



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval.  
Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

**\*\*\* Amendment \*\*\***

**Amendment**

1. Summarize the proposed changes to the protocol in lay terms.

We are adding participants from Chandler Gilbert Community College campus and we have made changes to some of the survey items we ask the students.

Proceed to the appropriate section(s) and make your changes.

Make necessary changes in Consent Form(s), when applicable.

2. Indicate Level of Risk involved with the changes proposed.

(If level of risk has changed, please update the section 'Risks' in the protocol information.)

No Change

List of Sections (and questions) that have been changed/modified.

3. Describe any Other Changes

List of Sections (and questions) that have been changed/modified

-----

**\*\*\* Personnel Information \*\*\***



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval.  
Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

**Principal Investigator**

<b>Name of Principal Investigator (Faculty, Staff or Postdoc)</b>	<b>Degree: (MS/PhD)</b>	<b>Title</b>
Kraft, Katrien	MS	PI
<b>Email</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Fax</b>
katrien.kraft@mcmail.maricopa.edu	480-654-7382	480-654-7372
<b>Department Name</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	<b>Institution</b>
Geosciences	7110 E McKellips Rd Mesa, AZ 85207	MCC at RDM
<b>&lt;a href='http://www.citiprogram.org' target=_blank &gt; Human Subjects Training Completed?</b>		Y

**Co-Principal Investigator**

<b>Name of Co-Principal Investigator</b>	<b>Degree: (MS/PhD)</b>	<b>Title</b>
Wilson, Merry	MS	Consultant
<b>Email</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Fax</b>
merry.wilson@sccmail.maricopa.edu	(480) 423-6392	
<b>Department Name</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	<b>Institution</b>
Geosciences	9000 E Chaparral Rd Scottsdale, AZ 85256	SCC
<b>&lt;a href='http://www.citiprogram.org' target=_blank &gt; Human Subjects Training Completed?</b>		Y

No training data is available.

-----



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval.  
Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

**\*\*\* Subject Population \*\*\***

**Subject Population(s) Checklist**

- Children under 18 years of age
- Individuals with mental disabilities
- Prisoners
- Economically disadvantaged
- Elderly
- Individuals with physical disabilities
- Employees
- X None of the above
- Other, specify

MCCCD - IRB

-----

**\*\*\* Study Location \*\*\***

**Study Location(s) Checklist**

- Select All That Apply :
- X CG
  - EM
  - GW
  - GC
  - X MC
  - PC
  - PV



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-  
053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

- X RS
- SC
- SM
- DO
- Other (Specify other Study Locations)

\*\*\* General Checklist \*\*\*

**General Checklist**

Research Project Checklist (Check as appropriate.)

- X Does this project involve collection of data that identifies individuals (e.g., cohort databases include SSN# data on individuals, surveys or interviews identifiable by name or student number etc.)?
- X Will data identifiable by individual be shared with anyone (such as in a performance report for a funding source, conference presentations, published articles and reports, etc.)?

Data will be collected online through a server at University of North Dakota. Dr. Ronald Matheney at UND will be the one to randomly assign numbers to all the students.

Do you offer participants incentives to participate (such as money, extra credit for the class)? List the incentives here:

Will participants be videotaped, audio taped or digitally recorded during the project or study?

Does the funding source have any potential for financial or professional benefit from the outcomes for this study or project?

- X Is participation in this study voluntary for the individuals participating in the program/project?
- X Will participants be fully informed about the benefits and any risks?
- X Will participants' privacy and personal information be protected? Briefly explain how privacy and information will be protected:

Students will have a randomly assigned number for data analysis. Any data shared will be aggregate data, it will not be separated out as individual students. No names will be used at any point



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

during the data analysis or public documentation.

X Will participants, prior to the project, indicate informed consent to participate by completing and signing a written form? (Be sure to include the informed consent with this application.)

X Are data sources clearly identified (such as interviews, surveys, existing project data such as services received, reports, grades, existing school records, focus groups)?

Will participants be debriefed following completion of the project or study?

Project Type (Check all that apply.)

Faculty research

Thesis or dissertation

Undergraduate research

Student class project (under faculty direction): If class project, list class/course no.

