

# CIGNITION IMPLEMENTATION LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT: PARENTALLY PLACED PRIVATE SCHOOL STUDENTS' OFFICE (STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES)

Grades: K - 12 Program Length: 7 Months Treatment Year: 2024-2025

# **Table of Contents**

1.0 – Introduction	3
1.1 – Background	3
1.2 – Program Design and Description	4
1.3 - Purpose of Study	6
2.0 — Data Collection	7
2.1 — Introduction	7
2.2 – Engagement Metrics	7
1. Attendance	7
2. Participation	7
3. Contact Hours	7
4. Student Survey Feedback	8
2.3 – Academic Progress	9
3.0 – Data Analysis	10
3.1 – Engagement Metrics	11
3.1.1 – Attendance	11
3.1.2 – Participation	12
3.1.4 – Student Survey	14
3.2 – Student Progress	15
3.2.1 – Academic Standards Progress Score	16
3.2.1.1 – Math Progress Score	16
3.2.1.2 – ELA/Reading Progress Score	18
3.2.2 – Attendance and Academic Progress Analysis	19
3.2.3 – Executive Functioning Standards Progress Score	21
3.2.3.1 – Unit & Skill Outline	22
3.2.4 – Academic Progress vs. Engagement	22

# 4.0 – Findings Summary

25

# 1.0 – Introduction

# 1.1 – Background

Los Angeles Unified School District's (LAUSD) Tutoring Initiative began in the spring of the 2022-23 School year, with Cignition being one of the approved vendors providing high-dosage tutoring to students on site after school. During the 2024-25 school year, the Parentally Placed Private School Students Office (PPPSO) at LAUSD designated funds to provide high-dosage tutoring to students who attend a private school setting within the bounds of LAUSD and receive Special Education and Related Services through an Individualized Service Plan (ISP).

The program was slated to run for 20 weeks and began on October 15th, 2025. The majority of sessions concluded the week of March 24th, 2025, and the final session was held on April 9th, 2025.

# 1.2 – Program Design and Description

Tutoring sessions were conducted virtually using Zoom, a videoconferencing platform to connect tutors and students in real time. Students logged in from their personal devices, such as Chromebooks, laptops, or at-home desktop computers. Instruction was facilitated through a collaborative digital platform featuring interactive manipulatives and engaging activities.

Parents opted into the program by completing a survey, which collected each student's subject preference (Math, ELA, or Executive Functioning) and weekly availability.

Evening sessions followed one of three formats:

- A. 3x a week for 30 minutes (available to grades K-12)
- **B.** 2x a week for 45 minutes (available to grades 6-12)
- C. 1x a week for 60 minutes (available to grades 9-12)

Each student received 90 minutes of instruction per week for 20 weeks, equating to 30 hours of high-dosage tutoring over 5.5 months.

The program was designed to meet students' unique learning needs through small group instruction in three core areas: **English Language Arts (ELA)**, **Math**, and **Executive Functioning**.

Because participating students attended a variety of schools, they were grouped by both **subject area** and **grade band** to ensure instruction was developmentally appropriate and academically relevant. The grade bands were organized as follows:

- Kindergarten & 1st Grade
- 2nd & 3rd Grades
- 4th & 5th Grades
- 6th & 7th Grades
- 8th Grade
- 9th & 10th Grades
- 11th & 12th Grades

The small group tutoring sessions provided individualized attention while fostering peer collaboration. Each group focused on foundational and grade-level content aligned with the subject selected by the family.

Parents of participating students were invited to select preferred days of the week for tutoring sessions. Cignition created schedules that prioritized each family's first-choice subject while aligning availability with group structure. During the initial phase of the program, it became necessary to make several scheduling adjustments. Since parents had selected time slots well in advance, we had to realign schedules and resources to better accommodate their needs.

Because students attended different schools, Cignition's Curriculum and Instruction Team tailored the curriculum to focus on the most essential grade-level standards. For Kindergarten through 3rd grade ELA, we incorporated <u>Phonics Hero</u>, supplemented by Cignition's own decodable readers and comprehension lessons. All K-5 students completed a Phonics Hero placement test to determine their starting reading level.

