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Goal setting in educational settings has been examined at length, but typically as an affective component and as a tool to boost individual and overall classroom morale. While learning environment is a major concern of mine as a middle school special education teacher, this study looked not only at the self-efficacy of students working on goal setting, but also on student achievement, which is identified as the rate and accuracy at which a student learns academics in a determined amount of time (Carter, 2016). This study focused on small groups of middle school students using an online program called MobyMax to improve their reading and math. In this study, the effects of daily goal setting on higher student achievement was not found to be a strong factor.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROVAL PAGE</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE PAGE</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions of Terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delimitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Prior Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHOD</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. RESULTS</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables and Figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. DISCUSSION</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. REFERENCES</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX I: IRB APPROVAL LETTER</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX II: PROJECT MATERIALS</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

My research will focus on the relationship between daily student goal setting and student achievement in math and reading classes at Webb Middle School in Reedsburg, WI., while also examining the effects goal setting has on students' self-efficacy.

While student goal setting has been examined at the affective level extensively, often research does not explore the direct relationship between student goal setting and student academic achievement. Smithson (2012) questioned whether goal setting would increase weekly test scores in three subject areas (reading, math, language arts) and found that, in her class of 18 third graders, test scores increased or maintained on average in all classes. Moeller, Theiler, and Wu (2012) examined goal setting over a long period of time (five years) in a quasi-experimental study of goal setting and achievement in high school Spanish students, and found a statistically significant relationship between the goal-setting process and language achievement.

Statement of the Problem

My research will build on the two aforementioned studies by using an equal time sample design to examine the relationship between daily student goal setting in math and reading classes and student achievement, specifically the rate and accuracy at which work is completed, and self-efficacy. My hypothesis is that the phases in which daily individual goal setting is implemented will coincided with more efficient (faster, more accurate) student achievement and higher levels of student self-efficacy.
Definition of Terms

**Daily Student Goal Setting** - During the phases in which goal setting is implemented, students will be expected to write a brief goal for what they would like to accomplish during their independent or guided work time. Students will receive lessons on how to write goals and will follow a basic template when writing these goals each day. The goals they write will follow the S.M.A.R.T goal format, which stands for specific, measureable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound (Creating S.M.A.R.T. Goals, n.d.).

**Self-Efficacy** - Self-efficacy is the belief one has for themselves that they can accomplish the task at hand. Self-efficacy in the classroom setting gives students a base for motivation and positive thinking (Self-Efficacy Theory, n.d.).

**Equal Time Sample** - A quasi-experimental design that consists of a series of observations during which an independent variable is administered and then withdrawn multiple times to examine the effects it has on the given dependent variables (Glossary/Lexicon, n.d.).

**Student Achievement** - The rate and accuracy at which a student learns academics in a determined amount of time (Carter, 2016).

**MobyMax** - An online based adaptive and differentiated curriculum that creates a unique, individualized education plan for each student. Higher functioning students may progress as quickly as they like while simultaneously ensuring that lower functioning students get the instruction and time they need to progress through the curriculum without leaving significant gaps (For Every K-8 Subject, n.d.).
Delimitations and Limitations of Research

There is a delimitation to the research on the relationship of goal setting on student achievement and self-efficacy, relating to differentiated curriculum the students will all receive. It is possible that due to prior knowledge of certain topics, some lessons could be easier or harder for some students than others. Understanding that this is a delimitation to the study, differentiated instruction is vital to my students’ individual success in math and reading.

There are two possible limitations to the study. The first limitation possibility is student behavior. My caseload is primarily students who have been identified as having emotional/behavioral disabilities, which often disrupts our desired instructional time.

The final possible limitation is the possibility of students setting goals on their own during the phases in which I am not prompting them to write goals. If students see success during the first phase of goal setting, it is possible that even when not prompted to write goals, they will do so.