X Federal grant application. List source:

NSF Grant # 1022980

Non-federal grant application. List source:

Other, specify

-----

**\*\*\* Funding \*\*\***

**Funding Checklist**

NONE

Funding - Grants/Contracts



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

Funded By	OGCA #	GAID #	Funding Administered By
National Science Foundation			

**Funding - Other**

**NOTE: Applicable Federal Grant Application, including competing renewals must be attached. Applicable investigator's brochure and sponsor's protocol must be attached for all industry sponsored clinical trials. You will be prompted for these in section #11.**

-----

**\*\*\* Exempt Paragraphs \*\*\***

Federal law 45 CFR 46.101(b) identifies the six (6) EXEMPT categories listed below using the language found in the legislation. Check all that apply to your project or study and explain why your proposed project or study falls into the category.

NOTE: The exemptions at 45 CFR 46.101(b) do not apply to research involving prisoners, fetuses, pregnant women, or human in vitro fertilization. The exemption at 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2), for research involving survey or interview procedures or observation of public behavior, does not apply to research with children, except for research involving observations of public behavior when the

Special note to Grant Projects Directors: In most cases, your grant projects are not what we traditionally think of as research studies. Nevertheless, the participant data, pre and post tests of student learning, and other information you generate, compile, analyze, and report on in carrying out project activities and project evaluation are now considered Human Subjects Research by federal funding agencies. As you review the exemption categories listed below, think about the data you are collecting and reporting for the participants you serve and other data you will be using for project evaluation purposes.

In order to qualify as Exempt, a protocol must be no more than minimal risk AND must only involve human subjects in one or more of the following paragraphs.



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

Select one or more of the following paragraphs:

- X (1.) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

Students will be answering questions from some of the subscales in the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ), one subscale from Shell & Husman's Subscale on Self-Regulation, one subscale from Schraw and Dennison's Metacognition subscale on self-evaluation, and the Geoscience Concept Inventory (GCI, version submitted may change, but will contain similar style of content-based questions), which will provide feedback on their own learning, and will help them as students. These are all taking place within the context of the classroom. None of the curriculum or classroom practices change during this research.

- X (2.) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human participants can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; AND (ii) any disclosure of the human participants' responses outside the research could reasonably place the participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the participants' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Students will complete the MSLQ (69 items), and 2 other Self-regulation similar types of questions (15 items) that measure student attitudes and motivations for learning in this particular class. They will also complete a pre & post of a content assessment (Geoscience Concept Inventory test items) that pertain to course content. All of these questionnaires are used on a national basis and have been externally validated.

- (3.) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, if: (i) The human participants are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter. Please explain how your research falls into this category:

- (4.) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that participants cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the participants. Please explain how your research falls into this category:

- (5.) Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate or otherwise examine: a) Public benefit or service



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

programs; b) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; c) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or d) possible changes in methods or levels or payment for benefits or services under those programs.

-----

(6.) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, a) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or b) if a good is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspective Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Please explain how your research falls into this category:

-----

-----

**\*\*\* Purpose, Study Procedures, Background \*\*\***

**Title**

Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2

**Project Status**

- New Project
- Revision to Previously Approved Project
- Periodic Review of Continuing Project

Project Start Date                      08/23/2010                      Project End Date                      11/15/2013

Complete Sections 1 - 11. Specify N/A as appropriate. Do not leave any required sections blank.

1. Purpose of the study

- a) Briefly describe the project or study



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

Despite increasing numbers of students attending the community college, and ongoing efforts to incorporate effective pedagogies into classroom teaching, the proportion of students majoring in the natural sciences has decreased over the last decade (NSB Science and Engineering Indicators, 2006). There are several probable reasons for this situation but one obvious contributor to this paradox can be inferred from Seymour and Hewitt's analysis (1997), i.e., neglect of the affective domain – the feelings, emotions, and general moods that a learner brings to a task or that are generated in response to a task (Ormrod, 2006). Seymour and Hewitt (1997) reported that the principal reasons given by students for switching out of STEM programs were: 1. Students became unmotivated as they lost the feeling that STEM disciplines were interesting or enticing; 2. Students became more interested in other majors. Clearly, if we are to attract and retain greater numbers of students to STEM disciplines, we need to be more intentional about addressing the affecting elements of learning in STEM classrooms.

