

University of Redlands Institutional Review Board  
**Application to Use Human  
Subjects in Research**  
(Form revision date: May 19, 2014)

NOTE: Please be sure to use the most updated version of this application posted on the IRB website

**Section A. Identification Information**

Current date: 1/8/17

Target start date for project: January 31, 2017

Title of project: Program Evaluation: Appreciative Inquiry Model as an Instructional Literacy Approach With low SES Elementary Students

Name of principal investigator (PI): [REDACTED]

Email of PI: [REDACTED]

Telephone number of PI: [REDACTED]

Highest degree held by PI: MA  
*If PI does not hold a degree, enter "None."*

Department or major of PI: Social Justice Educational Leadership, Ed.D., School of Education Doctoral Program

Position held by PI:

- fulltime faculty
- part-time faculty
- visiting faculty
- adjunct faculty
- administrator
- staff
- student

A.1. Has the PI completed the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (i.e., CITI training)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----



If you answered "Yes," attach the certificate of completion to this application.



**If you answered "No" to the previous question, stop completing this application until you complete the CITI training. Do not submit the application for IRB review.**

NOTE: Everyone associated with a research protocol needs to submit the CITI completion reports for the Investigators – Human Subjects modules as well as the Social and Behavioral Responsible Conduct of Research modules.

If PI is a student, complete the following:

Student's status:

- undergraduate
- master's level graduate
- doctoral level graduate

other

Name of faculty or administrator sponsor:

Email of sponsor:

Telephone number of sponsor:

Highest degree held by sponsor:

Department or office of sponsor:

Position held by sponsor:

- fulltime faculty
- part-time faculty
- visiting faculty
- adjunct faculty
- administrator

A.2. Has the faculty/administrator sponsor completed the CITI training?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	



If you answered "Yes," attach the certificate of completion to this application. (Advisor CITI Completion report submitted with hard copies of IRB application).



**If the answer to the previous question was "No," stop completing this application form until your faculty/administrator sponsor completes the CITI training. Do not submit the application for IRB review.**

List the names and departments/offices of all other project personnel (e.g., co-investigators, secretaries, administrative assistants) and anyone else who will have contact with subjects or identifiable data from subjects.

	Name	Department/Office
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		

A.3. Has everyone listed above completed the CITI training?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----



If you answered "Yes," attach the certificates of completion to this application.



**If you answered "No" to the previous question, stop completing this application until everyone above completes the CITI training. Do not submit the application for IRB review.**

A.4. Is the proposed project a collaborative, multi-institutional study?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----

If "Yes," state the name of the collaborating researchers and institution(s)

	Name	Institution
1		
2		
3		

A.5. Has the proposed study been approved by the IRBs of the institutions listed above?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

If "Yes," specify the IRB approval number(s):

	IRB Approval Number	Institution
1		
2		
3		

A.6. Who or what is the funding source for the proposed study?

- departmental
- University of Redlands faculty research grant
- federal government or agency (e.g., NSF)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- state or local government or agency  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- private foundation (e.g., Carnegie)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- industry/business (e.g., ESRI)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- personal
- no cost study
- other  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## Section B. Abstract of the Study

**In lay language**, summarize the purpose and rationale of the proposed project. Summaries should specify clearly who the subjects are and the major criterion or dependent variables and the major predictor or independent variables. Do not exceed 200 words. There will be a place in the application to describe the project in greater detail.

This research study intends to gain insight of how low socioeconomic fourth grade students experience different literacy instruction through a mixed method comparative research study. This study will compare student achievement and experiences using different approaches to teaching reading lessons - one using current instructional practices (defined here as “traditional” instruction) and one using a strengths-based teaching instructional approach framed around Appreciative Inquiry theory. Methods will include both quantitative examination of student assessments and qualitative observations of student behaviors in both instructional settings.

The purpose of this study is to illuminate differences between strengths-based approaches to literacy instruction for students in comparison to traditional pedagogies. This study is intended to determine effective instructional practices in providing the highest quality education for all students, especially low SES students, with implications for all grade level instruction.

Participants will be twenty-four 4<sup>th</sup> grade male and female students in a small rural school setting. Based on the small population of fourth grade students (approximately 40 students), it is estimated that 45% (18 fourth graders) are currently enrolled in the Title I reading intervention program, 45% are Hispanic (16 fourth graders), 10% receive services in Specialized Academic Instruction (SAI, formerly called Special Education), and almost 60% of 4<sup>th</sup> graders will participate in the study.

## Section C. Review Category Requested

C.1. Has this project been approved by the IRB before?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	--

If “Yes,” give previous IRB Approval Number \_\_\_\_\_

C.2. Which type of review are you requesting? Check only one. *Note: Expedited or Exempt reviews are based on the criteria outlined in 45 CFR 46; these types of reviews are not granted on the basis of how quickly a PI wants to begin collecting data or the PI’s schedule.*

- Full IRB review  
 Expedited review  
 Exempt from review

**NOTE: The IRB chair makes the final decision about which type of review is appropriate for a proposed study.**

C.3. If requesting an expedited review or to exempt from review, include justification by making explicit reference to the information in 45 CFR 46. \_\_\_\_\_ be

## Section D. Information About Research Methods

For each part of Section D, be succinct but complete. Unless requested to do otherwise, do not include a grant proposal, thesis proposal, or any similar material with the IRB application. Do not exceed 200 words in any subsection (e.g., Research Objectives, Design and Methodology).

### Research Objectives

**In lay language**, describe the research objectives. Being sure to describe and justify the conceptual, theoretical, practical, or educational value of the proposed project. The IRB needs to understand the value of the proposed project to judge the risks and benefits to the research subjects. *A stronger case can be made by citing literature related to the project and rooting a study in unanswered conceptual, theoretical, or practical issues.*

The objectives of this research study are to: (a) compare (qualitative) through examination assessment scores in a strengths (or appreciative)-based instructional approach and a traditional instructional approach as a means to better understand how to increase student academic achievement (literacy focus), especially for low SES students; (b) describe (qualitative) appreciative and traditional literacy pedagogy to gain insight into how different instructional approaches impact student learning experiences; and, (c) describe the experiences (qualitative and quantitative) of low SES students in different literacy instructional settings, in order to gain insight into the relationship between instructional approaches, student behaviors/experiences, and student achievement through analysis (examining areas of convergence, divergence, and expansion) of mixed methods data as a means to increase teacher effectiveness in providing a high quality education for all learners, especially for low SES students. Though this study focuses on literacy intervention instruction, results may be extrapolated to other subject areas.

