2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: School of Teacher EducationFaculty

Innovation Rating:2
Innovation Comments: We already have a program for individuals with bachelor's degrees in content areas that want to become teachers, it's called the "Post Baccalaureate Program." As opposed to implementing this similar but parallel track, I suggest we bolster and improve the extant program.

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 1
Documentation of Need Comments: The proposal states, "The need to recruit knowledgeable experts who are motivated to move into a professional teaching career is well documented." I don't find any of that documentation in this proposal. / / My biggest concern related to need: "is there a need for these teachers in WY once they complete?" I see an Ohio program is mentioned as an example. Ohio, in some areas, has a teacher shortage. Wyoming, largely, does not. We do have shortages in Special Education, ESL, and some sciences. We could recruit and target individuals wanting to teach in these areas into a reinvigorated post bac program, and that would be more economically feasible and sustainable.

Literature Review Rating: 2
Literature Review Comments: The proposal includes things like induction. It's important. Done right, it's expensive. Good induction should be a goal for all of our early career teachers, not just those in this track. Induction is also more in the purview of school districts than it is teacher education programs'. / / The proposal, like the others, makes some vague mention of character education. Much more info needed. If by character development we are talking about the development of democratic skills and dispositions, like those advocated by the late John Goodlad, a dear friend of the college, please count me in. If we are talking about implementing a canned character education program designed mostly to indoctrinate and subordinate our students, no thanks. / / Goodlad also by the way avoided the term "fellows." He called participants in his group "leadership associates," a more palatable and gender neutral term.

Leading Programs Rating: 1
Leading Programs Comments: Included programs aren't really evaluated, but if we want to include another exemplar, and one we could and should evaluate and update, then we should look to our own Post bac option.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments: One identified constraint is recruitment, and if there aren't jobs for these graduates (especially outside the few high needs areas), maybe we shouldn't be recruiting them. / /

Risk Assessment Rating:
Risk Assessment Comments: The proposal 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. / / I'd prefer putting the time, funding and energy into improving a program we already have in place (post bac).This improvement could include targeting candidates for the highest need content areas, as well as targeting candidates willing to teach in areas of our state experiencing the most difficulty hiring and retaining quality teachers.

Narrative Comments: Proposal narrative is fine. It includes description of the 8 week PIP. That seems thin to me, and sounds like TFA. I realize those making these proposals are (at least as far as I know) not, nor have ever been, public school teachers or teacher educators, and so they might not be familiar with Lee Shulamn's notion of pedagogical content

knowledge. Generally, knowing a subject in depth is one thing, but knowing how to effectively teach it to groups of diverse students is a completely different thing, and it's highly complex. I doubt an 8 week cram course will adequately prepare these folks for the complex realities of teaching in a multicultural society.

Summary Comments: Mostly all mentioned in previous responses. My preference is to fold some of these ideas into the current post bac program, making that program stronger as opposed to creating a parallel program in which we compete with ourselves for students. / / Additionally, and this applies to all proposals, I am not a fan of calling these efforts an "academy." To me, that term means rigid and militaristic, and these are not descriptors I value in a teacher education program.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Education School of Teacher Education Faculty

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: I like the idea of providing experts in needed content fields the much needed training in teaching, assessment, and classroom management strategies. The year long residency is an essential. Using avatar and human simulations is great, but practicum placements in real classrooms with real students is essential. While focused observations are important, experience teaching individuals, small groups, and whole classes with mentor teacher feedback is essential. Presently, our COE students get their first real practicum experience at the end of their junior year which is too late. / I like that the pre service teachers will receive a cost of living stipend and a tuition scholarship and, depending on job availability, will pay this back by agreeing to teach for 4 years in a Wyoming school. I like the mentoring provided for the first four years of teaching. I think it is important for mentor teachers to have training in using co teaching strategies and in effectively mentoring pre service teachers (there are many mentor teachers who are excellent teachers, but don't have any training or guidance in how to mentor pre service teachers). Mentor teachers should receive a much larger stipend than they currently do the work they do is difficult and time consuming.

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3
Documentation of Need Comments: Would like more specifics.

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments: Would like more specifics.

Leading Programs Rating: 3
Leading Programs Comments: Would like more specifics.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments: Many contextual constraints are identified. One huge contextual constraint is that schools are under so much pressure to produce high standardized scores that they often don't want to bother with the extra burden of mentoring pre service teachers. Schools and mentor teachers will need to be convinced of the value of having more teachers in their classrooms and the benefits of co teaching strategies for them and their K 12 students. Often innovative, student centered, engaging, intrinsically motivating, memorable, and highly effective teaching strategies that emphasize critical thinking are de emphasized or eliminated altogether as teachers and schools strive to raise standardized test scores. When pre service teachers are exposed to these more teacher centered, bland, and joyless classrooms, what are they learning? How we do prevent the passing down of these more ineffective teaching strategies?

Risk Assessment Rating: 3
Risk Assessment Comments: Well thought through

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Education School of Teacher Education Faculty

Innovation Rating:1
Innovation Comments: We have a post bac program that is similar to this proposal.

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: 1
Leading Programs Comments: The proposal lists the programs, but the summary has no detail about what is learned from these programs. This section needs more development to show how these programs are models for us.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2
Contextual Constraints Comments: We have this program already. There are more constraints than you list. It would be important to discuss our own program with faculty and students.

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: Consider the risks of year long residency to students.

Funding Rating: 4
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments: This narrative sounds similar to the program we have. You can't provide mentorship training only to teachers in this program. We have other students in schools and all teachers need to be addressed.