The Foundational Literacy program uses a phonics-based curriculum with 26 reading levels. Advancing through 6-7 levels typically represents one year of reading growth. The program is designed to help students advance by two years (12-14 levels) within a single school year. Achieving this ambitious goal requires 50 hours of tutoring per student.

## 1.3 - Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of a large-scale, at-home tutoring program for private school students in LAUSD. While Cignition had previously delivered at-home sessions for several school districts and operated a direct-to-family model guided by parent choice, this program was unique in several ways. It served students from different private schools, and unlike prior models, their classroom teachers had no role in forming tutoring groups. To ensure instructional cohesion, student grouping was supported by Cignition staff in collaboration with Special Education consultants from the private school office. As a result, the program's results reflect learning gains independent of the students' school environments.

This marked our first large-scale initiative tailored entirely to Special Education students, requiring certified Special Education teachers and the verification of their credentials. Additionally, we introduced a newly developed curriculum focused on executive functioning skills. The goal was to deliver high-quality instruction aligned with Cignition's standards while keeping students meaningfully engaged and promoting academic and personal growth, despite the absence of a shared classroom setting and direct teacher involvement.

# 2.0 — Data Collection

# 2.1 — Introduction

Data from four sources was organized into two main categories: **student engagement** and **academic progress.** Data collection methods included tutor input and student feedback. All data was provided to the PPPO leadership team and each student's assigned consultant to inform instructional decisions and monitor progress.

## 2.2 – Engagement Metrics

Student engagement was evaluated using four indicators:

#### 1. Attendance

• The percentage of scheduled sessions a student attended.

#### 2. Participation

- At the end of each session, tutors rated students in three categories:
  - Persevered with Tasks
  - Listened Actively to Peers and Tutor
  - Participated in Discussions
- Each category was rated using a five-point Likert scale based on the percentage of session time:
  - 0% of the session time
  - 25% of the session time
  - 50% of the session time
  - 75% of the session time
  - 100% of the session time
- The average of the three ratings was used to generate an overall participation score for the session.

#### 3. Contact Hours

• The total number of hours a student was present in tutoring sessions throughout the program.

#### 4. Student Survey Feedback

- At the end of each session, students completed a brief survey by responding to four statements, each aligned to a specific engagement domain:
  - **Tutor Relationship**: "My tutor talks to me about my work to help me understand my mistakes."
  - **Collaborative Learning**: "I take turns, listen to, and work with others in my session."
  - **Conceptual Understanding**: "Right now, I understand more of what we covered than when we started."
  - **Productive Struggle / Growth Mindset**: "I don't give up when the material is challenging."
- Responses were recorded using a four-point Likert scale:
  - Strongly Agree
  - Somewhat Agree
  - Somewhat Disagree
  - Strongly Disagree

## 2.3 – Academic Progress

Measuring Student Mastery through Standards Progress

- Assessed by Tutors: Tutors evaluate student progress through ongoing observations and embedded Mastery Checks during instruction.
- Mastery Checks Embedded in Lessons: Each lesson includes built-in Mastery Check problems, aligned with the instructional pacing and standards identified by the Curriculum & Instruction (C&I) team.
- **Tutor Observation:** Tutors assess understanding based on the following expectations:
  - For Math
    - Provide the correct answer
    - Show all necessary work
    - Clearly explain reasoning
  - For ELA/Reading:
    - Provide the correct answer
    - Cite evidence from the text
    - Clearly explain thinking

#### • Four-Point Mastery Scale:

Student responses are rated using the following rubric:

- Emerging 0%
- Partially Proficient 33%
- Approaching Proficient 66%
- Proficient 100%
- **Instructional Goal:** Cignition emphasizes conceptual mastery rather than one-time correctness.
  - To support deep understanding, standards are reinforced across multiple sessions.

