

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** School of Teacher Education Faculty

**Innovation Rating:** 2

**Innovation Comments:** The summer institutes and uses of simulations are the primary innovations. Recruitment clubs, concurrent enrollment, induction programs, full year residencies, and in kind repayment commitments are not new, with some already being used at UW in general. The involvement of UW Theater students and faculty is interesting and falls under the category of simulations.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 2

**Performance Indicator Comments:** This proposal is well aligned with KPI's 4 and 5. Statewide perception, as suggested in the risks, would be limited to areas and districts that adopt the high school organizations. The complexity of the 10 phase program, along with long term commitments to stay in Wyoming, could be a deterrent to enrollment. The stipends for students include tuition and a living allowance, but other states such as Utah, may be offering better deals to entice Wyoming residents.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 1

**Documentation of Need Comments:** The literature review focuses on national needs, so ratings 2-4 would not directly apply. The fact that the UWCOE places students in a limited number of districts, does not document need in the other areas of the state. Along this line, we currently place students in Laramie CSD#1, Albany CSD#1, Sweetwater CSD#1 and #2, Natrona CSD#1, Sheridan CSD#2, Campbell CSD#1, and several Fremont CSD's, along with a smattering of smaller districts based on students' needs. I am not sure why the proposal states that only 6 districts are serving as partners. This can and should increase, so this comment is focused more on accuracy in the proposal.

**Literature Review Rating:** 2

**Literature Review Comments:** The issues are presented, but only a few of the solutions in the proposal are supported with literature. Induction, mentor teacher development, and partnered placements are addressed with the literature selection, but I do not see any references to successful recruitment practices, the benefits of year long residency experiences, the use of digital or role playing simulations, or in kind repayment programs. / The literature on the importance of teachers' depth of content knowledge is missing, but would challenge the compression of time for specialist knowledge development to 2 years. Regardless of policies set by the PTSB or the university on the amount of content required for secondary education, the research is clear that depth of content knowledge, as part of pedagogical content knowledge, is absolutely critical. I am not convinced that the proposed practices would yield desired outcomes related to content understanding.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** This question is loaded, as it is easy to list 3+ programs and then achieve a 4 rating. The evidence is not provided, however, on what was learned from evaluating the programs or even how the evaluations took place.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** The use of technology and partnerships are proposed as solutions.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** An important risk that is missing from the list is that the proposed program may actually do harm to students by not providing satisfactory preparation. / Also, what if a student is marginal, passes the program but is not wanted by any district in Wyoming? For that matter, what if Wyoming remains in an economically depressed state and districts are not able to hire all of the graduates? They will be left with a hefty repayment cost.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** I am not sure where the template came from for the proposals, but it would have been helpful to have the narrative first. It would have helped me understand the risk assessment, budget, etc. to know what the heck was being proposed in the first place. /

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Summary Comments:** I greatly appreciate how the proposal acknowledged inevitable push back from the faculty. The results of this and the other surveys will need to take this into account, not by discounting faculty feedback, but by negotiating concerns as we move forward.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Education Teacher Education Faculty

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** I like the summer institutes and other ideas for identifying prospective students. I have concerns about other aspects of this proposal such as the emphasis on VR simulation and modules (online, I suspect) for key aspects of the program. I get that these approaches are innovative but I would love to see some evidence that they are effective

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**Documentation of Need Comments:** There surely are teacher shortages in some content areas but that is hardly true across the board, particularly for Wyoming. There is a glut of elementary teachers in this state and although many of our elementary majors would prefer to remain in Wyoming, there simply are not that many teaching vacancies year to year. This will be more true in coming years as school districts increase class sizes rather than hire additional teachers as a way of coping with limits in state funding. More specifics about the content areas with greatest need and school districts with greatest needs would be useful. In short, this proposal paints with a broad brush regarding national trends but offers few specifics related to Wyoming.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** I really wish that you wouldn't cite Teach for America in these proposals. That program has a dismal track record in terms of the effectiveness of the teachers or their persistence in the teaching profession.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** /

**Risk Assessment Rating:**

**Risk Assessment Comments:** I have huge concerns about moving toward extensive use of modules and VR simulations these will be profound changes to a program that is actually quite high functioning in its current form. I object to idea of making substantial changes just for the sake of doing things different. For the exact same reason I question year long residency. And I assure you that I am not the only faculty member who will have concerns along the lines above. / This might be a good place to include the constraints of funding this proposal. The budget fails to account for stipends, tuition, etc that kick in with Phase 9. I would think those expenses will be quite substantial.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:** I like the summer institutes idea and think that is a worthwhile use for TEI money. / I am concerned that the proposal fails to account for any of the expenses (stipends, tuition, etc) in Phase 9. I would think those expenses will be quite substantial. Also wondering if this program is sustainable beyond the short term.

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** School of Teacher Education Faculty

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** The practice described in the proposal is highly innovative. However, a more specific plan for students who are from linguistically diverse backgrounds (who are also often racially diverse backgrounds) would be pertinent to making the proposal even more innovative. For instance, students who are already bilinguals can become UW E4 Fellows. Nationwide, there is a shortage on bilingual teachers, and the bilingual UW E4 Fellows not only benefit those individuals but they can be future assets to the state and nation.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:** The proposal's documentation provides evidence of need throughout Wyoming.

**Literature Review Rating:** 4

**Literature Review Comments:** The proposal's literature review includes extensive evidence that practices predicted to yield outcomes.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 4

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** Again, I wonder if it is possible to include in the proposal narrative, the practices that pertain to students from diverse backgrounds more specifically rather than practices that pertain to all students including diverse population.

**Summary Comments:** The proposal is very Wyoming specific and caters to the very needs of Wyoming students and educators.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Education We no longer have departments, but my school is Teacher Education Faculty

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** Future teacher groups (like FTA, FEA...) aren't a new idea. What's innovative about this proposal is that student participants would accrue college credit while in high school. We are already set up in Wyoming with a number of options for this to happen, leveraging these opportunities to specifically target and begin preparing future teachers is a good idea.

**Performance Indicator Rating:**

**Performance Indicator Comments:** This proposal does address multiple TEI performance indicators.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:** Not sure why the need specific to regions piece is added. I don't recall any analysis in the proposal specific to state regions. Anyway, there is definitely a need to better connect with potential future teachers before they graduate from high school. The proposal notes, "interest among ACT tested graduates in becoming educators continues to decline at an alarming rate." I'm confident this is true. The negative press and publicity specific to teachers and teacher educators has now persisted for decades. K 12 students see their teachers under increasing amounts of stress and external pressure, so of course they're less interested being teachers. Unfortunately, these critiques are often lacking in data and research to support them. Berliner and Biddle started debunking this "schools and educators are failing" myth more than 20 years ago. It's disheartening for educators working their tails off to be told they aren't effective. The same thing has happened to us in the CoEd. We have been the victims of unsupported critiques ourselves, told we have a bad reputation in the state, told we aren't graduating effective teachers, etc., but when we've asked for data to support these critiques, none have been forthcoming. Do we have room for improvement, you bet! Are we the nation's 6th best elementary ed program as rated by college choice, probably not, but we also aren't the D grade assigned by NCTQ. At the end of the day, we are a pretty good program that could and should get better, but this improvement should be a grass roots effort and pursued initiatives should be practical and sustainable. Schooling is complex. Our student populations are changing. Our family structures have changed. The nature of communities has changed. Socio economic factors have changed (more economic stratification, dwindling middle class, etc.). All of these factors/changes make teaching more difficult. So yes, we do need to connect earlier with future teachers and share our stories with them that teaching still can be a highly rewarding career and they are the generation that can move our profession forward. That said, we need to continue to be selective about who gets into our program. Not everyone can or should be a teacher. Teaching requires a unique set of academic and personal traits. A student with a 14 on the ACT doesn't have the academic capability to support students' learning at high levels. E.g., a teacher once told me about a student teacher, "she can't teach the 6th grade math because she can't do the 6th grade math." She was right. Likewise, a student (potential teacher) with biased attitudes and negative perceptions about his/her students shouldn't be a teacher either. // Finally, in this section about need (and this applies to all three of these proposals) where is the data showing there is a dramatic need for teachers IN WYOMING? These proposals are designed to keep teachers in WY, but what if there aren't jobs for them? I understand there is an increasing national need, but that hasn't translated to our state. In fact, multiple districts are cutting teachers. If the idea is that our economy will soon improve and therefore districts will have a bunch of \$ to hire teachers, that's doubtful. Our leading economists predict our economic recovery will be "slow and painful." /

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** A number of the practices outlined in the literature review (e.g., strong induction, robust partnerships...) could/should lead to positive outcomes.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 1

**Leading Programs Comments:** Other programs were identified, and there are some good examples worth exploring, but I don't consider the info in the proposal an "evaluation."

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** I agree that obstacles like geographic dispersion are legitimate constants, but I also agree these can be overcome. // I was disheartened in this section to see this, "Districts that have no student teachers are disengaged from UWCOE at this time. Addressing that issue is not an innovation and will not go through TEI." This 1st part is true, and we all, right up to the president of our university, realize that we need to broaden the number of schools and districts we work with and place our students in. It's an essential need, and rectifying this situation will be better for our program, better for our state, and better for our graduates. What's disheartening is that our seemingly highest priority needs, needs identified by the faculty and others, are outside the scope of initiative because they are not "innovative." Sorry folks, but just because something is presented as new or innovative doesn't mean it's good or a priority. Our priorities are things like curriculum and assessment revision and alignment (and this could happen in the

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

context of creating a series of "modules" as was done in the Sanford Inspire program), partnering with many more WY school districts, increasing the quantity and quality of field experiences, designing and implementing a systematic research program in the WTEP, figuring out ways to better meet the needs of students of color, 2nd language learners, and poor students (as these are the students we are failing in public schooling)... It saddens me to hear that the biggest needs of our programs, the activities that would truly work us toward excellence, are outside the scope of the initiative because they aren't "innovative." Guess what, future teacher clubs, post bac programs, and distance delivery aren't new or innovative either, and labeling them with creative acronyms doesn't make them so.

### **Risk Assessment Rating: 2**

**Risk Assessment Comments:** "Developing and implementing the multi pronged UW E4 model simultaneous to continuing the historic traditional model will require significant effort from existing UW College of Education faculty and staff." This proposal excerpt identifies what I consider to be problematic about all 3 proposals. I don't think we have enough faculty to continue offering the "traditional" program alongside a bunch of new programs. In my estimation, we've lost nearly 100 credit hours of quality teaching by faculty members leaving our college this year. As far as I know (and likely due to the financial state of the university/state), we don't have searches going to replace any of these faculty members. I'd personally be more comfortable if the TEI was focused on improving our existing program through innovation and good old fashioned hard work instead of creating parallel programs we can't staff or sustain. // No matter how successful the new models might be, the bulk of our students will still be in the "traditional" program. Why don't we put our time, money, energy, and focus where we'll get the most bang for the buck? // The proposal also notes, "the greatest risk for TEI is the inherent reliance on UW College of Education faculty and staff to embrace and implement with fidelity and integrity the proposed model." For sure, and if we want the faculty embrace and implement with fidelity, we'll need to convince them that these ideas are sound and will lead to the graduation of better teachers. Faculty involvement thus far in the initiative (including in the development of these 3 proposals) has been lacking. I am a long time public school teacher and teacher educator. Those initiatives that have the best chance of succeeding are those that people buy in to, and that they themselves see as needed and better than the current status quo. That's hard to achieve when these ideas are external, top down.

