

2017-12 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: National Expert Reviewer

Innovation Rating: 1

Innovation Comments: At the core, the proposal is for the College of Education to join an existing effort. The effort itself - the Deans for Impact initiative to research the utility of using a shared set of tools across institutions to attempt to identify the the most salient characteristics of effective programs -- is quite innovative. However, from the proposal and supporting materials, it appears that the College of Education of the University of Wyoming has not been involved in the conceptualization of this initiative, nor has it been involved in vetting and selecting the tools to be used. While it may be a laudable goal to join this effort, what would have made this proposal innovative is if a plan had been presented to build buy-in from the faculty and to utilize the data gathered for the purposes of improving the program at the University of Wyoming. Neither of these attributes seem to apply to this proposal.

Performance Indicator Rating: 3

Performance Indicator Comments: It is difficult to determine which key performance indicators would be met by the proposal. Certainly joining a consortium as proposed would affect 1) statewide perceptions of the College of Education, likely in a positive manner. It would also likely require 4) executed active clinical partnerships in order to gather the data required. It MIGHT help with 6) national CAEP accreditation. It is unclear whether joining a consortium to gather experimental data would affect any of the other key performance indicators.

Documentation of Need Rating: 1

Documentation of Need Comments: The evidence of need is provided very generally, in terms of doing benefit to the field. The participation of the University of Wyoming in the Deans for Impact study would certainly help the Deans for Impact study, but it is unclear from the proposal how it would help the University or the state of Wyoming. There is no indication that work has been done to create the type of faculty coalition that would be required in order to successfully participate in the Deans for Impact initiative. In addition, there is no indication that there are plans to use the data beyond what is required for the study. That means that a lot of work will go into an effort that will not have any immediate impact on the University of Wyoming College of Education or its graduates.

Literature Review Rating: 4

Literature Review Comments: The issue with this proposal is not that the practices will not yield desired outcomes, it is simply that the desired outcomes are advancement of the field of teacher education research in determining the utility of particular tools chosen by external parties, rather than advancement of the programs of the college of education. The proposal indicates multiple times that it is important to begin with the end in mind. But what is the end for the University of Wyoming College of Education? If the data that will be gathered for the study are to have any utility to the College, work must first be done to bring together a group of University of Wyoming faculty to identify the core outcomes desired for the College's graduates. Those outcomes MAY match or have significant overlap with those of the Deans for Impact initiative, but without the identification of those ends -- what is most important to the faculty of the University of Wyoming College of Education -- the participation in the study has little potential to assist the College in its continuous improvement efforts.

Leading Programs Rating: 4

Leading Programs Comments: Again, the Deans for Impact study has evaluated many external programs to select the core set of tools for assessment of a common set of program metrics. However, there is no indication that the faculty at the University of Wyoming College of Education have any buy-in to these tools or these metrics. The Wyoming faculty were not involved in the development of the Deans for Impact initiative, and there is no indication that there has been groundwork laid (or planned) to build the type of buy-in necessary for the results of the study to have any impact on the programs of the College. In other words, it may very well be a good thing for the field of teacher education for many universities to come together and test a core set of shared tools and metrics. However, for the participation of the University of Wyoming to be a good thing for the University and for Wyoming, those core set of shared tools and metrics must be aligned to the continuous improvement goals of a significant subset of the faculty of the College.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments: There are two very significant issues with the contextual constraints identified in the proposal. First, the financial impact of the work as described is limited to faculty training and part-time data analysis staffing. What is missing here is the huge financial burden of taking on the collection and storage and analytical capacity of massive amounts of quantitative and qualitative data. This will be sure to have a significant technology cost as well as staffing costs in gathering, entering, processing, and cleaning the data so that it is valid and reliable enough to be used for

2017-12 Feedback and National Reviews

the study. Second, the "state policy and statute forbidding the collection of teacher effectiveness measures connected to P-12 student achievement outcomes in the state of Wyoming" is sure to be a significant barrier, if not for the study itself, for the application of this work to continuous improvement efforts for the College of Education. If the College is truly seeking to "begin with the end in mind", certainly the end would be producing teachers that have a significant positive effect on student outcomes! If this cannot even be measured, it seems highly improbable that participation in the study will have a significant impact on the College's continuous improvement abilities.