# 3.0 – Data Analysis

Data collection metrics fall into two main categories: **Student Engagement** and **Academic Progress.** 

## Student Engagement

Student engagement and attendance are critical indicators of a tutoring program's overall effectiveness. Regular attendance ensures that students consistently interact with instructional content, directly influencing their learning outcomes. Engagement metrics provide insight into how students interact with the content, their level of interest, and the quality of their relationships with tutors and peers. Research and experience show that actively engaged students are more likely to absorb and retain information, which is reflected in stronger academic performance.

Additionally, student surveys offer valuable perspectives by capturing students' perceptions of their learning experiences, confidence levels, and sense of progress. This holistic perspective helps identify areas where additional support may be needed, allowing for timely and targeted interventions to ensure student success.

## Academic Progress

Academic progress is a key measure of a student's ability to demonstrate mastery of specific topics. Rather than focusing solely on correct answers, students are expected to explain their reasoning and show a deep, conceptual understanding of the content. This is assessed through Mastery Checks, which evaluate students' ability to apply what they've learned after engaging with their tutors, peers, and the curriculum. This approach supports not only short-term achievement but also the development of critical thinking skills necessary for long-term academic success.

# 3.1 – Engagement Metrics

Four key components anchor our engagement metrics:

- 70% attendance rate
- 80% participation rate,
- Total of 15.5 contact hours
- 90% positive student feedback score

Meeting these benchmarks has consistently indicated a solid baseline of student engagement in our previous programs, demonstrating that students are effectively interacting with the material and the tutoring process. These metrics provide a reliable framework for assessing and ensuring meaningful student engagement throughout the program.

#### 3.1.1 – Attendance

Average attendance for the program was 64.6%.



## 3.1.2 – Participation

Overall, student participation across all three key areas averaged an impressive **95.6%.** This high level of engagement reflects the students' commitment and responsiveness to the program's structure and content, underscoring the effectiveness of our instructional strategies and the positive learning environment we strive to create.



#### 3.1.3 - Contact Hours

The contact hours baseline is drawn from <u>Design Principles for Accelerating Student</u> <u>Learning with High-Impact Tutoring</u>, a meta-analysis from the Annenberg Institute at Brown University. However, this metric is difficult to hit as we work with students at home, often with conflicting after-school schedules and limited availability for sessions. Consequently, we frequently adjust our reporting standards to reflect actual student averages. 52.0% of students met the goal of 15.5 or more Contact Hours during the 20-week program.





## 3.1.4 – Student Survey

Student survey results aim to see a positive response of at least 90% of the time across the four areas we examine. Based on student survey data, the program had an overall average score of **95.2%**.



# **Student Survey**

## 3.2 – Student Progress

To measure overall academic progress, we track growth on each standard assessed across the lessons using **Mastery Checks**. When a new standard is introduced, students complete a baseline Mastery Check before receiving any instruction on the content. Tutors then score the student's response using a rubric developed by Cignition, which evaluates both the accuracy of the answer and the quality of the student's explanation.

Scores are assigned on a 4-point scale:

- **0** Emerging
- 1 Partially Proficient
- **2** Approaching Proficient
- **3** Proficient

This process is repeated each time a Mastery Check is administered while students continue working on a given standard. The final Mastery Check score is then compared to the baseline to calculate their academic growth over time.

## 3.2.1 – Academic Standards Progress Score



Across Math and English Language Arts, the overall standards progress growth was **44.5%**.

#### 3.2.1.1 – Math Progress Score

To assess student progress in mathematics, we use a detailed rubric to score Mastery Checks aligned to specific academic standards. These checks are designed to evaluate both procedural fluency and conceptual understanding. Tutors score each response based on three key components: the correct answer, a complete display of all calculation work, and a clear explanation of the reasoning used to arrive at the answer.