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: College of Education Science and Mathematics Teaching Center Faculty

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: I have taken a little over an hour to review the proposal on two different occasions – so, not as much time as I would like, but what I have for now. Things that I like full year supported residency – I feel that I learned the most on the job, and in a supported situation and that this will provide that support – in addition, having a living stipend provided is also critical in terms of being able to focus on the process. I also like that you have thought about having students be in school districts in cohorts – I think for them preservice teachers AND the school districts, this is also important. // Things to think about in this situation as well – as a former practitioner with many, many preservice teachers in my classroom, I found that in order to mentor properly and make the experience what the preservice teacher and my students needed, it was exhausting and taxing. The stipend I was offered was usually so small, it was insignificant. Even offering more $ may not get you the mentors you really want. On the other hand, in Wyoming, we have been lax in terms of getting the most out of our teacher leaders – we have MANY wonderful teachers in this state, many nationally board certified teachers, and many others who would like to work on board certification and master's degrees. I would recommend thinking about the teachers in cohorts as well and working with them on their own personal PD goals. // In addition, having a good (let alone top notch) 4 year induction program will take a lot of work and support from UW or other outside providers. To not provide this would be, in my opinion, irresponsible. This is another place where working within the school districts and with the cohorts of teachers would be important (in addition to the administrators, who usually don't know what they don't know and don't realize how much the same information would be helpful for them). Again, working in a system that also rewards and provides for the mentors to work alongside (differentiated as needed), with choices about outcomes for themselves (certificates, credits, degrees) would be a way to enhance this. // One of my major concerns is the master's degree that does not seem to include any research component. If you look at programs in Finland, their teacher programs include research within their initial teaching degrees, and I find that the teachers who come and work on our SMTC Master's degrees grow exponentially in their understanding of teaching and learning through the process of research. I think this is a critical component of any Master's degree (that is, becoming a master of some aspect of your profession in particular) and would encourage you to incorporate this into the 3rd program. // In addition, I spent a little time on the Mursion website and think that while it may be a good addition to the program, from what I could tell, the mode I saw in all the videos was teacher directed and teacher centered. As a science teacher and a teacher of science teachers, this is definitely NOT what I want my preservice teachers learning how to do (run teacher centered classrooms). I am not sure it is possible to do student centered work in this type of simulation – and it would require the actors to have had their own experiences in these types of classrooms (unfortunately, still not common in HS

and even more rare at the undergraduate level) – and possibly would be very difficult to pull off. I think this is something that should be considered carefully before a lot of $ is spent on a system like this. / / I am also concerned that the major message was that this is the best mode for learning like this because the preservice teachers would be "wasting the students time". As you know, teaching and learning is a messy process, learning (conceptual change) and reflecting (both for teachers and students), model building, communicating, learning how to think critically – all of these processes are way more complex than could be simulated. This is learned on both sides in real time situations. This message also implies that the preservice teacher has nothing new to offer to the students or the classroom – which I believe is an incorrect assumption. I always learned something from the preservice teachers who came into my classroom – and hopefully, vice versa. And even in the worst situations, I know my students also learned something. And as the mentor, it was my responsibly to make sure this occurred. / / I appreciate the work that has gone into this – though I am also concerned that other than yourself, there were no educators on this team (though I cannot find a bio for Thomas Botts, so I could be mistaken). Wava Tully (also board member) has a background in education… I am sure that the reasoning is complex, but this frustration for me comes out of one of the more exasperating aspects of being in Science/STEM on campus. We have been left out of all of the conversations (we have summarily been dismissed as a college on several occasions) that the scientists are having about teaching and learning science. Watching them "discover" ideas that John Dewey and others proposed over 100 years ago is a little humorous.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: EducationSchool of Teacher Education Faculty

Innovation Rating:4
Innovation Comments: While the proposal mirrors the current UW COE postbac program, its detail plans are highly innovative.

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: How would we ensure that those entering teaching through alternate route described in the proposal will feel competent in several areas of teaching besides their content area? Given that many who enter alternate routes to teaching are traditionally order, how would we address a possible gap while they are in the education program? /

Risk Assessment Rating: 4
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 4
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: Given the reality that there is a high demand for teachers in rural areas as well as in inner cities in content areas such as mathematics, sciences, engineering and technology, the plans in the proposal is highly innovative and necessary. / / /

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Education Teacher Education Faculty

Innovation Rating:4
Innovation Comments: The model provides different pathways into education for people at various stages of their lives. It gives faculty a unique opportunity to rethink and try out new pedagogical approaches for preparing teachers.

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 4
Documentation of Need Comments: The proposal does an excellent job of demonstrating the need for the academy. In particular, it does an excellent job at helping to fill areas of teacher shortage and address concerns in rural areas.

Literature Review Rating: 4
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 4
Contextual Constraints Comments: I think the proposal does the best it can with this short of actually engaging in the implementation. Clearly there is an awareness of contextual constraints and solutions are considered. However, the approach is also flexible and I think has been clearly thought out to the point that there is nothing left to do but implement it. Based on the level of thought and detail, constraints will be relatively easy to handle.

Risk Assessment Rating: 3
Risk Assessment Comments: The students clearly have some risk in this as they are entering a new program that will be refined along the way. However, the program is clearly committed to ensuring that all students have the best experience possible.

Funding Rating: 4
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments: I am very excited about these initiatives. They propose a clear and innovative way to bring more teachers into the profession. However, there is also a support mechanism in place to ensure that we work towards having our students be high quality teachers, and this is an important point. Quantity will not be sufficient. We must do what is needed to ensure quality as well. This proposal does this while allowing those who are involved the opportunity to engage students in new and meaningful ways.