Risk Assessment Rating: 1

Risk Assessment Comments: Data privacy is a serious issue, and simply saying that "we will insist that the data be used..." is not enough to address these concerns. Clear documentation and technology infrastructure to protect candidate, teacher, and student privacy would be necessary, if not for participation in the study, certainly for the use of the data gathered beyond the study. This would require additional technology, staffing, and financial resources not described in the proposal.

Funding Rating: 1

Funding Comments: The proposal budgets for the training of faculty to be involved in the study. While this may be satisfactory for the purposes of joining a study, this proposal is not viable unless the result of the work has some immediate and/or long-term benefit for the University, the College, and the state of Wyoming. The identification of factors that might relate to the effectiveness of programs in the aggregate does not provide direct benefits for the University, the College, or the state of Wyoming unless other structures are put in place to use the data for the purposes of continuous improvement of the College. In order to put those structures in place, a significantly greater financial investment would be required -- for privacy protections, data gathering, data input, data cleaning, data matching, data analysis, and the technology infrastructure required for all of this. In addition, there is a personnel cost that is not addressed in the proposal at all -- there is no indication that a significant subset of faculty at the University of Wyoming College of Education are even in agreement that the core set of tools and metrics identified by the Deans for Impact are the most appropriate tools and metrics for the College and its programs. Without this buy-in prior to engagement in the initiative, it is unlikely that there will be much long-term benefit for the institution to participating in the study, even if the study does result in material that is helpful to the field in general.

Narrative Comments: The narrative makes clear why it is important to have a common core of data across educator preparation programs, and why the Deans for Impact initiative has chosen the indicators it has chosen. What is not clear is why joining this initiative would be an innovative and beneficial investment for the University of Wyoming College of Education. What is the success metric here? Why will faculty buy in? How much will it cost to move from study participation to results that can actually be implemented locally? What will the University, the College, its programs, and the state of Wyoming gain from participation in this initiative? Without answers to these questions, it is unclear whether the investment in funds, personnel, technology, time and other resources is worth the cost.

Summary Comments: The proposal presents an intriguing idea: the University of Wyoming College of Education could join the Deans for Impact effort to identify a common set of tools and performance metrics to improve teacher education programs. However, it stops short of explaining why this would be a benefit to the University, the College, its programs, and the state of Wyoming. Certainly there is potential for this to be locally helpful, but the types of structures necessary for that to happen - data privacy protections, faculty buy-in, agreement on the "ends" that the college is trying to achieve through its programs - are missing from the proposal. Therefore, it is unclear how joining the Deans for Impact initiative, as suggested by this proposal, would result in local innovation.

2017-12 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 2

Funding Comments: Cost containment should be viewed positively as an opportunity to level set by investing in the programs that are most important and impactful while eliminate those that are ineffective. This would allow for a positive environment and better buy-in in the various communities. Too often education is viewed as hide bound and more concerned with teacher and administrator compensation than in student performance. Making these strategic at a local level could be hugely important.

Narrative Comments: Please see earlier comments.

Summary Comments: This is a particularly important time in our state to make wise use of our funding for education. It is a time to be clear and vocal in the decision making process. Any tax increase will be met with a very negative reaction in most communities. Since the boom years ended both business and industry have become much more efficient, but education is largely unchanged.

2017-12 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-12 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: OVERALL AVERAGE RATING

Innovation Rating: 2.333

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3.000

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2.333

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3.333

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3.333

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3.000

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 2.333

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 2.000

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-12 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: STAKEHOLDER AVERAGE RATING

Innovation Rating: 3.000

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3.000

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3.000

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3.000

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3.000

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3.000

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3.000

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 2.500

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: