

**So you found positive results, now what?  
A case study of 2:1 tutoring in Chicago**

There has been a concerted effort on the part of some social scientists- particularly in education- to build an evidence base using rigorous research designs in order to inform policy. The pathways through which this change should occur are through the testing of a promising strategy, the results of which are disseminated to policymakers or other funders. Many social scientists who work on policy problems share a (usually implicit) theory about how their work will make the world a better place: design or find a promising intervention strategy, test it at small to medium scale, disseminate the findings, and then some funder – a philanthropist or a government agency – will make the program work at large scale. However, the pathway from rigorous study to broad adoption and implementation is rarely straightforward. This panel interrogates this theory of change and asks what role researchers, funders, and policy makers can play in ensuring a stronger connection between research and practice.

To inform this conversation, we will draw on our experience of studying an intensive tutoring program in Chicago. In the 2014-15 school year, over 2,600 Chicago Public Schools (CPS) ninth and tenth graders drawn from 11 high schools that serve predominantly low-income students were randomly assigned to either participate in daily 2:1 tutoring in mathematics or business as usual. Participation increased math achievement test scores by 0.19 to 0.31 standard deviations (SD), depending on how the researchers standardize these measures; increased math grades by 0.50 SD; and reduced course failures in math by one-half in addition to reducing failures in non-math courses. The study was replicated in the 2015-16 school year, randomly assigning over 5,000 additional 9th and 11th graders from 15 CPS schools with similar results. These impacts on a per-dollar basis—with a cost per participant of around \$3,800, or \$2,500 if delivered at larger scale—are as large as those of almost any other educational intervention whose effectiveness has been rigorously studied.

This panel will examine how individuals from a variety of perspectives are thinking about moving this promising practice to broader implementation. Monica Bhatt (University of Chicago) will present the initial study findings as well as current efforts to expand the program model to serve students in different contexts, grade levels, and subject areas. Kelly Hallberg (University of Chicago) will describe efforts to understand the program's ability to implement at a substantially larger scale, while still operating at moderate scale. Michelle Welch (Arnold Foundation) will discuss how these kind of findings influence the work of policy makers and funders. Finally, Molly Burke (Chicago Public Schools) will talk about how the district is using the results of these and similar studies. All panelists will provide draw broader recommendations about how to strengthen the connection between research and practice.