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Ed School of Teacher Education Faculty

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: Of the three proposals, this is of most interest to me. It is very similar however to our post bac program with additional observations included via distance. I hope it works better than the distance classrooms I tried to supervise via technology last year. I found myself getting more out of a live visit than when I used the computer for my non partnership placements. I also like the mentoring work over the extended time range.

Performance Indicator Rating: 3
Performance Indicator Comments: Mentoring (and finding excellent mentors) is critical for these to be met. My experiences with mentor teachers are varied my residents have had some really great mentors but sometimes bad mentorships can occur. Sometimes these are with really respected teachers who do not understand that one can learn to teach but patience is required for some residents. CAEP and my SPA will not be met by not following the requirements for placements and attending to the content knowledge required.

Documentation of Need Rating: 2
Documentation of Need Comments: If you want great science and mathematics teachers, you need to consider what industry is offering salary wise because many leave the profession after a few years because they can make more money with less stress outside of teaching. You list STEM education throughout the proposal without addressing what engineering and technology prepared students will teach. While I agree that there is a perception out in the US that these are mathematically intensive majors, in reality most engineering professors will agree that mathematics is just used, but not understood by many engineers. Most engineering majors and computer science majors do not have mathematics preparation beyond Calculus and Differential Equations. These are the sophomore level required courses that provide preparation for the courses mathematics educators need for teaching mathematics as well as providing for SPA accreditation and CAEP accreditation. PTSB requires SPA accreditation. There are two years of content coursework beyond that level in our current program which ensures a bachelors in mathematics and mathematics education. In our current post bac program, many mathematics majors do not have two required courses that they must take in the program Geometry (a senior level proof intensive course) and History of Mathematics which both fulfill many SPA content requirements. When considering Engineering for Science majors, I imagine there is some overlap but again, maybe some content might be required. I only know of a few districts that offer one course that deal with engineering topics and there isn't a PTSB content area major that qualifies teachers to teach these they are more experimental coursework. They do not fulfill mathematics requirements at this time. The engineering courses I have seen so far are very limited in mathematics. Technology majors such as computer science could prepare to teach computer science but even in our largest Wyoming districts there are not the number of courses so that a full time load for this could occur.

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments: Mentoring the mentors will be exciting. It is a critical aspect of this proposal as is the continuation of work into their teaching careers.

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 4
Funding Comments: Interesting I like how this budget is delineated.

Narrative Comments: This is the proposal that interests me the most. I see it as viable and, I hope, sustainable past the grant.

Summary Comments: Interesting ideas. More explanations of STEM beyond the buzz word would be needed for NSF funding.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Ed Sch Teacher Ed Faculty

Innovation Rating:1
Innovation Comments: UW already has four programs that do what is in this proposal on campus. One is WITS an NSF Noyce grant (Wyoming Interns to Teacher Scholars) led by Leonard. Two is SWARMS an NSF Noyce grant (Sustaining Wyoming's Advancing Reach in Mathematics and Science) led by Burrows. Three is the post bac program through the Office of Teacher Education, which is a three semester program (fast tracked for those holding degrees) championed by Hutchison and Krieger. Four is LAMP a science initiative opportunity (Learning Actively Mentoring Program) led by Watson. Were any of these individuals, or the teams that they work with, contacted for this proposal?

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments: It addressed the indicators.

Documentation of Need Rating: 2
Documentation of Need Comments: The programs that are in place (post bac through OTE) could provide data on the need for this type of program. The funding for students is a good idea (and needed) since they are often career changers and have families to support.

Literature Review Rating: 2
Literature Review Comments: Because of a lack to leverage the existing programs, limited evidence was supplied for this proposal.

Leading Programs Rating: 2
Leading Programs Comments: The lack of using the programs in place at UW shows little reflection on how this type of program could work.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 1
Contextual Constraints Comments: There are many contextual constraints not addressed in this proposal, and leveraging the programs on UW's campus could aid in this section.

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: There is always an university perception risk as well as new teacher burnout risk (with even more requirements during their first few years).

Funding Rating: 2
Funding Comments: The proposal should address other areas of need, but funding students is important.

Narrative Comments: The people involved and the opportunities involved with these potential students will make or break this type of proposal. More attention to those points should be included.

Summary Comments: This idea is a good one, and several people on campus are already doing this type of work. However, attention to how it is implemented (especially by looking at the lesson learned by programs already in place) is extremely important.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:2
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments: All but 6 and 7

Documentation of Need Rating: 4
Documentation of Need Comments: Depending on the population center, so people may not even have folks interested.

Literature Review Rating: 4
Literature Review Comments:

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: I am concerned about the cost when we could have other solutions to get these STEM folks prepared. Many already have degrees in Science and Tech, so I am not convinced this is a good program for us. Maybe we need to consider a program like other states consider that just provides an expedited teaching certification for PIC people.

Summary Comments:

2017-07 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: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 4
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: I think this could help to meet the need in some of our hard to fill areas of K 12 education.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: This type of program has been successful in many other areas of the nation. Those programs will provide the CoE guidance.

Performance Indicator Rating: 3
Performance Indicator Comments: The most relevant indicators addressed in this proposal are 2, 3, and 4.

Documentation of Need Rating: 3
Documentation of Need Comments: WY has moderate need of this type of program offering.

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments: Adequate literature was provided

Leading Programs Rating: 3
Leading Programs Comments: Adequate support was provided

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments: It is absolutely necessary that outstanding mentors be identified. The proposal states that 3 students will comprise a cohort in a school district. What if there are not 3 students in a specific school district?

Risk Assessment Rating: 3
Risk Assessment Comments: It is unclear as to why identifying interested parties is a risk....the first risk listed.

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments: A budget was provided

Narrative Comments: The narrative was clear

Summary Comments: Identification of outstanding mentors is crucial. Is special education an area of need in WY?