Method of Approach

I am proposing to examine the relationship between goal setting and student achievement and self-efficacy through the use of an equivalent time sample, in which student data will be collected for 3 weeks without goal setting intervention, students will then set daily goals for 3 weeks, have goal intervention removed for 3 weeks, then implemented again for 3 weeks. Further detail can be found in Appendix I (IRB Proposal) and Appendix II (project materials).
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research Question

My research was built on prior studies on the effects that goal setting has on students by using an equal time sample design to examine the relationship between daily student goal setting in math and reading classes and student achievement, specifically the rate and accuracy at which work is completed, and self-efficacy. My main question was whether daily individual goal setting would coincide with more efficient (faster, more accurate) student achievement and higher levels of student self-efficacy.

Discussion of Prior Research

Bruh, McDaniel, and Fernando (2016) reviewed 40 studies in 39 different journal articles, looking specifically at students with behavior issues and behavioral goal setting. While their search and findings were very broad, one piece of their findings was of particular interest to me. They discussed two different levels of goal setting for students. The first was a scenario in which the teacher or counselor set the goal, the second was where the student had equal or more involvement in the goal writing process than the teacher. The most significant findings for me from this study was that the group of students who were directly involved in goal setting met significantly more goals than the students who had the goals dictated to them (Bruh, et al., 2016). This statement shifted my thinking and made me think carefully about how much involvement I should have in the student goal setting process once they understand how to set goals.

In a study by Carroll, et al. (2012), examined goal setting among youth, ages 12.7 to 17. The study grouped students into three distinct groups: delinquent, at-risk, and not at-risk. The subjects were placed into these groups based off of the Western Australian Legislative Assembly checklist indicators. Carroll, et al. posed four separate
hypotheses, and one of them was of particular interest to me. This hypothesis looked at whether group membership could be predicted by the types of goals that were set. The study found that delinquent students did not set very many educational goals (3.8%) or career goals (22.5%) compared to their at-risk or not at-risk peers.

Buzza and Dol (2015) explored the effects of goal setting on students’ self-efficacy, motivational beliefs, and academic engagement, but not on grades or achievement scores. They studied two tenth grade mathematics classes in an alternative education program called Fast Forward, which is designed to help students who have fallen behind to catch up. The students participating in the study had Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and had disabilities ranging from learning disabilities, emotional/behavioral disabilities, to mild intellectual disabilities. An equivalent time sample design was used, and the students were to write daily goals for a whole semester on-and-off in three week increments. After the study was complete, the authors found that the only statistically reliable changes were in the students’ abilities to write better goals as judged by a rubric. Of note (but not statistically founded), the authors also found that student goal statements had many more self-regulatory components in them during the last goal implementation segment of the semester, possibly showing growth in the students’ self-regulatory awareness. This study stood out among the rest due to their use of an equivalent time sample study during a semester, which I feel is very relevant for K-12 educators to use to help them make decisions on using best practices in their classrooms.

Smithson (2012) questioned whether goal setting would increase weekly test scores in three subject areas (reading, math, language arts) in her third grade classroom.
The design of the study was very basic (pre-experimental, pre-test/post-test design), and due to this the internal validity of the study is fairly weak. The students’ test scores were examined three weeks prior and then following the personal goal setting instruction. Students set class goals as a baseline, and then individual goals for each test based on their previous performance. Taking that into consideration the issues with internal validity, her study did show that test scores in all subject matters either increased or relatively maintained. While Smithson acknowledged motivation and self-efficacy, they were not her necessarily dependent variables. She, unlike Buzza and Dol (2015), focused on student scores, which is why this study is particularly relevant to my proposed topic. While the small sample size of eighteen students and the research design detracts from external and internal validity, this study shows a realistic example of what a study on goal-setting would look like in a K-12 classroom.

Klauda and Guthrie (2015) completed a longitudinal study on the development of reading motivation, engagement, and achievement in middle school students. While this study did not directly take goal setting into effect, the notion that goal setting may have an influence on student self-efficacy toward academics could also lead one to believe that goal setting could influence motivation and engagement. Their study showed that students that reported high reading motivation and engagement were likely affected by past achievement, as well as motivation and engagement affecting achievement. This is interesting, as it could give a strong case for a focus on raising motivation, engagement, and achievement all together, as they all may affect each other.

