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Executive Summary

The following assessment proposal is for the assessment of professional development opportunities provided to teachers in the Salem-Keizer School District by Language in Motion at Willamette University.

Language in Motion is a consortium program that currently exists at fourteen colleges and universities around the United States and is continuing to grow. It is a program that seeks to connect college students who have international experience with K-12 teachers and their classrooms in the community surrounding the institution. In the case of this assessment proposal, the Language in Motion office in question is the one located at Willamette University in Salem, Oregon.

Language in Motion has existed for many years at Willamette University but has recently moved from the International Education office to the Community Service Learning office. This change occurred along with a change in funding for the consortium, which is now being funded by a grant from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundation which has asked that Language in Motion begin to incorporate professional development opportunities for the K-12 teachers in the community with whom Language in Motion works. These are typically middle and high school foreign language and social studies teachers.

Given that the professional development is a new aspect of Language in Motion, the client wishes to understand how the teachers who use the various elements of language in motion (which are student presentations, mini-grants, classroom mentors, online resources, and events) and how they perceive the value of those elements toward their professional development.

This document proposes to assess these professional development opportunities through use of an online survey that is distributed to teachers who participate in Language in Motion activities. This method of data collection was chosen due to the fact that Language in Motion at Willamette University is run by one part-time staff member who does not have time to administer a more complex evaluation.

The first section of this assessment proposal identifies stakeholders and resources that are needed and exist for the assessment. The purpose statement and research questions are asked, which set the stage for identifying the goal and objectives of the assessment.

In the section that describes the design of the assessment, the purpose and frequency of data collection, along with sample size are described. This section also includes a discussion on how the assessment seeks to reduce survey error, and then discusses the questions asked, which is a description of what the survey designed for this assessment seeks to find and how it does so. Finally, there is a detailed description of how data should be analyzed, as the client will be responsible for analyzing the data after it is collected.

The full survey, recruitment letter, informed consent statement, and Institutional Review Board proposal can be found in the appendices of this document.
Stakeholders

Nomi Pearce, the director of Language in Motion (LiM) at Willamette University (WU), is the main stakeholder. She is the only staff member who runs the LiM program at WU. At Willamette, the LiM program is situated under the umbrella of Service-Learning, so leadership of Service-Learning programming are also stakeholders in an assessment of LiM. Given that this assessment focuses particularly on the professional development of the teachers in the Salem-Keizer school district who participate, in some way, in LiM programming, these teachers are also important stakeholders. Although the Willamette University students who are involved in LiM are generally important stakeholders, in this particular assessment, they are secondary.

Resources

1. Language in Motion SurveyMonkey account
2. Survey (Appendix A)
3. Recruitment letter (Appendix B)
4. Time (8-10 hours staff time)

The assessment will be administered via SurveyMonkey, a free online survey tool that is easily accessible to both participants and administrators of the assessment. Language in Motion at Willamette University already has an account with SurveyMonkey, which allows any number of surveys with any number of questions to be added free of charge. There is some existing data already on teachers’ experiences with Language in Motion from surveys already administered via SurveyMonkey which may be able to be used in future assessments. Although no report has been conducted on this data overall, it is important to note that it exists and is available.

Administering the survey will require a relatively small time commitment on the part of Language in Motion staff, as it is taken online by participants at their convenience. Analyzing the survey data is a simple process, as SurveyMonkey has tools to aid in this endeavor.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this formative assessment is to determine how Salem-Keizer teachers gain professional development from programming provided by Language in Motion at Willamette University.

Research Questions

1. Are teachers using the five elements of Language in Motion – 1) student presentations, 2) mini-grants, 3) classroom mentors, 4) website resources, and 5) events?
2. With what frequency are teachers using the various elements of Language in Motion?
3. To what extent do teachers find value in the various elements of Language in Motion in terms of their professional development?