### **Funding Rating: 3**

**Funding Comments:** The budget seems reasonable, but my concern is sustainability. What happens when the money runs out in 2020? I have been a part of many excellent education initiatives that didn't have sustainable funding sources. When the money ran out, the programs ceased, despite the fact that they were working and that many people had invested many hours.

**Narrative Comments:** Proposal narrative seems fine. It includes description of the year long residency. My comment about this also applies to all 3 proposals as all 3 include a year long residency. Where is the data that says a year long residency leads to substantially better teachers? Our state PTSB requires 8 weeks. We currently do 16; we double it. This proposal quadruples the minimum requirement. I'd need to see data to support doing this before supporting the quadrupling of the requirement. Additionally, the use of "regional adjunct faculty" is a concern. I'm guessing that the year long residency will include some form of what we now call "methods," and am also assuming that the "regional adjunct faculty" would be responsible for the delivery of the methods alongside the residency. I don't know who these regional adjuncts would be, maybe community college faculty? Retired teachers? I would be uncomfortable turning over what I consider to be among the most important parts of our program (methods and residency) to adjuncts. I am confident that our tenure line and APL faculty are the best equipped the state to deliver and oversee these components.

**Summary Comments:** I like the general idea of implementing Educators Rising in WY. My concerns (addressed throughout my feedback) include lack of sustainable funding, the lack of jobs in WY for these potential graduates (due to a failing state economy), the lack of research support for a year long residency, and the exclusion of UW School of Teacher Education faculty in the last and perhaps most important parts of this teacher education program. // An additional concern is that I doubt we have the personnel to create three new pathways while simultaneously maintaining our current ones. My preference would be to combine efforts, improve existing program in innovative ways, as opposed to creating parallel tracks.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** School of Teacher Education Faculty

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** I like that high school students who are interested in teaching get some experience, training, and college course work while still in high school much like the FAA programs. I LOVE that the students are engaged in cohort based, co teaching student teaching for an entire year. That is one area where in which we are struggling currently only a half year student teaching model (they don't know how to begin a teaching year). The full year of student teaching should include starting when the mentor teachers are required to start and going through the last required day of school. I also LOVE the cohort co teaching model where the mentor teacher and teacher candidates all plan together and engage in multiple co teaching strategies such as parallel teaching, one teach/one observe, team teaching, center teaching, etc. and provide constructive feedback to one another for the benefit of all (mentor teacher, teacher candidates, and P 12 students). This is much better than the more traditional residency approach (first 5 weeks observing and working into the teaching, 2nd five weeks teaching on own without mentor teacher there, 3rd 5 weeks transitioning back to the mentor teacher teaching full time). I think it is great that the teacher candidates will receive a cost of living stipend and tuition scholarship to make this model more workable. Paying this back by agreeing to teach for at least 4 years in a Wyoming school is a good idea, and I'm glad you included the stipulation that they do not have to pay back the stipend and scholarship if they are not offered a job in Wyoming. I also think the mentor teacher deserves a stipend. Currently they get a stipend, but they should receive much more money than they currently receive as the mentoring is a difficult job. I like the idea of teacher education being taught in competency based modules, but would like to know more about how this would work. I would also like to know more about the Sanford Inspire Modules. I like the idea of using the avatar and human simulations and also hope that teaching real kids in real classrooms with mentor teacher feedback will be emphasized. It is a good idea that education majors will not be able to declare their specialty area until they complete clinical rounds in all areas (early childhood, elementary, secondary, special education, P.E., art, and music).

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** The protocols for field experiences are great for the student teaching portion. The other states that preservice teachers will participate in embedded fieldwork observations as part of the coursework. Preservice teachers should, however, be doing much more than observing. They should be engaged in practicing their teaching, classroom management, and assessment strategies. The Mursion virtual reality simulations are a good idea, but preservice teachers also need a LOT of practice teaching real kids in real classrooms with mentor teacher feedback and support throughout all stages of their teacher education .

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**Documentation of Need Comments:** I didn't see much evidence of need in Wyoming schools. It looks like it will be a concern getting more school districts to agree to be a part of this initiative.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** I would like to see more information on this literature review. The sources are there, but not much specific information is provided.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** I would like to see more thorough information about these leading programs.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** The contextual constraints are identified and consideration about how to overcome the constraints is identified.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:** I didn't see the funding estimate for paying the student teachers cost of living stipend, the tuition scholarship, or the mentor teachers' stipends.

**Narrative Comments:** Very thorough.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Summary Comments:** Many schools across Wyoming and the country are over concerned with preparing K 12 students for standardized testing success. Even though Colleges of Education tend to emphasize teaching that is standardized based while being student centered, engaging and intrinsically motivating, meaningful, memorable, hands on, experiential, project/problem based critical thinking skills, etc., the reality is that many schools have become very teacher centered implementing scripted 'guaranteed and viable' curriculums with fidelity. There is often little focus on student engagement, critical thinking skills, holistic child development, and the development of 'grit' qualities that matter most to an individual's success (perseverance, curiosity, self control, conscientiousness, etc.). Even though the College of Education tries to teach the importance of these more student centered and whole child approaches, the schools where pre service teachers do their practicums often put these effective strategies on the back burner as they teach to raise test scores. In such practicum environments, how will our new teachers learn and implement these more effective strategies?



## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** School of Teacher Education Faculty

**Innovation Rating:** 2

**Innovation Comments:** The proposal includes innovation in the use of modules rather than traditional semester based courses. The focus on recruiting high schools is also an innovation for UW, but there are programs like these throughout the country. The collaboration with Theater Department is innovative, but there are many other collaborations that are missing from this proposal. If service learning is a component than SLCE Office should be involved. The new Honors College and LeaRN Office also work with high schools, so there could be some overlap. Requiring two summer institutes can be an issue for students who are employed in the summer months, travel to visit family (consider divorced parents in other states and communities), and options to study abroad. There is little information on the summer institute time requirement. I strongly discourage so many concurrent high school/college credits. Students should have the option to take AP classes. Students in some communities do not have this option, rather they need to attend community college. This takes away from the high school experience and lacks innovation. Working with high schools would be more innovative. Year long residency is not innovative and there are many studies that caution about a year in a single placement. It would be more innovative to consider other options that give great flexibility.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** While it does support partnerships with schools, one of the complaints we have heard is that these partnerships limit the number of districts with whom we work.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** The research exist for some but not all of the components of the proposal. No evidence of an urgent need for more teachers in Wyoming. Many of our graduates can't get hired in state.

**Leading Programs Rating:**

**Leading Programs Comments:** Proposal speaks mostly to the Sanford Inspire Program. While others are cited, there is little connection made between these programs and the proposal.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 2

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** You state that some of the constraints will not be issues. They might. You need to identify what you will do if these issues do arise.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 1

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** This proposal tries to address a perceived need for more teachers. Yet, many of our current graduates can't find jobs in Wyoming. Some of our best students can't. There are components that are innovative for Wyoming, but much of this has been done elsewhere. The use of concurrent college credit can really limit students options in high school for other courses, activities and sports. 6 classes is a lot.

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** School of Teacher Education Faculty

**Innovation Rating:** 2

**Innovation Comments:** The description of one set of innovations in this proposal includes the use of "modules" and "competency based approaches" in place of existing courses. My way of thinking about modules is that they represent content specific bits that could be embedded in traditional courses. Similarly, competency based approaches already exist in our undergraduate teacher education programs, in the form of common assessments that are tied to INTASC standards. If we thinking of modules and competency based approaches as the tools, I don't see this as significantly innovative.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 2

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**Documentation of Need Comments:** PLEASE NOTE that the cited reductions in baccalaureate enrollment for primary and secondary majors in education from 2008 to 2015 absolutely is a result of the institution of higher admission requirements for students in 2013. In fact, more recent enrollment numbers show the beginning of an increasing enrollment trend, as would have been noted if the 2016 and 2017 enrollment data had been included in the proposal.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** T

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** The issue of the "significant effort from existing UW College of Education faculty and staff" is one that should be very strongly considered. With reduced capacity as a result of the recent budget cuts, faculty and staff are stretched quite thinly to meet existing teaching requirements; in fact, we are hiring adjuncts and GAs to cover classes at a previously unknown rate. Asking these same individuals who are working harder than ever without a raise in the LAST EIGHT YEARS to take on the additional work from this proposal is irresponsible.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** I love the idea of establishing a Wyoming Educators Rising Chapter. Many school districts in the state are poised to engage with this, and it would be well received. In fact, the Wyoming School University Partnership might be the best home for such a chapter. // In Phase Three, I would recommend that the concurrent/dual credit be awarded through the Wyoming Community Colleges, as well as through UW. Builds partnership all around.

**Summary Comments:** This proposal, I can get behind. I like the high school involvement and summer institutes, as well as most of the work during the four year degree, and I like the four year induction model. A timeline for individual students would have been a helpful addition. Also, a specific degree plan would be a necessary component of this proposal.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Ed School of Teacher Education Faculty

**Innovation Rating:** 2

**Innovation Comments:** The use of Mersion and summer institutes are interesting and innovative. However, completing all of the content required (and I mean the content) in three years is unrealistic for most secondary teaching majors. Much of the course work is sequential or has small enrollments that only allow for courses to be taught once a year. It isn't the education faculty that would have trouble staffing this it is Arts and Sciences faculty.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:** We really will have to address more than the CAEP #4.3 for accreditation.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**Documentation of Need Comments:** The data used is inappropriate. In 2008, the economic downturn had many Wyoming residents turning to teaching as a way to get a job in the state so our numbers were very high. As the economy got better, those with choices chose higher paying careers. If you want people to go into teaching, salaries are a big draw for bright people. Finland has high salaries. If you want to produce the best, they come when salaries are commensurate with the responsibilities for high achievers.

**Literature Review Rating:** 2

**Literature Review Comments:** Very little support is made in the literature review for what you are proposing.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 2

**Leading Programs Comments:** According to Linda Darling Hammond's research Teach for America is a failure for a sustained teaching model. Since that model was included, I question if the researchers really analyzed these external programs beyond what they were told by the programs.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 2

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** The contextual constraints are not deeply analyzed or considered. There are many more contextual constraints that are not part of the analysis but that can keep these ideas from working.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** Since the stakeholders who are most at risk are not a part of these discussions I wonder if their needs will be addressed.

**Funding Rating:**

**Funding Comments:** The budget is done with a rather broad brush. More specificity would be expected in most of grant proposals.

**Narrative Comments:** It is well written.

**Summary Comments:** I would like to be able to "buy in" to this proposal but it seems like it is being done to the College of Ed and we are not actively participating. These are educated, caring individuals that want quality teachers for Wyoming, why would having our active participation in developing the concept be inappropriate? Educational history tells us that top down approaches to structuring education do not last. Bottom up doesn't either. You need a blended approach that stakeholders will commit to ensuring success. The manner in which this proposal is being brought forth does not engender commitment.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Education Thing 1 Faculty

**Innovation Rating:** 2

**Innovation Comments:** There are so many clubs in K 12. I don't see how this will encourage students to become teachers. Also, why is FFA (or like club) used as a model for future teachers? It will be difficult at best to get students to commit to a teaching club, and without something extra it will most likely have a stigma attached like the FFA clubs (which are not favorable).