While there have been limited efforts to assess some aspects of the affective domain in geoscience classes, most notably attitudes about science and the learning process (Libarkin, 2001; Stempien et al, 2007), there has been no previous effort to investigate the various dimensions of the affective domain on geoscience learning environments. In this research project we will examine the connection between motivation, ability, and learning outcomes.

Libarkin, J.C., 2001, Development of an assessment of student conception of the nature of science, *Journal of Geoscience Education*, v. 49, p. 435-442.  
Ormrod, J., 2006, *Essentials of educational psychology*. Pearson/Merril-Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.  
Seymour, E., and Hewitt, N.M., 1997, *Talking about leaving: Why undergraduates leave the sciences*. Westview Press, Boulder.  
Stempien, J.A., Bair, A.R., and Budd, D., 2007, A new survey tool for assessing attitudes about learning geology: The Colorado learning Attitudes about Science Survey, *Geology Version*. *GSA Abstracts with Program*, v. 39, #6, p. 550.

**b) What human participants will experience during the proposed project or study?**

We will ask students to complete the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ; Pintrich et al., 1993), one subscale from Shell & Husman's SPOCK survey, one subscale from Schraw and Dennison's Metacognition survey, a short student demographic questionnaire, and a content assessment based on the Geoscience Concept Inventory (GCI; Libarkin & Anderson, 2006) at the beginning and end of the semester. We will also self-evaluate our own assessment practices and external evaluators (Katrien Kraft (MCC), Tatiana Vislova at SUNY Oswego and David Budd at University of Colorado at Boulder) will observe our classrooms to compare the self-reflections with those of the Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol (RTOP) instrument score (Sawada et al, 2002). The MSLQ is an 81-item scale developed by Paul Pintrich and coworkers at the University of Michigan (Pintrich et al, 1993). The MSLQ assumes that motivation is a dynamic trait that can be influenced by activities in a given course. The FTP scale (Husman, McCann, and Crowson, 2000) is an 8-item questionnaire that asks students to compare their future goals with the current coursework in an effort to determine relevance.



**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval.  
Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

Libarkin, J. & Anderson, S., 2006, The Geoscience Concept Inventory, Retrieved 31 July, 2008 from <http://newton.bhsu.edu/eps/gci.html>.  
Pintrich, P.R., Smith, D.A.F., Garcia, T., and McKeachie, W.J., 1993, Reliability and predictive validity of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ). Educational and Psychological Measurement, v. 53, p. 801-813.  
Schraw, G. & Dennison, R.S., 1994, Assessing Metacognitive Awareness. Contemporary Educational Psychology, v. 19, p. 460-475.  
Shell, D. & Husman, J., 2008, Control, Motivation, Affect and Self-Regulation. Journal of Educational Psychology, v. 100, # 2, p. 443-459.  
Sawada, D., Piburn, M. D., Judson, E., Turley, J., Falconer, K., Benford, R., and Bloom, I., 2002, Measuring Reform Practices in Science and Mathematics Classrooms: The Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol: School Science and Mathematics, v. 102, no. 6, p. 245-253.

2. Study Procedures

a) Describe all strategies or experimental methods to be used, research design and program activities.

The assessments described above (MSLQ, Pofl, demographics, GPA, and GCI) will be used to investigate the relationship between motivation and cognition and the influence of different pedagogical approaches and self-regulatory teaching interventions.

For example, we are currently gathering baseline data to determine present attitudes, once baseline data is established, we will then select one intervention to attempt in the classroom that addresses one of the subscales within the MSLQ to attempt to improve student use of self-regulatory practices. One example is the use of reading reflections--students will be asked to read the course content and then be held accountable by filling out a reading reflection for each class. The instructor will be able to use this as a formative assessment, and previous studies have demonstrated this as effective method for improving student reading comprehension (Wirth, Aziz & Perkins, 2009). What we are hoping to determine is if this will have an effect on students self-efficacy and organizational skills (subscales on the MSLQ) as well as performance and learning of content (GPA and GCI scores).

Wirth, K.R., Aziz, F., and Perkins, D. (2009). Reading, Reflecting, and Relating: A Metacognitive Approach to Learning. Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs, 41(7), 602.

b) Indicate what data, measures, or observations will be collected and used in the study or for the project. If any questionnaires, tests or other instruments are to be used, include a brief description and attach one copy of the instruments with the application. Special note to Grant Projects Directors: In the case of educational or training grants, data collected about the participants served, assessment testing, pre and post testing and other aspects of project evaluation plans are critical.