It is important to note that the scope of this study is not to evaluate the overall Language in Motion program, but just the teacher professional development aspect. One of the newly added goals of Language in Motion is to provide professional development opportunities for K-12 teachers in the surrounding school district, and this study aims to find out how teachers are using the tools and opportunities made available to them and whether they find value in those tools and opportunities. The data gleaned from this study will provide valuable feedback to Language in Motion regarding their implementation of programming to promote professional development.
## Goal and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Mode of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote professional development of Salem-Keizer teachers in language and intercultural competence</strong></td>
<td>Teachers host presentations by WU students on their intercultural experiences.</td>
<td>Language in Motion plans WU student presentations with Salem-Keizer district teachers</td>
<td>End of year survey questions ask how many presentations each class received and the perceived value of those presentations (questions 1-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers use LiM mini-grants</td>
<td>LiM makes available information on how to apply for mini-grants and for what purposes they can be used.</td>
<td>End of year survey questions ask whether teachers applied for mini-grants and the perceived value of those mini-grants (questions 8-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers make use of classroom mentors who are WU LiM students.</td>
<td>LiM at WU trains students to be classroom mentors advertises their availability to teachers.</td>
<td>End of year survey questions ask whether teachers used classroom mentors and the perceived value of classroom mentors (questions 15-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers have access to online professional development resources</td>
<td>LiM makes readily available on its website resources for teachers to further their professional development in language and intercultural competence.</td>
<td>End of year survey questions ask how frequently teachers used online resources and the perceived value of those resources (questions 20-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers attend LiM-affiliated events</td>
<td>LiM informs teachers of events such as meetings and conferences on a regular basis.</td>
<td>End of year survey questions ask how many events teachers attended and the perceived value of those events (questions 26-31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design of Assessment

Purpose of Data Collection

The purpose of data collection for this assessment is to determine how teachers in the Salem-Keizer school district find professional development through use of Language in Motion at Willamette University. The data will be collected via an online survey sent to each of the approximately 200 teachers who participates in Language in Motion programming. This survey asks questions about the five elements of Language in Motion programming (student presentations, classroom mentors, mini-grants, events, and online resources), namely which ones teachers make use of the most and what they find valuable in each of these elements.

As this is a formative assessment, the data collected from this survey will provide valuable information on how Language in Motion can improve its activities in promoting professional development of teachers in the area. As professional development is a relatively new focus of Language in Motion, this assessment is an important step in the process of determining what works, as teachers can give feedback on the first attempt to provide professional development programming. Data collected during this assessment can also be used to promote Language in Motion in the future based on what it does well, and can be used when writing future grant proposals for funding of the program.

As the section on the goal and objectives indicates, the questions in the survey answer the research questions delineated above because they first ask whether teachers made use of the five elements of Language in Motion, and then, depending on the element, ask how many times or with what frequency teachers took advantage of those opportunities during the school year. The survey also asks teachers to rate valuableness of each element and provides space for teachers to answer open-ended questions regarding what they would like to see changed in the future.

Frequency of data collection

The survey is designed to be administered each year to attain an overall picture of how teachers as using the tools. Language in Motion staff can choose to administer the survey more frequently, however, if they find this to be valuable.

Sample size

The sample of this assessment is all teachers in the Salem-Keizer school district who are involved in some way in Language in Motion. This sample is about 50 teachers.

Reducing Survey Error

Survey error in this assessment will be reduced in a number of ways. First of all, establishing trust reduces survey error. This trust is already established with teachers who participate in Language in Motion as they have contact with LiM and understand that it is a part of Willamette University, which is a well-respected institution, and therefore an authority to be trusted.

Survey error will also be reduced by increasing the benefits and decreasing the costs of survey participation. The benefits of survey participation will be that respondents will have had their voices heard and that they know they are helping to shape a program that directly benefits them. They will also feel a sense of social validation from participating in the assessment. The costs of participation are reduced by the fact that the questions are written in a logical manner that minimizes ambiguity. The survey is designed to take 30 minutes at most, but less based on how respondents answer some of the questions. This will be explained further in the section on Questions Asked. Survey questions have been piloted to ensure clarity
and ease of understanding. The questions will also be interesting to teachers in that they ask for information on their experiences.