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 2

**Performance Indicator Comments:** This concept seems forced instead of authentically bringing future teachers into the university, and it addresses #1 (but not the others as it stands).

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 1

**Documentation of Need Comments:** I don't see the literature to support a K 12 future teachers club.

**Literature Review Rating:** 2

**Literature Review Comments:** The literature provided is a stretch for a K 12 future teachers club.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3

**Leading Programs Comments:** It appears that others programs were used as a guide for this idea.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 2

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** A K 12 future teachers' club does not seem realistic in promoting teaching and increasing university/CC enrollment.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** If this K 12 teaching club fails it will negatively impact perceptions of UW and the College of Education. We should proceed with extreme caution with this idea.

**Funding Rating:** 2

**Funding Comments:** It is a large budget for large potential risks and little possible impact.

**Narrative Comments:** The idea itself has merit, but the realities of K 12 clubs are rooted in personnel and conflict resolution (and these are not clearly outlined). Additionally, K 12 teachers/students and university/CC should be interviewed/surveyed about this type of club/pathway.

**Summary Comments:** Basically, this appears to be a lot of text and work for little possible impact. Who on in the group that created this has worked with K 12 students in classrooms or clubs?

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Faculty

**Innovation Rating:** 2

**Innovation Comments:** Why is innovation important in this case? Whether or not it can be successfully carried out is of more importance///

**Performance Indicator Rating:**

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:**

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:**

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:**

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:**

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:**

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:**

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 1

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 2

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 2

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 2

**Innovation Comments:** The Education Rising idea is new as far as I know, the offering of college courses and concurrent enrollment is dependent upon the cooperation of the school districts and is not uniformly desired. The additional coursework would also have to fit in with the Hathaway criteria and graduation requirements which may not allow for much diversity. Would the grant pay for the dual enrollment courses, if so what happens when the grant money is gone.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 2

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 1

**Documentation of Need Comments:** States there is a teacher shortage in Wyoming, but no statistics given to back up claim.

**Literature Review Rating:** 2

**Literature Review Comments:** There are some sources cited, but I cannot see how you would measure outcomes other than a possible increase in UW Education enrollment; however that is also susceptible to other factors.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** Did address some constraints as to School District involvement, student transfers, etc. Failed to address what I believe is the most critical constraint: financial. Who will pay for the dual/concurrent enrollment courses, how will they be made to fit into current graduation and Hathaway requirements, who will fund the Summer Institutes and stipends at the end of the Grant cycle?

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:** Risk is primarily limited to those students who might transfer out the program while at UW.

**Funding Rating:** 1

**Funding Comments:** Did not address cost of dual/concurrent enrollment courses.

**Narrative Comments:** Has some merit, but must address costs to students, school districts and university. Must also address compatibility with high school graduation requirements and Hathaway eligibility.

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 2

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 1

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 2

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 2

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 1

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** I would be concerned with high school students charged with teaching assignments to their peers. Especially in core areas where high stakes testing is concerned. If it is the intent to have them teach mock lessons during class time, then I would be concerned with a misuse of class time that should be devoted to the curriculum.

**Funding Rating:** 2

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** If the intent is to approach this from an intracurricular aspect, then I can see a value. The FFA Association (Formerly known as the Future Farmers of America) provides a 3 circle model approach that integrates all curricular, intracurricular, and extracurricular activities that support each other towards the student's education. I would be concerned with what content area, or areas will this plan be associated with? Will it become a potential organizational club that has no classroom ties? If it is tied in with 1 area (English, Math, Science, CTE, etc.) will students be pressured into pursuing that 1 area?

**Summary Comments:**



## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** Bringing in Educators Rising into the state is a great first step and encouraging more apprenticeship is a great direction.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** All but #6 and #7 are evident in the plan

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:** All areas of Wyoming are impacted by teacher needs and lack of prep for HS students who want to go into education.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** Shows multiple other programs that are promising practices.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** I think that the use of technology as suggested is critical to the success of this plan, and many other education initiatives in the state. In addition, PTSB is critical in to being open to alternative ideas of what it means to be a teacher beyond the traditional 4 year college graduate with a education degree.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:** Shows quite a seriousness on paying back tuition if the person leaves the state. I wonder if this plan is enough to encourage people to stay in the state instead of leaving or if these stipulations are just one more reason that a person might leave instead of seeing this as a fantastic opportunity.

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** I think this is the most promising of the three plans.

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** The proposed initiatives described in the proposal are innovative to Wyoming. They may not be realistic, or achievable, but they do introduce a several innovative methods new to Wyoming to enhance new teacher recruitment, educational experience/training at UW, and post university support/mentoring.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** The proposal is well aligned to the TEI key performance indicators.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:** The need for more K 12 educators in WY is well documented in the proposal. The need for all of the elements outlined in the proposal is not as well supported with documentation.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** The applicant provided a well referenced proposal.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** Although the proposal's bibliography of leading programs is referenced, it is not clear how the sources cited were studied. For example, were site visits conducted? Did team conduct surveys of participants in the program? Did the proposal members merely look up a bunch of titles on the internet that supported what they wanted to do and list them as referenced? More clarification of methods used to reference cited evidence of leading programs is need before an accurate assessment of the value of the references can be made.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 4

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** The proposal did address contextual constraints and proposed solutions that may not be realistic or able to be implemented in Wyoming school districts.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** The risk assessment provided in the proposal was thorough and inclusive.

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:** The funding request aligned with the narrative to address the need.

**Narrative Comments:** The proposal outlined sweeping changes. It is not reasonable to expect that students take all areas of educational classes, i.e. primary, secondary, special education for one year. Students who go into education do so because they know the grade levels/subject that they are interested in teaching. If that proposed course change is implemented, UW will see less Wyoming students enter their education program, not more. Already, many students attend out of state schools that better align with their interests. 4 years of peer mentoring at post UW education program studies at local school districts, which the local districts are expected to fund with fundraising efforts is unrealistic and unnecessary. One year of mentoring is reasonable. Grant funding for peer mentoring is reasonable. The proposal did not address the lack of continuity between community colleges and the University of Wyoming with regards to receiving teaching certification in the state of Wyoming. Adult learners who go back to college after raising children, for example, were also not addressed in the proposal.

**Summary Comments:** The proposal as outlined is not likely to be implemented either by the UW Department of Education or by local school districts. The proposal contains large gaps regarding significant members of Wyoming residents, i.e., community college students and adult learners, that need to be further addressed.

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** I think this will be great for Wyoming education.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 4

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** As they have stated, the University will need to work with school districts for this to work, and not all school districts may want to be included.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** I think this is a great proposal.

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** Although there is the inclusion of many "best practices", this proposal is innovative in the way that it integrates these into a comprehensive model.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** I think the proposal exhibits very strong alignment to KPI 1, 2, 6, and 7, I feel that there is potential for greater collaboration with school districts (KPI 3,4, and 5) in terms of both selection of participants and in fieldwork. Perhaps this is intended but not elaborated upon in the narrative. Clarification would be helpful.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 1

**Documentation of Need Comments:** Need is assumed and implied rather than fully described. Citations and survey data would strengthen the proposal.

**Literature Review Rating:** 2

**Literature Review Comments:** The literature review does a nice job of supporting strong induction of novice and support for pre service teachers. However, some literature establishing that starting early (one of the key elements of the proposal) is supported. Also literature that supports how this program will retain these teachers, as "the best and the brightest" often leave the profession, will be useful. Here are two suggestions: //

[https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/After\\_School\\_Programs/Teacher\\_Programs.html](https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/After_School_Programs/Teacher_Programs.html) // Feng, L., & Sass, T. R. (2016). Teacher quality and teacher mobility. Education Finance and Policy. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED529180.pdf> //

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 4

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 4

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:** This is an exciting and innovative project that could dramatically improve the WY teacher pipeline and induction process. I do have some concerns around whether WY would then retain these teachers, or are we investing in candidates who will not stay in the state or the profession. This might be addressed through stronger partnerships with districts, further literature review on retention strategies, and buiding in some incentives or contingencies that will encourage longer term commitment on the part of the participants.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 2

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 2

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** While I think it's a neat idea, special emphasis needs to be placed on rural schools and hard to fill positions such as reservation schools.

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** This is an interesting innovation; however where is the support and buy in from K 12 districts and educators as part of the proposal? This cannot be perceived as a top down imposed change on K 12. Where is K 12's participation?

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** Literature review is fine and appropriate.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3

**Leading Programs Comments:** The proposal includes external programs as part of evidence for implementation.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 1

**Risk Assessment Comments:** This proposal is a high risk proposal to all involved K 12 stakeholders, CoE members, and students this is a fundamental redesign and transformational proposal this cannot be conducted without significant participation and sustainability.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:** Budget is appropriate for proposal at this time; however, budget may be shortsighted due to lack of K 12 participation in program development and implementation.

**Narrative Comments:** I believe this proposal is good; however, without K 12 letters of support and commitment from Superintendents and Boards of Education as well as WDE I do not support.

**Summary Comments:** See previous.

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 4

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 4

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**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:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**



## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** Evidence supported the need and the problem. Am not completely sure how well the evidence supported the attainment of desired outcomes which would be reflected in this model.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** Seems very complicated and the number of moving parts and programs that must be coordinated stands out as a significant risk.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** Excellent innovative thinking.

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** Other states/institutions have been trying out this approach for a number of years. As I understand it, however, it is not yet widespread. The collaboration with the Theater Department is a nice twist.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:** Certainly, an impending teacher shortage will be felt in all areas of Wyoming as it will around the nation.

**Literature Review Rating:** 4

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:** The risk of transferring to a new department for an education student seem to be no riskier than an engineering major switching to the education department. The burden on UW staff facing change might be significant at the outset, but I'm convinced that the rewards would more than balance with the risks.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:** It seems that the budget estimate is a bit too conservative to meet the goals of the proposed plan.

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:** I'm not sure of the need to have clinical exposure to all age groups perhaps 2 of 3. An element that seems to be lacking is an intention and preparation for introductory courses to be offered to promising candidates in their home high schools. Summer institutes are fine, but I would like to see collaboration between UW faculty and qualified faculty on high school campuses to offer introductory education courses in high school curricula.

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:**

**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:**

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 2

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**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:**

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 4

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 4

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**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:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 4

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 4

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:** The amount of work that went into this proposal is evident across the board. As this rolls out and changes requirements for education at UW there will be some risks to stakeholders; however, this can and will be a good thing since it is changing.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** The model seems innovative, to an extent, however partnerships with school districts to develop teacher education pathways is a key piece that doesn't seem to be fully addressed in the proposal. Also, new and innovative education models that integrate STEM, makerspaces, etc. are critical. Proposal does address the use of technology to help address rural needs in the state, which is good. Also, the proposal had good scope and reach.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:** I would like to see a broader set of evidence addressing need. Career and Technical Education, which includes teacher education, is in decline in the state due to budget cuts. Also, there are really no teacher education pathways established at the secondary level in the State of Wyoming. This type of data would be helpful to evaluate/incorporate.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**



## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** Could be a powerful piece for students to use virtual reality and integrate UW theater faculty for real world simulations. Starting an education chapter in high school could be innovative if the program has support from districts, teachers, and students.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**Documentation of Need Comments:** The documentation for need seems to be at a macro level of the state which isn't specific towards regions in Wyoming.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** Awareness that the required dual enrollment courses and time requirement needed during school hours for program preparation does not diminish opportunities for students required/elective credits for graduation.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** There is risk in finding public/private donors for funding within communities (especially rural). There is also a risk for students in the program to find employment in Wyoming upon graduation. This risk would require students to pay back their initial tuition and stipend at no fault of the student. It is currently very difficult to find employment as an educator in Wyoming without experience.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:** Didn't see any support for transportation.

