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**X A. PURPOSE, RESEARCH VARIABLES, AND POPULATION**

**Purpose of the study-State concisely and realistically what the study is intended to accomplish.**

The purpose of this study is to use archival data to evaluate the effectiveness of the computerized reading intervention *Academy of Reading* and related instruction as it is used at East Garner Middle School (EGMS). This research is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the principal investigator’s school-based doctoral internship in school psychology. It is anticipated that this program evaluation will show if students who received the *Academy of Reading* –based course last year made different year-to-year Reading End-of-Grade tests (EOG) gains than students of similar EOG performance who attended EGMS prior to the implementation of *Academy of Reading.* The EOG tests are North Carolina’s annual statewide assessment.

**Background-Briefly state the background of the study, including some relevant references and identify the main questions the current study is intended to address.**

The *Academy of Reading* program was first piloted in the Wake County Public School system (WCPSS) by two district middle schools during the 2004-2005 school year with the goal of meeting the needs of struggling readers at the secondary level. As of the fall of 2010, all middle schools in the district and all but one high school were using this computerized reading intervention program. EGMS began using *Academy of Reading* during the 2008-2009 school year. For 2009-2010, a system was put in place at EGMS to identify students for participation in the program, and data regarding student performance on the *Academy of Reading* assessments were collected. At EGMS, students who perform below a certain level on the statewide EOG assessments are targeted for enrollment in a remedial reading course that combines the *Academy of Reading* program with individualized reading instruction from teachers. Although it should be noted that a student’s Reading EOG score is only one of several criteria considered when placing students in this course, it does carry a high weight. The course usually lasts one semester, although actual time varies by student depending on progress made. While teachers have qualitatively observed that many students who receive this remediation do show improvements in their reading skills, no formal data analysis has been conducted to determine how well the program works for EGMS students in terms of improving Reading EOG scores.

The *Academy of Reading* program includes instruction of phonemic awareness, phonics, and reading comprehension. It is designed to be an intervention for students in kindergarten through adulthood. *Academy of Reading* instruction is meant to supplement a student’s regular reading instruction. When using the program, students work through training modules. Pre-tests and post-tests help teachers monitor student progress, as do periodic assessments throughout the course of the intervention. Performance on these assessments is measured in terms of reading levels defined by the program. Reading levels are reported as whole number grade-equivalencies (i.e., 3.0 for third grade reading level or 6.0 for sixth grade reading level) (Florida Center for Reading Research [FCRR], 2004; Autoskill, 2009.)

The FCRR conducted a review of the *Academy of Reading*, and concluded that the instructional strategies on which the program is based are aligned with current reading research. The FCRR considers the *Academy of Reading* to be a comprehensive reading intervention program because it provides instruction in all five essential components of reading instruction (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary), although it addresses vocabulary and comprehension to a lesser degree than the other components. These essential components are identified and supported through the findings of the National Reading Panel (NRP) (2000). In addition, the FCRR judged *Academy of Reading* instruction to be both explicit and systematic. However, the FCRR also reports that many studies evaluating the program did not meet the standards necessary to be considered scientifically based research. In summary, research at this time suggests that the program is promising, but more rigorous research is necessary. (FCRR, 2004.)

The NRP (2000) also judged that the use of computerized instruction in reading instruction is very promising. Computers can successfully provide some direct instructional tasks and allow students to receive exposure to text even without the constant supervision of a teacher. Computerized instruction provides exposure to word processing and hypertext, and multimedia computer software is very motivating to students (NRP, 2000). In addition, many computerized instructional programs such as *Academy of Reading* include regular assessments for the purpose of progress monitoring. The assessments are often given and scored by the instructional program, and student data are stored by the program, saving teachers time and energy. At EGMS, *Academy of Reading* students take the program’s assessments as they work through the program. In addition, the program differentiates instruction for each student, and ensures that the students work through each skill as many times as needed until mastery of that skill is achieved.

After consulting with EGMS staff members most involved with the *Academy of Reading* program, the principal investigator (who is also EGMS’s school psychologist) developed the following question and research plan: Do students who have received *Academy of Reading* instruction make different gains on the Reading EOG from year to year than similar students who have not received the intervention?

It is hoped that participation in the *Academy of Reading* course will cause students to make greater gains from year to year on their Reading EOG. To see if there is a difference in EOG change from year to year for students who participated in the program and students who do not participate in the program, two cohorts of EGMS students will be compared with each other. The first cohort will consist of sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students who were enrolled in the *Academy of Reading* course during the 2009-2010 school year. The second cohort of students will consist of sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students who attended EGMS during the 2007-2008 school year (prior to program implementation) who would have likely been selected for enrollment in the course based on their 2007 Reading EOG performance. For each cohort, year-to-year differences in EOG performance will be compared (2007 to 2008 EOG scores for Cohort 2, and 2009 to 2010 EOG scores for Cohort 1).