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2
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: 2
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 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: 4
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:2
Innovation Comments: This proposal is largely a duplication of a program that we have had in place for more than 10 years the post baccalaureate program. That existing program has always been more attractive to / The focus on STEM is somewhat different, but post baccalaureate students in the STEM fields have always had access to the existing program and a number of those have earned eligibility for certification through the existing program. It may be worthwhile to look into how many students with undergraduate degrees in the School of Teacher Education fields have completed the existing program. If it is a respectable number, I see no reason to create a parallel program. If it is not a significant number of students, we might be better served by marketing the existing program more effectively to the target population. / The part about this program leading to a masters degree also duplicates what we already have in place. Essentially, students who complete the existing post baccalaureate program have roughly one half of the credits that can be applied to a C and I masters degree program. / I also have serious reservations about a year long residency. How does that work with methods? If the answer is that they will have methods prior to the year long experience, where does that happen? If the answer is some combination of methods delivered by community college faculty, the faculty at the student's placement site and/or delivered by UW faculty via distance technology, I do not view that as a terribly effective model. Furthermore, I am not familiar with much research that supports the idea that year long residency is a superior model, and there is no research cited in the proposal that indicates that is so.

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments: Proposal addresses a number of the indicators but that does not necessarily merit the creation of a program that is essentially parallel to something we already have in place.

Documentation of Need Rating: 1
Documentation of Need Comments: Don't really see a need to create a parallel track to the existing post baccalaureate program.

Literature Review Rating: 3
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:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:
Innovation Comments: Please see my previous comments for this section. I was trying to preview the questions and I reached the end where my feedback was submitted and I could not go back. Pete Moran

Performance Indicator Rating:
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating:
Documentation of Need Comments: Would love to see something here that addresses the needs in Wyoming specifically. These students are going to be required to teach in Wyoming for 4 years it would be helpful to see the areas of greatest need, both in terms of content areas and which Wyoming school districts are most affected.

Literature Review Rating: 2
Literature Review Comments: Don't see much in this literature review that supports the idea of year long residency as a superior model to what we are already doing. I have real doubts that just because the experience is longer, it is necessarily better. If feedback from our students counts for anything here, it would be worthwhile to survey their perspectives on year long residency. I can absolutely assure you that substantial numbers of our student teachers believe that 16 weeks of residency is more than adequate.One redeeming quality of this proposal is that these students will be paid if we ever move toward a year long model (not that I would ever advocate for such a change), we going to have to figure out some ways to pay students in residency.

Leading Programs Rating:
Leading Programs Comments: I agree that these sorts of alternative programs are popular and many institutions (including UW College of Education) have developed something like this. / I also agree with the statement about recruitment. My question here is why do we not devote our attention to recruiting STEM students more effectively for the existing post baccalaureate program.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2
Contextual Constraints Comments: I think the constraint of working with PTSB around certification issues is critical. This proposal does not address those issues. For instance, there are a couple of math courses that are required for certification in this state but are not required for the mathematics degree in A & S. / I also agree that identifying the STEM students who might join a teacher certification program (like our existing program) is critical, but I don't understand why we would not channel those students into our existing program.

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: Need to make sure that these students will be employable in Wyoming. I recognize that some STEM areas are in high demand but I doubt that assures that all of these students will end up in teaching positions in Wyoming. For instance, there is no shortage of biology / life science teachers in this state. Furthermore, given the fiscal climate of the state, several school districts have actually implemented reduction in force mechanisms that have eliminated teaching positions. / To my mind, there is great risk that our faculty will not support a proposal of this sort for a variety of reasons: duplication of an existing program, reservations about the efficacy of year long residency, lack of clarity about how methods are delivered to these students, etc. In some respects, the references to faculty losing some control over critical elements of our current programs could be interpreted as an affront to what the faculty here have to offer and take great pride in doing well. If this proposal, in practice, strips faculty of significant elements of what they do (i.e. teach the methods courses), then I think it is particularly bold to expect faculty to willingly vote themselves off the island. I have significant concerns about methods and other major elements of teacher preparation being delivered in an 8 week period. / There is a lot of faith placed in modules, VR simulations, etc in this proposal. I am too old school to be a big fan of those. I believe there is much more value in face to face interactions with a real person.

Funding Rating:
Funding Comments: There certainly seems to be enough budgeted here to cover a total of 18 students. Makes me question the long term viability of a program of this sort what happens after 2 years?

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: I think I have noted my reservations on previous screens. I think this will be a very hard sell to our faculty. The proposal diminishes the role and expertise of the faculty in ways that I find objectionable, largely duplicates an existing program, moves residency to a format that few of our faculty support, profoundly favors particular slices of our student population (STEM) over all others and at levels of monetary commitment that are hard to justify. / One final comment, I suspect that the faculty will object strongly to this proposal because it was developed by a group that is comprised of individuals with no experience in teacher education and who lack an even rudimentary understanding of our programs. Given the extraordinary efforts to include diverse stakeholders and varied points of view on all of the other initiative working groups, I find it highly unusual that this proposal was developed without any representation from the faculty who work in our teacher education programs.

2017-07 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: I think you do a better job of establishing need than in supporting the innovation. Why were the particular traditional programs chosen to inform the innovation? Where is the evidence base for the chosen interventions?

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: Phase 1 could use further elaboration. How will you identify potential candidates? What will the recruitment mechanism be, particularly among STEM professionals who have been out of school for a while?

Summary Comments: I think this is a critical need addressed with innovation. I have the same concerns as with the other 4 year commitment proposal there is a significant risk of default and exit from Wyoming. That could be addressed through recruitment of individuals with strong ties to the state, however, should be addressed more clearly in the proposal.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:
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:

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: The use of technologies for clinical and field placements are innovative, but other parts are solutions that I think have been addressed in other contexts.