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** I like that UW is planning on getting to students early, in their high school years. As a school administrator and teacher I have found that the most insightful information that I can get is to ask those who are involved in an innovation their thoughts about their experiences as they progress through the system, but most importantly, three or four years out after they have been in the job. Does the University of Wyoming have any baseline data on how students currently feel about their training as potential teachers at graduation and after graduation? As I read the prospectus, it is not clear to me how students perceptions of the process will be measured. I think this would be very valuable to the process, as they will be the result of the innovation.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:** Again, ask the kids. A University provides a service. I think that feedback from school district to UW is covered and well thought out. What graduates say about their experience is paramount.

**Documentation of Need Rating:**

**Documentation of Need Comments:** stated in a previous comment.

**Literature Review Rating:** 4

**Literature Review Comments:** I think the research is rock solid. My hope is that we can replicate many of the strategies used and described in the literature.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** The graduates coming out of the program will, in my opinion, provide the best evaluative data.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 4

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** I think the data collected has been addressed.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 4

**Risk Assessment Comments:** You hit it!

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:** In this time of fiscal restraint, money will a huge hurdle. When the University provides a well thought out plan, I think it greatly increases the probability for funding. This is a well thought out plan!

**Narrative Comments:** As UW progresses, please let me know if there is anything I can do to continue to support this proposal.

**Summary Comments:** Well done. The University should be proud of the hard work they have done to support, provide, and expand opportunities and programs to education majors for the the State of Wyoming

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** Wyoming Educators Rising Chapters, great idea and a good opportunity for high school students who are interested in education as a profession; I would be curious to know if the districts would be willing to participate/support this program. The collaborative effort with the UW Theater Program is inventive! The tuition scholarship and cost of living stipend, is this in addition to the Hathaway Scholarship (if eligible)?

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 2

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 1

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:** Seems to be a number of technology related resources that will be required; students, faculty, mentors... Who will provide them and at what cost (hardware, software, connectivity, etc)?

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:** Is there enough stakeholder "by in" for this proposal; it's difficult to identify.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** I like the connection from early entry to completion of successful teaching opportunity.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**Documentation of Need Comments:** If UW is willing to allow all districts to participate in the induction / year long teaching experience that will be most beneficial. Limiting to only districts easily accessed by staff will limit is potential.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** Local districts will also be providing induction programs so it will be imperative that 1st year teachers not have too much in terms of induction and mentorship.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:** Limited placement in only certain districts could impede some stakeholders.

**Funding Rating:** 2

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** It will be necessary to have local liaisons to work closely with year long placements as well as 1st year hired teachers. Local districts will need teachers to understand local evaluation, instructional frameworks, and assessment accountability. It will be imperative UW works hand in hand with local district administration to ensure this does not become a barrier or hurdle to the natural process of a teacher completing the local induction and mentor program.

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**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:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** I'm not certain about the UW theater program participating in what seems to be "mock" parent/educator interactions. During the one year residency the pre service teachers should be required to be part of all parent/educator interactions such as parent teacher conferences, BIT team meetings, family nights, IEP team meetings, etc.

**Summary Comments:** I appreciate the mentor teacher having to take some training prior to being a mentor teacher. However I believe there should be more to selecting the mentor teachers. There needs to be stringent criteria for the mentor teacher, if mentor teachers aren't "master" teachers we won't be doing any justice for the pre service teacher. Pre service teachers will only be as strong as the mentor teacher they are paired with.

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:**

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:**

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:**

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:**

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:**

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:**

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:**

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** The UW E4 proposed pathway is exactly what we need in Wyoming to encourage high school students to begin thinking about, and working towards, becoming teachers in Wyoming. The important innovation here is that we start working with students while they are in high school, throughout college, AND we support them while they are early career teachers. I also love that students need to experience many different possible areas of teaching before settling on one particular area. Bravo!

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** The work cited reveals that the ideas proposed in this initiative have merit.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** A host of programs were studied in the process of creating this Initiative.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 4

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** It is clear that the writers of this proposal are aware of potential problems and that they have thought through potential solutions to these problems.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** Like the other sections of the proposal, this section has been carefully thought through. The writers suggest that one of the greatest risks is the extent to which UW education faculty will embrace the project. I agree. I recommend two ideas for consideration here: First, consider the nature of some wording in the proposal: "implement with fidelity and integrity the proposed model." Whereas the initial model is powerful, there should be room for innovation and co construction/revision (on the part of all constituents) as the model is enacted. The current wording implies (perhaps in a manner not intended) that UW faculty, school and community college faculty, etc. should "do what they are told." At least that is how I interpret words like "implement with fidelity." I think that words like "thoughtfully and critically implement the model" might allow for innovative and thoughtful problem solving as constituents are guided by the model. I also think it would be useful to consider feedback and revision loops in the model as constituents (including the students themselves) are thoughtfully and critically co constructing their implementation of the model. Second, I think it is particularly powerful that this proposed model will run alongside the existing program in the CoE. That way, not everyone has to 'buy in' to the model. That said, however, I think it will be crucial to carefully select (and reimburse) the CoE faculty who work within this model. You will want highly committed folks at the helm. I'm not sure how the budget was determined for the CoE faculty to work in this innovative program, but I'm not sure that \$30,000 is enough to buy out enough time for CoE folks to put in the time needed to do this innovative program justice.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:** Please see my comments to the last item. I'm not sure that enough money has been set aside to buy out CoE faculty to effectively implement this program.

**Narrative Comments:** Clearly and thoughtfully written.

**Summary Comments:** This proposal is OUTSTANDING! I highly recommend that it move forward through the approval process.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** This model allows students to determine whether becoming a teacher would be a good profession for them to peruse.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:** This proposal definitely addresses 1,2,and 3.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 2

**Literature Review Comments:** Although the UW enrollment data show a decrease in education majors, current Wyoming certified teachers are having to look outside the state for positions.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** Students leaving the program require them to pay the stipend and tuition fees. If the student is unable to seek employment within Wyoming or chose to leave the program they are penalized. / There is a risk to the College of Education for not initiating or supporting the program.

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** This is a great opportunity for Wyoming students who have identified themselves as wanting to become teachers during their HS years. The program is rather lengthy and requires additional commitment on the student and University's part. I think this is a worthwhile approach that does not require a large amount of financial support.

**Summary Comments:** I support this proposal.



## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** This type of project has not been, to my knowledge, included at UW CoE to this point.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:** Indicators 3 & 4 are particularly addressed

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:** It was important to clarify that with the limited partnership schools, that area would need to be addressed.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** Adequate literature cited

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3

**Leading Programs Comments:** Adequate external programs cited

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** Again, the limited number of CoE and Wy partnership schools is a constraint....as is the distance from Laramie requiring regional facilitators.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:** There is minimal risk

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:** A budget is provided. Identifying needed local financial support is concerning. In the time of financial stress across Wyoming, this will prove challenging.

**Narrative Comments:** Adequate explanation.

**Summary Comments:** The content areas of music, art, and physical education were mentioned. These areas are not directly under the control of CoE. When working with these content areas, it would behoove the CoE to seek recommendations for quality mentors.

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 4

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 4

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** The use of Educators Rising and a full year in classrooms training will be extremely effective and open the pathways to innovative teaching practices with early career teachers

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:**

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:**

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:**

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:**

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:**

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:**

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** I like the idea of clinical experiences and field placements early on as well as mentoring and induction following completion. Also, beginning in high school provides an extended period for future teachers to engage in educational contexts and work with pedagogical practices. The idea of avatar based simulation tasks seems interesting, yet I wonder about the research base on the efficacy of such an approach (a curiosity based in my own ignorance of the programs beyond superficial descriptions).

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** I think the innovation if carried out well meets these indicators, yet the risks outlined in the proposal are real ones. With a lot of work and flexibility, these can be met, but it will take a strong, unified partnership between the faculty, university, WDE, PTSB, and Wyoming school districts. This is a lofty goal, but I would like to see it happen.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:** I think the need is there, but I wonder if the school districts see this as something viable for them. Also, the requirement of employment in WY makes sense, but how will we be certain that districts have the requisite jobs available each year to meet the demand of students graduating? Some students leave WY because there are no jobs for them. Will they be penalized for those circumstances?

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** You might be under space restrictions with these proposals, but it seems rather thin on evidence with a couple of studies supporting particular practices. Some ideas are well supported by the literature, e.g., clinical experiences and mentoring/induction programs, but others, e.g., competency based modules, I'm not sure of (maybe I just don't know the literature well enough).

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** It reflects the evaluation of multiple external programs, but some of the programs have mixed reviews, e.g., Teach for America. There is a very mixed evidence base on the quality of preparedness of TFA teachers. When evaluating the programs, how were the affordance and limitations of different external programs considered? It's unclear how these ideas were integrated into this proposal or not.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** There are several contextual constraints that were outlined. Using technology to address geographical constraints and ensuring alignment with PTSB seem like reasonable solutions. The third constraint doesn't seem to propose a clear solution. How will trust be ensured and the perception issue be remedied?

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 1

**Risk Assessment Comments:** It's unclear how this will exist side by side with other pathways AND the more traditional approach to the COE. Was I reading that correctly? Will there be a great influx of faculty to support this process? How will the transition process be handled as existing faculty are re imagining their role in the COE or in the Community Colleges? / If a student leaves WY for a CO because there is a lack of availability for jobs, will that student be penalized?

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:** The budget seems sound to me.

**Narrative Comments:** I think it is a rich proposal. I only wonder about the abilities of everyone involved to address all of the associated risks among all of the stakeholders. It is also unclear how this proposal (along with the other two pathways) integrate with the existing teacher preparation programs. Are there essentially four pathways towards licensure, and what does that mean for faculty? I don't have a clear sense of this.