EOG scores are reported as both scaled scores (three-digit numbers that reflect the exact number of points earned) and in terms of levels. Scaled scores are divided into five levels, Level 1 being the lowest and Level 5 being the highest, but the scaled score ranges that compose each level vary according to grade. Scoring at a Level 3 or above is considered to be proficient.

**Characteristics of the Subject Population-The following information should be provided:**

**a. Age Range-What is the age range and why was it chosen?**

Student data that will be used were collected during the students’ fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grade years. An age range of 11-14 includes most students in these grades. These grades were chosen because the program is being evaluated at a middle school and *Academy of Reading* is available in all three grade levels that compose EGMS (sixth, seventh, and eighth). Because year-to-year EOG change is being compared, fifth grade EOG scores will be necessary for comparison to sixth grade scores.

**b. Sex-What is the sex of the subjects? If there is a restriction, provide the rationale.**

There is no restriction on the sex of the subjects.

**c. Number-What is the estimated number of subjects?**

Approximately 140 students across sixth, seventh, and eighth grade were enrolled in the *Academy of Reading* courses during the 2009-2010 school year. It is estimated that approximately 280 students total (140 from each cohort) will meet the criteria for the study. It is anticipated, however, that data from approximately 30 fewer students will be available and usable for analysis, due to incomplete or inaccessible data for some students (for example, students moving in or out of the district or state). Thus, the anticipated number of students with usable data is estimated to be approximately 220 (N = 110 for each cohort).

**d. Inclusion Criteria-What are the specific inclusion criteria?**

Only EGMS students who were enrolled in the *Academy of Reading* course during the 2009-2010 school year or students who would likely have been eligible for enrollment in the course during the 2007-2008 school year will be included. Most eligible students are those who score a Level 1 or Level 2 on the Reading EOG during the previous academic year’s test. Level 1 and Level 2 scores are considered to be below proficient. It is estimated by the teachers that these students are usually reading one or two grade levels behind current grade level expectations, although some are reading at a lower level.

**e. Exclusion Criteria-What are the specific exclusion criteria? Clear rationale should be provided for the exclusion of any particular population group, unless the title of the study reflects the restricted population range.**

Students who do not participate in the *Academy of Reading* classes during 2009-2010 or who would probably not have been chosen to participate in the classes during 2007-2008 will be excluded. As this is an evaluation of an intervention program provided to students with low reading achievement, students who achieve proficient scores on the EOG in 2009 or 2007 will be excluded from the study. Also, students taking alternate versions of the EOG (EXTEND 1 or EXTEND 2 tests) as part of special educational accommodations will be excluded because the content and difficulty level of their EOG is markedly different than the regular EOG.

**f. Vulnerable Subjects-If vulnerable subjects will be included (children, pregnant women, fetuses, prisoners, mentally disabled persons), provide justification of the need to use these subjects in research.**

The use of academic performance data of children is necessary to the study, as the study’s purpose is to evaluate the effects of an academic intervention implemented in a middle school. These vulnerable subjects will not be identified as subgroups during the data collection or analysis. Some students whose data will be used may be considered to be mentally disabled and may receive special educational services through the school. Also, a percentage of the EGMS population is considered to be economically disadvantaged. Mental disabilities and economic disadvantage are two risk factors that may contribute to low academic achievement, so it is necessary to include members of these populations in the research sample. Removing them from the sample would make the sample an inaccurate representation of the population of students typically served in the *Academy of Reading* course and make generalization of results difficult.

**X B. METHODS AND PROCEDURES**

**Method of Subject Selection-Describe the study's method(s) of identification and recruitment of prospective subjects. Provide a copy of any planned advertisements.**

Because archival data will be used, recruitment of subjects is not necessary.

**Study Site-State the location(s) where the study will be conducted. Include letters of approval to conduct the study from all non-IUP sites.**

The study will be conducted on the campus of East Garner Magnet Middle School, 6301 Jones Sausage Road, Garner, NC 27529. Approval for the study has been granted by the schools’ principal, Ms. Cathy Williams, and is documented in the attached letter of approval.