In the article Goal Setting and Student Achievement: A Longitudinal Study, Moeller, Theiler, and Wu (2012) discuss that there are many studies that examine goal setting as an independent variable and motivation as a dependent variable, but few
examine the relationship between goal setting and student achievement at the classroom level. This study examines goal setting over a long period of time (5 years) in a quasi-experimental study of goal setting and achievement in high school students in Spanish classes. The educational platform that was used was a program called LinguaFolio, which encourages and focuses on "student self-assessment, goal setting, and collection of evidence of language achievement" (Moeller, et al, 2012). The study covered a large sample size (23 high schools and 1,273 students). Moeller, et al. (2012) found that after 5 years of collecting data, a statistically significant relationship between the goal-setting process and language achievement was found. This study is most relevant to my proposed topic due to the focus on measuring student achievement during the goal setting process.

Another study, conducted by Allito, Malecki, Coyle, and Santuzzi (2016) concluded after two separate studies (one on fourth graders and one on fifth graders, both groups having over 100 students) that positive results were seen in the group that received weekly goal setting and feedback on English/Language Arts work over multiple weeks. These results are intriguing specifically due to the results being based on student achievement and not on self-efficacy or attitude. Allito, et al. (2016) concluded that both studies indicated that the groups receiving the goal setting and feedback intervention performed much higher on production-dependent writing indices after the interventions than did the control groups.

In the article The Effects of a Goal Setting Intervention on Aerobic Fitness in Middle School Students, McDonald and Trost (2015) conducted a study on the effects of goal setting interventions, specifically using S.M.A.R.T. goals, on aerobic fitness testing in 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students. The use of S.M.A.R.T. goal interventions lead to
dramatic results. The school using the goal setting interventions saw scores on the
given aerobic fitness test go up significantly on average, while the school not receiving
goal setting interventions actually saw a decrease in scores over time. McDonald and
Trost concluded that educating sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students on S.M.A.R.T.
goal setting techniques could be effective in improving their aerobic fitness.

Stevenson (2016) examined the effect of goal setting intervention on task
engagement, something that could lead to improved student achievement. Also,
Stevenson was working with small groups of students, which made this study more
relevant to my interests. His observations showed that the small group of middle school
students that used the goal setting intervention lowered their mean latency to task
engagement. While this is an affective-type result, student engagement could potentially
have an effect on student achievement levels.

Martin and Elliot (2016) assessed the effects of personal best goal setting on
math achievement on 89 elementary and secondary school students, split into two
groups. Personal best goals focus on setting a specific target for an upcoming
assessment, which is a part of S.M.A.R.T goal setting. They found that the treatment
group showed greater growth in achievement than the control group, thus concluding
that goal setting may help increase student achievement.

**Summary**

Overall, there is a lot of recent research on the topic of goal setting in the
classroom. There seems to be a resounding agreeance to the fact that goal setting is
likely a beneficial practice in K-12 classrooms. It has been shown in statistical results
and has been discussed at length that goal setting improves things like self-efficacy,
motivation, autonomy, and other similar affective objectives. Comparatively, there is limited research on the effects of goal setting in classrooms on student achievement. I am proposing to examine the relationship between goal setting and student achievement through the use of equivalent time sample, in which students will set daily goals for 3 weeks, then not set goals for 3 weeks, then set goals again for 3 weeks to examine the relationship between goal setting and student achievement, while also examining the relationship between goal setting and self-efficacy of my students.

Hypothesis

I hypothesize that, relative to time samples in which no goal setting intervention is used, student achievement and self-efficacy will have increased, on average, in reading and math classes during time samples in which daily goal setting was implemented.
CHAPTER III: METHOD

Participants

Research was done at Webb Middle School in Reedsburg, WI. Data were collected from students in my sixth, seventh, and eighth grade reading and math classes during the 2016-2017 school year. Participants included students on my special education caseload who were designated to have individualized math and/or reading instruction on their Individualized Education Plan.

Materials

Data for student achievement in reading and math were collected using MobyMax, an online differentiated curriculum system that automatically generated data each time students used the program. To monitor self-efficacy, I used the Academic Efficacy Subscale from Patterns of Adaptive Learning Scales (Midgley, et al., 2000). These scores were then placed in a data collection form and analyzed for growth or regression during each phase.

