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# Study Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Study Title** | Using Research to Inform Teaching |
| **Study Design** | Retrospective review of student data. |
| **Primary Objective** | The purpose of this study is to analyze students’ responses to coursework to gain a better understanding of preservice teacher experiences regarding education research. |
| **Secondary Objective(s)** | NA |
| **Study Population** | Students who the PI taught as an instructor in Fall of 2017 and Fall of 2018. |
| **Sample Size** | 23 |
| **Study Specific Abbreviations/ Definitions**  | NA |

# Objectives

2.1 The purpose of this study is to analyze students’ responses to gain a better understanding of preservice teacher experience regarding education research.

2.2 NA

# Background

3.1 Fundamentally, this research is advancing an agenda aimed at preparing preservice teachers to use research to inform their practice. This is a process that has often been labeled as evidence-based practice (EBP). Often, public calls for EBP in education stem from the proposition that teaching would be improved if teachers only utilized research in their teaching (Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, 2002; Hargreaves, 1996; Slavin, 2008). This position is represented well in Slavin’s (2002) unfavorable comparison of EBP in education with EBP in other practitioner-based fields: ‘At the dawn of the 21st century, educational research is finally entering the 20th century. The use of randomized experiments that transformed medicine, agriculture, and technology in the 20th century is now beginning to affect educational policy’ (p. 15).

Although teachers have not often been prepared for EBP, they have often been criticized for the ways in which they engage in EBP. Frequently, EBP discourse in the US places the researcher who generated the evidence and administrators/ policy makers who demand use of the evidence in positions of power over the teacher who is expected to engage in EBP. Such power dynamics are revealed when researchers evaluate the fidelity of practitioner implementation (e.g., Antil, Jenkins, Wayne, & Vadasy, 1998; Furtak et al., 2008; Marshall & Drummond, 2006) or when administrators use the phrase ‘research says’ to mandate the use of a specific practice in their schools while silencing dissent from teachers (Gore & Gitlin, 2004, p.50).

# Procedures Involved

4.1 The PI was the instructor for two courses in Fall of 2017 and Fall of 2018. Both years, the PI asked students to complete a “Reflection” in which the class members read research and then responded to prompts about their understanding of that research and their attitude towards it. The PI would now like to analyze those responses for research purposes. The PI will do this by giving each student a number and then copying and pasting their responses into an excel sheet that has their number. Once the PI does this, there will be no way to connect the student name to the response. All responses will be de-identified at that point. The data that the PI will use were collected in the normal course of classroom activities. Once the PI has created the de-identified spreadsheets, the study team will analyze the data using the principles of Grounded Theory. The PI will use open coding, and engage in multiple iterative rounds of coding. The PI will have a second coder who will also code the de-identified data. The study team will compare codes, discuss differences, identify common codes, engage in further rounds of coding, collapse codes into themes, and then write up the findings for publication.

4.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [x]  Record Review - Educational | ☐ Record Review - Employee |
| ☐ Record Review - Medical | ☐ Record Review - Publicly Available Dataset |
| ☐ Record Review - Prisoner | ☐ Record Review - Other  |
| ☐ Existing Specimen Analysis |  |

4.3 The PI will use course assignments which the PI has access to because the PI was the instructor of both courses.

4.4 NA

# Data and Specimen Storage for Future Research

NA

# Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

6.1 The study team will review the records of each student the PI taught in Fall of 2017 and Fall of 2018. There are no exclusion criteria.

# Vulnerable Populations

NA

# Data Sources

8.1 The PI’s course records from Fall of 2017 and Fall of 2018.

# Risks to Subjects

9.1 There is minimal risk to this retrospective data review. The main risk would be breach of confidentiality, however names will be removed prior to analysis to protect against that risk.

# Potential Benefits

10.1 There are no direct benefits to participants as this is a retrospective analysis but there can be benefits to future preservice teachers because we will learn more about the effectiveness of the course assignment.

# Data Management and Confidentiality

11.1 A data collection excel sheet will be created in which each student will be given a number and then their responses will be copied onto that sheet. Once this is completed, there will be no way to match student name with the response. This data sheet will be kept on a password-protected computer in the PI’s USF office. All records are electronic only-- there are no physical records.

11.2 The data will be stored on password-protected computer only accessible to the PI and Co-I. The data will be maintained for 5 years after the final report is submitted at which time it will be permanently deleted.

11.3 NA

# Provisions to Protect the Privacy Interests of Subjects

NA

# Consent Process

13.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ ] Obtaining Signed Consent (Subject or Legally Authorized Representative) | [ ] Obtaining Consent Online (Waiver of Written Documentation of Consent ) |
| [ ] Obtaining Signed Parental Permission | [ ] Obtaining Verbal Consent (Waiver of Written Documentation of Consent) |
| [ ] Obtaining Signed Assent for Children or Adults Unable to Consent | [x] Waiving Consent and/or Parental Permission (Waiver of Consent Process) |
| [ ] Obtaining Verbal Assent for Children or Adults Unable to Consent | [ ] Waiving Assent/Assent is Not Appropriate |

13.2 NA

13.3 NA

13.4 All names will be removed from the class assignments before they are analyzed for research purposes in order to protect against breach of confidentiality. The assignment was about reading research on teaching fractions. No personal information was solicited/included in the responses so once the names are removed, all data are de-identified. Because this is a retrospective study, the risk to subjects is minimal. The study team will only be analyzing assignments that were given as a normal educational activity. The analysis of these assignments will not affect the rights or welfare of the students. Most, if not all of these students have already graduated. There is no way to contact them to ask for consent. Participants will not be provided with additional information as there is no way to reach them.

13.5 NA

13.6 NA

# Setting

14.1 MGS Conference