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments: The proposal, if carried out as specified, would meet most of the indicators.

Documentation of Need Rating: 4
Documentation of Need Comments: The need for these positions is clear in WY and the nation. Is there sufficient evidence that the recruited teachers acquire the necessary skills in alternative preparations as well as the incentives to stay (e.g., lower salaries and more hours compared to other jobs they could get in other fields)?

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments: Teacher shortages have been a focus of research and scholarship for a while. There seems to be sufficient evidence for the need, but I wonder about the comparative evidence of the alternative preparation programs. Are they showing significantly different outcomes than traditional routes?

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments: Several programs external to UW and the state have been evaluated. I notice that Finland's program has been evaluated for all three pathways. I think it is important to keep in mind that Finland is a different country than we are with different economic, social, and cultural beliefs and approaches than we often hold in the US, e.g., salaries, benefits, curriculum, assessment, when schooling begins, etc.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 4
Contextual Constraints Comments: I think you have identified contextual constraints and solutions. It seems that it is not only qualified candidates that have a desire to teach, but also a desire to work and live in rural environments. Many of the novice teachers I have worked with since being here are looking for the bigger towns in WY or looking elsewhere because they are looking for more than the small, rural town life offers.

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: I think risks have been addressed, especially the changes to the current COE structures and programs.

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments: Overall the budget seems sound, but I wonder about having only one person develop the program objectives and experiences. Would this be better as a small group?

Narrative Comments: I think the narrative is clear overall. All three proposals have extensive field experiences and 4 year mentoring/induction. Are these also going to be components of the traditional pathway to teacher preparation? If not, it seems that these three pathways would eventually put the other traditional pathway "out of business." If they are going to be parts of all 4 pathways to licensure, it puts tremendous weight and ownership on the school districts as well. I think this is a good ideal but something that needs to be approached strategically.

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: This proposal is good and moderate in its innovation.

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments: I agree with the proposal's indicators.

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: The proposal seriously underfunds district mentors.

Risk Assessment Rating: 3
Risk Assessment Comments: The proposal lacks letters of support and involvement from the K 12 community thus unclear as to the buy in and acceptance of proposal. Places an additional burden on districts for development of teachers that may be unwanted as well as seriously underfunds teacher mentors.

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments: Underfunds teacher mentors.

Narrative Comments: See previous comments

Summary Comments: See previous comments

2017-07 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: 4
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 4
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 4
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:4
Innovation Comments: Professional from the workforce outside of education could provide an added plus to the education of Wyoming students.

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2
Documentation of Need Comments: Need appears to be a national struggle but I am unsure if Wyoming has the shortage to support the need to more teachers.

Literature Review Rating: 2
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments: This program has potential to provide additional teachers who come from a diverse workforce background. My only worry is that there could be the potential of those teachers ot having positions within the school district they were trained.

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:2
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
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: 2
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: Based upon actual feedback and research done within our state, I do not determine the need for STEM educators to be as great as the current documented shortage of special education teachers and an impending shortage of CTE teachers.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: The proposal objectives are moderately innovative. Teach for America has been in operation for years.

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments: The proposal is aligned with 5 of the TEI performance Indicators.

Documentation of Need Rating: 1
Documentation of Need Comments: The data in the proposal showed zero statistics documenting the need. The statements in the narrative regarding the need were broad and not backed up by citations.

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments: The literature review in the proposal was well cited. The sources were well documented; the narrative did not clearly demonstrate that practices predicted to yield desired outcomes.

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments: Multiple sources were documented in the proposal. Evaluation methodology of source evidence was not provided in the proposal, making the validity of evidence review conclusions and proposal recommendations difficult to assess.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 4
Contextual Constraints Comments: The proposal identified potential obstacles and also identified strategies to address projected obstacles to proposal implementation.

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: The risk assessment provided in the proposal was likely realistic.

Funding Rating: 4
Funding Comments: The budget request and supporting narrative fully addressed the areas of need addressed in proposal objectives and implementation.

Narrative Comments: The proposal narrative does not address privacy/confidentiality of students in creating video libraries by the software provided for Panopto. The proposal narrative does not sufficiently cite statistics regarding the need and Wyoming statistics in particular compared to national statistics was not addressed. There is a need for non education majors to become teachers if they so desire. Mentoring by district administration (i.e. principals) and fellow teachers of cross over career educators is also needed. Teach for America lessons learned was not thoroughly discussed in the proposal narrative. Four years of mentoring is not practical or necessary. I personally know of a UW elementary education graduate who has failed the Praxis 5 years in a row and was recommended after student teaching that she not be hired. She is still working as a teacher in a classroom. There are many people with bachelor's degrees that I know that could take the Praxis and pass it without studying. The proposal has innovative ideas. The question is, are the activities recommended practical? People who want to go into teaching after successful careers in other areas will not jump through the many required hoops proposed in this proposal. They can easily go to another state to teach. Cross over career educators need support, definitely. They need mentoring in how to teach students in a classroom in a school. They also need to be able to not lose income by deciding midstream career changes and to be able to get into teaching quickly, with a smooth transition. I know of three non education majors who are successful teachers in Wyoming. They became successful teachers because of mentoring from their principal and from fellow teachers, none of whom were paid any extra to mentor highly intelligent people who decided to go into teaching. The proposal objectives seem like punishment, rather than support, for people who want to become teachers who don'[t have an education degree.

Summary Comments: Please see previous comment.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: Why are the arts not included STEAM?