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** I really like these proposals. This is a great opportunity for getting teachers in the program.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**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:** I do have one strong suggestion. In these or any programs we must take the responsibility to remove those who are not going to be good in the area. Too often in education we overlook the words of evaluation from mentor teachers and advisors as well as obvious facts. I know we all have kind hearts and want to help people to be successful but at the expense of who? Our children!! That can't be. I am not a hatchet man and someone saying we need to be hardnosed but I do know we need to be honest with students who do not have correct language, social skills, knowledge and the ability to make strong relationships without being a friend because we get them into the system and then we have not done our students or the person justice. It isn't any different with someone hired in the first year at a school. We tend to continue to try to save them instead of coaching them out of the profession and into something better for them. We must take this responsibility serious and look for alternatives. If they can take more college and get to the level needed great but if they can't they need to look for other opportunities in their lives. In the years I had student teachers, I had two who should have not been ok as teachers and yet they were moved to other instructors because I was not ok with them so they could get approved. I am not saying I am great at picking but when you see them later and they are not doing justice to the job it really bothers. We have to have a way to be picky as it is our future we are dealing with. I hope I am coming across the way I would like to have this viewed and not as a harsh or crabby person because that is not the case at all. // Thank you and I applaud you for the outstanding proposal. There is great potential here and I will be willing to do whatever I can to help make it happen. /

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** Use of virtual reality and completing clinical rounds in all areas both seem innovative

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** It seems to address these. Not sure about accreditation, not sure if it will get buy in from existing Faculty

**Documentation of Need Rating:**

**Documentation of Need Comments:** There is need for more teachers. Not sure if this would specifically focus on the need for STEM faculty

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** Should there be an "exit" strategy built into the program for those who decide that education is not a good fit or for those who faculty/mentors indicate may not be suited for teaching? Are the experiences early in the program so that those who exit don't lose too many credits, investment in time and money? // It indicated "completing clinical rounds in all areas". How much time will this take? Will other coursework/competencies be removed or will it add time to completion to the program? //

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:** credits may not be transferable to other degree programs. // virtual reality technologies to simulate parent teacher engagement are there some people who would not be able to use VR? cost of headsets?

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:** it seems like an interesting way to address increasing number of teachers

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 4

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 4

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** Highly innovative and addresses a pressing need for our state's schools!

**Summary Comments:**



## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** Innovative to reach out to high school students and pursue concurrent credits...

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** The proposal addresses many indicators in some degree or another.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:** As the proposal suggests, only six districts currently work with UW to provide student teaching opportunities...with the new requirements asking for a full year of internship, I'm not sure if it will provide a service throughout Wyoming.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** There is literary evidence provided; however, I also believe that there are numerous variables that will impact the outcomes which are specific to Wyoming (rural nature of the state, small number of students pursuing education, funding, etc...).

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** I did not see any suggestions in regards to students who are also active in extra curricular or co curricular activities with the university. There are numerous students that pursue education which are also members of athletic teams or band/cheer and so forth...how would the year long residency impact these students?

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:** I don't think 'risk' is an appropriate term, I do see that some challenges that may present themselves...such as what happens when a student in a year long residency isn't performing to the level expected? Or what happens if they behave in an unprofessional manner?

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** I appreciate the committee's efforts to think outside the box and do believe that you may have some great candidates...the marketing of this program will be crucial in its success, especially for those smaller communities that haven't been as involved but that need educators. I have concerns with the university's ability to retain professors, and provide pedagogical content that is relative to today's students. In addition, I have concerns with students looking at more online opportunities that are quicker and more conducive to their day to day lives...flexible around work, families, and so forth...

**Summary Comments:** Please see previous...

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** UW E4 has the ability to attract more high quality educators to work in Wyoming. By starting in high school, students will see that education is a highly valued profession. The mentoring component will be a huge asset for the fellows. Collaborating with an established mentor will offer immense insight and guidance that far exceeds anything learned in a traditional college lecture format.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** The proposal meets nearly all of the key performance indicators. It could potentially meet all of the indicators but I was uncertain of number 6, National Accreditation. The proposal has detailed a plan for promoting perceptions of excellence by University of Wyoming's College of Education. By allowing the hosting school districts the first opportunity to hire the fellows, school districts will feel safe investing in the fellows and want to partner with U.W.

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 1

**Documentation of Need Comments:** The documentation of need was a little too general. They cited teacher shortages from across the country; I am curious to know if there are specific areas of Wyoming facing these shortages or if the shortages are occurring in other districts that have factors Wyoming does not; such as inner city schools or low salaries for teachers. // They did note the decline of education students enrolled at University of Wyoming. This proposal would help increase enrollment and retention of skilled teachers.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:** They established the value of this type of fellow and mentor program to achieve the desired outcomes.

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** Several similar programs have been identified. Finland has a similar program and their educational system is widely recognized as being one of the most advanced. They are highly skilled at recruiting and retaining passionate educators so utilizing part of their model was a wise choice.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 4

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** The biggest contextual restraint is that of U.W.'s current partnership with school districts throughout the state. However, it has been identified as a problem the Education department is focused on addressing. Without that change, this program would be less effective throughout the state, however it would still be very valuable for a limited number of districts that are partnered with U.W. already.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** The risks identified are accurate. However, the greatest risk is for the University of Wyoming and their ability to restructure their current education programs. It would be incredibly beneficial for the entire state for this proposal to be implemented but I am concerned that there will be too much pushback from U.W. faculty. As educators, we must do what is right for students, regardless of how uncomfortable or challenging it may be.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:** It may be beneficial to look at how vital the summer institute is for the fellows. While it would elevate the program to one of prestige and foster enthusiasm for education, removing it would dramatically lower the costs. Perhaps the summer institute could be re evaluated with that in mind.

**Narrative Comments:** Each of the phases are deliberately designed and well thought out with the intent of recruiting high quality teachers and then retaining them in Wyoming. This proposal would give Wyoming the opportunity to rise far beyond other states and be a leading model for the U.S.

**Summary Comments:** This proposal is ambitious and has unique challenges. The proposal has identified innovations that have significant impact for recruitment and retention of educators; an issue that we are currently facing. It is my belief that this proposal should move forward as it will dramatically transform education within our state; thereby creating a stronger state that is recognized across the country for its dedication to education.



## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**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:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** The model itself with early induction of high school age students into a feeder program is not uncommon, but the level of commitment to the program in high school is pretty significant. I wonder about the risk of attrition from the program. To recruit students this early in their education will likely require very intelligent and strategic marketing that elevates the teaching profession. I am especially intrigued and supportive of the emphasis on character building through a much greater emphasis on parent engagement and looking at the whole child and his/her environment. I am also supportive of developing a strong, solid, broad foundation on education before having fellows declare a specialty.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2

**Documentation of Need Comments:** Specific regions in Wyoming weren't called out in the proposal, nor where the types of teaching needs specified in detail.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** Multiple external programs were cited, but there was not detail about the specific strengths of the external program would apply to Wyoming. For example, what were the strengths in the Sanford Inspire Program or of international teacher training in Finland that can result in promising results here in Wyoming?

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 2

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 1

**Risk Assessment Comments:** The proposal is such a dramatic change from the current paradigm for education students, professors, school districts that I have some concern about its viability. Not that the proposed approach is not correct (because I think it is correct), but that I'm concerned about the quantity of buy in needed by all stakeholders to make it successful. I wonder if there could be a proposed phasing.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:** With regard to local placements of student teachers and identified promising high school students in the program I wonder if there can and should be a stronger connection and alignment with Wyoming community colleges.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**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:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:** There seems to be the risk that the content areas, particularly STEM areas will not have enough sequential semesters to complete their content hours by meeting pre requisites. It appears that there is only 2 to 3 years of full time enrollment to meet these.

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** The narrative explains all of the components of the proposal.

**Summary Comments:** After close study, It appears that Phase Seven and Phase Eight address content. It states that content courses will be completed by fellows in Phase Eight. Is that only two years to address content? This is not clear.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:** I do not know of any other university utilizing this approach and I believe that connecting with young people prior to joining our program is extremely innovative and would more effectively support the development of quality teachers in Wyoming.

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 4

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 4

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 4

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:** This is a very exciting option and one that should be supported through the TEI initiative.

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 4

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:**

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:** The full year residency is a magnificent idea. This model provides a great way for high school students to get a jump on their career preparation. / / I'm still concerned about the fundraising in local communities.



## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Stakeholder

**Innovation Rating:** 4

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:** Although approximately 37 school districts out of 49 in Wyoming have some variation of a Childhood Development/Textiles/Early Childhood Career CTE Course Pathway (Education, Child Development & Family Services), twelve did not. In my quick browsing of the statewide list of district CTE pathway course offerings, of those offering courses in this pathway, only a small number offer courses in early childhood development. None of districts offered a course specifically for promoting careers in education.

**Literature Review Rating:** 3

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 2

**Leading Programs Comments:** Unfortunately I didn't have time to study the success and effectiveness of these leading programs within the time constraints of this survey evaluation. I'm so sorry.

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** I feel that the highest potential risk identified in this proposal, as wonderful as it sounds, is the reality that no Wyoming school district may want to establish an Educator Rising local chapter, especially when you look at the short list of only 5 official CTSOs (student organizations) in Wyoming's CTE programming with none currently focusing on education as a career. / Districts will also want to know "what's in it for them" and why should they desire a partnership with UWCOE for the full year residency. / Getting buy in by school districts for the implementation of this idea will take a lot of innovative advertising and promotion. / I believe that the offering of opportunities for students to explore the field of teaching while in high school will help recruit more young adults into the education profession, but Districts will need to acquire a desire for either adding the education pathway to their CTE program list or viewing this proposal as "welcomed support" in districts where limited coursework in the Education/Childhood Development/Family Services pathway is offered.

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3

**Funding Comments:** I am not familiar enough with the whole concept of Educators Rising and the University's budget constraints to make a judgment on whether the budget presented addresses all the key areas. Sorry.

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:** Although I believe in the strategies presented in this proposal, I wonder how long it will actually take for districts to buy into this proposal's ideas as well as the University's COE to see increased recruitment numbers in its education program and degree programming.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Nat Review

### **Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** This proposal is similar to other reform efforts in including a year long residency, an induction program. It is similar to the other proposals I read in focusing on character development (the Sanford Inspire Program) as well as content knowledge and teaching skills. A very innovative element of this program is the inclusion of working with the Theater Department and I would like to know more about what / expectations there are from this work. I would like to see more information about the development of content knowledge and how rising high school students will be identified, and how the faculty will control for the fact that most students select elementary education rather than the high need areas of the state and the country. /

### **Performance Indicator Rating:** 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:** UW E4 Key performance indicators. / 1. Assuming success of the program, the plan will enhance statewide perceptions of U of Wyoming COE by meeting state needs, partnering with more communities. / 2. Assuming success of the program, the enrolment of Wyoming residents in the COE will increase through engagement of high school students / 3. The plan provides for continuous improvement protocols but does not indicate criteria for success or how "improvement" is defined. / 4. I don't see a plan for executing active clinical partnership agreements. These agreements are assumed and noted as a challenge for achieving the success of the program / 5. Assuming success of the program, the plan will lead to employment of U of W graduates in U of W schools. There is a plan for penalizing defaults. / 6. The plan does not address accreditation and CAEP would require more than standard 4. However, there is a plan for program impact. I did not see a plan for evaluating the impact nor did I see a plan for obtaining information on the satisfaction of employers. / 7. It appears that the plan will use the technology capabilities of the SOE to monitor development of candidate teaching skills, but I did not see the method of evaluation of success of the development of these skills (e.g., The Measuring Effective Teaching Project (MET) of Kane et.al., list five instruments in this report: / 1. Framework for Teaching (or FFT, developed by Charlotte Danielson of the Danielson Group), / 2. Classroom Assessment Scoring System (or CLASS, developed by Robert Pianta, Karen La Paro, and Bridget Hamre at the University of Virginia), / 3. Protocol for Language Arts Teaching Observations (or PLATO, developed by Pam Grossman at Stanford University), / 4. Mathematical Quality of Instruction (or MQI, developed by Heather Hill of Harvard University), and / 5. UTeach Teacher Observation Protocol (or UTOP, developed by Michael Marder and Candace Walkington at the University of Texas Austin). / / It is not clear how the faculty of the SOE and the faculty engaged in the proposed work will collaborate with each other or how changes in the climate of the SOE will change as a result of the program. /

