



Application, page 3

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON HUMAN SUBJECTS PROTOCOL FORM

NOTE: To complete the application, first highlight the appropriate pages. Then, using the edit option on the tool bar, copy and paste the form into your word processing program. Feel free to use as much space as you need to answer the questions. The form must be typed (12 point font), printed single-sided, and an original plus three clear copies (four altogether) submitted to the CPHS/IRB. Refer to the [protocol checklist](#) for a list of all materials needed to submit a completed protocol. Questions concerning the forms or procedures should be directed to the Office of Human Subjects Compliance, at (541) 346-2510. Room location: Riverfront Research Park, Suite 106. (Protocol pages must be numbered).

1. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

a. Purpose of research (may include brief references to literature)

The purpose of this study is to examine *how* current prison arts programmers organize, fund, develop, execute and maintain an arts program in prison. After answering these questions, the researcher will summarize the data retrieved from prison arts facilitators in order *to develop* a prison arts programming model to be utilized by arts programmers in both prison and non-prison settings.

b. Specific research objectives

- 1) Hypotheses, questions to be answered, data to be tested or gathered

Objectives of this project include:

- identifying how arts facilitators in prisons define ‘prison arts programming’, identifying the perceived benefits for inmates
- the institution and the community if arts programming is supported and implemented in a prison setting

- What prison arts programs are offered? Why?
- Identifying if collaborations occur between the prison and outside community arts agencies? How are they initiated? Frequency?

2) Relevance to continuing work in the field

Potential benefits of this study is the ability to more accurately define and interpret the current state of the arts in prison by interviewing key facilitators on their experiences and knowledge. The study will also benefit the field of arts administration and prison arts programming by building a model prison arts program based on these interviews, literature and researcher knowledge.

- c. Brief discussion of academic background and experience for principal investigator and all key personnel (include special training or copies of certificates, e.g., safety training for the Lewis Center for Neuroimaging or Advanced Cardiac Life Support)

The researcher has completed an undergraduate Bachelor of Arts in Art History and Political Science at the University of Oregon in 2002. She is currently pursuing her Master's of Arts in Arts & Administration at the University of Oregon while building relevant experience in the field of arts programming, criminal justice and arts advocacy through volunteering. The researcher has worked for 6 months at Lane County's Juvenile Detention Center as a detention volunteer, assisting youth with tutoring, arts activities and counseling. The researcher has previously worked as liaison to the 'Art of Death Row' exhibit held in conjunction with the Wayne Morse Center's *Law & Politics of Death Row* Symposium held in 2001 at the University of Oregon. An internship during the summer of 2003 at the San Francisco Arts Commission in San Francisco,

California proved highly valuable in developing her public and community arts programming skills and experiences.

2. DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT POPULATION(S)

- a. Source and description of subject population (e.g., age-range, gender, ethnicity, etc.) NOTE: Whenever any human subject in a research protocol becomes a prisoner at any time during the study, the investigator must report this situation to the Office of Human Subjects Compliance.

One subject is a white female in her mid-80's and has worked at the Lane County Jail as a volunteer and arts programmer for thirty years. The second subject is a white male in his 50's and has worked as an arts programmer at the Sheridan Federal Prison in Oregon for over twenty years.

- b. Number of subjects

Two subjects: 1 male, 1 female.

- c. Recruitment procedures (i.e., how subjects are identified, accessed, assured voluntary participation, etc.)

Both subjects were chosen based on references to them in the field of arts programming in prisons through the media, websites or word of mouth as being 'stand-outs' in their field.

- d. Criteria and method for including/excluding subjects (e.g., screening forms, MRI Screening Questionnaire, etc.)

Subjects were chosen based on proximity to researcher and experience, knowledge and notoriety in the field of arts programming. Subject's names and contact information was given to the

researcher via word of mouth conversations with interested parties in the field of corrections. Time and distance were deciding factors in determining how many subjects to interview and from which local.

- e. Rationale for using vulnerable populations (children, people with intellectual or developmental disabilities, prisoners, pregnant women, fetuses)

This study does not use vulnerable populations.

- f. Include copy of advertisement, recruitment letter, telephone/verbal script, and any other subject recruitment documents, if applicable (NOTE: Advertisements/scripts need to include the following: (1) clearly stated purpose, (2) type of research, (3) an approach that is honest and straight forward, (4) ages of eligibility, (5) contact person's name, department, institution, and (6) benefits, if any.)

This study did not recruit or advertise for subjects to be interviewed. Subjects were chosen based on their experience in the field, proximity to the researcher and popularity within the field of corrections in which the researcher spent a great deal of time volunteering.

