

2026 Evaluation of Tutoring and Interventionist Programs



ORPE

Office of Research and Program Evaluation

Prepared in Response to *Shaw et al. v. LAUSD* Settlement – August 5, 2026

Introduction

This report fulfills the annual evaluation requirement established under the court-approved settlement in *Shaw et al. v. Los Angeles Unified School District*, paragraph E.8. The settlement agreement requires the District to annually evaluate the effectiveness of its tutoring and interventionist programs, publicly report the findings consistent with federal and state confidentiality requirements and District data suppression rules, and use the results to support continuous program improvement and inform decisions regarding provider selection and contract terms and renewals.

Consistent with the settlement agreement, this evaluation examines student outcomes associated with participation in the District's tutoring and interventionist programs during the 2025-26 school year. Specifically, the report analyzes changes in students' i-Ready English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics assessment results and attendance between baseline and end-of-year, assesses whether those changes are statistically significant, and explores factors associated with student improvement, including length of time participating in tutoring and intervention programs, general qualifications of tutors and/or interventionists, and subject matter (ELA and Math).

Methods and Data

The objective of this evaluation is to examine changes in outcomes among participants in the District's tutoring and interventionist programs from the beginning to the end of the 2025-26 school year, and determine whether those changes (also referred to as gains) are statistically significant. Analyses were conducted separately for each of the four targeted instructional programs implemented in the District during the 2025-26 school year:

- High-Dose In-Person Tutoring
- High-Dose Virtual Tutoring
- Locally Designed Intervention
- Division of Instruction (DOI) Intervention

For each program, we calculated average pre-post changes (gain scores) in students' i-Ready ELA and Math scores and attendance by comparing students' baseline and end-of-year measures. Statistical tests were conducted to determine whether observed gains differed significantly from zero.¹ In addition to average gains by program, we examined

¹ Following the statistical standards of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2012, <https://nces.ed.gov/statprog/standards.asp>), we consider gains to be statistically significant if the probability of observing them is less than 5%, under the null hypothesis that the true gain was zero.

2026 Evaluation of Tutoring and Interventionist Programs

whether student gains varied according to characteristics identified in the Shaw settlement, including length of attendance and instructional subject (ELA or Math).

The evaluation used administrative records from the District's student information systems and tutoring vendors, including:

1. Student participation records identifying enrollment in each tutoring or interventionist program and recorded length of participation during the 2025-26 school year.
2. Student outcome measures, including:
 - 2025 and 2026 yearly attendance rates (percentage of days attended out of days enrolled); and
 - 2026 i-Ready ELA and Math test scores, measured at beginning- and end-of-year.
3. Student demographic characteristics, including grade level, gender, race/ethnicity, English learner status, socioeconomic disadvantage, special education status, homelessness, and foster youth status.

A program participant is defined as an LAUSD-enrolled student who has a record of participating in tutoring or targeted intervention services. Because participation data are collected differently across programs, participant identification varied slightly by program based on available administrative records.

- **High-Dose Tutoring (Virtual and In-Person).** Participants were students with at least one recorded session (recorded in minutes) of tutoring attendance. Attendance data were provided by each District tutoring provider. This evaluation includes data from 25 providers; one provider was excluded because reliable attendance records were not available.²
- **Locally Designed Intervention.** Participants were students who either (a) had at least one session (recorded in hours) of participation or (b) had a valid intervention outcome recorded in the District's student information system, known as "My Integrated Student Information System" (MiSiS) (i.e., a letter grade of A-F or a program completion status of *Satisfactory*, *Unsatisfactory*, or *Incomplete—Attended Less Than Half the Program*). Schools are required to report participation for locally designed interventions through the MiSiS intervention module.
- **DOI Interventionists.** Participants were students with at least one recorded intervention session. Sessions are expected to last 30 minutes in elementary school and 30-45 minutes in middle school and high school (midpoint of 37.5 minutes was used in the analysis). Schools report DOI Interventionist participation through the Extended Learning module in the FOCUS³ system.