As previously explained, the following data will be collected:



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ): 69 questions  
SPOCK survey (9 items)  
Metacognition survey (6 items)  
Demographic Questions (age, race, gender, number of science classes, reason for enrolling in course, previous number of science courses, etc..)  
Geoscience Concept Inventory (GCI; ~20 questions pertaining to introductory geology content--still in revision process, attached is a version similar to final draft).  
--All of these data are collected at the beginning and end of the semester (demographic data is not-recollected, but there are follow up questions such as, do you intend to take another geoscience course, what is your current interest in the topic).  
In addition, the following data will be gathered during/at the end of the semester:  
Student GPA, cumulative and course grade (for only those who consent)  
Classroom Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol (RTOP) Instrument  
Instructor self-reflections and phone interviews

All student data are gathered as an aggregate and assigned a random number. As data are interpreted, there are no ways to identify any specific student with the data.

Copies of all questionnaires are included.

### 3. Methodology

a) **Specify who the research participants will be.**

Students enrolled in our GLG 101 courses who consent.

b) **Indicate how they will be solicited, recruited, and contacted. Include recruitment letters and materials with this application.**

All surveys and course assessments will be a part of the class curriculum, students will be informed of the research during class, assigned the survey to take online as part of a homework assignment at which time they will have the opportunity to consent or not.

The questionnaires will be administered online (developed and monitored by Ronald Matheney at University of North Dakota). His software automatically assigns a random number to each consenting student. As an instructor, I can see who has completed the assignments, but I will not see if they agree to participate to the research until after grades are submitted.

c) **State how much time will be required of each participant or subject.**

Completing the questionnaires takes approximately 20-30 minutes; the GCI will be a total of ~20 questions, which will take approximately 30 minutes. This will require approximately 2 hours to complete both pre- and post-tests.

d) **Describe procedures or activities to which individuals will be subjected.**



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

All activities are a course of normal classroom activities.

-----

**\*\*\* Subject Population \*\*\***

4. Subject Population - Check all that apply and estimate total number of individual participants in each relevant category about whom you will be collecting data for your project or grant:

- X College students
- X Faculty
- Staff
- General Public
- Children and Youth Under 18
- Other (specify categories and number):

**Comments (Optional):**

We estimate approximately 100-150/semester from our classes and involves 5 faculty.

**Voluntary Participation:**

a) **Specify the steps that will be taken to ensure that each individual's participation is voluntary.**

Since these are activities that fit within the domain of our course content, all activities will be required and a part of the overall grade. However, students have the opportunity to opt out of research component. Before students begin answering any questions on the online survey are presented with the informed consent form and at the end of the form ask the students to select one of two options, "1) I agree to participate in the research or 2) I do not agree to participate in the research." The default setting is to not consent so that students need to actively choose the setting to participate (see the image attached at the end of the consent form). The instructor will not be privy to this information until after completion of grades.



**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

b) State what incentives, if any, will be offered for their participation.

N/A

-----

**\*\*\* Risks \*\*\***

**5. Risks**

US Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) Regulations define a subject at risk as follows: "...any individual who may be exposed to the possibility of injury, including physical, psychological, or social injury, as a consequence of participation as a subject in any research, development, or related activity which departs from the application of those accepted methods necessary to meet his needs, or which increases the ordinary risks of daily life, including the recognized risks inherent in a chosen occupation or field of service."

a) Include all known and anticipated risks to the participants such as side effects, risks of placebo (inert treatments, etc..

We do not anticipate any risks.

b) Indicate how you plan to reduce or address risks (for e.g., keep data files in a locked cabinet to which only the PI has the key and use a coded number for each file; identify your security to keep names and responses to an online survey confidential).

Students will not be identified by name in any of the research documentation. Students will need to fill out survey information that allows their pre and post data to match, but once the semester is completed, names are discarded and only the randomly assigned numbers are used for tracking purposes. The office of Research and Planning will provide the GPA for students who consent to research as one item to add to the database for each student (to compare scores to scores). Ronald Matheney at University of North Dakota has designed the software to track the students and remove identifiers before anyone else analyzing data will see the information.

c) In research that proposes substantial risk to human participants, list emergency backup procedures that are in place such as medical or counseling interventions.