Coverage error will be reduced by ensuring that Language in Motion staff has correct email addresses for all participant teachers. Given that teachers who use Language in Motion elements are in contact with Language in Motion via email already, so the staff administering the survey will already have easy access to email addresses for all participants.

Sampling error will be reduced by making sure to contact every teacher in the program. Language in Motion has a comprehensive list of all teachers who participate in LiM. Therefore, the sampling strategy is a census sample and each of them will receive a request to participate in the assessment.

Non-response error will be reduced by the way that participation in the assessment is requested of teachers. The recruitment letter (see Appendix B) asking teachers to participate avoids subordinating language and appeals to teachers’ sense of social responsibility in helping to better the Language in Motion program for the future. The survey is also made interesting for teachers to avoid fatigue on the part of the teachers based on how the questions are worded and the information they request as a response. It also automatically skips questions that do not apply to them. (For example, if respondents answer “no” to a question asking if they had a classroom mentor during the past school year, the questions regarding classroom mentors are automatically skipped.) The online survey is also convenient for teachers to participate in, as they will receive a link in an email that takes them directly to the survey, which they can complete at their leisure.

Finally, measurement error is reduced in this assessment by ensuring that the units cited for different questions are kept consistent. This reduces the possibility that participants will accidentally mark the wrong answer due to a misunderstanding of what the answers mean. Additionally, survey questions have been piloted to ensure that multiple choice options cover all possible responses, and ordinal questions are written the same way each time so that participants don’t mistakenly mark the wrong answer. Questions have also been piloted to ensure that they are interpreted the way they are intended, and are specific in terms of what they seek from the response.

Questions Asked
The survey is split into six distinct sections (see Appendix A for the full survey). The first five sections focus on the individual elements of Language in Motion and the sixth section asks overarching questions about the program.

- Section A focuses on the student presentations element and consists of questions 1 through 8.
- Section B focuses on mini-grants and consists of questions 9 through 14.
- Section C focuses on classroom mentors and consists of question 15 through 19.
- Section D focuses on online resources and consists of questions 20 through 26.
- Section E focuses on Language in Motion-affiliated events and consists of questions 26 through 31.
- Section F, which consists of questions 32 and 33, asks about teachers’ experience with the program overall.

The first question in each section seeks to ascertain whether or not the participant made use of a particular element during the preceding school year. With the exception of section B, if the participant answers, “no” to the first question in a section, the survey skips to the next section. Section B has an additional question participants complete if they answer that they did not apply for any mini-grants during the preceding school year, as Language in Motion staff seeks to find out why teachers are not applying for mini-grants.
The following questions in each section ask with what frequency or how many times (depending on the element on which the section focuses) the participant made use of the programming. There is also a question in each section which asks about the value teachers found to their professional development from each element, and an open-ended question at the end of each section that asks for additional feedback on how participants would change that element.

How Data Should be Analyzed

For each of the sections in the survey, described above, questions about the perceived value of each activity will be analyzed in correspondence with the first questions in the section about how much they participated in the activity. For example, it is valuable to know the level of participation a respondent had in an element of the program that he/she rates as having little value toward his/her professional development. Therefore, the first questions in a section are important for the analysis of the later questions that ask about value. Below is a table showing which of the questions in each section are the objective questions (those that ask for factual answers) and which are subjective (those that ask about perceptions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Objective Questions</th>
<th>Subjective Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Student Presentations</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 6, 7, &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Mini-Grants</td>
<td>9 &amp; 11</td>
<td>10, 12, 13, &amp; 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Classroom Mentors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16, 17, 18, &amp; 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Online Resources</td>
<td>20 &amp; 21</td>
<td>22, 23, 24, &amp; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Events</td>
<td>26, 27, &amp; 29</td>
<td>28, 30, &amp; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 &amp; 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is a visual representation of the categorization of the questions in the survey.

The data collected from this survey should be analyzed for descriptive purposes first. At this point in the program, staff is interested to find out descriptive information on how participants (teachers) use the resources provided by Language in Motion and what they think of those resources. Staff may choose to focus on bolstering a different element during different school years or semesters and therefore may choose to focus on one or a few sections of the survey over others.