² One vendor (Scholars Collective) was excluded from the analysis. The following vendors provided in-person high-dose tutoring during the 2025-26 school year and were included in the analysis: A Better Tomorrow, A Tree Of Knowledge, Braintrust Tutors Inc, Hey Tutor, Mundo Academy, One On One Learning, Proximity Learning, Southeast Community Foundation, Springboard, Student Nest, Study Smart, Sylvan Learning, Thrive, and Tutor Me. The following vendors provided high-dose virtual tutoring during the 2025-26 school year and were included in the analysis: Axiom, Book Nook, Carnegie, Cognition, Intervene K-12, K12 (Stride) Tutoring, Inc., Reading Futures, Step Up, Tutor.com, Tutored By Teachers, and Varsity Tutors.

³ FOCUS is an ad hoc reporting and data analytics tool provided by the District that integrates data from multiple District systems, such as MiSiS.

2026 Evaluation of Tutoring and Interventionist Programs

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND MINIMUM PROVIDER QUALIFICATIONS

High-Dose Tutoring was provided by vendors during the 2025-26 school year. Tutoring was offered outside of the regular school day, either virtually or in-person. Vendors used their own curricula and assessments and provided tutoring in ELA and Math only. The expected minimum dosage was three 30-minute sessions per week for 10 weeks per semester, with a student to tutor ratio of 3-5:1.

Minimum required provider qualifications: Tutors were required to have a high school diploma or equivalent and at least one year of experience providing tutoring services to K-12 students. At least 80% of tutors were required to hold a bachelor's degree.

Locally Designed Intervention was provided by LAUSD teachers outside the regular school day, with a student to teacher ratio of 4-6:1. Services could include subjects beyond ELA and Math.

Minimum required provider qualifications: Providers were required to be LAUSD certificated teachers, credentialed in the grade level and subject(s) taught.

DOI Intervention was provided by LAUSD interventionists during the regular school day and focused on early numeracy and literacy for the lowest performing students.

Minimum required provider qualifications: Providers were required to have at least five years of successful full-time teaching experience in a public school. Elementary providers were also required to hold a valid Clear California Multiple Subject Teaching Credential, English Learner Authorization, and English Language Development Authorization. Middle school providers were required to hold English Learner Authorization and at least one valid Clear California credential authorizing K-12 service.

Findings

Results are presented separately for each tutoring and intervention program. These include participant characteristics, estimated pre-post gains, statistical significance tests, and factors associated with student gains.

Program participants

A total of 74,359 students participated in at least one of the four intervention programs, representing 17.7% of students enrolled in the District during the 2025-26 school year (Table 1). The largest program by participation was High-Dose In-Person Tutoring, which served 29,951 students, followed by DOI Intervention (25,238 students) and Locally Designed Intervention (25,010 students). High-Dose Virtual Tutoring was the smallest program, serving 8,238 students. Approximately 17.5% of participating students (13,032) received services through more than one intervention program (not shown in table).

2026 Evaluation of Tutoring and Interventionist Programs

Table 1. Number of program participants

Program	Participants	% of Total
High-Dose In-Person Tutoring	29,951	7.1%
High-Dose Virtual Tutoring	8,238	2.0%
Locally Designed Intervention	25,010	6.0%
DOI Intervention	25,238	6.0%
Total number of students participating in any tutoring or intervention program	74,359	17.7%
Total number of students in the District^a	419,332	100%

^aThis total corresponds to all students enrolled in the District at any point during the 2025-26 academic year, excluding those enrolled in independent charter schools.

Table 2 compares the demographic characteristics of students who participated in each of the four intervention programs with those of all students enrolled in the District during the 2025-26 school year. Asian and White students participated in tutoring programs at lower rates than their share of the District's student population. The exception was High-Dose Virtual Tutoring, where Asian students participated at about the same rate as their share of the District population, and White students participated at a slightly higher rate. In contrast, Black and Latino students participated in DOI Intervention and High-Dose In-Person Tutoring at higher rates than their share of the District population. Latino students also participated at above-average rates in Locally Designed Intervention and High-Dose Virtual Tutoring. Students of "Other" race/ethnicity participated at lower rates than their share of the District population across all four programs. This category includes American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, students identifying with two or more races, and students whose race/ethnicity was unknown.

Although boys made up more than half (52%) of the District's student population, they participated at lower rates than girls in all four intervention programs. Students in all four programs were more likely to be socioeconomically disadvantaged than students in the District overall. In DOI Intervention, Locally Designed Intervention, and High-Dose In-Person Tutoring, between 92.1% and 96.6% of participants were socioeconomically disadvantaged. Students receiving Special Education services participated at higher rates than their share of the District population in In-Person Tutoring and, especially, in High-Dose Virtual Tutoring. English Learners were represented at much higher rates than their population share in all four programs. Program participants were approximately two to three times as likely to be English Learners as students in the District overall. Foster youth and students experiencing homelessness also participated at above-average rates in DOI Intervention and High-Dose In-Person Tutoring.