Procedures

Research began by collecting MobyMax data on student achievement in math and reading. Specifically, the rate at which problems were completed and the accuracy with which they were completed were examined. Data were collected for three weeks, and this phase ended with students taking the Academic Efficacy Subscale. During the last week of Phase 1, students were briefly instructed on the daily goal setting process, although all students in the sample already had previous knowledge on goal setting from lessons given during Response to Intervention (RTI).
Phase 2 incorporated goal setting each and every day. Students filled in blanks on a generated goal setting template that assisted each student in setting goals that were specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound. Students continued with the reading and math curriculum as normal, and data were collected again for three weeks on student achievement. Phase 2 also ended in students taking the brief Academic Efficacy Subscale.

Phase 3 was identical to Phase 1, in which daily goal setting was not offered during class time. During Phase 4, goal setting was reintroduced daily. Data were collected in the same manner each Phase.

After all Phases were completed, data were analyzed and compared between all four Phases.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

A T-Test for paired samples was conducted to determine if the time periods in which goal setting intervention was administered had an effect on academic achievement and/or self-efficacy. The rate at which students completed math problems during time samples with goal setting intervention ($M = 1.11$, $SD = 0.30$) was lower than during time samples in which no goal setting intervention was administered ($M = 1.66$, $SD = 1.07$), which was not significant, $t(11) = -1.56$, $p = .05$, $d = .73$. The achievement percentage at which students completed math problems during time samples with goal setting intervention ($M = 76.89$, $SD = 7.24$) was higher than during time samples in which no goal setting intervention was administered ($M = 73.45$, $SD = 14.48$), showing no significance, $t(15) = 0.69$, $p = .05$, $d = .12$.

For reading scores, The rate at which students completed reading problems during time samples with goal setting intervention ($M = 25.71$, $SD = 1.02$) was slightly higher than during time samples in which no goal setting intervention was administered ($M = 23.64$, $SD = 6.61$), yet still showing no statistical significance, $t(8) = .093$, $p = .05$, $d = .31$. The achievement percentage at which students completed reading problems during time samples with goal setting intervention ($M = 72.57$, $SD = 9.14$) was slightly higher than during time samples in which no goal setting intervention was administered ($M = 71.41$, $SD = 11.61$), showing no statistical significance, $t(14) = 0.22$, $p = .05$, $d = .01$.

Affective qualities were examined by comparing ratings on the Academic Efficacy Subscale from Patterns of Adaptive Learning Scales (Midgley, et al., 2000). In math, students showed similar self-efficacy during the weeks with goal setting
intervention ($M = 19.67$, $SD = 3.00$) than during weeks without ($M = 19.18$, $SD = 3.46$), not showing statistical significance, $t(18) = 0.33$, $p = .05$, $d = .03$. During reading classes, students rated themselves as having slightly higher self-efficacy during the weeks with goal setting intervention ($M = 21.57$, $SD = 1.90$) than during the time samples without goal setting intervention ($M = 20.11$, $SD = 2.98$), $t(14) = 1.19$, $p = .05$, $d = .38$. 
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

As a special education teacher, primarily focused on serving students with emotional and behavioral disorders, I have consistently looked for ways to improve students’ overall experience at school. Students are referred to my classroom for varying levels of low grades, low motivation and work ethic toward school, low self-esteem at school, and struggles controlling their emotions and behaviors. As a former athlete and current coach, I started implementing goal setting early on in my teaching career, first in athletics and then in the classroom. I first came across S.M.A.R.T. goal setting strategies in 2012, and started facilitating individual goal meetings once a week with students that had completed S.M.A.R.T. goal setting lessons and were able to set basic goals. I initially saw a lot of success, some quantitative (grades, less missing assignments, less discipline referrals), but mostly qualitative and intrinsic in nature (better attitude, better social skills with peers and adults, more motivation and ownership toward education). These results for the weekly goal meetings I run on broad academic and social/behavioral goals are still very successful to this day.