Also, the principal investigator has been in communication with the WCPSS Department of Evaluation and Research, located at 3600 Wake Forest Road, Raleigh, NC, 27609. She will adhere to school district procedures regarding the conduct of research. WCPSS policy requires approval of an Institutional Review Board prior to applying to conduct research in the district. Upon project approval by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB), a copy of the approved protocol will be submitted to the Department of Evaluation and Research. The WCPSS Research Study Application (available at http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research/external\_research/index.html) will also be completed and submitted with the IRB protocol. Data retrieval and analysis will not take place until WCPSS approval is granted, per district policy.

**Methods and Procedures Applied to Human Subjects-Describe in detail the study design and all procedures (sequentially) to be applied to subjects. Attach copies of any instruments to be used, such as surveys, rating scales, or questionnaires.**

Existing archival data will be used for this project. The data used in the study were gathered and archived by school personnel prior to and independent of this proposal. Therefore, no procedures will be applied to the subjects. Methods and procedures related to obtaining and analyzing the archival data, however, are discussed below, following a study summary table. In addition to summarizing the main details of the project, the table also includes a timeline of when the archival data collection took place by the school, and when the data will be obtained.

**Study Summary Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Description** |
| Research Questions | Do students who have received *Academy of Reading* instruction make different gains on the  Reading EOG from year to year than similar students who have not received the intervention? |
| Hypotheses | Students who have received *Academy of Reading* instruction will make greater gains on the  Reading EOG from year to year than a comparison group of students who did not receive  the instruction. |
| Participants | N = 140 sixth, seventh and eighth grade students who participated in the *Academy of Reading* intervention during 2009-2010.  ***AND***  N = 140 students who were enrolled at EGMS during 2007-2008 who would have been eligible for  for participation in *Academy of Reading* based on their 2007 Reading EOG score.  \*Note: it is estimated that only about 220 participants will have usable data (EOG scores  available for both years) |
| Independent Variable | Participation in the *Academy of Reading:*   1. *Academy of Reading* group (2009-2010)- Cohort 1 2. Control group (2007-2008)- Cohort 2 |
| Dependent Variable | Year –to-year differences in Reading EOG scaled score (first year scaled score minus the  second year scaled score). |
| Method of Analysis | 3x2 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) using SPSS. |

**Data Collection Method Table**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data** | **Date data was collected (all data already exists)** | **Date obtained by principal investigator (projected)** | **Method of obtaining data** |
| 2007 Reading EOG scores | May 2007 | March 2011 | Using the databases Quickr and EVASS, the assistant principal (Ms. Burroughs) will create a list of students meeting the parameters of the study, add EOG scores, record which cohort the students belong to, and then remove identifying information from the data before giving the data to the principal investigator. |
| 2008 Reading EOG scores | May 2008 | March 2011 |
| 2009 Reading EOG scores | May 2009 | March 2011 |
| 2010 Reading EOG scores | May 2010 | March 2011 |

First, the necessary data will be obtained. It is anticipated that the data will be obtained in March of 2011, but if IRB and WCPSS approval is not granted by then, it will be obtained pending IRB and WCPSS approval. The principal investigator will provide Ms. Jessica Burroughs, EGMS Assistant Principal of Instruction, with a copy of the approved project proposal and discuss the desired participant parameters and desired data with her. Ms. Burroughs will use her access to district Quickr and EVASS databases to compile all data into one spreadsheet. Ms. Burroughs will identify students by name or by NCWISE number as needed to retrieve the data from the databases, but Ms. Burroughs will remove this identifying information before providing the data to the principal investigator. (The NCWISE number is an identification number assigned to all public school students in the state of North Carolina.)

Data retrieved by Ms. Burroughs will be as follows: Data will be collected and recorded for two cohorts of students. The first cohort will consist of sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students who were enrolled in the *Academy of Reading* course during the 2009-2010 school year. For these students, 2009 and 2010 Reading EOG scaled scores will be recorded. The second cohort of students will consist of sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students who attended EGMS during the 2007-2008 school year (prior to program implementation) who would likely have been selected for enrollment in the course due to their 2007 Reading EOG performance.

For the purposes of this data analysis, students earning proficient (Level 3 or higher) scores on the 2007 or 2009 EOG will be excluded from the study. Students taking alternate versions of the EOG (EXTEND 1 or EXTEND 2 tests) as part of special educational accommodations will not be included. For students who took the Reading EOG re-test during one or both years, only original EOG scaled scores for each year will be used (students who score a Level 2 EOG typically take an EOG re-test several weeks after initial EOG scores are available).

Ms. Burroughs will email the data set, with all identifying information removed, to the principal investigator. The principal investigator will save the data on her personal laptop for analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. SPSS was obtained by the principal investigator from the IUP Help Desk and is licensed for student use for the 2010-2011 school year. This program will be installed on the principal investigator’s personal computer that is used for her academic coursework.