Overall, students who participated in the four programs started the school year with lower ELA and Math achievement than the District average (as evidenced by negative baseline z-scores). Students in DOI Intervention had the lowest baseline academic performance, which is consistent with the program's design, followed by students in In-Person Tutoring. Participants in DOI Intervention also had attendance rates in the prior year (2024-25) below the average for the District.

2026 Evaluation of Tutoring and Interventionist Programs

Table 2. Participant demographics and baseline performance (percentages unless otherwise indicated)

Characteristics	Participants by Program				All District Students ^a
	High-Dose In-Person Tutoring	High-Dose Virtual Tutoring	Locally Designed Intervention	DOI Intervention Model	
Race/Ethnicity					
Asian	2.2	4.2	1.7	1.1	5.2
Black	8.8	6.0	5.4	8.3	7.2
Latino	78.6	73.8	85.1	83.7	70.6
White	5.8	10.4	4.8	3.4	9.7
Other Race	4.7	5.5	3.0	3.5	7.3
Gender					
Male	48.6	48.3	48.6	48.4	52.0
Female	51.4	51.7	51.4	51.6	47.9
Special designations					
Socioeconomic Disadvantage	92.1	86.5	94.6	96.6	83.2
Special Education	18.9	21.7	15.3	15.0	18.6
English Learner	27.4	22.7	28.3	37.9	12.7
Homeless	5.5	3.5	5.0	7.6	3.8
Foster	1.1	0.7	0.9	1.4	0.9
Average performance prior to participation (z-scores) ^b					
i-Ready Math, BOY	-0.39	-0.31	-0.31	-0.65	0.00
i-Ready ELA, BOY	-0.44	-0.32	-0.36	-0.75	0.00
Attendance, 2024-25	0.00	0.09	0.05	-0.14	0.00
Students with prior performance data (range) ^c	27,727 – 29,761	7,906 – 8,206	23,189 – 24,652	22,641 – 24,959	359,010 – 370,623

^a As in Table 1, “All District Students” corresponds to those students enrolled in District schools at any point during the 2025-26 academic year, excluding those enrolled in independent charter schools.

^b Prior performance measures are standardized so that the District average is zero. Negative values indicate that program participants performed below the District average; positive values indicate above-average performance.

BOY = Beginning of Year 2025-26.

^c Sample sizes are presented as ranges because the number of students with data varies across outcomes.

Participants’ gains

Students in all four programs experienced positive, statistically significant gains in all outcomes measured, including test scores and attendance rates (Table 3). Participants improved in both Math and ELA over the course of the year. On average, participants’ i-Ready Math scores increased by 24 to 29 points from the beginning to the end of the year, while their i-Ready ELA scores increased by 32 to 41 points. Students in all four programs also attended schools more often in 2026 than in 2025. This increase in attendance rates —0.45 to 0.67 percentage points—amounts to between 0.8 and 1.2 additional days of attendance over the course of an academic year.

2026 Evaluation of Tutoring and Interventionist Programs

Table 3. Pre-post gains in participant outcomes by program

Outcome	High-Dose In-Person Tutoring	High-Dose Virtual Tutoring	Locally Designed Intervention	DOI Intervention Model
i-Ready Math	28.48**	23.97**	28.11**	29.13**
i-Ready ELA	39.62**	32.12**	38.51**	40.88**
Attendance	0.67**	0.45**	0.61**	0.67**
Number of Participants (range)^a	25,475 – 27,727	7,061 – 7,906	20,807 – 23,184	21,847 – 22,640

** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

^a Sample sizes are presented as ranges because the number of students with data varies across outcomes.

Factors associated with gains

Students who participated in tutoring and targeted interventions for more hours generally had larger improvements in test scores and attendance (Table 4). For every additional 10 hours of participation, participants' i-Ready ELA scores were, on average, 7 to 13.4 points higher, and their Math scores were 5.2 to 9.8 points higher. Students who participated for more hours also tended to have higher attendance rates, with attendance rates averaging 0.15 to 0.25 percentage points higher in 2026 than in 2025 for every additional 10 hours of participation.