Research literature evidences increases in student achievement using strengths-based instructional approaches. A review of the literature reveals that students positively respond to instruction with strength-based approaches evidenced in higher test scores, lower dropout rates, and increases in student self-efficacy (Abdi, 2014; Awan, Noureen & Naz, 2011; Corkett, Hatt, & Benevides, 2011; Howard, 2010; Kosmonski, Gay & Vockell, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 2006, 2014; Lehner, Ruona, & Georgia, 2004; Lemberger, Brigman, Webb, & Moore, 2011,2012; Orr & Cleveland-Innes, 2015; Smith, Connolly & Pryseski, 2014; Willis, 2009; Yilmaz, 2008). However, education pedagogies do not embrace strengths- based instructional models but, rather, continue reproducing deficit-based pedagogies embedded in the status quo, regardless of empirical research data to the contrary. (Abdi, 2014; Awan, Noureen & Naz, 2011; Corkett, Hatt, & Benevides, 2011; Howard, 2010; Kosmonski, Gay & Vockell, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 2006, 2014; Lehner, Ruona, & Georgia, 2004; Lemberger, Brigman, Webb, & Moore, 2011,2012; Orr & Cleveland-Innes, 2015; Smith, Connolly & Pryseski, 2014; Willis, 2009; Yilmaz, 2008).

This study is designed to collect evidence of differences in student achievement and experiences using two different instructional approaches. The intent of this study is to empirically evidence the relationship between strengths-based instructional settings and academic achievement in literacy for low SES students.

The potential impact of strengths-based literacy instructional models for students includes higher retention rates and increased student academic achievement through rich, student-centered learning environments. Results of data analysis intend to provide empirical evidence examining strengths-based models of instruction with academic achievement levels for low SES students in comparison to models of instruction that are typical in the U.S. education system in spite of no substantial increase in student academic achievement since the 1970s (NAEP, 2016).

## Design and Methodology

**In lay language**, describe and justify the design and methodology. *Illustrate clearly how the methodology permits the goals of the research/educational objectives to be adequately met.*

A QUANT → qual → QUANT deductive theoretical design using data from two different instructional settings. One study group will receive instruction employing a strengths-based approach framed around Appreciative Inquiry theory, while the other group will receive instruction employing current teaching methods practiced in the Title I reading intervention program. The project will include 10-12 students in each instructional group, 20-24 students in total, from fourth grade. All participants will have signed parental consent allowing voluntary participation prior to commencing the study.

Data collection will include quantitative data in the form of pre-reading comprehension and fluency assessment scores at the beginning of the study, qualitative data collection throughout the study in the form of external classroom observation note-taking and narrative reflection, and finally quantitative data in the form of post-reading comprehension and fluency assessment scores at the conclusion of the study (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

Data will be generated (comprehension and fluency assessment scores) at the beginning of the study and again after the six-week study. The assessments are designed to be completed in 45-60 minutes, and therefore would take participants approximately 90-120 minutes between the pre- and post-test examination. These tests are routinely part of the experience of students in at the study site, and thus represent a common educational practice. The reading comprehension and fluency assessment instruments are commonly employed in schools nationally and are validated and research driven. There will be nine qualitative observations of each instructional group by an external observer using an observation form developed by the PI in collaboration with her doctoral advisor and vetted by seven experienced classroom teachers.

Data will be collected in the form of pre- and post-test scores, external observation notes in keeping with a structured observation guide with peer debriefing. All collected data will remain confidential.

The PI will analyze 20-24 pre-and post-assessment data cases and 18 observation note sets for analysis. Data will be kept in a locked file drawer of the project PI and after translation into an electronic form, the data will be kept in a password protected computer in a password protected file folder on the hard drive of the PI. An additional electronic copy of the file will be kept on a password protected USB drive of the PI.

Data will first be examined within methodological tradition (quantitative data will be examined for differences in pre- to post-test scores in both instructional groups, qualitative data will be examined through thematic coding of narrative observation records) and the data will be mixed between methods. Comparative analysis through triangulation of mixed data, using cluster and correspondence analysis will be used to evidence congruence or incongruence of different instructional approaches when compared with academic assessment rates, instructional climate rates, and student experiences in both instructional settings.

## Debriefing Procedure and Disclosure of Results

Describe how subjects will be debriefed and what will be included as part of the debriefing procedure. Include the following information: the study's rationale, the person who subjects can contact with future questions and whether subjects can obtain a copy of the results (and, if so, how they do so). Where

appropriate, include or attach a copy of the debriefing script. If you do not plan to disclose the results of the study to subjects, describe the rationale for not doing so. If you do not plan to use a debriefing script, describe the rationale for not doing so.

The PI will provide a debriefing script to study group participants concluding the study. The PI will read the script and answer any questions at that time. Participants will also be given contact information for the PI in order to obtain a copy of the results, if they'd like to do so. (Attached)

**NOTE: Participants need to be offered a summary of results following completion of the data collection/analysis. This should NOT be contingent on publication of the study's findings.**

### Data Analysis

**In lay language**, describe how the qualitative and/or quantitative data will be analyzed. Explain how the sample size is sufficient to achieve the study's aims. This explanation might include a formal power calculation or an explanation of why a small sample is sufficient (e.g., qualitative research, pilot studies).

Quantitative analysis of data from pre- and post- reading comprehension and fluency scores will employ non-parametric statistics using a repeated measure t-Test for each as a comparison to examine individual and group differences within the data from pre- to post-assessment. Cluster and correspondence analysis will seek to determine if there are statistically meaningful differences between the two groups at the pre-test and again at the post-test for final results.

Qualitative data from External Observation form, Part 1: Behavior Domains 1-4 scale scores, of the observation form will be transformed into quantitative data and analyzed using descriptive statistics with ANOVA. Transforming the observational data into quantitative scores will allow us to describe total domain scores aggregated from all session observation forms for each group yielding a frequency score for *instructional climate*. *Instructional climate scores* for both groups will be compared using between-method triangulation for evidence of dominant congruence or incongruence of different instructional approaches and student experience levels.