3. METHODOLOGY

A qualitative means for examining current prison arts programs via literature and web-based research is necessary to grasp a more well-defined definition of arts programming in American prisons. The exploratory nature of this method allowed the research to direct itself to the perceived most relevant issue – developing a prison arts programming model. Due to the lack of cohesion in the field of prison arts program facilitators, the development of a model arts program for prisons should be extremely useful.

- a. Location of study

Eugene, Oregon and possibly Portland, Oregon area (pending contact and interview scheduling with Sheridan Federal Prison Arts Facilitator).

- b. Activities involving subjects

One interview (preferably face-to-face, or email) per Prison Arts Facilitator.

- c. Frequency and duration of each activity

One interview each with each Facilitator for no longer than one hour.

- d. Method of data collection (Questionnaires, interviews, observations, standardized tests, other. Attach copies of all instruments, including interview protocols)

Interviews – see attached interview questions (questions are the same for both subjects)

- e. Existing data to be used? If yes, specify. Clarify if coded data will be used and indicate if a collaborator retains the key to the code, even though the researcher may not have access to subject identifiers.

Existing data will not be used.

4. DATA DISPOSITION

- a. Method of data recording (field notes, audiotape, videotape, computer entry, other)

The researcher will take field notes during face-to-face interviews, or will conduct interviews via email and will record notes electronically, in both cases.

- b. Procedures to maintain confidentiality (coding, pseudonyms, storage, access to data)

Confidentiality will be maintained by referring to subjects based on their type of prison (i.e. Federal or County) unless otherwise requested during the interview process. Storage and access to the interview data will reside with the researcher and the advisor.

- c. Plans for maintaining and destroying data after study is completed (e.g., when will the code list, videotapes, and/or audiotapes be destroyed/erased)

Notes and emails will be destroyed per subject's requests.

- d. If the data are kept, indicate purpose (data analysis, training, conferences, etc.)

The researcher has no further purpose for the original data collected. Records of interviews may be given back to subjects upon their request.

- e. If the project has been submitted for funding or is funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and requires a Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (DSMP), the DSMP procedures need to be described

N/A

5. POTENTIAL BENEFITS

- a. Benefits to subjects, if any

Potential benefits of this study is the ability to more accurately define and interpret the current state of the arts in prison by interviewing key facilitators on their experiences and knowledge. They may also benefit from knowing that they contributed to the field of arts administration and prison arts programming by helping to build a model prison arts program based on their interviews, literature and researcher knowledge.

- 1) If applicable, amount of compensation (financial, course credit) and schedule for compensating subjects throughout study

N/A

- b. Benefits to general subject population, if any

The field of arts programming in prisons is rather scattered and non-cohesive. The product of this research, a model prison arts program, will help to provide a basis of information as well as a tool for future prison arts programmers to follow. Subsequent research, projects and models may result from this basic model which, in turn, has the capability to yield a more consistent and informed prison arts programmer.

- c. Benefits to science and humanity

The product itself may help institutions, which had not previously employed a prison arts program, the initiative, precedent and tools for initiating one. Arts administrators have long supported the value of art in developing the human creative mind and providing an alternate means of communicating in a very expressive and personal way. This research and arts programming model was created with the intent of benefiting human kind, especially the lives and futures of those imprisoned in America. Providing an outlet through art while within prison has the capability of instituting a more orderly prison atmosphere and community as well as a more successful offender upon release. The community's opportunity to involve itself within the arena of collaborations, partnerships and volunteer sessions with their local prison community might lead to lasting relationships and arts supporters post-incarceration. The prisoner's life, well-being, expression and rehabilitation is the driving focus behind this research.

6. POTENTIAL RISKS

Federal regulations define "minimal risk" as follows: "The probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests." (See examples of risk in packet.)

- a. Physical--identify, describe, and categorize as None, Minimal, More than Minimal or Unknown

None.

- b. Psychological--identify, describe, and categorize as None, Minimal, More than Minimal or Unknown

None.

- c. Social/Economic--identify, describe, and categorize as None, Minimal, More than Minimal or Unknown

None.

- d. Legal--identify, describe, and categorize as None, Minimal, More than Minimal or Unknown

None.

- e. Loss of confidentiality--identify, describe, and categorize as None, Minimal, More than Minimal or Unknown

Minimal (see Section 3, Methodology).

7. PRECAUTIONS TAKEN TO MINIMIZE RISKS (Describe procedures to minimize identified "Minimal" and/or "More than Minimal" risks)

N/A

8. METHOD OF OBTAINING INFORMED CONSENT (Describe how study will be explained to subjects and attach informed consent documents)
Note: If Protected Health Information (PHI) will be collected on subjects,
information and forms available at ([HIPAA Instructions](#))

A written consent form will be presented and explained prior to the interview of the subject.