To answer the research question (do students who have received *Academy of Reading* instruction make different gains on the Reading EOG from year to year than similar students who have not received the intervention?), an analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be used. For each cohort (*Academy* and control), year-to-year differences in EOG performance will be compared (2007 to 2008 EOG scores for Cohort 2, and 2009 to 2010 EOG scores for Cohort 1). Specifically, a 3 (grade) x 2 (cohort) design will be used, with the difference in EOG scores acting as the dependent variable. The data will be examined for overall effects and for main effects by grade and group.

Finally, a written report of the program evaluation will be prepared and submitted to the principal investigator’s faculty internship supervisor (Dr. Kovaleski), site-based internship supervisor (Dr. Lynne Myers, school psychologist), EGMS principal (Ms. Cathy Williams), EGMS assistant principal (Ms. Jessica Burroughs), EGMS *Academy of Reading* teacher (Ms. Michelle Parkerson), and the WCPSS Department of Evaluation and Research (attn: Nancy Baenan and Angelia Wright). This report will address both research questions and include a review of related literature, discussion of methods and results, conclusions, and recommendations.

**X C. RISKS/BENEFITS**

**Potential Risks-Identify the potential risks of the study. Specify the types and levels of risk.**

It is the opinion of the principal investigator that there are no potential risks associated with this research project. All data to be analyzed have already been collected during the course of academic instruction at EGMS.

**Protection Against Risks-For all studies involving greater than minimal risk, specify the procedures for preventing or minimizing any potential risks.**

It is not the opinion of the principal investigator that the study involves greater than minimal risk.

**Potential Benefits-Describe any potential non-monetary benefits of the study, both for subjects and for society in general.**

The expected benefit of this study is that EGMS staff will gain a better understanding of the efficacy of the *Academy of Reading* course and associated instruction. It will provide information to EGMS and to WCPSS regarding how effective this particular intervention is for middle school students. Secondary reading intervention has been identified by the WCPSS Department of Evaluation and Research as an area of needed research. If it is found that this program is working for EGMS students, then it can be hypothesized to work similarly in other district middle schools composed of students with similar demographics and academic need. If, however, it is found that the program is not working for EGMS students, school administration will then know to consider modifying the existing program or to consider adopting a different program that will better suit the needs of EGMS students.

**Compensation for Participation-Describe any monetary or other forms of compensation which will be provided to subjects, and any conditions which must be fulfilled to receive compensation.**

No compensation, monetary or otherwise, will be provided to students or staff at EGMS in relation to this study.

**Alternatives to Participation-Describe any alternatives to participation in the study which might be advantageous to the subject. If the subjects are to receive academic credit for research participation, describe the alternatives available to earn equivalent academic credit.**

There are no alternatives to participation for this study. Academic credit is not being offered for participation.

**Information Withheld-Identify the nature of any information to be purposely withheld from subjects, and provide justification for the non-disclosure.**

There will be no information gathered that will be withheld from the students. Students at EGMS are typically informed of their EOG scores and other indicators of academic performance.

**Debriefing-Describe the procedure for post-study debriefing of subjects.**

It is the opinion of the principal investigator that debriefing is not necessary because the participants will not be directly involved with the study. No procedures will occur that have not already occurred as part of typical instruction and assessment. No new data will be collected, and students are already aware of their EOG scores.

**X D. CONFIDENTIALITY**

**Describe explicitly how confidentiality of data will be maintained. If any information with subject identifiers will be released, specify the recipients. Include a statement that all data will be retained for at least three years in compliance with federal regulations.**

The principal investigator will not receive student names connected with student data at any point during this project and will not maintain a list of students whose data are being used. Data will be obtained by Ms. Burroughs, EGMS Assistant Principal of Instruction, by accessing the district’s assessment databases. This information is kept secure and confidential according to WCPSS policy. Ms. Burroughs will create a data spreadsheet that includes students’ names, ID numbers, and data for the purposes of obtaining the data, but will remove names and ID numbers prior to giving the file to the principal investigator. Ms. Burroughs is the person at EGMS who regularly reviews EOG scores each year, and is also the person that determines course placement/Academy participation, so she will not be seeing data that she has not seen before.

Non-identifying data collected for this project will be stored primarily on the principal investigator’s personal laptop, which is kept in a secure location at all times. A backup of all files associated with this project will also be kept on an external hard drive stored at the principal investigator’s home, and on a USB data device kept at school. Data files, including SPSS files, will be kept confidential from people not associated with this project and will contain no student names or other identifying information. All data collected, including all electronic spreadsheets, will be retained for at least three years in compliance with federal regulations. All data collected will be deleted/destroyed at the end of three years from the project completion date (written report date), as per WCPSS Department of Evaluation and Research policy.