Qualitative data from External Observation forms, Part 2: Narrative Reflection will be transposed into a Word document and categorically coded. Thematic coding using a triple sorting process will facilitate further data reduction. The first read will code major overarching themes, the second read will code categories with common characteristics within each major theme, and the third read will code anomalies or outliers found within the observer narratives. Narrative data will be represented in quotes under coded themes.

Final Analysis will include Parallel mixed analysis of data within and between groups. Cluster and correspondence analysis will be used for evidence of congruence or incongruence of instructional practices and student experience levels and academic achievement rates comparisons. Triangulation of mixed data will be used in developing a grounded theory of effective instructional practices and student achievement and experiences. Legitimation will be determined using parallel mixed analysis of dependent and variable data, making contrasts/comparisons, and peer debriefing for final conclusions, recommendations, and implications.

### Project Materials

Include copies of all materials used in this study (e.g., surveys), and information about the source of these instruments (e.g., who developed the instrument, reference where additional information about the instrument's reliability and validity can be found, etc.).

External Observation Form: This form was developed by the PI, in collaboration with her advisor, using the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) as an organizing framework to manage and analyze qualitative data. The four domains in Part 1 emerged from the six CSTP standards. Categories within each domain will be scale-scored using a 7-point value scale based on presence, frequency, and quality of observed behaviors in each domain to transform qualitative observations into quantitative data (Brackett, Reyes, Rivers, Elbertson & Salovey, 2011). Part 2 contains two parts for narrative reflection that will be coded into three interpretive categories: 1) Observed student experience scaled rating framed around CSTP 1-6; 2) Observed teacher practice scaled rating framed around the CSTP 1-6; and 3) Critical analysis narrative and overall session scaled rating of positive, flat, or negative.

Fluency measurements will be in the form of one-minute oral readings of short passages (by grade level with ability level formats) from Read Naturally Program used in the school's Title I program currently. Comprehension measurements will be from Reading Counts online program used school-wide with Lexile scores posted upon completion of exam. Daily lesson materials provided by Title I Interventionist following current program lesson instruction (in the form of worksheets in reading, writing skill review and practice, and listening center with multiple copies of a book on tape).

### Deception

D.1. Does the research use deception?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----

If "Yes," provide the justification for the use of deception.

### Audio and Videotaping

D.2. Does the research use audio taping of subjects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----

If "Yes," provide the justification for the use of audiotaping.

D.3. Does the research use videotaping of subjects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----

If "Yes," provide the justification for the use of videotaping.

### Hazardous Materials

D.4. Will drugs or hazardous substances be used as a part of this study?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----

If "Yes," explain.



## Section E. Description of Subjects

E.1. Does the PI or faculty sponsor have an existing relationship with any of the subjects?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

If "Yes," describe the nature of the relationship.

The project PI is a current 4/5<sup>th</sup> grade teacher at the study site with 10 fourth graders who may be possible participants. The PI will demonstrate active vigilance to maintain objectivity at all times throughout the study regardless of participant random selection to each study group.

Describe the subject population even if your study does not involve direct interaction with them (e.g., archival data).

Total number of subjects	24
Number of males	15
Number of females	9
Age range of subjects	9-10 yrs. old

E.2. Does the proposed study target any social, ethnic, religious, medical, or other group of individuals (e.g., NCAA athletes, Chinese-Americans, Catholics, HIV positive)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

If "Yes," specify the group(s): Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students attending a Title I school qualified through the National School Lunch Program guidelines.

E.3. Will the subjects consist of University of Redlands students?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----

E.4. Will the subjects consist of any persons from protected groups as per 45 CFR 46 (e.g., children under 18 years of age, prisoners, cognitively impaired persons, individuals who are institutionalized, pregnant women)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

If "Yes," specify the protected group(s): Children under 18 years of age.

E.5. Will any of the subjects live outside of the United States?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----

If "Yes," specify the country or countries where they live: \_\_\_\_\_



**Research involving human subjects living outside of the United States is difficult for the IRB to evaluate and requires special attention on the part of the PI (e.g., with regard to the cultural climate in these other countries). In the appropriate sections of this application, the PI should describe clearly whether there are any aspects of the cultural, political, or economic climate in the country where the research will be conducted that might present unique risks for subjects in comparison to what subjects in the United States might experience if they participated in a similar study. If there are unique risks, the PI should describe how she or he will mitigate these risks. The PI also must describe how she or he will deal with 45 CFR 46's requirement that all human subjects in research be given the opportunity to ask questions, how the PI will address the requirement that all human subjects be given the PI's contact information during the consent process, and how other requirements of 45 CFR 46 will be met. Investigators conducting research outside**

of the United States should consult the Department of Health and Human Services information about international human subjects protections at <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/intlcompilation/intlcompilation.html>.

E.6. What will be the duration of an individual subject's participation?

Less than 30 minutes

30 minutes to 60 minutes

1 hour to 2 hours

Greater than 2 hours Specify duration:

Intervention instruction for each group will consist of 40 minute sessions, 5 days per week for 6 weeks consecutively for a total of 20 hours of participation. This study will replicate literacy intervention instruction and lessons in the current Title I school program but one group will receive a strengths-based approach to teaching lesson material. Time requirements for pre- and post-assessments in the study will exceed the allotted time for research study instruction for approximately two additional hours. Study participation time will total 22 hours over the 6-week period. It should be noted that Title I reading intervention classes will occur with or without the study.

E.7. Will there be any inducement for participation (money, extra credit, course requirement)?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	--

If "Yes," describe the inducement. *Inducements should not be so large as to be considered coercive.*

E.8. Where will the subjects be studied? Provide the name of building/department, address, and office/lab/classroom number. If the subjects will be studied in a public setting, provide information about the setting (e.g., San Bernardino National Forest, Santa Monica pier).

Big Bear Elementary School, Room 13  
40940 Pennsylvania Ave.  
Big Bear Lake, CA 92315

E.9. If applicable, did you append a letter from an appropriate gatekeeper (i.e., school principal, facility director, hospital administrator, Vice President of Student Life) that states clearly that you have permission to study subjects at the location you specified above? *The letter from the gatekeeper must be on official stationary with letterhead and the letter must contain the gatekeeper's name and contact information.*

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
---	-----------------------------	---

If you answered "No" to the previous question, explain why you did not.