To earn a score of **Proficient (3),** a student must:

• Provide the correct answer, show all necessary work, and include a full explanation of their thinking

An **Approaching Proficient (2)** may be assigned if the student:

• Has the correct answer, but only partial work or explanation

Or

• The answer is incorrect, but the student has shown all their work and provided a full explanation

A student receives a score of **Partially Proficient (1**):

• If the answer is incorrect and only some work and/or a partial explanation is provided

An **Emerging (0)** score is assigned when:

• The response includes an incorrect answer with no work shown and no explanation provided

Using this rubric, we calculated the students' overall average math progress growth score to be **56.0%**, reflecting their level of conceptual mastery across the assessed standards.



## 3.2.1.2 - ELA/Reading Progress Score

To calculate academic progress in English Language Arts, we compare each student's baseline Mastery Check to their highest Mastery Check for a given standard. These assessments are scored using a rubric that evaluates comprehension and textual analysis.

A **Proficient (3)** score is awarded when a student:

- Provide the correct answer
- Cite comprehensive and directly relevant textual evidence
- Clearly explain their reasoning

An **Approaching Proficient (2)** score may be given if the student:

• The student gives a correct answer but includes only partial or loosely relevant evidence and/or a partial explanation

#### Or

• The answer is incorrect but is supported by full evidence and a well-developed explanation, even if misaligned with the question

A student receives a score of **Partially Proficient (1)** for:

• An incorrect answer supported by some evidence and a partial explanation that reflects misunderstanding or misalignment

An **Emerging (0)** score is assigned when:

• The response includes an incorrect answer with no cited evidence or explanation.

In this rubric, "full evidence" refers to responses that thoroughly support the student's reasoning, directly address the question, and demonstrate a deep understanding of the text. In contrast, "some evidence" may be incomplete, only loosely connected to the question, or indicative of limited comprehension.



Additionally, K-3 students were assessed using a phonics program called Phonics Hero, which tracks reading growth in months. **On average, students demonstrated 8.4 months of reading growth throughout the program. This translates to approximately one month of reading proficiency gained for every 2.1 hours of tutoring, or one month of growth for every four tutoring sessions—a strong indicator of accelerated progress.** 

#### 3.2.2 – Attendance and Academic Progress Analysis

Attendance significantly impacted academic outcomes. While the overall attendance rate was 64.6%, notable differences in academic progress were observed based on attendance levels:

• Students with less than 60% attendance (17 of 48 students) averaged 38.0% attendance, pulling down the overall rate.

- The remaining 31 students had significantly higher attendance, averaging 84.8%.
- Students below 60% attendance in ELA had an Academic Progress score of 22.9%, versus 36.4% for those above 60%.
- Students below 60% attendance in Math had an Academic Progress score of 32.3%, compared to 85.1% for those above 60%.

Despite lower attendance, students in the <60% group still received an average of 11.1 hours of instructional time and achieved an Academic Progress average of 28%, close to the program goal of 33%. However, students with higher attendance far exceeded that goal, averaging 54.8%, underscoring the importance of consistent attendance for maximizing academic growth.

## 3.2.3 – Executive Functioning Standards Progress Score

The Executive Functioning curriculum was specifically developed for this program. Student progress was assessed through Mastery Checks aligned to performance goals, along with qualitative input from tutors. While this data is not included in the overall Academic Growth, it serves as a **separate measure of student development**. **Overall,** students demonstrated a **67.9% growth** in executive functioning skills, reflecting strong gains in areas such as focus, self-monitoring, and emotional regulation.



#### 3.2.3.1 – Unit & Skill Outline

Students worked on a variety of skills throughout the Executive Functioning Curriculum. Each lesson focused on a specific skill area and included embedded Mastery Checks to assess understanding and application. The skills addressed included:

- Growth Mindset
- Focus/Attention
- Working Memory
- Self-Monitoring
- Impulse Control
- Emotional Control
- Planning and Organization
- Collaboration and Social Skills
- Organization
- Flexible Thinking
- Stress Tolerance/Perseverance
- Self Advocacy
- Defining and Achieving Goals

#### 3.2.4 – Academic Progress vs. Engagement

To evaluate the relationship between student engagement and academic success, we compared the percentage of students who met academic standards in relation to the number of engagement benchmarks they met. Engagement was defined by three key metrics: achieving at least a **70% attendance rate**, maintaining an **80% participation rate**, and receiving a **90% or higher positive student feedback score**. Academic standards were measured through demonstrated mastery on content-aligned mastery checks.