1. **COPY OF CONSENT FORM**

**See attached Essentials of Informed Consent and Informed Consent Form. Please note that an informed consent form addresses five critical points: 1) subject participation in the study is voluntary (provide a description of the procedure to be used if choosing not to participate); 2) a statement of the subject's right to withdraw at any time and a clear description of the procedures for withdrawal from the study without penalty; 3) subjects are informed of the level of risk (from 'no known risk' through the level appropriate to the study) and the means of protecting the subjects from known risks or minimizing the risk; 4) confidentiality is ensured; and 5) the means by which confidentiality is to be ensured is elucidated. While it is not mandatory that an Informed Consent Form is identical to the example, the five points listed above are critical elements of any form an investigator may develop. It is important to include sufficient specific information regarding the purpose and nature of your study to ensure that subjects are fully informed. A copy of the Informed Consent Form should be given to each subject who participates in the study. Please note: the IRB will not accept "blanket waivers" of the right to privacy. Subjects (or their legal agents must sign a consent form for each research study.)**

Mailed surveys ordinarily receive expedited reviews and do not need consent forms except when one of the following conditions prevail: 1) the person's name or other identifier is known to the researcher; or 2) the content of the survey puts the respondent at risk for emotional, physical, or other types of distress. If an informed consent form is not required, the researcher should use a cover letter to potential subjects which addresses all the elements of informed consent previously described. Please include a copy of this cover letter with your protocol.

No informed consent letter is attached because no new data are being collected from students as part of this study.

**7. Protected Populations and Sensitive Subjects: If any Human Subjects from the following list would be involved in the proposed activity, place an X next to the category.**

**X minors fetuses pregnant women**

**test subjects for abortuses illegal behavior**

**new drugs or clinical devices incarcerated X mentally disabled**

**X educationally or economically disadvantaged persons**

**8. Nature of Risk. In your judgment, does your research involve more than minimal risk? "Minimal risk" means that the risk of harm anticipated in the proposed research is not more likely than those risks encountered in daily life, or during routine physical or psychological examinations/tests.**

**Yes X No**

**9. In your judgment, does your research fall under one of the six exempt categories? (List of Exempt Categories attached.) If you believe it does, indicate the number of the category under which you are claiming an exemption.**

Yes, I am claiming an exemption under category 1 (educational research) and category 4 (use of existing data).

**10. Does your project fall under one of the categories eligible for expedited review? (List of Expedited Review Categories attached.) If you believe it does, indicate the number of the category under which you are claiming expedited review.**

Yes. This project should be eligible for expedited review under category 3 (the study of existing data, documents, or records) because only existing archival data will be used. No new data will be collected. All data to be used were collected during the normal course of operations at EGMS, independent of and prior to this proposal.

**11. Additions to or changes in procedures involving human subjects as well as any problems connected with the use of human subjects once the project has begun must be brought to the attention of the IRB.**

**I agree to provide whatever surveillance is necessary to ensure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. I understand that I cannot initiate any contact with human subjects before I have received approval/or complied with all contingencies made in connection with the approval. I understand that as the principal investigator I am ultimately responsible for the welfare and protection of human subjects and will carry out the project as approved.**

**Signature of Principal Investigator/Program Director Date**

**12. Approval by Faculty Sponsor (REQUIRED FOR ALL STUDENTS):**

**I affirm the accuracy of this application, and I accept the responsibility for the conduct of this research and supervision of human subjects as required by law. THE PROPOSED PROJECT HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE THESIS/DISSERTATION COMMITTEE.**

#### Signature Date

References

Autoskill. (2009). AutoSkill Products: *Academy of Reading*. Retrieved from [http://www.autoskill.com/products /reading/index.php](http://www.autoskill.com/products%20/reading/index.php)

Florida Center for Reading Research. (2004). FCRR Report: *Academy of Reading.* Retrieved from <http://www.fcrr.org/FCRRReports/PDF/AcademyReadingFinal.pdf>

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction: Reports of the Subgroups* (NIH Pub. No. 00-4754). Washington, D.C: National Institute for Literacy.

**FOR COMMITTEE USE ONLY**

**DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

**This project:**

**poses minimal risk.**

**poses greater than minimal risk.**

**is Exempt from Continuing Review.**

**requires Expedited Review.**

**requires full IRBPHS Review.**

**Signature Date**

**IRBPHS:**

**Approved to Proceed Disapproved**

**Signature Date**