Section A: Student Presentations

Question 3 should be compared with question 2, to find out overall if teachers are finding that they are receiving too many or too few presentations. Respondents’ answers to question 2 should be taken into account because it will help define what they identify as too few or too many. Question 8 is the open-ended question at the end of this section and asks what teachers would change about presentations. This is a good opportunity for staff to find out from teachers what they would like to be different. Depending upon respondents’ answers to question 8, and what they identify as problematic with the program, their answers should be compared with their answers in the section regarding the value they see this element of LiM adding to their classes and/or their professional development.

Section B: Mini-Grants

This section differs from the other sections in that question 10 asks why respondents did not apply for mini-grants, if they did not. This provides valuable information to LiM staff on why teachers are not applying for mini-grants and perhaps how they can make them more accessible. Question 12 is an open-
ended question that should be analyzed for descriptive purposes; staff can read answers to this question and identify whether or not trends exist and perhaps how teachers understand what mini-grants are to be used for. Respondents’ answers to question 12 should be taken into account when looking at question 13, as it may allow for identifying trends in what teachers find to be valuable to their professional development in terms of what mini-grants can be used for. Question 14 should be analyzed for descriptive purposes, and may provide additional information to staff on what teachers think about the mini-grants.

Section C: Classroom Mentors

Questions 17 and 18 should be compared with question 16, as their answer to how much interaction respondents had with classroom mentors may inform whether or not they felt the mentors added value to their classes. Teachers may answer that the mentor did not add value to their classes, not because of what the mentor did, but because they felt they did not have enough interaction with the mentor. Question 19, which is open-ended, can provide useful information on teachers’ experiences with the classroom mentor program and gives teachers an opportunity to add information that may not specifically be asked for in the survey. This question should be analyzed for descriptive purposes.

Section D: Online Resources

If the survey is implemented at the end of the current school year, this section may be taken out, as resources are not yet online, and therefore all teachers will answer “no” to question 20. It may, in fact, cause confusion to ask about resources to which the teachers do not yet have access. Once the resources are implemented on the website or somehow distributed to teachers, this section should provide valuable information. Questions 23 and 24 should be analyzed in comparison with question 22, as the value respondents found in the resources may be dependent on the frequency with which they accessed the resources. Similar to the other sections, the final question in this section, which is question 25, should be analyzed for descriptive purposes. This should provide valuable information particularly in the first year after resources are put online, as it is a new aspect of the program and therefore may need to be changed or augmented.

Section E: Events

In this section, question 28 should be analyzed in comparison with questions 27 and 29, separately. In its comparison with question 27, staff should take into account the number of events respondents participated in when looking at the value they perceived. Similarly, comparing question 28 with question 29, may show trends regarding the value respondents perceive from attending different types of events. Questions 30 and 31 will also provide valuable descriptive information on what respondents find to be valuable and how they might change the programming.

Section F: Overall Program

Question 32 will provide information on what teachers find to be most valuable and should be cross-tabulated with the answers to questions 1, 9, 15, 20, and 26, as it is important to understand which elements respondents took advantage of when analyzing how they ranked each element. The answer to question 32 should also be cross-tabulated with the questions in each section about perceived value of each element. These questions are: 5, 6, and 7 in section A, 13 in section B, 17 and 18 in section C, 23 and 24 in section D, and 28 in section E. The final question of the survey, 33, should be analyzed for descriptive purposes as it is an opportunity for respondents to provide any other information which may not have been directly requested by other survey questions.
Appendices

Appendix A: Survey

Section A: Student Presentations

1. Did any of your classes receive presentations from Willamette University Language in Motion students during the past school year? Please select one.
   - Yes
   - No
   *If you marked “No” for question 1, please skip to question 9.*

2. If yes, how many presentations did you receive during the past school year? Please select one.
   - 1-3 presentations
   - 4-6 presentations
   - 7 or more presentations

3. Which of the following best describes your opinion on the number of presentations you received during the past school year? Please select one.
   - Far too few
   - A little fewer than I would have liked
   - The right amount
   - A little more than I would have liked
   - Far too many

4. Overall, which of the following best describes your opinion about the length of the presentations? Please select one.
   - Far too short
   - A little too short
   - The right length
   - A little too long
   - Far too long
5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Language in Motion presentations were relevant to my class(es).” Please select one.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Strongly agree

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Language in Motion presentations added value to my class(es).” Please select one.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Strongly agree

7. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Language in Motion presentations added value to my professional development.” Please select one.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Strongly agree

8. Your answer to the following question provides valuable information on how to improve the presentations program. What would you change about the presentations? Please answer in the space provided.