The analysis revealed a strong correlation between higher engagement and academic achievement. Among students who met only one engagement benchmark, **41.2%** also met academic standards. This rose to **54.5%** for those meeting two engagement benchmarks, and reached **84.2%** for students who met all three. These results highlight the critical role that consistent attendance, active participation, and positive student perceptions play in driving academic progress, reinforcing the need to prioritize engagement to improve student learning outcomes.



PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHO MET ENGAGEMENT AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS

In addition to examining overall academic proficiency, we also analyzed how engagement metrics relate to student academic progress growth, specifically whether students achieved a minimum growth benchmark of 33% from their baseline to final Mastery Check scores. The same three engagement criteria were used in this analysis: 70% attendance, 80% participation, and a 90% positive student feedback score.

The data again revealed a positive relationship between engagement and academic growth. Only 10.3% of students who met no engagement benchmarks achieved the 33% growth goal. Among those who met one benchmark, **36.7%** reached the growth target. This percentage increased to **48.8%** for students who met two engagement benchmarks and peaked at 53.9% for students who met all three engagement standards.

These findings reinforce the critical connection between consistent, meaningful engagement and academic improvement. Students who are regularly present, actively participate, and report positive learning experiences are significantly more likely to demonstrate measurable academic growth over time.



# 4.0 – Findings Summary

The exceptional success of our tutoring program is supported by strong quantitative and qualitative measures. The remarkably high participation rate (95.6%) and tutor relationship strength (96.4%) created an ideal environment for learning, significantly contributing to students' outstanding academic improvements. Despite accessing sessions from home, outside of a school-regulated setting, students remained consistently engaged. These outcomes suggest that the home environment, when paired with family support, not only failed to hinder learning but may have enhanced it. Although not the primary focus of this analysis, the data points to a potential correlation between students' comfort at home, available support during sessions, and improved academic outcomes. Virtual tutoring enabled students to benefit from instructional support while learning in a familiar, stable environment.

Additional metrics reinforce the program's academic impact. **High scores in** collaboration (94.6%) and conceptual understanding (93.1%) confirm that students developed deep comprehension rather than relying only on rote memorization. Furthermore, increased student confidence and persistence, reflected in a 96.6% score for productive struggle, show that the program fostered skills with lasting benefits beyond the tutoring sessions, supporting long-term academic success.

Overall, the data clearly demonstrates the program's exceptional effectiveness in promoting substantial academic achievement and high levels of student engagement. The strong emphasis on tutor relationships, collaborative learning, and productive struggle played a key role in closing learning gaps and fostering essential learning skills. With further refinement and expansion, this model has strong potential to deliver even greater success for a broader range of learners.

Looking ahead, several key improvements could strengthen future implementations based on insights from this year's study. First, greater emphasis should be placed on understanding student availability and aligning session times with family routines. One of the primary difficulties faced was the shifting nature of students' after-school commitments, often leading to decreased attendance and fewer contact hours than expected. To address this, future implementations could include multiple cohorts or a mid-program scheduling reset, allowing families to adjust their tutoring times as needed. This flexibility would be especially valuable given the diverse range of school districts and external factors affecting students' availability. Given the complexity of scheduling across subjects and grade levels, building more adaptable scheduling structures would improve both participation and consistency. Another critical area for improvement involves the initial grouping of students. Incorporating data from families, schools, or district-level standardized assessments could help ensure students are placed into more academically cohesive groups from the outset. This year, several groups required mid-program adjustments due to coursework and instructional needs variations. A more data-informed grouping strategy would increase instructional alignment and improve learning outcomes from the outset.

One of the program's greatest successes was the use of certified Special Education tutors. These educators brought deep expertise in differentiation, allowing them to tailor instruction to a wide range of academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs. Their ability to support diverse learners and build strong relationships was instrumental in maintaining high engagement and promoting long-term academic success.