design of the tutoring program and the needs of the community it serves. The program does not have a theory of action. It is not clear how the program model and budget are aligned to broader program vision.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**

Artifact(s) provide a clear summary of the connection between program design and community needs. Artifact(s) provide a clear theory of action for the tutoring program.	Artifact(s) provide a clear summary of the connection between program design and community needs. Artifact(s) provide a clear theory of action for the tutoring program. improvement exist.	Artifact(s) may or may not reveal a connection between program design and community needs. Opportunities for further tailoring to local context may exist. Artifact(s) provide a theory of action for the tutoring program, but room for improvement may exist. Artifact(s) confirm a budget that is somewhat aligned to the program's overall design and goals. Significant areas for improvement exist.	Artifact(s) reveal a disconnect between program design and community needs. Artifact(s) reveal that the program does not yet have a defined theory of action or value proposition. Artifact(s) reveal that the budget is not yet aligned to the program's overall design and goals.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.

6b. Leader Role Clarity

Element	**Cohesion**			
Quality Standard	**Leader Role Clarity:** The tutoring program has clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the leadership team, with particular attention to clearly defining tutor coaching responsibilities.			
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Leader Job Descriptions, Organizational Chart, Performance Management System			
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Roles and responsibilities for the leadership team are clearly defined, including clear job descriptions, a defined reporting structure, and a performance management system.	Roles and responsibilities for the leadership team are *mostly* clearly defined. Reporting structures and performance management	Roles and responsibilities for the leadership team are defined, but significant opportunities for improved clarity exist. Reporting structures and performance management	Roles and responsibilities for the leadership team are undefined or unclear. The program does not yet have clear reporting structures or a	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.

	systems are in place, with minor areas for improvement noted.	systems exist, but need significant improvement.	performance management system for leaders.	
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm that there are job descriptions, organizational charts, and performance management systems in place for all members of the leadership team.	Artifact(s) confirm that there are job descriptions, organizational charts, and performance management systems in place for all members of the leadership team. Minor areas for improvements may be noted.	Artifact(s) confirm that there are job descriptions, organizational charts, and performance management systems in place for all members of the leadership team. Significant areas for improvements may be noted.	Artifact(s) reveal a lack of clear roles and responsibilities, no org chart that outlines reporting structures, and no performance management system for promoting or addressing performance issues with program leaders.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review. Stakeholders were not able to

6d. Organizational Culture

Element	**Cohesion**			
Quality Standard	**Organizational Culture:** The tutoring program has a defined mission, vision, and set of organizational goals; these guiding documents are aligned with broader context and well understood by stakeholders.			
Relevant Evidence Sources	**Artifact Review:** Mission, Vision, and Org Goals, Sample Communication Regarding Org Progress			
Definitions of Ratings for Quality Standard				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
The tutoring program has a defined mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. These guiding components are well understood by stakeholders, and there is a system for regularly updating	The tutoring program has a defined mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. Stakeholders are aware of the high level goals, but there is not yet a process for updating them on organizational progress.	The tutoring program has at least two of the following: a defined mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. Stakeholder awareness of these components is low, and there is not yet a process for updating	The tutoring program does not yet have a mission, vision, or set of organizational goals.	There was insufficient evidence to rate this standard.

stakeholders about organizational progress.		them on organizational progress.		
Evidence Look Fors (To Guide Quality Standard Rating)				
Fully Aligned to Quality Standard	**Mostly Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Partially Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Not Yet Aligned to Quality Standard**	**Insufficient Evidence**
Artifact(s) confirm that the program has a codified mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. Artifact(s) confirm that there are regular processes for updating stakeholders about high-level organizational progress.	Artifact(s) confirm that the program has a codified mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. Artifact(s) reveal that there is not yet a standard process for updating stakeholders about organizational progress. These updates appear to occur in an ad hoc or informal fashion..	Artifact(s) confirm that the program has at least two of the following: a codified mission, vision, and set of organizational goals. Artifact(s) reveal that there is not yet a process for updating stakeholders about organizational progress. Updates do not occur.	An artifact review reveals that the tutoring program does not yet have a mission, vision, or set of organizational goals.	Relevant artifacts were not submitted for review.