### **Documentation of Need Rating:** 4

**Documentation of Need Comments:** UW E4 / The need for teachers in Wyoming is clearly documented and the declining pipeline for students enrolling in education is noted. However, the shortages are in specific areas. It is not clear how the faculty will convince high school students to pursue majors in the high need areas. See Learning Policy Institute Report, 2016: [https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/coming\\_crisis\\_teaching](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/coming_crisis_teaching) / Attrition is a major factor in explaining the shortages and the program will penalize candidates who drop out. / / The need for teachers with good character is less well documented and it is not clear what evidence there is that the Sanford Inspire programs successfully build character. The need for teachers with strong pedagogical content knowledge has been well documented since the 1980's. (Shulman, L. S. (1987). "Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform." Harvard Educational Review Feb. 1987: 1 22. /

### **Literature Review Rating:** 2

**Literature Review Comments:** UW E4 / The plan states that clinical rounds will be used but doesn't cite the work of Joseph McDonald on protocols for evaluating those rounds. See Going Online with Protocols: New Tools for Teaching and Learning (Teachers College Press, 2012). With Janet Mannheimer Zydny, Alan Dichter, and Beth McDonald. (link) / / The proposal calls for working with the theater department to build parent teacher engagement but doesn't cite work of Ben Dotger at the University of Syracuse on using the "standardized patient" method for teaching future teachers to work with parents. See: Dotger, B. (2013). "I had no idea!": Clinical Simulations for Teacher Development. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing. / / Other articles that may be of use: / Allen, M., Coble, C., & Crowe, E. (2014). Building an evidence based system for teacher preparation. Washington, DC: Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. / Coffman, A.N., Patterson, R., Raabe, B., & Eubanks, S. (2014). Teacher residencies: Redefining preparation through partnerships. Washington, DC: National Education Association. / Council of Chief State School Officers Task Force on Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession. (2012). Our responsibility, our promise: Transforming educator preparation and entry into the profession. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. / Crowe, E. (2010, July). Measuring what matters: A stronger accountability model for teacher education. Washington, DC: Center for American

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

Progress. Retrieved from:<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2010/07/29/8066/measuring-what-matters/> // Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2011, April). Model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. / National Research Council. (2000). How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School: Expanded Edition. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. / Teacher Preparation Analytics (2016). A Guide to the Key Effectiveness Indicators (November 22, 2016) / /

### Leading Programs Rating: 2

**Leading Programs Comments:** Leading programs that have implemented residency programs and used the Sanford Inspire program are listed, but missing is any exemplar of high school to college programs (early colleges could be explored), who successfully recruit and retain high quality teachers whose students achieve. Educators Rising (Nebraska, Ohio, Arizona etc. may be a useful model. I was not able to find any evidence of its success. The faculty also might look at the University of Michigan which has a program for community college students.

### Contextual Constraints Rating:

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** I do not know how the Wyoming Professional Teaching Standards match up to other standards (e.g., INTASC (2011):

[http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2011/InTASC\\_Model\\_Core\\_Teaching\\_Standards\\_2011.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2011/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf) adopted by many teacher preparation programs and by CAEP. It will be important to identify what learning outcomes are expected and how attainment of these objectives will be assessed. // Engagement with the District (and earning their trust) appears to be a major challenge and constraint. It is not clear what the faculty (or SOE or University) plan will be to engage the District and develop a deep partnership, as will be required for the success of the program. /

### Risk Assessment Rating: 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:** UW E4 / A number of risks are listed, but no plan for mitigation is presented. I wondered also how they will overcome the risk of students who are too young (high school) to make an informed decision about a career, and should be counseled out; some may persist for financial reasons. Also, I think the risk of lack of adequate content knowledge is significant, given that they will take three years of course work in the SOE and it is not clear how they will get the content courses they need. It is also not clear how they will avoid the trend of so many going into elementary or early childhood, when the need is in other fields of certification. // Engaging the College of Arts and Sciences to meet the content (and pedagogical content) knowledge of the candidates will be essential. Is the University administration willing to help with this great challenge to all schools of education? // Other administrative challenges listed will require University engagement in the necessary changes (affiliation agreements, moving from a credit based system of financial accounting, dual enrollments, staffing during the summer, etc. will need University support and buy in. Within the SOE structures for rewarding faculty will need to be examined and aligned with the goals of the proposals like this one. // The faculty note that the State does not allow "disaggregation of student assessment outcomes by teacher." This, I assume refers to outcome data from state standardized testing of P 12 students. The SOE and University leadership could pursue an agreement to reveal data aggregated by certification area; while some teachers in Wyoming will not be from the U of W, growth scores could be calculated as a rough indicator of changes in P 12 learning as the program progresses. Other SOEs that do not have access to state data are also finding innovative ways to assess learning outcome. See for example, CAEP discussion of Standard 4 on program impact (file:///Users/marybrabeck/Documents/caepstnd4 faq.pdf ) and //

### Funding Rating:

**Funding Comments:** I would like to see a breakdown by categories of costs: How much to support the candidates, the administrative costs, the faculty? It was not clear how summer institute funds are being divided.

**Narrative Comments:** I would like to see in the narrative, more information on how the modules are going to be developed and the quality of modules judged. It would be useful to know how they will articulate the coordination between SOE and the College of Arts and Sciences with the certification requirements of the State. Around 2005, the CUNY system developed a program to bring high school students into the profession; there was a change in leadership at CUNY and the program failed. The main difficulty they faced was that high school students don't know what they want and change their mind a lot. Perhaps something might be learned from this experience. The plan requires that students complete 4 years of high school, 4 years of college with a residency year and 4 years of an induction program. I would like to see a plan for addressing the inevitable attrition.

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Summary Comments:** The need is clear and getting more teachers from high school who want to and will become teachers is an important goal. My significant hesitation about this program is that there are few metrics for judging formative and summative success. I would like to see a plan where there are clear goals (how many students? What level of success on what measures? By what time in the program? Etc.), unexpected challenges (what if there is a major economic decline and Wyoming citizens must stop to work, and cannot afford even a funded program in higher education? ) and plans for addressing shortfalls and failed expectations (as there surely will be). / This is an ambitious program with many risks involved, the primary one being attrition. I also would like to see more specific goals and metrics for assessing the success of the program. These metrics should be applied developmentally. For example, specific numerical goals could be set for numbers of students at different phases of the program, monitored, and corrective action taken to address any attrition throughout the program. Likewise, I would like to see specific goals for character development (e.g., scores on Duckworth's measure of grit), accomplishments of grades in content courses, performance on observational measure (e.g., EdTPA, CLASS, etc.), and other outcome measures. These metrics were not requested in the proposal (that I could tell), but how will the program assess successes along the 12 year period of implementation?

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

### Response Representing: Nat Review

#### Innovation Rating: 3

**Innovation Comments:** This is not a new idea, but I do like the thoughtful way that you are thinking through transitioning the students from high school to college...so the idea makes real sense in terms of growing your own teacher talent. // I also like the fact that you are thinking about the specific admission's criteria for the students that you want to recruit but I am not certain that a dispositional assessment is the right approach...The academic criteria that you have seem fine...but I would try to look for other ways to assess the dispositional attributes of the students that you want to attract...such as, the student most evidence a certain amount of time working with young children and have feedback from a knowledgeable adult about the ability of the student to effectively interact with young people...I would, in essence, DISCOURAGE the use of a paper assessment and ENCOURAGE the use of other ways of observing the potential teacher to assess his or her disposition to success in the classroom. If you have a strong academic student using the measures that you define ( e.g., college ready ACT and SAT scores...) coupled with the observational assessments that I am recommending, I think you will come closer to your goal... // I like the focus on helping the teacher candidates build their skills regarding developing character and grit and civic engagement in the students that they potentially will be teaching...this is NOT easy to do and if the program does it successfully, it will be accomplishing something quite innovative. That said, if you use Paul Tough's work, he argues that the real key is for the teacher to create an environment that fosters competence, autonomy and relatedness...and these are fostered by teachers who know how to connect with students...See Tough's piece in The Atlantic ( August 2017)... "How Kids Learn Resilience" // My point is, I am more confident that you will get the teachers that you want in this program IF you find a way to really assess whether they can connect and interact at a deep level with students...and some type of paper and pencil dispositional assessment is not going to get you to that goal...in essence, that approach is NOT very innovative. // I am also concerned with the professional development that you plan to provide the cooperating teachers...will the program that the students matriculate through expose the students to selected high leverage teaching strategies and will those same strategies be taught to the cooperating teachers?...that is how you get real impact...the teacher candidates learn a defined set of high leverage teaching strategies in their classes...and the cooperating teachers learn and use those same strategies so that candidates see them in situ...here is how they present it at the U of M:  
[http://www.soe.umich.edu/academics/bachelors/elementary teacher education/high leverage practices/](http://www.soe.umich.edu/academics/bachelors/elementary%20teacher%20education/high%20leverage%20practices/)

#### Performance Indicator Rating: 3

**Performance Indicator Comments:** I like the fact that candidates can complete their coursework at either UW or at a partner community college, but this places a BIG burden on the program designers and implementers to make certain that there is agreement in terms of the content of the modules, which is why I am suggesting that you identify and make explicit the high leverage teaching strategies that you want the students to exhibit when they exit the program ...again, something similar to what they do at the University of Michigan:  
[http://www.soe.umich.edu/academics/bachelors/elementary teacher education/high leverage practices/](http://www.soe.umich.edu/academics/bachelors/elementary%20teacher%20education/high%20leverage%20practices/)  
Unless you do this ( or something like it) I am very concerned with the fidelity of the clinical and field placements that are implemented with partner school districts. This will be especially important in an area such as classroom management...this is something that most teacher prep institutions do poorly...and this occurs because they really don't teach the students to use and to see in practice the classroom management skills that they need in order to effectively deal with the range of student behaviors that they will see as teachers.. // I like the co teaching proposed as part of the residency experience...several IHEs around the country have been using this model/approach with modest success ( e.g., St Cloud State in MN, and I think Montclair State is also using it)) and those using the model have learned a lot over the past 10 20 years: [http://www.edweek.org/tm/articles/2014/10/15/ctq\\_sacks\\_coteaching.html](http://www.edweek.org/tm/articles/2014/10/15/ctq_sacks_coteaching.html) // I assume that you will draw on those experiences and would even encourage site visits for you to see what can be learned and incorporated in the UW model that would make your implementation of co teaching more successful. // I like the idea of using the Panopto technology to store lessons and then access those for reflection, analysis and coaching...you need to be thinking, though, of how those reflection and coaching sessions will be conducted and structured....there are different levels of reflection ( e.g., starting with reflection on the actual teaching strategies that a teacher uses)...to achieve the outcome that you want, and you need to be thinking about how to structure the coaching... /

#### Documentation of Need Rating: 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:** I would have liked to see more information on the specific areas of licensure that Wyoming is struggling to secure and make certain that you have available for employment...I don't think enough emphasis is placed on the in demand licensure areas ( e.g., math and science) that may be needed in your schools...I don't know what the teacher supply and demand looks like for Wyoming but my guess is that there are some licensure areas

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

where schools districts are having more challenges in finding candidates than others...if that is the case, I think it needs to be addressed or else you could be preparing candidates for areas for which there are no jobs or you have teaching areas for which there are jobs but an insufficient number of candidates.