Section B: Mini-Grants

9. Did you apply for a Language in Motion mini-grant during the past school year? Please select one.
   - Yes
   - No
10. If you did not apply for a Language in Motion mini-grant, which of the following reasons best represents why not?

   o Was not aware of mini-grants
   o Not enough time
   o Did not see benefit of mini-grants

   *If you marked “No” for question 9, please skip to question 15.*

11. Did you receive a Language in Motion mini-grant during the past school year? *Please select one.*

   o Yes
   o No

12. What did you use the mini-grant for? *Please answer in the space provided.*

13. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “The Language in Motion mini-grant added value to my professional development.” *Please select one.*

   o Strongly disagree
   o Somewhat disagree
   o Neither agree nor disagree
   o Somewhat agree
   o Strongly agree

14. Your answer to the following question provides valuable information on how to improve the mini-grant program. What would you change about mini-grants through Language in Motion? *Please answer in the space provided.*

**Section C: Classroom Mentors**

15. Did you have a classroom mentor in your class(es) during the past school year? *Please select one.*

   o Yes
   o No

   *If you marked “No” for question 15, please skip to question 20.*
16. Which of the following best describes your opinion on the amount of interaction you had with your classroom mentor? Please select one.

- Not nearly enough interaction
- A little less interaction than I wanted
- The right amount of interaction
- A little more interaction that I wanted
- Far too much interaction

17. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “The classroom mentor provided added value to my class(es).” Please select one.

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

18. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “The classroom mentor provided added value to my professional development.” Please select one.

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

19. Your answer to the following question provides valuable information on how to improve the classroom mentor program. What would you change about the classroom mentor program? Please answer in the space provided.

Section D: Online Resources

20. Did you use any of the online resources provided by Language in Motion during the past school year? Please select one.

- Yes
- No

If you marked “No” for question 20, please move on to question 26.
21. Which of the following best describes the frequency with which you used the online resources? (15 times per semester equates to about once per week) Please select one.

- More than 15 times per semester
- About 15 times per semester
- Between 10 and 14 times per semester
- Between 5 and 9 times per semester
- Between 1 and 4 times per semester
- Once per year

22. Which type of online resource did you find most valuable? Please select one.

- Scholarly articles
- Classroom activities
- Websites
- All were equally valuable

23. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Online resources provided by Language in Motion added value to my class(es).” Please select one.

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

24. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Online resources provided by Language in Motion added value to my professional development.” Please select one.

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

25. Your answer to the following question provides valuable information on how to improve the online resources. What would you change about the online resources provided by Language in Motion? Please answer in the space provided.
Section E: Events

26. Did you attend any Language in Motion events during the past school year? Please select one.
   o Yes
   o No
   If you marked “No” for question 26, please skip to question 32.

27. How many Language in Motion-affiliated activities did you attend during the past school year?
   (examples include advisory board meetings, teacher panels, presenter orientations, retreats,
   national meetings, end-of-year gatherings, and teacher conferences) Please select one.
   o 1-2 events
   o 3-4 events
   o 5 or more events

28. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Language in Motion events
   added value to my professional development.” Please select one.
   o Strongly disagree
   o Somewhat disagree
   o Neither agree nor disagree
   o Somewhat agree
   o Strongly agree

29. Which event(s) did you attend during the past school year? Please select any that apply.
   o Advisory board meeting(s)
   o Teacher panel(s)
   o Presenter orientation(s)
   o Retreat(s)
   o National meeting(s)
   o End-of-year gathering(s)
   o Teacher conference(s)