Performance Indicator Rating: 3
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3
Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating:
Literature Review Comments: I am not able to view the research

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: Is the cost of living stipend appropriate for all areas of Wyoming?

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: Interesting to know why the arts aren't included

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:2
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2
Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 2
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 2
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 1
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 2
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 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: 3
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: Will individuals who already hold a BS degree and want to transition to teaching be willing to commit to the entire program summer, four years and one year residency? Inidividuals who have been successful in their profession may not be prepared to engage in such a long term transition process.

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: This initiative would help develop excellent teachers however, the transition itself from one profession to another is a significant commitment. Even with stipends and scholarship assistance, will there be individuals who are interested?

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: There have been alternative certification programs used in WY and elsewhere. / / "four year formalized mentoring and induction program" Are people paid by the district? is the amount paid similar to a teaching salary? Would it be sufficient for someone with a family to be able to afford to do this?

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments: Would want to be sure the participant in the program would be able to get certified in another state.

Documentation of Need Rating: 3
Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments: Would like to see some information about places where this did not work for comparison

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments: Would like to be sure the participant can move to other states certification? Will this work for someone who may not be able to spend 8 weeks (single parent, other job requirements to support family)?

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: can someone pay their own way and go to another state? Would this be a draw for someone who does not plan to be in WY? Does it need to be restricted to WY only?

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: I think there may be many second career people who would be interested in this

2017-07 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: 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:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:2
Innovation Comments: The innovation in this proposal is largely housed in the same levers as in the other two proposals related to the "UW Educator Preparation Academy" modules, virtual reality, full year residency, four year induction program. The provision of a program for bachelors degree holders repeats one that is already present and thriving at UW the two Graduate Certificates, Teaching in the Elementary School (TES) and Teaching Secondary Content (TSC).

Performance Indicator Rating: 2
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 1
Documentation of Need Comments: The evidence provided here is all at a national level, instead of providing evidence of need in Wyoming. From my own research, I know that the areas of need in terms of teachers is focused on special education, math and science education. It's not clear from this proposal what programs or licensure areas are being targeted.

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments: External programs are cited; however, several of them are urban in nature. This doesn't necessarily match with Wyoming's cultural and geographic realities.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: Again, the issue of "significant effort from existing UW College of Education faculty and staff" is one that bears further examination. In a cash strapped environment with high tension and low capacity, is this the time to be asking more of people who have not had a raise in about 8 years? / Another risk is to the existing post baccalaureate licensure programs for elementary and secondary licensure: Teaching in the Elementary School and Teaching Secondary Content. These programs have been in place for over a decade, and have been producing teachers particularly at the secondary level for that entire time. I'm guessing that the Breakthrough Innovation Team, which has no UW CoE faculty on it, was not made aware of these programs. If the UW T3 program is instituted, what happens to these well established and relatively popular programs, programs that make the best use of existing faculty and ensure high quality teachers? / /

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments: I'm very concerned about Phase Two, which provides very little content specific pedagogical guidance for this program prior to sending students out to classrooms for their residency. I'm concerned that there will be significant burn outs, because students will not have sufficient preparation for classroom settings. This will not be in the best interest of students.

Summary Comments: There are some meritorious aspects of this proposal. Instead of creating a new and competing! program, I would prefer to see elements of this proposal embedded in the existing post baccalaureate licensure programs.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: This concept is not new. However, a quality compressed (immersion) approach supplemented by use of technology to monitor quality seems somewhat innovative.

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 4
Documentation of Need Comments: In some rural areas, STEM subjects are not the only ones where there are/will be shortages. I would plan for an expansion to other content areas not currently identified as high need.

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating:
Contextual Constraints Comments: Identifying a pipeline (make that pipelines) of qualified and motivated individuals will be a challenge, but I'm convinced that advertisement of opportunities in specific arenas and through general media appeals will reveal a good number of individuals that are ready and able to make a career switch. It will be difficult to ascertain the potential candidates' level of intrinsic motivation, but an intensive, immersive training experience can "weed out" many of the candidates who would likely not succeed. The mentoring provides a backup plan for identifying qualified individuals.

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: Getting cooperation from districts around Wyoming may be a challenge, but with excellent communication and promotion, I think the support will be there. There will be attitudinal barriers individuals who had to do the "whole" program, folks who think the "lack" of preparation may jeopardize children. However, the risk is worth it. I have a colleague (from another state) who not only met a need in a hard to fill rural teaching position but excelled to the point of being that state's teacher of the year. The individual entered the profession through Teach for America and was recognized (after only a couple of years) as being among the best of the best.

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: We would be missing out on a lot of talent that could meet very real needs if we ignore this approach to recruiting quality individuals into the profession. I would encourage the eventual broadening of the scope of content areas. Rural areas with small schools often lack decent core area (and elective area) teachers simply because of the fact that they are rural.

2017-07 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:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:4
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3
Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 2
Funding Comments: Not enough marketing money minimal in year one non existent in years 2 and 3.

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: Does not address how you find students.

2017-07 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: 4
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 4
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 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:
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 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: Minimal risk is to be expected

Funding Rating: 4
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:2
Innovation Comments: Teach America has been in place for several years with mixed results, no data from it was reported.

Performance Indicator Rating: 3
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2
Documentation of Need Comments: Though national shortages are addressed it does not break it down to specific regions or school districts in Wyoming to assess need.

Literature Review Rating: 2
Literature Review Comments: The Teach America program is very similar to this proposal and has shown mixed results, data on results of this program would have been useful.