### Literature Review Rating: 2

**Literature Review Comments:** I found the literature review to be weak... / I would have liked for them to reference at least some of the following... / Deborah Ball's work:

[http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2011/10/high\\_leverage\\_teaching\\_practices.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2011/10/high_leverage_teaching_practices.html) / Doug Lemov's teaching strategies for "champion teachers":[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/07/magazine/07Teachers\\_t.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/07/magazine/07Teachers_t.html) / Barnett Berry's work on preparing next generation teachers:[https://www.teachingquality.org/about/barnett\\_berry/](https://www.teachingquality.org/about/barnett_berry/) / NCTQ examples of strong teacher preparation programs:<https://www.usnews.com/education/nctq>

### Leading Programs Rating: 3

**Leading Programs Comments:** As I shared in my last response...I would have liked for them to reference at least some of the work that has been or is being done buy others around the country...my examples included... / Deborah Ball's work:

[http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2011/10/high\\_leverage\\_teaching\\_practices.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2011/10/high_leverage_teaching_practices.html) / Doug Lemov's teaching strategies for "champion teachers":[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/07/magazine/07Teachers\\_t.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/07/magazine/07Teachers_t.html) / Barnett Berry's work on preparing next generation teachers:[https://www.teachingquality.org/about/barnett\\_berry/](https://www.teachingquality.org/about/barnett_berry/) / NCTQ examples of strong teacher preparation programs:<https://www.usnews.com/education/nctq/> / / If you look at the literature they review, it does not include what I believe to be any of the key teacher educator researchers in the country...I agree that Ingersoll is significant, but his he is really know for all his work around teacher shortages and turnover:[http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1093&context=gse\\_pubs&sei\\_redir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.bing.com%2Fsearch%3Fq%3Drichard%2Bingersoll%2Bteacher%2Bturnover%26src%3DIE\\_SearchBox%26FORM%3DIENSTR#search=%22richard%20ingersoll%20teacher%20turnover%22](http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1093&context=gse_pubs&sei_redir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.bing.com%2Fsearch%3Fq%3Drichard%2Bingersoll%2Bteacher%2Bturnover%26src%3DIE_SearchBox%26FORM%3DIENSTR#search=%22richard%20ingersoll%20teacher%20turnover%22) / / I understand that NCTQ has political issues associated with it, but, again, I would have liked to at least see that the program developers look at what other putatively high performing teacher education programs are doing... / /

### Contextual Constraints Rating:

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

### Risk Assessment Rating:

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

### Funding Rating:

**Funding Comments:**

### Narrative Comments:

**Summary Comments:**

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

**Response Representing:** Nat Review

### **Innovation Rating:** 3

**Innovation Comments:** I like several aspects of this E4 program....of particular note are the following... // 1 The emphasis of the early identification of the participants as UW E4 Fellows...connecting with the students in high school is a great way to begin to create the future workforce of the future that you are going to need in Wyoming. // 2 The use of virtual clinical experiences is somewhat innovative, but a lot depends on the quality of those clinical modules that you use...I would tend to prefer having the students engage in more real life experiences with students ( i.e., using them as tutors or as mentors ) to see if they really like working with young people and to determine if they are good at it....do they have the right skills and dispositions? Still, the virtual clinicals offer a real opportunity // 3

### **Performance Indicator Rating:** 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** This proposal does address several of the TEI Performance Indicators...I especially like... // ....the Educators Rising approach as a way of creating the pipeline and the early recruitment of promising youth for teaching... // ....the use of guided fieldwork observations...if this is done correctly, it could be powerful ( but see below, the second concern)... // ....the use of the on line character education modules...though I am not convinced that the Sanford Inspired modules are the best option // I have a couple of concerns, though, with the proposal as articulated... // First, I like the fact that they are going to be using Wyoming teachers to mentor the UW educator candidates....that makes real sense...and I like the fact that they are going to have the mentors go through a focused and intensive professional development program....but what is not clear is if the teachers serving as mentors will be using teaching strategies that match what is being taught in the teacher preparation programs....as I indicated on my P3 evaluation, I really think that they should explore the identification of selected high leverage teaching strategies that the emerging candidates will learn and that the teacher mentors will model....similar to what is evidenced at the University of Michigan:[http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2011/10/high\\_leverage\\_teaching\\_practices.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2011/10/high_leverage_teaching_practices.html) // Second, I encourage the program developers to look at Barnett Berry's work in Teaching 2030, and especially his concept of "teacherpreneurism." See:[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vk\\_aulXHymQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vk_aulXHymQ) / My point is that for this program to be truly innovative these candidates are going to have to be exposed to innovative practices...this could occur through either finding Wyoming teachers who are innovative OR by bringing in for the Summer Institutes persons like Barnett Berry who are exploring what next generation teachers will be able to do... // I love the idea that they are connecting with the theatre programs, but they really need to be thoughtful in implementing this and I do encourage them to look at the work of others ( e.g., Bruce Joyce) who have played with this idea of helping teachers understand that there is a certain "drama" to teaching...though as technology becomes more evident in teaching, it begins to call into question whether next generation teachers will really "be on stage" as they have in the past...

### **Documentation of Need Rating:** 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:** They clearly suggest that there is a need to attract additional teachers, but what I find missing is the documentation as to the level of need by specific licensure field. They do suggest that there is a documented need in the STEM fields, which is certainly a national issue, but to what degree is this a problem in the Wyoming schools...and to what degree is the problem regional...I would like to know more about the specific magnitude of the need by licensure field. This is important because if the state is experiencing acute shortages in selected areas then the recruitment process needs to be focused on identifying teacher candidates for specific licensure fields...I have concerns with thinking about a general shortage of teachers when in most states the shortage is significantly more pronounced in selected areas...and a truly innovative program would be one that tries to address that circumstance...OTHERWISE, you could implement this program and have a lot of teacher recruits BUT you would still have the shortage situation in selected areas... // They talk in the proposal about concerns with the clinical preparation of UW candidates, but I don't know what that means....are they suggesting that no clinical preparation is occurring OR that they have no real comfort with the quality of the clinical practices that are in place in the IHE? In other words, they suggest that there is a need, but I am not exactly sure what the exact nature of the need is... // I like the fact that they are going to support character development for the teachers through engagement with parents and families...I am unclear as to whether the Sanford Inspire modules allow for or foster that to occur...I am not inclined to think that you can teach candidates the character traits that you want them to evidence...that, to me, is something that they possess or do not possess...I think you want to have a process in place that identifies candidates who evidence already the traits that you want them to possess and then you use the Sanford Inspire modules to reinforce those traits and to help the candidates learn how to foster grit and honesty and other positive non cognitive dispositions in the students that they teach...see especially:[https://consortium.uchicago.edu/publications/teaching\\_adolescents\\_become\\_learners\\_role\\_noncognitive\\_factors\\_shaping\\_school/](https://consortium.uchicago.edu/publications/teaching_adolescents_become_learners_role_noncognitive_factors_shaping_school/) FYI: If you look at the research, high school grades are a better predictor of college success than ACT/SAT scores or class rank or family background....you might want to make certain that the students that you recruit to the

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

program evidence the specific traits you want them to encourage and foster in students:

<https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/VUE%20Noncognitive%20Factors.pdf>

### Literature Review Rating: 3

**Literature Review Comments:** They have a reasonable amount of evidence but I question whether they have the RIGHT evidence....for example... // 1 They have Ingersoll and Strong as part of their literature review on mentoring and I agree that they have done work on this but I would have liked to see more recent research such as some of the work by Ellen Moir....this is really her area of specialty and I think she knows the actual efficacy of the mentoring practices better than someone like Richard

Ingersoll:[http://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/teaching\\_now/2017/06/new\\_teacher\\_center\\_mentor\\_study.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/teaching_now/2017/06/new_teacher_center_mentor_study.html) // 2 I am not sure how helpful the research from Finland might be in terms of informing mentoring practices in Wyoming...Finland draws from the top 5% of the college graduates for the teachers that they place in the classroom...mentoring there is much different than what you would find in the US....or in Wyoming....so I have a concern with the relevance of the research that they cite....again I would tend to rely more on the work of... // Ellen Moir:

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED515444> ( BTW: if you proceed with this effort, Ellen is a terrific resource!!!) // Carol Pelletier:

<https://www.americanbookwarehouse.com/131935/> // 3 The STEM teacher shortage area is one where citing Ingersoll and referencing his work makes sense...the citation that they have is from a journal that I would not consider to be a primary source...I would have cited some of Ingersoll's work here because he has done a lot of work on teacher shortage areas...here is a somewhat dated citation:[http://www.cpre.org/mathematics\\_and\\_science\\_teacher\\_shortage\\_fact\\_and\\_myth/](http://www.cpre.org/mathematics_and_science_teacher_shortage_fact_and_myth/) ...and here is a citation for a program in California that is dealing with the same issue that is highlighted in Wyoming:[https://edsources.org/2017/fresno\\_tackles\\_its\\_shortage\\_of\\_math\\_and\\_science\\_teachers/581342/](https://edsources.org/2017/fresno_tackles_its_shortage_of_math_and_science_teachers/581342/) //

### Leading Programs Rating: 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** Clearly they have looked at some other programs...so I gave them a very positive evaluation in that regard... // My concern is with HOW they decided WHICH programs to review. // I know that this will be controversial, but I don't think of Cleveland State as having a strong and innovative teacher preparation program...why did they decide to look at it? The Corbin and Western Oregon programs are strong from what I know of them...and when I looked at the NCTQ site I noticed that they surfaced there as strong

programs:<http://www.nctq.org/teacherPrep/2016/findings/home.do> // My point is that I would like to know HOW they decided to include a school as a "leading" program? // I would have looked at the NCTQ site for their rating of programs and I would have also looked at programs such as the University of Michigan because of Deb Ball and their use of high leverage teaching strategies, especially in specific teaching content areas AND/OR the University of Pennsylvania because of the unique partnerships that they have created with schools...and there are others... // It appears a bit haphazard and random in terms of how they selected their leading programs to review and explore...and if I am wrong in that assessment, I would like to know how they did decide to include a program.

### Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** I agree that the broad dispersion of the population represents a risk, but I don't see issues like that as being the biggest risks to successful program implementation... // They capture a variety of risks and here are the ones that I see as most significant... // The districts that are currently not engaged with UW are a problem....how will those districts know ( and their teachers know) what teaching practices that they need to be evidencing if they assume responsibility for taking on a student teacher? This is why I am strongly advocating that UW identify specific high leverage teaching practices that it plans to make certain that graduates of the program will have learned and will have observed in classrooms...again, see the Uof M program that I have previously referenced... // IF you are going to have the students repay a full year of tuition and all their living expenses, then you better make certain that you have great selection protocols in place....this can be a mess if students decide not to fulfill their obligations...I know this from experience...recovering these dollars is a problem...put in place procedures for this early on and really make this clear to students in terms of what will occur if they do not teach in Wyoming. // IF the E4 model works....it should positively impact your traditional programs...I agree that it will require effort to maintain both, but it should also strengthen your current programs... // A BIG risk is the involvement of A&S faculty...the key to mitigating that risk is to know exactly what you want them to do to assist you...what are the specific expectations that you have for the A&S faculty?...and also make certain that the UW Provost embraces those expectations....and is publicly supportive!!! // Moving to the use of modules does represent a risk...it is too easy to not have the contact with students that you need to make the assessments that are required...make certain that as you move to modules that you are also connecting directly with the students in ways that permit you to clearly assess their performance... // How are you marketing this to all your stakeholders?...I agree that buy in is essential but for that buy in to occur people need to see that this really does



## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

represent a new and positive next generation model for teacher education and teacher placement. You need to take the time to make certain that you have the right key early adopters on board who can help in "selling" the program to others...and are your senior IHE leaders absolutely committed to this effort?...and are they going to help message it?