**NOTE: Gatekeeper letters need to be on official letterhead (not an email or other unofficial document).**

## Section F. Information About Recruitment of Subjects

Specify all methods that will be used in the recruitment of subjects:

- Newspaper
- Internet (websites, social media)
- Email (personal or mass mailing)
- Letter (personal or mass mailing)
- University common area bulletin board (e.g., Hunsaker, Armacost Library)
- University departmental bulletin board (e.g., Appleton, Hall of Letters)
- University dorm or residential area bulletin board
- Publically-posted notice outside of the University of Redlands
- Flyers
- Radio
- Television
- Telephone
- Other      *Specify:* \_\_\_\_\_

Describe how subjects will be recruited for participation. In your description, address the following:

- efforts to ensure equal access to participation;
- what, if any, exclusion criteria will be used (e.g., any student under 18 years of age);
- how and where subjects will be identified and recruited;
- who will do the recruiting;
- where recruiting will be done;
- how you will protect the privacy of potential subjects during recruitment
- how non-English speakers will be recruited.

There are approximately 18 (out of 40) fourth grade students currently receiving Title I services. These students will continue receiving these services they are entitled to and will be included in the participant pool. Six more students will need to be included in the participant pool and the PI will request recommendations from the Title I Interventionist. Random selection of participant pool will be a limiting factor, but random selection for dividing participants into two groups will not be a limiting factor. Participant pool selection will occur at the school site by the PI. Once parental consents are returned, a participant list will be generated by the PI replacing names with coded ID's and the ID list will be divided into two groups ensuring random selection. The list with student names will be shredded and destroyed.

Selection criteria for participation have been generated, but may not be necessary to determine eligibility based on the small population size. Criteria include: (a) reading comprehension and fluency rates below grade level standards, (b) flat rates in literacy skill development, (c) receive Title I literacy intervention services. Based on the percentage of Hispanic students in 4<sup>th</sup> grade, it is estimated that approximately 35% (about 12 fourth graders) receive Title I services currently so CELDT levels will not be used as criteria. Assessment data will not be used as criteria for participant selection for this research study.

Study participant identifying markers will be replaced with coded study ID's for use in study data collection and tracking. Coded ID's will consist of the first name initial of the participant's regular education teacher (capitalized) and the classroom number, followed by the first name initial of the participant (capitalized). Once the ID list has been divided into two groups (labeled "A" or "B"), the letter of the group will be added to the end of each ID (lowercase "a" or "b"). Example: "N14Aa" identifies teacher Nicol, Room 14, Participant Al Smith in study Group A. If any initial of

student's or teachers first names are identical, a decimal point followed by a chronological number (based on alphabetical order of first initial of participant last names) will follow the letter of the first name of the participant. Example: "N14A.2a" identifies teacher Nicol, Room 14, Participant A1 Trust in study Group A.



Attach a copy of any document or script that will be used to recruit subjects (or insert below).

F.1. Does the PI, faculty sponsor, or other person who will be obtaining informed consent have an existing relationship with any of the subjects?

X	Yes		No
---	-----	--	----

If "Yes," describe the nature of the relationship and what steps will be taken to prevent undue influence or coercion.

The PI is a 4/5<sup>th</sup> grade general education teacher with possible 4<sup>th</sup> graders who may also become study participants. These students will be randomly assigned to instructional groups and may be assigned to the group receiving instruction from the PI (myself). Regardless of the student-teacher relationship to the PI, there is no need for undue influence or coercion to participate in the research study.

F.2. Did you append a letter from an appropriate gatekeeper (i.e., school principal, facility director, hospital administrator, Vice President of Student Life) that states clearly that you have permission to recruit participants in the manner you specified above? *The letter from the gatekeeper must be on official stationary with letterhead and the letter must contain the gatekeeper's name and contact information.*

X	Yes		No
---	-----	--	----

If you answered "No" to the previous question, explain why you did not.

**NOTE: Gatekeeper letters need to be on official letterhead (not an email or other unofficial document).**

## Section G. Information About The Consent Process and Documentation

The standard consent process is for all subjects to sign a document containing all the elements of informed consent as specified in 45 CFR 46. Some or all of the elements of consent, including signatures, may be altered or waived under certain circumstances (as discussed in 45 CFR 46). Under no circumstances can informed consent include false or misleading statements for the purpose of deception.

G.1. The standard consent process is for all subjects to sign a document containing all elements of informed consent. The subject is given a copy of the consent form or computerized equivalents. All consent forms must be securely stored for three years after the conclusion of the study. Will informed consent be obtained according to these requirements and all others specified in 45 CFR 46?

X	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
---	-----	--------------------------	----



**If you answered “No,” then complete the sections below *Justification for a waiver of written (i.e., signed) consent* and/or *Justification for a full or partial waiver of consent*. If you answered “Yes,” do not complete the sections *Justification for a waiver of written consent* or *Justification for a full or partial waiver of consent*.**

### Obtaining informed consent

Describe who will be obtaining consent (or permission) and from whom. In the description, include discussion of the steps that will be taken to minimize coercion or undue influence. If children will be enrolled as subjects, describe how parental permission will be obtained and by whom. Also, describe how assent of the child will be obtained. If cognitively-impaired adults will be used as subjects, describe how permission will be obtained from a legally authorized representative. If non-English speaking subjects will be recruited, explain how consent in their native language will be obtained and by whom.

The PI will obtain consent from parents or legal guardians of subject participants using the Parental Consent Form (English and Spanish). The PI will deliver the form to pool participants individually in a sealed envelope addressed to the parent/guardian prior to final participant selection. Return instructions will be printed on the front of the enveloped with a 1-2 day request to return to the project PI at the school site. This will be the only form of contact that will be made by the PI to parents/legal guardians. Only pool participants with signed parental consent will be recruited for study participation and requested to sign Assent Forms. A volunteer (bi-lingual) translator will translate the Parental Consent Forms. No identifying markers will be included with translated materials.



Attach a copy of the informed consent or parental consent



For subjects under the age of 18 years, attach a copy of form that will document assent of the child

### Justification for a waiver of written (i.e., signed) consent

Is either or both of the following true? Check all that apply.

The only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principle risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality. Each subject will be asked whether she or he wants documentation linking him or her with the research, and the subject's wishes will govern.