In general, students who participated for more than 10 hours had larger improvements than students who participated for fewer than 10 hours. However, results also suggest that after about 30 hours of participation, the gains in outcomes did not increase further. Specifically, students who participated for more than 30 hours generally had outcomes similar to those of students who participated for 10 to 30 hours and, in some cases, their gains were slightly smaller.

Table 4. Pre-post gains in participant outcomes by duration of program participation

Program	Outcome	Average gains from additional 10 hours	Gains by duration of participation			Number of Participants (range) ^a
			Up to 10 hours	More than 10, and up to 30 hours	More than 30 hours	
High-Dose In-Person Tutoring	i-Ready Math	8.30**	24.90**	29.62**	27.90**	25,475 – 27,727
	i-Ready ELA	11.49**	35.92**	41.09**	38.26**	
	Attendance	0.22**	0.17*	0.80**	0.73**	
High-Dose Virtual Tutoring	i-Ready Math	9.83**	21.70**	24.82**	25.21**	7,061 – 7,906
	i-Ready ELA	12.96**	29.56**	33.28**	32.50**	
	Attendance	0.24**	-0.01	0.65**	0.65**	
Locally Designed Intervention	i-Ready Math	9.80**	26.41**	29.08**	29.51**	20,807 – 23,184
	i-Ready ELA	13.43**	35.46**	39.28**	42.33**	
	Attendance	0.25**	0.39**	0.83**	0.78**	
DOI Intervention Model	i-Ready Math	5.16**	27.84**	28.16**	29.84**	21,847 – 22,640
	i-Ready ELA	7.05**	40.30**	39.61**	41.60**	
	Attendance	0.15**	0.01	0.58**	0.87**	

** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

^a Sample sizes are presented as ranges because the number of students with data varies across outcomes.

2026 Evaluation of Tutoring and Interventionist Programs

Table 5 shows participants' gains based on whether they received tutoring services in ELA or Math. Across the four programs, students who received support in ELA generally had higher gains than those who received Math services across all outcomes measured. The exception was the DOI Intervention model, where students who received intervention in Math showed slightly higher gains in Math test scores than students who received intervention in ELA.

Table 5. Pre-post gains in participant outcomes by subject of instruction

Program	Outcome	Tutoring Subject		Number of Participants (range) ^a
		ELA	Math	
High-Dose In-Person Tutoring	i-Ready Math	29.83**	26.89**	25,475 – 28,996
	i-Ready ELA	43.18**	34.71**	
	Attendance	0.84**	0.47**	
High-Dose Virtual Tutoring	i-Ready Math	24.75**	23.60**	7,061 – 8,068
	i-Ready ELA	35.85**	28.64**	
	Attendance	0.56**	0.36**	
Locally Designed Intervention	i-Ready Math	29.08**	26.71**	20,807 – 24,289
	i-Ready ELA	40.88**	34.73**	
	Attendance	0.71**	0.59**	
DOI Intervention Model	i-Ready Math	28.76**	31.09**	21,847 – 23,853
	i-Ready ELA	42.13**	36.79**	
	Attendance	0.70**	0.62**	

** p<0.01, * p<0.05.

^a Sample sizes are presented as ranges because the number of students with data varies across outcomes.

Conclusion

This evaluation describes patterns in the data and the relationship between tutoring and targeted intervention program participation and changes in student outcomes. These findings show associations only and should not be interpreted as evidence that the programs or longer participation caused the observed improvements.

Students who participated in tutoring and targeted intervention programs during 2025-26 entered the programs with greater academic needs than the average LAUSD student. Compared with students Districtwide, participants were also more likely to be socioeconomically disadvantaged and English Learners. Among the four programs offered, DOI Intervention served the highest-need students, who had the lowest attendance rates and test scores prior to program participation. These patterns are consistent with the programs' purpose of providing Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports within the District's Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS).

This evaluation found that students who participated in District tutoring and targeted intervention programs in 2025-26 made statistically significant improvements in attendance and in their i-Ready ELA and Math test scores. Students who participated for 10 to 30 hours showed larger improvements than those who participated for fewer than 10 hours. Students who received support in either ELA or Math improved in all outcomes examined, with only slightly larger gains for students who received support in ELA than those who received support in Math.