### **Risk Assessment Rating: 2**

**Risk Assessment Comments:** I agree that there are some risks associated with this program, but I think that they are all manageable...and in some cases I don't really see that the identified risk represents a realistic threat. // For example, I can't conceive that NO Wyoming school district will want to pursue the development of an Educators Rising chapter...many will likely not have problems with securing teachers and I can see that they will "pass" on participation, but I cannot conceive that NO district will be engaged, especially if you work with the supts to help them understand what you are trying to do and why you are trying to do it...this is a messaging and marketing issue...and if that is done correctly, then the risk of "no school district participants" should disappear. // I am also not particularly concerned with fidelity of the implementation of this program IF the faculty are being actively engaged in the new program's development...if this is being imposed, I see problems, but if faculty are being recruited to help design and implement it and have "ownership" in the new model, then you will minimize the risk... // The E4 proposal references that the new program is competency based and not a "traditional course based approach." To some degree, even traditional course based programs are competency based...those traditional courses have goals and expectations and outcomes that are associated with their successful completion...I would suggest you not think of these as two different programs but rather as two different ways to deliver to teacher candidates the same program...If you have one set of teaching skills being delivered by different program models, that, to me, is NOT a risk issue...it is a research opportunity! BUT if you have two different programs with different expectations and outcomes, then that is more than a risk issue...indeed, that raises issues about the overall integrity of the work that you are doing... // I agree that the seamless transfer of classes can be an issue, but if your senior administrators are embracing what you are doing around the transfer and articulation of coursework, and are advocating for procedures to be put in place to make that occur, then this should not be a risk issue...

### **Funding Rating: 3**

**Funding Comments:** I think that the budget as proposed does address the primary program costs that will be incurred....but I see two issues with the proposed expenses... // First, I am VERY concerned with the dollars being set aside for the PD relative to the Educating Rising sponsors and for the mentor teachers....for this program to work, these participants really need to understand and buy into the program that you are proposing...and these dollars really don't look sufficient to me given the scale of the program that you are proposing. Think seriously about increasing the PD dollars!....I would think that you could take some dollars from the Institute speaker stipends....those fees look a bit high to me, UNLESS you think you need to bring in outside consultants to do all this speaking work.Regardless, think about increasing the PD dollars! // Second, I think the overall budget for this appears to be too modest...IF your intention is to do this program well, then invest more dollars in the areas where you have the greatest associated risks, especially in PD and marketing. One of your identified risks is whether school districts will participate in sufficient numbers and whether you will have sufficient numbers of candidates, YET YOU HAVE A VERY LIMITED MARKETING BUDGET...I would try to place more dollars in PD and marketing...to make certain that the participants really have solid grounding in the program expectations and that you have sufficient numbers of participants. // // // // Second, // //

**Narrative Comments:** The problem that I have is that the narrative describes a program that has lots of complexity and moving parts and yet the implementation BUDGET for the program is VERY modest...I just don't see how you can accomplish something that is this dramatically different with the limited dollar investment that you are proposing...PLEASE find more dollars because the following are going to take funding if they are to be implemented with fidelity.. // ...the early recruitment of the RIGHT candidates is going to take a lot of marketing effort to ensure that partner school districts know exactly what type of candidate you are looking for...INVEST MORE DOLLARS AND EFFORT IN MARKETING // ...the coaching and mentoring of the candidates means that you have to have the right persons in those roles and they need to have the right skills to be successful. This needs a lot more attention and focus if it is going to be successful...INVEST MORE DOLLARS AND EFFORT INTO THE PD EFFORTS THAT YOU PUT IN PLACE FOR THE MENTOR TEACHERS...if you don't have the right people in these roles and if they don't have the right skills, this program will not be successful. // ...identify what high leverage teaching skills you want the students to observe and focus on during their field and clinical placements. The candidates should not simply be observing how different teachers teach...THEY SHOULD BE LEARNING SOME SPECIFIC HIGH LEVERAGE TEACHING STRATEGIES THAT THEY WILL BE ABLE TO USE ONCE THEY TEACH..... and they need to see these strategies being used and modeled in situ. // ...you indicate that you want the Fellows to be paired with mentor teachers so that they can co teach and share responsibility for planning and instructional differentiation....this is really hard to do unless there is agreement about what types of differentiation

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

teaching practices will be used in the classroom...I really like this idea that is being proposed...my point is that it is quite hard to do this with success unless you are clear about exactly what instructional differentiation skills you want the mentor teachers and Fellows to be able to use in the classroom...TRY TO IDENTIFY SOME SPECIFIC PLANNING, INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS AND ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES THAT YOU WANT EVERYONE TO BE ABLE TO USE...and then make certain that all the key participants are able to model those in real classrooms. // ...I like the idea of having the local schools doing some of the fundraising to make this mentoring effort impactful....you might want to beta test this approach in a couple of early adopter districts and then use those as potential best practice sites as you expand the concept statewide...IN ESSENCE, START WITH SOME SPECIFIC AND PURPOSEFULLY SELECTED BEST PRACTICE SITES //

**Summary Comments:** This is a very ambitious program proposal...my concerns, as you will see in my previous responses, are that I think they are simply trying to do too much...and I am convinced that there are not sufficient funds being budgeted to ensure that this will be accomplished with fidelity...please reconsider the dollar allocations for things like mentor PD and marketing if you decide to proceed with this.. // I am also concerned with the degree to which senior leaders are embracing this model...that is, senior leaders at UW and senior K 12 leaders...IF they really have ownership for the success of this program and buy into the goals and implementation, then I have some optimism, but if that is not evidenced and if the funding is not increased, I simply cannot envision that this program will achieve what it hopes to accomplish!

## 2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews

### Response Representing: Nat Review

#### Innovation Rating: 4

**Innovation Comments:** Year long residency is still limited in it's national use, but it shows good evidence of success / The idea of going into high schools to attract talent is a huge win for Wyoming kids. / That you've thought through each cohort with several phases is great, I'd encourage trying to keep the candidates together once they reach UW so they can help each other through the process.

#### Performance Indicator Rating: 4

**Performance Indicator Comments:** For CAEP accreditation it will be important to put a plan in place to track how these teachers are doing once they're in the classroom. I think there are many options for doing so, but it'll be important since you have a long term project here, that you gather the data. / This will be a big shift for faculty. It directly addresses number 7, but I think the risk you've identified about faculty shifts is a huge one, and I'm not sure the plan adequately addresses how to deal with that change. / This should result in more Wyoming districts wanting clinical agreements. I think the harder sell will be to allow those candidates into classrooms before they choose their area of focus. I think it's a really important part of the program, but I'm unclear how districts benefit.

#### Documentation of Need Rating: 3

**Documentation of Need Comments:** I know a bit about Wyoming's challenges from working with the State Superintendent, but I'd be interesting in learning more about how you accommodate candidates from different parts of Wyoming. This proposal is good, and makes sense with the kids from Cheyenne, and Laramie, but how do you engage rural kids into a future educators' chapter when there may be a smaller number of candidates possible / I think the evidence is strong nationally that we must "grow our own" in many of these places, so the approach taken here aligns with that.

#### Literature Review Rating: 4

**Literature Review Comments:** I'm not an academic, so the literature referenced would be important for others to review as well, but I'm quite familiar with the evidence presented. I think it covers the need for students to develop skills that are different than the ones currently grown in our current candidates. / I'm interested in learning how the Tough book fits into this. I've read that and I agree that those skills are important. Could it be more explicit how the program will grow those skills?

#### Leading Programs Rating: 4

**Leading Programs Comments:** The proposal indicates review of other programs and does reference conclusions from those programs. / I'd be interested in adding a program from Louisiana, who, in my opinion, has done the best job of thinking about year long residency as a state. / The Arizona State program is also doing a good job of having educators in the classroom for a longer period of time.

#### Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

**Contextual Constraints Comments:** I'm wondering if the Standards Board in Wyoming really understands how big a shift is proposed here and if they are willing to grant licenses in a different way than they have in the past. / I don't know how you will address the issue of only having 6 districts. It seems like a huge issue that needs a longer explanation.

#### Risk Assessment Rating: 3

**Risk Assessment Comments:** The early field work is a big risk for districts that should require some initial conversation with districts before proceeding. I think it's a really important part of the process that could get scrapped if not careful during implementation. / The faculty changes are going to need to be implemented in a way that allow faculty to change and see the benefits of having candidates learn this way.

#### Funding Rating: 2

**Funding Comments:** I believe the budget is too small for the proposed activities. Although, the in kind from districts is probably a piece that isn't outlined in the budget. / I encourage really thinking about how this will be funded long term. These type of projects fail to continue in many places due to lack of funding continuity.

**Narrative Comments:** I really like the way the proposal talks about recruiting high school students to experience what it's like to be a future educator. / I like the way it works in phases and keeps the groups together throughout those cohorts. I

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

like the induction phase as well, which would help teachers transition in. We know many teachers leave in the first few years due to lack of support / I think the overall design is very thoughtful, I'd encourage thinking about whether the budget is adequate, and whether the University is ready for this shift. Also, the shift for districts will be big. I think there should be separate plans on changing the University program and engaging districts in a new way.

**Summary Comments:** Good proposal, very aggressive. I think the challenges identified in the previous box will be the big ones to address.

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** OVERALL AVERAGE RATING

**Innovation Rating:** 3.175

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3.481

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2.923

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3.019

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3.509

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3.020

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2.500

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3.157

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** FACULTY AVERAGE RATING

**Innovation Rating:** 2.500

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3.000

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 2.111

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 2.778

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3.125

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 2.778

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2.125

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3.125

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** STAKEHOLDER AVERAGE RATING

**Innovation Rating:** 3.326

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3.571

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3.077

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 3.100

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3.610

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3.075

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2.561

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 3.195

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**

## **2017-05 Feedback and National Reviews**

**Response Representing:** NATIONAL REVIEW AVERAGE RATING

**Innovation Rating:** 3.250

**Innovation Comments:**

**Performance Indicator Rating:** 3.500

**Performance Indicator Comments:**

**Documentation of Need Rating:** 3.250

**Documentation of Need Comments:**

**Literature Review Rating:** 2.750

**Literature Review Comments:**

**Leading Programs Rating:** 3.250

**Leading Programs Comments:**

**Contextual Constraints Rating:** 3.000

**Contextual Constraints Comments:**

**Risk Assessment Rating:** 2.667

**Risk Assessment Comments:**

**Funding Rating:** 2.500

**Funding Comments:**

**Narrative Comments:**

**Summary Comments:**