In 2014 while teaching high school special education, I started using MobyMax two days a week in math classes I was teaching, as I was having a hard time differentiating for having freshman through seniors in one math period due to high caseload numbers. The students did fantastic, being taught brief five to ten minute lessons whenever finishing a previous lesson at their own pace, and then getting back to work on the material at hand.

These two successful strategies were combined in this study. Although adjustments to the aforementioned strategies were made to accommodate to my
current classroom situation and the needs of this study, the basis of combining two
successful strategies into one had me very excited for the potential positive influence
the implementation of the perimeters of this study could have on my students.

My research set out to examine the relationship between daily student goal
setting in math and reading classes and student achievement, specifically the rate and
accuracy at which work is completed, and self-efficacy. The study was built on prior
studies on the effects that goal setting had on students’ academic achievement (e.g.
Martin and Elliot, 2016) and self-efficacy (e.g. Buzza and Dol, 2015), with most studies
being focused on self-efficacy. I questioned whether daily individual goal setting would
coincide with more efficient (faster, more accurate) student achievement and higher
levels of student self-efficacy.

I hypothesized that, relative to time samples in which no goal setting intervention
was used, student achievement and self-efficacy would have increased, on average, in
reading and math classes during time samples in which daily goal setting was
implemented. Student achievement was defined as the rate and accuracy at which a
student learns academics in a determined amount of time (Carter, 2016), while
self-efficacy was defined as the belief one has for themselves that they can accomplish
the task at hand (Self-Efficacy Theory, n.d.).

After re-teaching S.M.A.R.T goal setting practices to the students that would be
participating in the study, I introduced them to the goal setting templates that we would
eventually be using. We set up a system on days that the study was being administered.
Students would fill out and get their daily student goal sheets checked by me. The equal
time sample study ran for four total phases, two phases in
which data was collected and no goal setting intervention was administered or offered, and two phases in which goal setting was administered. The phases alternated, starting with a phase of no goal setting, and each phase lasted three weeks.

Martin and Elliot (2016) assessed the effects of personal best goal setting on math achievement on 89 elementary and secondary school students, split into two groups. Personal best goals focus on setting a specific target for an upcoming assessment, which is a part of S.M.A.R.T goal setting. They found that the treatment group showed greater growth in achievement than the control group, thus concluding that goal setting may help increase student achievement. This study in particular had me excited about the possibility of the results we could see, specifically on student achievement.

In addition, a study by Moeller, et al. (2012) found that after 5 years of collecting data, a statistically significant relationship between the goal-setting process and language achievement was found. This study was also cause for optimism, as the time that was able to be used in this study added further to the validity of the study, and hopefully further making a case for goal setting in academic settings.

From all of the studies that I have examined, an overwhelming majority displayed distinct positive effects on student achievement and/or self-efficacy after and during goal setting interventions. While my study did not garner the level of results that I hypothesized, there were some limitations and delimitations to the study. When looking at specific student scores on rate and comparing that with accuracy, there was often a negative relationship between the two. If a student had a extremely high rate of completion, it often coincided with a lower accuracy percentage, and vice versa. Also, specifically in math, some material was tougher for students than others (lowering
percentages) and some of the unit’s problems took much longer to do (e.g. long
division) than did other units (e.g. adding coins and bills up to five dollars). Additionally,
in reading class, two of the students in the study were given a separate intervention, 10
minutes, 2 times per week in reading, as their reading scores were falling behind. This
additional intervention was not administered to all students. Lastly, from my
observations, daily goal setting became a “chore” after a while for my middle school
students. I think the demographics of my caseload (emotional and behavior disabilities)
could have been a factor, as well as the age of the students. Possibly, younger students
would tolerate daily goal setting more readily than middle or high school students, such
as in some of the studies previously examined (e.g. Allito, et al., 2016; Martin and Elliot,
2016; Smithson, 2012)

As seen in the results section, I also had students leave our school while the
study was in progress, thus removing their data for subsequent phases, and further
creating an even smaller sample size by the later phases of the study.