The research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

**NOTE: One should only ask for a waiver of written consent IF they are NOT getting informed consent (either electronic or written)**

### Justification for a full or partial waiver of consent

A waiver might be requested for research involving only existing data or human biological specimens. More rarely, it might be requested when the research design requires withholding some study details at the outset (e.g., behavioral research involving deception).

I am requesting a waiver of some elements of informed consent.

If you checked the above box, describe which elements you are requesting be waived.

---

I am requesting a waiver of all elements of informed consent on the basis of the following. Check all that apply.

The research will involve no greater than minimal risk to subjects or to their privacy.

Explain.

---

The waiver will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of subjects. *(Consider the right of privacy and possible risk of breach of confidentiality in light of the information you wish to gather.)*

Explain.

---

The research would be impracticable without the waiver.

Explain.

---

The risk to privacy is reasonable in relation to benefits to be gained or the importance of the knowledge to be gained.

Explain.

---

## Section H. Information About Confidentiality

H.1. As part of the data collection process – **excluding information collected as part of the consent procedure** – will you collect or receive any of the following? *Check all that apply but only those that are collected as part of data collection, not as part of the consent process.*

- No identifying information will be collected
- Names
- Telephone numbers
- Any dates related to a subject (e.g., date of birth)
- Current or past addresses
- Fax numbers
- Email addresses
- Social security number
- Account numbers (e.g., bank, health plan)
- License/certificate numbers (e.g., drivers, professional)
- Vehicle Identification Numbers
- URLs
- IP addresses
- Photographs or images of the subject
- Other *Specify:*

**NOTE:** The information to the left should only be checked if it is part of the data collection; do not check items here if you are using the information solely for the purposes of recruitment and/or consent procedures.

H.2. Will any of the identifiers listed above be linked or stored with the research data?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	Not Applicable
------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------

H.3. If you answered “Yes” to H.2, specify with whom, excluding research personnel, will identifiable data be shared (i.e., the information listed above)?

	Name	Department/Office
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		

H.4. If you answered “Yes” to H.2, specify where the identifiers listed above will be stored? Where applicable, list building name/department, address, and office numbers.

	Department/Office, Address, Office numbers
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	

For electronic data stored on a desktop computer or network, check all of the ways in which the data will be secured:

- Secure network
- Password protected computer
- Password protected data files
- Encrypted files

For portable computing and storage devices (e.g., smart phone, laptop computer, flash drives, CDs/DVDs), check all of the ways in which the data will be secured:

- Password protected device
- Password protected data files
- Encrypted files

For hardcopy data (e.g., information recorded on paper, audio and videotape), check all of the ways in which the data will be secured:

- Locked office or suite
- Locked storage cabinet
- Data will be kept separate from identifiers listed above

H.5. Will the data eventually be destroyed (including identifiers)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

NOTE: The most recent version of this application asks for justification if the "No" is checked for destroying data (e.g., some places require archiving of data)

If "Yes, answer the following:

Who will destroy the data?

PI

How will the data be destroyed?

In accordance with university policies, the project PI will ensure all project data in the form of paper documentation will be shredded and recycled, all data in technological form will be purged using commercial software designed to erase records from the computer storage device, all data on any type of USB device will be physically crushed by the PI, and a record of all destroyed documentation, including when and the way in which data was destroyed will be kept by the PI indefinitely.

When will the data be destroyed?

All study data will be destroyed when no longer needed for defense in accordance with current state laws and university institutional policies or five years, whichever is longer.



## Section I. Cost Benefit Analysis

**NOTE:** Payments or other compensation/incentives to participate are NOT potential benefits.

I.1. Are there direct and practical benefits to the subjects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----

If you answered "Yes" to the preceding question, describe the reasonable, major, practical benefits to individual subjects. **Do not engage in hyperbole; do not list monetary payment or other compensation as a potential benefit.**

I.2. Are there direct and practical benefits for society/community?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

If you answered "Yes" to the preceding question, describe the reasonable, major, practical benefits to society. **Do not engage in hyperbole.**

Societal/community benefits include positive student experiences in the elementary public school setting, continued Title I services, providing a quality education to students, and strengthening the school-family relationships within the community.

I.3. Are there direct and practical benefits for the discipline/profession?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

If you answered "Yes" to the preceding question, describe the reasonable, major, practical benefits to the profession. **Do not engage in hyperbole.**

Generating data evidencing effective instructional practices that impact student achievement levels with implications for application in all grades may provide an alternative pedagogy all educators can embrace, thereby ensuring instructional practices that will benefit all students regardless of their rates of achievement or services they receive in school (both core curriculum and pull-out remediation type programs).

I.4. If the PI is a student, are there direct and practical educational benefits for him or her? *If the PI is not a student, enter "Not applicable".*

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable
-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------	----------------

If you answered "Yes" to the preceding question, describe the reasonable, major, practical educational benefits. **Do not engage in hyperbole.**

As a doctoral student, practical benefits of this study include advancing my expertise in the correlation of strengths-based theories with student achievement. The results of this study may provide evidence to support (or not) the hypothesis that strengths-based approaches to teaching are more effective in raising student achievement levels for all students than commonly practiced deficit-based approaches found in classrooms today. This study advances my knowledge and experience in the field of research which may lead to further research studies and potential employment opportunities.

### Analysis of Risk/Benefit Ratio

Provide an analysis of any short-term or long-term risks to subjects and precautions taken to minimize risks. Your response should include information about the risk of psychosocial harm (e.g., emotional distress, embarrassment, breach of confidentiality), economic harm (e.g., loss of employment or insurability, loss of professional standing or reputation, loss of standing within the community), legal jeopardy (e.g., disclosure of illegal activity or negligence), and pain and physical injury. Describe procedures for follow-up, when necessary (e.g., such as when subjects are referred for psychological services). If there is no direct interaction with subjects and risk is limited to breach of confidentiality (e.g., for archival data), then state that this is so.

Participation in any research study has risk. Risks here include breach of confidentiality. To limit this risk, precautions to replace all participant identifiers with coded study ID's will immediately follow participant selection for all data collection. The External Observer will not have any direct contact with participants at any time during observations, and observer notes will not contain participant identifiers. The potential of one teaching approach possibly impacting achievement levels of one group more positively, negatively, or not at all (than the other group) is also a risk. In order to limit such risk, all participants will continue receiving Title I services they are entitled to with both groups receiving instruction using the exact same lessons (and materials) that will be taught in the Title I program regardless of the study. The only difference being the approach to teaching the lessons.