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments: The programs cited were again from states with large urban areas which could significantly impact the number of STEM professionals available to recruit.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments: I see the biggest constraint as financial. $25,000 a year to leave a much more lucrative profession in STEM careers is hardly much of an incentive. You are either going to recruit one of two type of people: 1. a person who is burned out on his job or retired or 2. a person who is willing to take a substantial reduction to follow their passion to teach. A very limited number of potential participants remain.

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: The student who transfers from the program or teaches out of state.

Funding Rating: 2
Funding Comments: $25,000 for a stipend to leave their current career and pursue a less lucrative career is not much of an incentive.

Narrative Comments: Programs similar to this have shown mixed results. Wyoming would have a very small potential pool to draw from and is the expenditure of $700,000.00 for a maybe program a good fiscal risk to take?

Summary Comments:

2017-07 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:

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: The proposal references "content experts" multiple times, especially in the context of recruiting. A very keen and thorough understanding of what STEM education is and how it can be integrated into ANY content area is very important and key to this proposal. Also, a better explanation of how existing state partnerships and resources can be leveraged for this project would be helpful. There are multiple efforts in the state currently to engage K 12 educators in STEM (Wyoming Afterschool Alliance, Wyoming Department of Education). Rather than duplicating efforts, it would make sense to collaborate effectively to support this initiative holistically. Finally, a plan for sustainability of this initiative would be helpful.

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:4
Innovation Comments: I am excited about this proposal. Some of the best teachers are those who have real world experiences!

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments: Proposal is clear, meaningful, and realistic. It hits the targets.

Documentation of Need Rating: 4
Documentation of Need Comments: Thanks for gathering all of the research for the initiative.

Literature Review Rating: 4
Literature Review Comments: Evidence is realistic and well thought out.

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 4
Contextual Constraints Comments: Some constraints will raise their head as the initiative progresses. I am confident that UW will respond in a proactive manner.

Risk Assessment Rating: 4
Risk Assessment Comments: Comprehensive!

Funding Rating: 4
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments: Thanks UW for all of your hard work!

Summary Comments:

2017-07 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: 4
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 4
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: I would be interested in seeing such a program.

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:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: I would recommend considering distant learning opportunities for those being considered for this program. Most will already be employed while looking at transitioning. If the course work... was made available (evenings/nights/weekends) more would be willing to make this transition as it would be from steady employment to steady employment. Just something to consider.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:1
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 1
Documentation of Need Comments: Essentially the same as the current Post Bac program with the exception of the 1 year residency. I can see push back occurring from the year long residency requirement.

Literature Review Rating: 2
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 2
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 1
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 1
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:4
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2
Documentation of Need Comments: What are Wyoming's specific needs? Where is the data showing what areas have teacher shortages. What content areas have specific shortages? How is the data collected and what does it say.

Literature Review Rating: 2
Literature Review Comments: I did not find information that the provided practices will yield desired outcomes, specifically in the state of Wyoming.

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: What are the high need teaching fields in Wyoming. Is data available to demonstrate these shortages? Are they consistent across the state? The need that seems to be addressed in this proposal is not clear.

Summary Comments: Why are these fellows placed in High Need Schools to start their teaching careers. Some of these positions could drive the Fellows directly out of the field of Education.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 1
Documentation of Need Comments: The evidence is not specific to Wyoming. Only three articles were cited as being the evidence for need.

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3
Leading Programs Comments: Woodrow Fellowships and Finland's process seem to be the most authentic leading programs for this.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2
Contextual Constraints Comments: I agree that finding individuals who have expertise in the content area but also have a strong desire to teach will be a challenge. One thing that was not listed under constraints would be the potential financial cost for those individuals. Depending on the field, they likely have higher earning potential than a teacher and would not only have to return to school but would also have to take a pay cut.

Risk Assessment Rating: 3
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments: This component is very thorough and while the budget is quite large, it should be able to completely cover the program.

Narrative Comments: Having perspective fellows take an aptitude test to determine if they will enjoy teaching is a good basis but this needs another step. Teaching is so much more than just enjoying content or believing all children can learn. / It was wise to include the escape clause for fellows who are not offered a position. / The length of this program appears to be too long; four years to achieve a masters? The mentoring component is important but it should be tied in another way as four years is too long to ask someone with a BA in STEM topics to consider changing careers.

Summary Comments: Recruiting individuals who are strong in STEM content is innovative and will serve UW well. However, as written in another comment, finding people willing to leave their current situations and become a full time student will be an immense challenge. The innovation proposal itself is creative and could bring a higher rigor to STEM content within schools.

2017-07 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:
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating:
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating:
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments: Using the terms "historic traditional" together seem to add a bit of negativity in reference to the College of Education's current practices. I do not think the term "historic" is needed.

Summary Comments: I am very interested in what the focused, intensive professional development program to develop coaching and mentoring might entail. Again, that June 1st date to release individuals of paying back is still concerning to me. Should it be June first of the following year? There seems to be a "loop hole" or "easy way out" for the unmotivated and ineffective with the proposed structure.

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:4
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: 2
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments: Good proposal. I appreciate that after the completion of PIP the student attends the year long residency in a school district. Co teaching is an incredibly effective way to meet diverse needs of students, however how will it be determined that a district is implementing co teaching with fidelity. Many educators believe they are co teaching but it's not truly co teaching. How will districts/mentors be chosen to ensure pre service teachers are teaching in a true co teaching model?

Summary Comments: The proposal is strong. The PIP is a great way to train pre service teachers, the only concern is the instructional strategies, how and who will determine the strategies are effective?

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder

Innovation Rating:4
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3
Performance Indicator Comments: Curious if the recruitment will result in more out of state graduates being a part of UW T3.

Documentation of Need Rating: 3
Documentation of Need Comments: The proposal appears to focus on needs with STEM instruction. There's not specific data in the proposal of how much STEM instruction is a need/gap throughout Wyoming compared to other disciplines.