In conclusion, while my results were not as substantial or conclusive as other
previous studies on goal setting and student achievement and self-efficacy that were
examined and my hypothesis was not fully supported, I still think that there are benefits
of goal setting instruction and implementation for educators and all levels and discipline
areas. An overwhelming majority of the studies examined saw positive impacts on
achievement and/or self-efficacy. I think teachers that are flexible with their
implementation of goal setting practices and try to adapt the implementation of goal
setting to best meet their students needs will see positive results in student
achievement and self-efficacy over time.
References


Klauda, S. L., & Guthrie, J. T. (2014). Comparing relations of motivation, engagement,


Self-Efficacy Theory. (n.d.). Retrieved from

http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?vid=19&sid=ef7d6ad5-9314-4fcb-a7cb-d3fba26828f5@sessionmgr101&hid=107&bdata=JkF1dGhUeXBIPWlwLHVpzCZzaXRIPWOb3N0LWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ==#db=ehh&AN=89233346

APPENDIX A: IRB APPROVAL LETTER

9/23/2016

Brandon Peyer
Sponsor: Dale Henze and Betsy Klinger
Department of School of Education
University of Wisconsin-Platteville

RE: IRB Protocol #2016-17-07

Project Title: The Relationship Between Goal Setting and Student Achievement

Approval Date: 9/21/2016
Expiration Date: 9/20/2017

Your project has been approved by the University of Wisconsin-Platteville IRB via a Full Board Review. This approval is subject to the following conditions, otherwise approval may be suspended:

1. No participants may be involved in the study prior to the IRB approval date listed above or after the expiration date.
2. All unanticipated or serious adverse events must be reported to the IRB.
3. All modifications to procedures, participant selection, and instruments used (surveys, consent forms, etc) must be reported to the IRB chair prior to their use. Extensive modifications may require full board approval.
4. If the project will continue beyond the expiration date, then the researcher must file for a continuation with the IRB at least 14 days prior to the expiration date. If the IRB approval for this project expires before approval for continuation is given, then a new protocol must be filled out and submitted. Federal guidelines allow for no exceptions to this rule. Any data collected after the expiration date cannot be used in the study.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB chair at the address below. Include your protocol # on all correspondence.

Sincerely,

Dr. Barb Barnet

Dr. Barb Barnet
Institutional Review Board Chair
Professor, Mathematics Department
Gardner 451
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
(608) 342-1942
barnetb@uwplatt.edu
APPENDIX B: PROJECT MATERIALS

Academic Efficacy subscale from Patterns of Adaptive Learning Scales (PALS)  
Midgley et al., (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Somewhat true</th>
<th>Very true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I’m certain I can master the skills taught in class this year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I’m certain I can figure out how to do the most difficult class work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I can do almost all the work in class if I don’t give up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Even if the work is hard, I can learn it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can do even the hardest work in this class if I try.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Daily Goal Setting Template

Name ____________________________________________

By the end of class today, I will ____________________________________________

by ____________________________________________.

Example - By the end of class today, I will have an 80% or better on the math problems I complete today by working hard and asking questions when I am stuck.
PARENT/GUARDIAN CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION OF HUMAN PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-PLATTEVILLE & WEBB MIDDLE SCHOOL

1. Purpose: The purpose of this research is to determine the relationship between daily student goal setting and academic achievement at Webb Middle School.

2. Procedure: For 2 minutes at the beginning of some of your child’s math and/or reading classes, your child will set a goal for what they would like to accomplish that hour. Students will also be asked to take a 1 minute survey every 3 weeks. All other classroom procedures will beunchanging. PARTICIPATION IS VOLUNTARY AND HE/SHE WILL BE ASKED TO GIVE HIS/HER ASSENT. YOUR CHILD’S NAME WILL NOT BERecorded ON THE RESEARCH MATERIALS AND IT WILL NOT BE INCLUDED IN OUR DATA SET OR IN ANY REPORTS ABOUT THE PROJECT.

3. Time Required: If you and your child agree to participation in the study/data collection, all time required will be during regular class time, therefore no additional time is needed. All students will be engaging in the activities during class. Responses will only be record if permission is granted.