Following university policies, final research study conclusions and recommendations may be provided to the school district of different teaching practices and the impact to student achievement for elementary students with possible implications for all students across grades levels and across the curriculum.

## Section J. The Use of Existing Records and Biological Specimens

J.1. What records, data, or human biological specimens will you be using? *Check all that apply.*

- None
- Data already collected for another research project
- Data already collected for administrative purposes
- Public records
- Private (i.e., custodial-controlled) records
- Biological specimens

For each of the boxes checked above, summarize how the original data, records, or human biological specimens were collected. The IRB is particularly interested in whether the data or specimens were obtained ethically, especially as regards to issues of informed consent.

Enrollment of students receiving Title I services currently and recommendations of students for the participant pool will be requested from the Title I Interventionist. Approximately 18 students are estimated to be currently enrolled in the Title I program with six to be recommended for the pool. The criteria for selection may be requested by the Interventionist for recommendations.

For each of the boxes checked in J.1, where do these data, records, or human biological specimens currently reside?

Do all of these data, records, or specimens exist at the time of this application?

X	Yes		No		Not Applicable
---	-----	--	----	--	----------------

If not, explain how prospective data collection will occur.

## Section K. Conflict of Interest

The following questions apply to all investigators and research personnel engaged in the design, conduct, or reporting of the results of this project and/or their immediate family members (e.g., spouse, significant other, dependent children). Currently or during the term of the study, does any member of the research team or his/her family member have or expect to have a ...

	Yes	No
... personal financial interest in or personal financial relationship (including gifts of cash or in-kind) with a sponsor of this study?		X
... personal financial interest in or personal financial relationship (including gifts of cash or in-kind) with an entity that owns or has the right to commercialize a product, process, or technology studied in this project?		X
... personal financial interest in or personal financial relationship (including gifts of cash or in-kind) with an entity engaged in the performance of this project as a subcontractor, sub-recipient, or vendor?		X
... board membership of any kind or an executive position (paid or unpaid) with a sponsor of this study or with an entity that owns or has the right to commercialize a product, process, or technology studied in this project?		X

If the answer to any of the questions above is "Yes," describe in detail the conflict of interest.

---

## Section L. Checklist

Applicants: Please complete the checklist. Do not continue to Section M. without completing this checklist.

Yes	No	N/A	Item
X			All questions and items in the IRB application have been answered fully and completely.
X			A hardcopy of this application with all signatures was sent to the chair of the IRB.
		X	The IRB approval numbers of collaborating institutions is included.
X			A letter from an appropriate gatekeeper/authority figure specifying that you have permission to recruit subjects in the manner described above has been attached to the hardcopy.
X			A letter from an appropriate gatekeeper/authority figure specifying that you have permission to study the subjects at the location(s) described above has been attached to the hardcopy.
X			The informed consent has been attached.
X			The informed consent includes a statement that the study involves data collection.
X			The informed consent includes an explanation of the study's purpose.
X			The informed consent specifies the expected duration of a subject's participation.
X			The informed consent describes the procedures to be followed.
X			The informed consent describes any foreseeable risks or discomforts for the subjects.
X			The informed consent specifies any benefits to the subjects.
X			The informed consent specifies any compensation for the subjects.
X			The informed consent describes how confidentiality will be maintained.
X			The informed consent specifies whom to contact with questions.
X			The informed consent states that participation is voluntary.
X			The informed consent states that subjects can cease participation at any time without loss of benefits, any other penalty, or prejudice.
X			The informed consent specifies the approximate number of subjects in the study.
X			A copy of the form used for assent of a child is attached.
X			Copies of all instruments, questionnaires, and interview protocols are attached.
X			The debriefing script is attached.

**NOTE: This checklist was revised and condensed in the current version of the IRB Application.**

## Section M. Certification for Research

*I certify that to the best of my knowledge the information provided above is complete and accurate.*

*I agree to obtain approval from the IRB for any modifications of the above protocol as described.*

*I accept responsibility for ensuring that the rights, welfare, and dignity of the subjects in this study have been protected and are in accordance with applicable federal/state/local laws and regulations and the University's Institutional Guidelines for the Treatment of Human Subjects in Research.*

*I will provide progress reports to the IRB at least annually, or as requested.*

*I will report promptly to the IRB all unanticipated problems or adverse events involving the subjects.*

*I will follow the IRB approved consent process for all subjects.*

*I will ensure that all personnel conducting the work of this protocol have or will receive appropriate training in the use of human participants in experimentation.*


*I certify that this research does not unnecessarily duplicate research already published.*

*I understand that IRB approval is normally for 1 year.*

*I will not collect data after the IRB's approval has expired.*

*I will submit a request for continuation of approval if I plan to collect data after the IRB's approval has expired.*

*I will submit a final report once the data have been collected.*

	<i>January 8, 2016</i>
Signature of PI	Date

*Because the PI is a student, I accept that I am ultimate responsibility for ensuring that this study complies with all the obligations listed above for the PI.*

Signature of Faculty/Administrator/Staff Sponsor	Date

**For IRB use only. Do not write or type below this line.**

---

**IRB Decision**

Approved

IRB approval number:	
----------------------	--

Date approval starts:	
-----------------------	--

Date approval ends:	
---------------------	--

Approved with conditions (i.e., the IRB requires as a condition of approval that the investigator make specified changes to the research protocol or informed consent document(s), confirm specific assumptions or understandings on the part of the IRB regarding how the research will be conducted, or submit additional documents)

Not Approved

Signature of IRB Chair	Current date

**External Observer Framework Form**

Observation#: \_\_\_\_\_ Circle: Group 1 (8:25-9:05) / Group 2 (10:00-10:40)

Number of students being observed: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part 1-Note-taking:** Rate every observed behaviors in each domain below using a seven-point scale (1-2: *low*, 3-5: *mid*, 6-7: *high*). Record each behavior observation score in the appropriate behavior domain categories.

**Domain 1: Comprehension of material** (recall, retell, define, list, memorize, repeat, restate, etc. content of resources):

Full

Some

None

**Domain 2: Fluency of material:** (oral accuracy and expressions with passages read aloud):  
Record one scale score for every observed rate of fluency in each category level.

