

TEI Stakeholder Feedback Group • 2017-04 Proposal Reviews

Alignment to Performance Indicators	Comments on Performance Indicators	Documented Need	Comments Documentation of Need	Literature Review	Comments Lit Review	Leading Programs Research	Comments: Ldg Progra	Contextual Constraints	Comments Context Constraints	Risk Assessment	Comments Risk Assmnt	Funding	Comments Funding	Comments Narrative	Summary Comments
3	Boxes were not checked; based decision on overall review of proposal.	2		3	While multiple sources were used the summary was weaker than others.	2		1		4		3		While budget is broken down there is no clear narrative.	
3		3		3		3		3		3		3			
3		3		3		4		3		4		3			
4		4		3		3		3		3		3			
4		4		3		4		3		2		3			
4		4		4		3		1	When looking at the proposal I did not see any of the boxes checked for the constraints. Reading through the proposal I can see how these were addressed.	4		4			

TEI Stakeholder Feedback Group • 2017-04 Proposal Reviews

Alignment to Performance Indicators	Comments on Performance Indicators	Documented Need	Comments Documentation of Need	Literature Review	Comments Lit Review	Leading Programs Research	Comments: Ldg Progra	Contextual Constraints	Comments Context Constraints	Risk Assessment	Comments Risk Assmnt	Funding	Comments Funding	Comments Narrative	Summary Comments
3	Although several indicators are listed, it appears that only 3 would be directly addressed	2	Although there is a need for highly qualified special education teachers in WY, this proposal does not provide enough information to assure this reviewer that the needs will be addressed or exactly how they will be addressed	2	Again, there is not enough information in the methods of how the program will be developed to make a determination.	1	Although Akron was listed, the information provided in this proposal did not clarify how that information would be utilized	1	limited information provided	1	none provided	2	A table was provided, but supporting narrative was limited	This project is intriguing in theory. Unfortunately, the proposal does not provide enough information to make a determination.	This reviewer suggests that this proposal be resubmitted with much more detail to understand how such an ambitious project would unfold. Additionally, the writing must be considerably more clear. For example, what is an LEA? Although this reviewer searched multiple times in the introductory paragraphs, LEA was not defined. Also, a representative from Big Horn school district was listed as a collaborator, but Cheyenne, Sheridan, and Fremont schools were identified as consultants or mentors. Why this disparity? The proposal needs to be made much more clear.
1	Performance indicators are listed in the proposal, but there are none checked. If this proposal meets all the indicators, which I believe it does, there is no narrative.	4	Lots of outreach to stakeholder groups.	3		1	The mixed methods approach seems to focus solely on Wyoming stakeholders.	1		4		3	The narrative is weak. The strength of this program is that it will address K-12.	I have mixed feelings about this proposal. It is funded by the US Dept of Ed. I would feel more favorable. I just didn't feel that this was really thought through.	

TEI Stakeholder Feedback Group • 2017-04 Proposal Reviews

Alignment to Performance Indicators	Comments on Performance Indicators	Documented Need	Comments Documentation of Need	Literature Review	Comments Lit Review	Leading Programs Research	Comments: Ldg Progra	Contextual Constraints	Comments Context Constraints	Risk Assessment	Comments Risk Assmnt	Funding	Comments Funding	Comments Narrative	Summary Comments
3	Unfortunately, the proposal did not complete this portion of the proposal. However, based on my assessment, the proposal covers Key Performance Indicators 1. through 4.	4	I appreciate that this proposal took a holistic view of special education and its need throughout the state. They plan to involve mentors and novice educators throughout the state based on specific guidelines.	2	While a thorough and complete list of literature was provided in the proposal, there was barely an explanation of how the literature provided evidence that supports this proposal.	2	According to this proposal, their was only one evaluation of an external program. No summary was provided for this evaluation.	1		4	Not addressed at all within the proposal	2	This budget was detailed and itemized. It did not include a budget narrative explaining how it addressed the need.	The proposal narrative included an excellent timeline to begin this new special education program over fours years. I understood very easily to purpose and need of this program.	The evaluation data of surveys and town halls showed an excellent breadth in justifying the need for this proposal. There were too many gaps and portions of the proposal itself that were not addressed. See my previous comments in this survey.
4	Reviewing the proposal I am comfortable with its Vision and Mission statement. Proposal Initiative Goals 1 thru 5 are well thought out and organizationally sound.	4	Evidence of need is throughout Wyoming is addressed thoroughly.	4	The Literature Review utilizes the latest in research from around the country that is most recent. I will mention again I did not see much research that addressed Native American students.		no comment ...	4	Weaknesses as outlined on page 67 "could" be identified as contextual constraints. But with identification(s) the TEI leave no unknown variable and is positioned to move forward progressively and positively.	3	I hope that the "Cadre of National Experts" has prominent Native American scholars on board to review and participate.	4	Budget narrative appears to be in order, breakdown by years.	I am in agreement with the proposal narrative.
32	TOTAL	34	TOTAL	30	TOTAL	23	TOTAL	21	TOTAL	32	TOTAL	30	TOTAL	GRAND TOTAL	202
3.20	MEAN	3.40	MEAN	3.00	MEAN	2.56	MEAN	2.10	MEAN	3.20	MEAN	3.00	MEAN		