4. Risks: No short-term or long-term risks are foreseen.

5. Benefits: Students will engage in daily student-centered goal setting in reading and/or math classes. Goal setting has been shown to improve student motivation, self-efficacy, and self-regulation.

6. Your Rights as the Parent of a Student Participant: The information gathered in this study will be confidential. Data or summarized results will not be released in any way that could identify you or your child. If your child would like to withdraw from the study at any time, he/she may do so without penalty or repercussions. The information collected from your child up to that point would be destroyed. If you have any questions afterward, please ask:

Brandon Peyer, Graduate Student in Education
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Special Education at Webb Middle School
Phone Number: 608-768-8930
Email: bpeyer@sd.k12.wi.us

Faculty Sponsors: Dale Henze (henzed@uwplatt.edu)
Betsy Klinger (klingerb@uwplatt.edu)

Once the study is completed, you may request a summary of the results by contacting me (Brandon Peyer) or Casey Campbell, Webb Middle School Principal.

________________________________________________________________________

I have read the above information and (check one):

____ DO give consent for my child to participate in the research.

____ DO NOT give consent for my child to participate in the research.

Please print your child’s name (First, Middle, Last):

Please print your full name (First, Middle, Last):

Please sign: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Then return this completed form to ____________________________ by ____________________________
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STUDENT ASSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-PLATTEVILLE
WEBB MIDDLE SCHOOL, REEDSBURG SCHOOL DISTRICT

Dear Student,

We want to provide the best education possible to you and to future students. Therefore, we are conducting a research project. You are invited to participate in our study on goal setting and student academic achievement.

The purpose of our study to examine the possible effects of goal setting on student achievement in reading and math. You are being asked to participate in this study because you are in Mr. Peyer’s math and/or reading class.

Whether you participate in this study or not will have absolutely no impact on your grades. The information gathered in this study will be used to help make Webb Middle School a better, more engaging place for you and your classmates.

Your parents have already given permission for you to participate in our research project and we are hoping that you will agree to participate. Your voluntary completion of the survey constitutes your agreement (assent) to participate. Thank you for helping us to better help you.

If you do not agree to participate, please tell me as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Brandon Peyer, Graduate Student in Education
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Special Education at Webb Middle School
Phone Number: 608-768-8930
Email: bpeyer@rsd.k12.wi.us
Faculty Sponsors: Dale Henze (henzed@uwplatt.edu) and Betsy Klinger (klingerb@uwplatt.edu)

Casey Campbell
Principal, Webb Middle School
608-768-8930
KCampbell@rsd.k12.wi.us

If you have any questions about your treatment as a participant in this study, please call or write either of us or contact:

Barb Barnet
Chair of the UW-Platteville IRB
(608) 342-1942 barnetb@uwplatt.edu
TO: Casey Campbell  
FROM: Brandon Peyer  
RE: Request for Permission to Conduct Research at Webb Middle School, Reedsburg.  
DATE: July 21, 2016

In the completion of my master's degree at the University of Wisconsin-Platteville, I am required to conduct an action/applied research project. I am asking permission to collect data at our school. The IRB proposal describes my study, identifies who I would like to participate, and requests your approval. Once the study is completed, I will share a summary of the results with you.

Attached is a copy of my research protocol/proposal. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or my faculty sponsor.

Thank you,

Brandon Peyer, Researcher  
Dr. Joan Riedle, Faculty Sponsor  
Department of Psychology  
University of Wisconsin-Platteville  
riedlej@uwplatt.edu

I give consent for Brandon Peyer to conduct his research on goal setting and student achievement, using MobyMax for data collection, at Webb Middle School.

☐ Yes, I give consent.  
☐ No, I do not give consent.

Casey Campbell  
Principal

Name  Signature  Title
### Math - Achievement Rate (problems per minute)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.106666667</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>0.605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Math - Achievement Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>67.333333333</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Math - Self-Efficacy (out of 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reading - Achievement Rate (problems per class)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>25.33333333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading - Achievement Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>65.34</td>
<td>68.05</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76.566666667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading - Self-Efficacy (out of 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Phase VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.33333333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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