

Posted on 2019-10-04 11:46:09 AM (CDT) by Anonymous

I agree with the policy

Posted on 2019-10-04 11:46:51 AM (CDT) by Anonymous

I agree with the policy

Posted on 2019-11-04 06:05:32 PM (CST) by Anonymous

I have reviewed the policy and feel that the changes are superficial. My concern is that the determination of what will benefit the Board of Education is highly subject to political pressures within and around CPS. I understand that this situation is unavoidable to an extent and that CPS cannot possibly honor all requests made of its schools, but still feel, based on my experience as a researcher and those of others I have spoken with, like the review process seriously curtails research activity around areas of potential controversy. It also favors quantitative research, which holds great value but will not shed light on all relevant phenomena that could provide rich learning opportunities for CPS and other districts who would like to learn from CPS and a number of its policy decisions. I encourage the board to engage experienced local researchers with an array of disciplinary orientations and research foci in a process of an authentic review of its protocols and priorities. As it stands, the Research Office seems like it is oriented more toward politics than the generation of useful, informative data. This situation represents serious, unnecessarily missed opportunities on the board's part.

Posted on 2019-11-05 11:35:35 AM (CST) by James Lynn

I worry about narrow interpretations of the part of the proposed policy change that requires a delineation of how the proposed research will be "of direct benefit to the Board." There are no doubt educational studies where a "cost-benefit analysis" would likely lean to rejecting a request for a study within district schools--say, where onerous demands on study subjects, esoteric research topics, etc. are involved. But educational research sometimes yields indirect and/or delayed benefits. There are factors that must be balanced when considering how research will be conducted in school districts, but strong university-school district partnerships can yield incredible benefits to both parties, and I would hope that the implementation of the proposed policy adjustment leaves sufficient room for such collaboration.

Posted on 2019-11-05 11:39:22 AM (CST) by Anonymous

In general, the CPS RRB policy prioritizes the value of a research project to the Board and the general field above privacy protections for students, teachers, staff, and others who may be involved in a project. The revised policy should place greater emphasis on privacy projects and ensuring researchers adhere to the highest ethical standards in recruiting participants and

securing their consent. I recommend that the policy include a new "General Provision" that requires all research proposals submitted to the RRB be reviewed for compliance with federal "Common Rule" (link - <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/common-rule/index.html>) and with a specific Board-approved addendum to the Common Rule that, in instances where the Common Rule offers protections that are inadequate or fit poorly for work in schools, provide additional standards and expectations for researchers. Securing IRB approval from an researcher's home institution may not provide sufficient protections for the unique features of schools-as-research-sites; it would behoove the district to consider what addition protections may be appropriate for activities such as observation of classroom lessons, audio recording of students classroom discussion, and so on. The SQMR can be given one year to develop and propose such an addendum for Board approval.

For external projects, the policy states "Whether the Researcher has the support of the Officer or Chief Officer responsible for the proposed subject area of the research study" (IV.B.i.5). But in practice, I have been told by Officers & Chief Officers that they had been directed NOT to provide letters of support for research proposals to the RRB, that only principals can provide such letters. I have been told this by 3 different Officers over the course of the past 5 years, and after submitting the corresponding RRB applications, the RRB did not respond with a request to seek support from Officers. In short, the policy needs to be clarified among central office staff or it needs to be changed.

Posted on 2019-11-05 11:50:01 AM (CST) by Anonymous

NM

Posted on 2019-11-05 03:52:05 PM (CST) by Anonymous

I agree with the policy

Posted on 2019-11-07 12:51:51 PM (CST) by Anonymous

The modifications are minor and I agree with the policy

Posted on 2019-11-08 04:08:20 PM (CST) by Anonymous

While the changes to this policy are minimal (in terms of word count), they represent a potentially important opportunity to generate new, useful knowledge, if implemented in an expansive way. Two (related) phrases in particular raised my attention: 1) "How the study will contribute to the profession of education and be of direct benefit to the Board;" and 2) "Director of School Quality Measurement and Research." As a pragmatic researcher, I only endeavor to engage in school-based research that will contribute to the profession of education (and to the local contexts I study, such as CPS) . However, the

inclusion of the phrase "School Quality Measurement" side by side with "Research" makes me wonder whether the RRB would consider studies that are non-evaluative as having potential for making a contribution. I agree with the Anonymous commenter above (2019-11-04 06:05:32 PM) that RRB should "engage experienced local researchers with an *array of disciplinary orientations and research foci*" in order to maximize the potential of these changes to the policy. That is, not all "useful" research is quantitative or evaluative. I hope the changes to the Board's research policy are intended to invite a wider variety of research conducted in CPS.