Fluent

Reads words continuously

Some Fluency

Reads 2-4 words at a time

Non-Fluent

Reads word by word

**Domain 3: Teacher behavior/engagement** (physical and emotional responses to students):

Positive

Flat

Negative

**Domain 4: Student engagement/experience** (physical and emotional responses to teacher and text):

Positive

Flat

Negative



**Part 2: Narrative Reflection:**

**Part A:** Briefly summarize observed behaviors and engagement that evidence practice in any or all of the standards below. Using the point-scale from page 1, rate the level of teacher behavior/engagement during the lesson for each standard.

CSTP 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

CSTP 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning (CSTP 2)

CSTP 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning (CSTP 3)

CSTP 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students (CSTP 4): (students equally participate, can relate and participate in group discussions of material in lessons)

CSTP 5: Assessing Students for Learning (CSTP 5) (informal or formal)

CSTP 6: Developing as a Professional Educator (CSTP 6): (evidence of current educational research standards, practices, strategies, etc.).

**Part B:** Critically analyze the observed teacher and student behaviors and experiences during the session. Provide a detailed summary of the critique.<sup>1</sup>

---

January 17, 2017

RE: Parental Consent for Child  
Participation in Study

Dear Parent or Guardian:

**NOTE: Although this is not the standard parent consent form template posted on the IRB website, it does include all the relevant/necessary information. The IRB recommends use of the standard template, though it is not necessary. Also note that you will need to provide translated copies of any materials (if applicable).**

I am writing to request consent for your child to participate in a research study that will be conducted on January 31, 2017 to March 3, 2017 at your child's school. I am currently enrolled in the Social Justice for Educational Leadership Doctoral Program at the University of Redlands in Redlands, CA. The research study is entitled: "Program Evaluation: Appreciative Inquiry Model as an Instructional Literacy Approach With low SES Elementary Students". The research study is part of my dissertation thesis on strengths-based approaches to teaching and the impact on student achievement.

Appreciative Inquiry Theory (AI) is an approach to teaching that stresses a positive influence to how students learn. This is often called a strengths-based approach to teaching. The teacher takes a lesson and enhances how it is taught by intentionally including and discussing the strengths of students in their ability to learn the concepts from the knowledge and skills they already possess. AI reinforces what students already know to guide them in learning skills taught during each lesson.

The purpose of this study is to determine any impact on student achievement using different approaches to teaching. Data will be collected using test scores from reading comprehension and fluency tests given to all participants before, and after the study period, and observations recorded by an external observer (prior teacher in the school district) who will observe both groups on three days every other week during the study period. The data will be analyzed concluding the study to determine any changes in student achievement in different learning environments. All of the data collected in the study is confidential and all names and information identifying participants will be replaced with a coded identifier in data collection to maintain participant confidentiality.

Participants in the study will be randomly divided into two groups and will receive the same reading lessons currently taught in the Title program. The same lessons for both groups will follow Title I program for reading intervention and all students continue to receive the same Title I services they are entitled to during the study. The difference will be the approach to teaching the lessons only. One group will continue to receive regular instruction and the other group will receive the same lesson with an added strengths-based approach to teaching.

This study is intended to determine the best instructional practices in providing the highest quality education for all students. However, the potential risk for participation to consider is a possibility that one teaching approach will impact student achievement more positively, negatively, or has no impact on student achievement. Such risks difficult to foresee until after the study when the data is analyzed. In an effort to minimize such risks, the lessons taught for both study groups will be the exact same lessons (taught in the same classroom) that will be taught in the Title I program regardless of the study. The only difference being the approach to teaching the lessons.

This study is designed to collect evidence of any changes in student achievement using two different instructional approaches. Results of the study will be made available following University of Redlands policies and regulations.

Your consent for your child to participate will be greatly appreciated. I have received approval from the site administrator as well as the school district to conduct this study. If you agree, please sign below and return in the envelope provided to my mailbox in the school office. You may contact me anytime with questions or clarifications at the school or my email address:

██████████. Thank you for your consideration.

This study was approved by the University of Redlands Institutional Review Board (IRB Approval #: ████████). This board tries to ensure that your child's rights and welfare are protected if you allow him or her to participate in the study. If you have any questions about your child's involvement or how she or he were treated by the research personnel, you may contact the Chair of the IRB at catherine\_salmon@redlands.edu or by telephone at 909-748-8672.

Sincerely,

██████████, University of Redlands  
cc: ██████████ Research Advisor, University of Redlands

Parental consent for \_\_\_\_\_:  
(Name of participant)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Parent name:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

17 de enero de 2017

RE: Consentimiento de los padres para la participación de los niños en estudio

Estimado padre o tutor:

Le escribo para solicitar el consentimiento para que sus hijos participen en un estudio de investigación que se llevará a cabo en 31 de enero de 2017 al 03 de marzo de 2017 en la escuela de su hijo. Actualmente estoy inscrito en la Justicia Social para el Programa Doctoral liderazgo educativo en la Universidad de Redlands en Redlands, CA. El estudio de investigación se titula: "evaluación de programas: elogioso modelo de consulta como un enfoque instruccional de la alfabetización con baja SES estudiantes". El estudio de investigación es parte de mi tesis sobre enfoques basados en las fortalezas a la enseñanza y el impacto en el logro del estudiante.

Teoría de investigación apreciativa (AI) es un enfoque de enseñanza que enfatiza una influencia positiva a cómo aprenden los estudiantes. Esto se denomina un enfoque basado en fortalezas a la enseñanza. El profesor toma una lección y realiza cómo se enseña intencionalmente incluido y discutir las fortalezas de los estudiantes en su capacidad para aprender los conceptos de los conocimientos y capacidades que ya poseen. AI refuerza lo que ya saben los alumnos para orientarlos en los aprendizajes impartidos durante cada lección.

El propósito de este estudio es determinar cualquier impacto en el logro del estudiante usando diferentes enfoques de enseñanza. Los datos se recogerán puntuaciones de comprensión lectora y pruebas fluidez a todos los participantes antes y después del período de estudio y observaciones registradas por un observador externo (profesor anterior en el distrito escolar) que se observa en ambos grupos en tres días cada dos semanas durante el período de estudio. Los datos se analizarán concluir el estudio para determinar cualquier cambio en el rendimiento de los estudiantes en ambientes de aprendizaje diferentes. Todos los datos recogidos en el estudio es confidencial y todos los nombres y los participantes identificación información serán reemplazados con un identificador codificado en recopilación de datos para mantener la confidencialidad de los participantes.