30. Which event(s) did you find to be most valuable? Please answer in the space provided.

31. Your answer to the following question provides valuable information on how to improve the
    Language in Motion events. What would you change about the events? Please answer in the space
    provided.
Section F: Overall Program

32. Please rank the value of each of the five different parts of Language in Motion, 1 being least valuable and 5 being most valuable.

  o Student Presentations
  o Mini-Grants
  o Mentors
  o Online Resources
  o Events

33. Is there anything else you would like us to know?
Appendix B: Recruitment Letter

Dear Teacher’s name,

We are assessing the Language in Motion program at Willamette University and would very much appreciate your feedback. As a teacher who participates in the program, we very much value your input as it can direct us as to how to improve the program for the future. Please help us continue to evolve Language in Motion by telling us about your experiences. The link below will take you to a short survey (which will take no longer than 15 minutes) where you can give your input.

Thank you for your contribution!

The Language in Motion team
Appendix C: Informed Consent

Informed Consent:

The purpose of this study is to assess the value of Language in Motion’s activities as they relate to the professional development of teachers in the Salem-Keizer School District. This is an assessment being conducted by Nomi Pearce, director of Language in Motion at Willamette University. You are invited to participate in this assessment because you are a teacher in the Salem-Keizer School District who has had involvement with Language in Motion.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate. If you decide to participate in this assessment, you may withdraw at any time. If you decide not to participate or if you withdraw from participating at any time, you will not be penalized.

The procedure involves completing an online survey that will take approximately 30 minutes. Your responses will be confidential and we do not collect identifying information such as your name, email address or IP address. The survey questions will be about your experiences with Language in Motion.

We will do our best to keep your information confidential. All data is stored in a password-protected electronic format. To help protect your confidentiality, the surveys will not contain information that will personally identify you. The results of this study will be used for scholarly purposes only and may be shared with Willamette University representatives.

If you have any questions about the research study, please contact Nomi Pearce at (503) 370-6566. This research has been reviewed according to Willamette University IRB procedures for research involving human subjects.

ELECTRONIC CONSENT: Please select your choice below.

Selecting “agree” below indicates that:

- You have read the above information
- You voluntarily agree to participate
- You are at least 18 years of age

If you do not wish to participate in this study, please decline participation by selecting “disagree” below.

- Agree
- Disagree
Appendix D: Institutional Review Board Application

The Willamette University Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Application Form for Research Involving Human Subjects

Instructions

- Please type in the gray boxes. They will expand as necessary.
- Please be concise and eliminate disciplinary jargon.
- When you have completed the following application, please send this, your (required) informed consent document and any other supporting documents as email attachments to irbchair@willamette.edu.
- Non-electronic supporting documents can be sent by campus mail to: Laura Leete, Chair WU IRB Committee, 320 Smullin Hall.
- You can expect to receive notification that your application has been received and processed within one week of submission. (If you do not receive this notification please contact irbchair@willamette.edu)
- Please allow 3 weeks total for ‘exempt’ and ‘minimal risk’ reviews. Please allow 1 month total for projects requiring ‘Full Board’ review. (See web page titled ‘Review Criteria’ for discussion of different types of reviews.)
- Note for students: an email address for your advisor is required. When your form is received by the IRB committee it will be forwarded to your advisor. Your advisor will be informed that they must send an email of approval to the IRB committee before your application will be considered.

Application

Name – Principal Investigator (PI): Nomi Pearce

Name – Faculty Advisor (if PI is student):

WU Department: Community Service Learning

Project Title: Language in Motion Assessment

Present or Proposed Source of Funding (if applicable): Language in Motion grant funding. (Submit a copy of funding proposal as a document attachment, if applicable.)

Indicate Type of Project: Faculty Research Senior Project
Carson or Lilly Grant Student Class Project
XOther Student Research

(If Carson or Lilly Grant project, please attach copy of original grant proposal as an electronic attachment along with your application.)