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

Describe any potential risks to participating individuals for the following categories

1. **Physical well-being**

There are no anticipated risks

2. **Psychological well-being**

There are no anticipated risks

3. **Legal**

There are no anticipated risks due to the stripping of personal information once a random number has been assigned to each submission.

4. **Social well-being**

There are no anticipated risks

5. **Other**

-----

**\*\*\* Benefits, Procedures to Maintain Confidentiality \*\*\***

6. **Benefits:**

a) **Describe the benefits and/or any compensation that the participating individuals can expect.**

This study will benefit participating students immediately by making them more aware of their own learning, and those factors that may influence this process. Upon the completion of the survey, tips are provided to each student about their scores and what they can do to help improve their performance in their geology class based on how they responded to the questions.



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

In the short term this study will also help me as the instructor to benefit because it will provide valuable feedback in order to improve my own instruction. Based on the baseline data gathered for each classroom, we will work to implement practices in our classroom that will help to benefit all students in learning and performance in their introductory classrooms.

**b) Describe the gains in knowledge that may result from the project.**

In the long term, we hope that what we discover will eventually help improve teaching and learning in many college geology classrooms besides our own. We have already learned very interesting information that helps us inform us about student experiences in classrooms that will be reported out at the upcoming Geological Society of America Conference including:

- Students with a high self-efficacy, but low performance ability are just as likely to success as those students with a low self-efficacy, but high performance ability (an important consideration with many of our students entering as developing students)
- Minorities enter the classroom with lower scores on motivation and use of self-regulatory skills than white students and stay that way throughout the class (this is an important issues for the geoscience community to consider when determining how to better recruit minorities into the geosciences).

The more we can learn about students at the community college, the more we can begin to make nationally-based recommendations.

**7. Procedure to Maintain Confidentiality**

**a) Describe the methods to be used to safeguard the privacy of your participants and ensure the confidentiality of data obtained.**

Students will not be identified by name in any of the research documentation. Students will need to fill out survey information that allows their pre and post data to match, but once the semester is completed, names are discarded and only the randomly assigned numbers are used for tracking purposes. The office of Research and Planning will provide the GPA for students who consent to research as one item to add to the database for each student (to compare scores to scores). Ronald Matheny has designed the software to track the students and remove identifiers before anyone else analyzing data will see the information.

**b) Include plans for publication, storage, and ultimate destruction of data, including that of computer, print, videotape, and audio materials.**

Once the federal funding has completed, all data will be destroyed after the federally required amount of time (3 years) to preserve it has passed or all research has been completed, whichever comes last.



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

-----

**\*\*\* Potential Conflict of Interest \*\*\***

**8. Potential Conflict of Interest**

Please answer the following questions a through e:

- a) N Do any of the involved investigators or their immediate family (as described below) have consulting arrangements, management responsibilities or equity holdings in the Sponsoring company, vendor(s), provider(s) of goods, or subcontractor(s)?
- b) N Do any investigators or their immediate family have any financial relationship with the Sponsoring company, including the receipt of honoraria, income, or stock/stock options as payment?
- c) N Is any Investigator(s) a member of an advisory board with the Sponsoring company?
- d) N Do any investigators receive gift funds from the Sponsoring company?
- e) N Do any investigators or their immediate family have an ownership or royalty interest in any intellectual property utilized in this protocol?

"Immediate family" means a spouse, dependent children as defined by the IRS, or a domestic partner.

If one or more of the above relationships exist, please include a statement in the consent form to disclose this relationship. i.e., a paid consultant, a paid member of the Scientific Advisory Board, has stock or stock options, or receives payment for lectures given on behalf of the sponsor. The consent form should disclose what institution(s) or companies are involved in the study through funding, cooperative research, or by providing study drugs or equipment.

If you answer yes to any of the questions above, you must file a Conflict of Interest disclosure statement located at <http://keyusa.com/IRB.htm>



**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval.  
Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

\*\*\* Informed Consent \*\*\*

9. Informed Consent

You can add different Consent Forms, Alteration Forms, and Waivers. Provide consent process background information, in the table below, for each Consent Form(s), Alteration Form(s), and Waiver(s).