Los participantes en el estudio se dividirá en dos grupos al azar y recibirán las mismas lecciones de lectura enseñadas actualmente en el programa de título. Las mismas lecciones para ambos grupos seguirán programa Título I para la lectura de la intervención y todos los estudiantes continúan recibiendo el mismo título I servicios tienen derecho a durante el estudio. La diferencia será el enfoque a la enseñanza de las lecciones sólo. Un grupo seguirá recibiendo instrucción regular y el otro grupo recibirá la misma lección con un mayor enfoque de fortalezas a la enseñanza.

Este estudio pretende determinar las mejores prácticas instruccionales en la educación de calidad más altos para todos los estudiantes. Sin embargo, el riesgo potencial de participación a considerar es la posibilidad de que un enfoque de enseñanza afectará el rendimiento de los estudiantes más positivamente, negativamente, o no tiene impacto en el logro del estudiante. Tales riesgos difíciles prever hasta después del estudio, cuando los datos son analizados. En un esfuerzo para reducir al mínimo esos riesgos, las lecciones enseñaban para ambos grupos de estudio será el exacto mismo clases (impartidas en el mismo salón) que se impartirán en el título que programo sin tener en cuenta el estudio. La única diferencia es el enfoque a la enseñanza de las lecciones.

Este estudio está diseñado para recoger la evidencia de los cambios en el rendimiento de los estudiantes utilizando dos métodos diferentes de enseñanza. Resultados del estudio se harán normas y políticas de la Universidad de Redlands siguientes disponibles.

Su consentimiento para que sus hijos participen será grandemente apreciada. He recibido aprobación del administrador del sitio, así como el distrito escolar para llevar a cabo este estudio. Si está de acuerdo, por favor firme abajo y devuelva en el sobre proporcionado a mi buzón de correo en la oficina de la escuela. Usted puede entrarme en contacto con en cualquier momento con preguntas o aclaraciones en la escuela o en mi dirección de correo electrónico: [REDACTED]. Gracias por tu consideración.

Este estudio fue aprobado por la Universidad de Redlands Junta de revisión institucional (IRB Approval #: [REDACTED]). Esta tabla intenta garantizar que los derechos y el bienestar de su hijo están protegidos si permites que él o ella participar en el estudio. Si tienes cualquier duda sobre la implicación de su hijo o cómo él o ella fueron tratados por el personal de investigación, puede comunicarse con el Presidente de la IRB en catherine\_salmon@redlands.edu o por teléfono en el 909-748-8672.

Atentamente,

[REDACTED] Universidad de Redlands

CC: [REDACTED] Asesor de investigación, Universidad de Redlands

Consentimiento de los padres de \_\_\_\_\_ (Nombre del participante)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nombre del padre

\_\_\_\_\_  
Firma

\_\_\_\_\_  
Fecha



NOTE: If collecting child assent, make sure the level of vocabulary/language used is appropriate to the age level of the children.

## Agreement to Participate in Research

(For possible use with persons under the age of 18 years)

Your parent or guardian has said that it was okay for you to take part in a research study. Now we want to ask whether you want to take part in the study. Just because your parent or guardian said it was okay doesn't mean that you have to. It's really up to you. No one will be angry if you don't take part in the study. No one will mind if you say that you want to take part in it now, but change your mind later. You can stop participating at any time.

On the rest of this form, you can read some information that will help you decide whether or not you want to participate. If you have any questions at any time, ask.

The title of the project is **Appreciative Inquiry Model for Literacy Intervention With Low SES Elementary Students**

The name of person doing the research is: [REDACTED]

Your parent or guardian has other information in case you want to contact the investigator later.

### Here's the information that will help you decide whether to participate in the research

We are inviting you to take part in a research study we are doing. A research study is one way that we can learn more about how student's experience different teaching approaches.

We are inviting you to be in the study because you struggle with reading comprehension.

If you agree to take part this study, we will ask you to attend Title I intervention sessions during the morning hours of the school day for 40 minutes each day of the week.

There are no risks related to participating in this research study.

The possible benefits of participating in this research study include better reading skills.

As we said up top, you don't have to participate if you don't want to. No one will be angry if you don't participate. No one will mind if you say that you want to participate now, but change your mind later. You can stop what you're doing in the study at any time.

You can also ask any questions at any time. No one will mind.

If you sign your name below, it means that you agree to take part in this research study.

Print your name in the white box below.

Printed Name of Child/Adolescent Participant

Sign your name in the grey box. Fill in the date, too. (We'll tell you what it is if you don't know.)

Signature of Child/Adolescent Participant	Date

**You can stop here. The researcher will fill in the information below this line.**

---

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name of Person Obtaining Assent

Signature of Person Obtaining Assent	Date

## Debriefing Statement

Primary Researcher: [REDACTED]

Title: Program Evaluation: AI model for Literacy Intervention with low SES students

Thank you so much for participating in this study. Your participation was valuable and I would like to explain in more detail exactly what was being studied.

This study was intended to provide insight into how students experience and respond to routine instruction and strengths-based instruction for literacy intervention. Based on prior research, I expect to find increased test scores and more positive behaviors in the strengths-based instructional intervention.

I collected data on reading comprehension and fluency scores at the beginning and the end of the project to make comparisons between the instructional groups, for individual students and for each instructional group overall. There was an external observer who came and observed both groups nine times and recorded student and teacher behaviors, frequency of those behaviors and an overall score of positive, flat, or negative for the observed session. I also compared this data between the groups to see if there were any significant differences in overall student behaviors or experiences in different instructional settings.

I am interested in asset-based instruction and the impact on student achievement. Were you aware of any changes in instruction, learning, or experiences? If you are interested in more information about asset-based instruction, you may be interested in the following: *Appreciative Inquiry* by David Cooperrider, or *The Power of Appreciative Inquiry* by Diana Whitney & Amanda Trosten-Bloom.

Again, thank you for your participation in my project. If you have any questions later about the study, please feel free to contact me anytime. My contact information is: [REDACTED] and my Advisor's contact information is: [REDACTED]. If you would like a copy of the results, I can email a copy to you once they are approved for release by my advisor.