Phone Number
(1) PI: (503) 370-6566
(2) Advisor (if applicable):

Campus Mail
(1) PI:
(2) Advisor (if applicable):
E-mail Address
(1) PI: npearce@willamette.edu
(2) Advisor (if applicable):

Indicate type of review requested:  X Exempt   Minimal Risk   Full Board
[Please refer to the web page titled ‘Review Criteria’ to determine the Type of Review requested. The IRB reserves the right to change status.]

(1) Briefly describe (one paragraph) the project’s purpose and/or research hypothesis in lay terms. [The IRB realizes that discipline terminology is often difficult to explain in lay terms. Please attempt to make the majority of the description in lay terms but if a few professional terms are unavoidable, then submit a copy of a definition list as an additional attachment.]

The purpose of this formative assessment is to determine how Salem-Keizer teachers gain professional development from programming provided by Language in Motion at Willamette University. The research questions are as follows: Are teachers using the five elements of Language in Motion (student presentations, classroom mentors, online tools, events, and mini-grants)? With what frequency are teachers using the various elements of Language in Motion? To what extent do teachers find value toward professional development in the various elements of Language in Motion?

(2) Briefly describe the research methods and procedures for this project.

Teachers who have participated to some extent in a Language in Motion affiliated activity during the past school year will be contacted by email and asked to complete an online survey. The email will contain a link to a SurveyMonkey survey of 33 questions that attempts to answer the research questions identified above. Teachers will be encouraged to complete the survey but will be informed that their participation in the study is voluntary and anonymous. The results will be analyzed by Language in Motion staff.

(3) Describe subject population inclusive of: number, characteristics, and selection method. Justification is required if subject population is restricted to one gender, ethnic group, or other specific group.

The subject population for this study is teachers in the Salem-Keizer School District who have been involved with Language in Motion at Willamette University or have participated in a Language in Motion affiliated event during the preceding school year. Around 200 teachers fit this criteria and will be contacted by email to complete the survey. The reason for this selection method is that the assessment seeks to find out how teachers are using the various elements of the Language in Motion programming and how they find professional development from such programming. As Language in Motion at Willamette University only works with teachers in the Salem-Keizer School District, the population is limited to those teachers who work in the district.

(4) Describe benefits (if any) and/or subject’s risk involved in project.

The benefits of participation are future improvement of the Language in Motion program for the participating teachers. Teachers who give their feedback on programming will be asked to identify their perceived value of the different elements of the program and to provide input on how it could be improved for the future. Therefore, if they have concerns or ideas for improvement, their participation in this assessment can benefit them greatly. There are no real risks associated with participation in the assessment.

(5) Describe method by which anonymity or confidentiality of subjects will be assured.
Participants will complete a survey that they will access through a link sent in an email. This will not be a unique link, so their individual participation cannot be traced back to them, and they are not asked to identify themselves in the survey nor are they asked to give any identifying information. Once the survey is completed, there is no way of knowing who the individual is who completed it.

(6) Describe the method(s) by which informed consent will be obtained. [Submit a copy of your required informed consent document along with this application as a document attachment. See the web page titled ‘Informed Consent Documents’ for more information and document templates.]

The first page of the survey will be an electronic informed consent. It will describe the purpose of the study, the reason they are being asked to participate, the procedure, and the fact that they can choose not to participate or to withdraw at any time and will not be penalized for doing so. It provides contact information for the principle investigator should they have questions. It then notes that by selecting "agree" they are indicating that they have read the consent information, that they voluntarily agree to participate, and that they are at least 18 years old.

**Document Attachments**

Please indicate which of the following documents are also included as electronic document attachments with this application:

(1) Informed Consent Document (required):
Attached?  X

(2) Funding Proposal (if applicable):
Attached?

(3) Definition List of Professional Terms Used (if applicable):
Attached?

(4) Carson or Lilly Project Grant Proposal (if applicable)
Attached?

(5) Other Research Documents (e.g. survey, testing instruments, screening form, if applicable):
Attached?  X

(6) Other Documentation or Information (e.g. other approvals which have or will be obtained from school districts, hospitals or cooperating institutions, if applicable):
Attached?

Thank you for completing an application for IRB review of your research proposal. Please submit this document, your informed consent document as well as any other supporting documents by email to irbchair@willamette.edu.