Provide consent process background information, in the table below, for each Consent Form, Alteration Form, and Waiver.

**Informed Consent**

Title	Consent Type	Created Date
GarNET consent form	Consent	08/17/2010

\*\*\* Assent Background \*\*\*

10. Assent Background

All minors must provide an affirmative consent to participate by signing a simplified assent form, unless the Investigator(s) provides evidence to the IRB that the minor subjects are not capable of assenting because of age, maturity, psychological state, or other factors.

See sample consent forms at <http://www.keyusa.com/IRB.htm>

Provide assent process background information, in the table below, for each Assent Form, Alteration Form, and Waiver.



**PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges**

Protocol # 2010-08-  
053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval.  
 Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
 -----

\* \* \* Attachments \* \* \*

**11. Attachments**

Add appropriate attachments (e.g., federal grant/sub-contract, questionnaires, surveys, advertisements, reference list, sponsor's protocol, investigator's brochure, etc.) in this section.

To update or revise any attachments, please delete the existing attachment and add the revised document to replace it.

Document Type	Document Name	Attached Date	Submitted Date
Full grant proposal	GARNET2_proposal_all	08/17/2010	08/18/2010
Certificate of Completion of CITI Training Module	Citi_certificate_2010	08/17/2010	08/18/2010
Data collection forms	MSLQ_PofI_Quest	08/17/2010	08/18/2010
Data collection forms	GARNET GCI v4-1-1	08/17/2010	08/18/2010
Grant/ external support letter or award letter	NSF FastLane __ Proposal Status	08/17/2010	08/18/2010
Appropriate signatures on the application	2	08/18/2010	08/18/2010
Certificate of Completion of CITI Training Module	K.Kraft updated CITI quiz	08/20/2010	08/20/2010
Other	Secondary Reviewer comments via email	08/20/2010	08/20/2010
Data collection forms	NEW_SRL_items	08/19/2011	08/19/2011

\* \* \* Obligations \* \* \*



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval. Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

**Obligations**

In making this application, I certify that:

- 1) I have successfully completed the IRB Required CITI Tutorial (with at least 80% pass score on each section). I have attached the certificate of completion
- 2) I have read the protocol and method of obtaining informed consent, as outlined by the MCCCCD IRB Handbook, and will follow it during the period covered by this research project.
- 3) I agree to comply with the letter and spirit of MCCCCD IRB Policies.
- 4) I agree to comply with federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of human participants in research.
- 5) I will submit any future changes to the research project to the IRB for review and approval prior to implementation, as these may alter the exempt status of the project.
- 6) I agree that any new findings that develop during the course of this study that may affect the risks and benefits to participants will be promptly reported to the IRB in writing.
- 7) I agree that any adverse events that occur in the course of this study will be promptly reported to the IRB in writing.
- 8) I agree and understand that records of the participants will be kept for at least six (6) years after the completion of the research.
- 9) I understand the IRB review is in effect for one year, unless changes are made to the study/project. If I plan to continue my research for more than one year, I will submit a Continuing Research Review form to the IRB.



PROTOCOL  
Exempt  
Maricopa County Community Colleges

Protocol # 2010-08-  
053  
08/19/2011

**Protocol Title:** Geoscience Affective Research NETwork (GARNET) 2  
**Protocol Type:** Exempt  
**Important Note:** This Print View may not reflect all comments and contingencies for approval.  
Please check the comments section of the online protocol.

-----  
-----

10) I may begin research when the IRB gives notice of its approval.

11) I accept responsibility for the conduct of this research.

X The Principal Investigator has read and agrees to abide by the above obligations.

-----

\*\*\* Event History \*\*\*

Event History

Date	Status	View Attachments	Letters
08/17/2010	PROTOCOL CREATED		
08/18/2010	SUBMITTED	Y	
08/18/2010	PANEL ASSIGNED		
08/18/2010	REVIEWER(S) ASSIGNED		
08/23/2010	APPROVED	Y	Y
04/03/2011	AMENDMENT FORM CREATED		
04/03/2011	SUBMITTED	Y	
04/05/2011	APPROVED	Y	Y
08/19/2011	AMENDMENT FORM CREATED		
08/19/2011	SUBMITTED	Y	