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 1
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments: While the proposal budget addresses a smaller cohort of 9 gradulates, I believe that the marketing budget of $2,500 is not adequate. Particularly since I think this program might have more interest with out of state college grads.

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: A dispositional assessment would be an important element in identifying and recruiting the most suitable college graduates into the program.

Response Representing: Nat Review

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: This proposal includes a year long residency and an induction program. The candidates would engage in "Pedagogical Immersion Program" (PIP), an eight week summer term in which Fellows would be prepared in teaching methods, assessment and data literacy, classroom management, and skills in differentiating instruction. Is 8 weeks enough time? Lessons from Teach for America indicate it is not. The idea tht candidates will be embedded in a co teaching model with a mentor Wyoming teacher, is innovative and may be mutually beneficial to to the candidate and the mentor teacher IF there is proper experiences, feedback, and modeling. Fellows would be supported by a formalized induction and mentoring program for their first four years of teaching in a Wyoming school. The candidates will also complete Sanford Inspire Program.

Performance Indicator Rating: 3
Performance Indicator Comments: Performance indicators are 'checked' but it is not clear what the targets (e.g., how positive should state perceptions be?) or that they are monitored (e.g., how will you know state perceptions have changed?) / 1. Assuming success of the program, the plan will enhance statewide perceptions of U of Wyoming COE by meeting state needs in a high need area of STEM fields. / 2. Assuming success of the program, the enrollment of Wyoming residents in the COE will increase through engaging career changers. / 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. / 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 not 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) / / 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. / The need for STEM teachers in Wyoming is clearly documented. However, attrition is a major factor in explaining the shortages; the program will penalize candidates who drop out, but Teach for America shows us engaging high quality content rich STEM teachers is a huge challenge. What is the plan to retain these career changers?

Documentation of Need Rating: 3
Documentation of Need Comments: The need for STEM teachers in Wyoming is clearly documented. However, attrition is a major factor in explaining the shortages; the program will penalize candidates who drop out, but Teach for America shows us engaging high quality content rich STEM teachers is a huge challenge. What is the plan to retain these career changers? / / 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 builds 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. But pedagogical content knowledge is not the same thing that content knowledge is. Some of the worst taught courses are in colleges and university classrooms taught by brilliant leaders in their discipline, but no knowledge of content pedagogy. How will the faculty instill these skills? How will they know their candidates are successful? /

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments: The literature review cites a number of seminal texts on teacher preparation in STEM; fields., career changers, and mentoring and induction programs. What is not clear is which ideas are taken from these sources that have informed the Fellows program. See also: / / National Research Council (2005). How Students Learn: History, Mathematics, and Science in the Classroom. Washington DC: The National Academies Press. / National Research Council, 2005. How Students Learn: Science in the Classroom. . Washington DC: The National Academies Press. / 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. / / Parent engagement is cited as important and the faculty might examine the 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. /

Leading Programs Rating: 4

Leading Programs Comments: The faculty cite appropriate programs, but it is not clear which aspects of the programs reviewed and literature cited has been incorporated into the plans.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments: The plan does not acknowledge the significant problem of recruiting STEM educated individuals into education programs. The faculty seem to assume that anyone with a major in these fields has "mastery of content knowledge in STEM." That may not be the case as there is clearly variability in training in these fields. How will mastery of STEM content be assessed?

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: A number of risks are listed, but no plan for mitigation is presented. / If candidates do not teach in a high need school, they will have to repay tuition and stipend. / / The faculty do not acknowledge the risk that modules will not adequately prepare candidates for the high need schools that candidates are expected to enter. The challenges to the SOE faculty are acknowledged. / / This proposal (and all the proposals I read) see a risk in the state statue that "prevents access to disaggregation of student assessment outcome by teacher." Programs can evaluate their effectiveness without these data (See CAEP website on meeting Standard 4). /

Funding Rating:
Funding Comments: The stipends and tuition awards to attract and retain teacher candidates appear to be appropriate, but what % of their college expenses will this program cover? What debt will they graduate with? / / I would like to see a percentile breakdown of the funding that goes to support students, faculty, district, schools, administrative costs, and a plan for the accountability of each of these groups of recipients of funding. /

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. There is a lot about what the components of the curriculum will be (e.g., 8 week immersion; Sanford program; modules,) but not much information of the content, goals, outcome expectations, and ways that they will evaluate success in (or development toward) attainment of the goals. / /

Summary Comments:/ Career changers with backgrounds in STEM fields are an excellent resource pool for aspiring teachers. Identifying those who have expertise in these fields, and want to become teachers is an important goal. How will the quality of these candidates be assessed? How will they be identified and recruited? / / I would like to see 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. How will teaching skills be assessed? The technology license for Panopto will be purchased, but it is only as good as the criteria for judging candidate performance. Will the faculty monitor the development of candidates using observational measures (e.g., EdTPA, CLASS, etc.)? These outcome targets and metrics were not requested in the proposal (that I could tell), but how will the program assess successes of candidates in the residency year, and throughout the induction program? Some like will leave and others should be encouraged to leave, but there is no plan for attrition (or failure of candidates). / /

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Nat Review

Innovation Rating:3
Innovation Comments: My comments on this review will be similar to the P3 section because I find the challenges very similar. I'm not sure they need to be separate proposals. In the recruitment of rural individuals, you are running into similar challenges (I imagine) to that you will run into with career switchers. The process outlined is innovative, but won't have individuals in the programs unless there is more care taken to how you incentivize them into the profession. I'd rather see more front end incentives and less on the back end (once in the school) because if we support teachers well, they'll stay, they will not need the incentives on the back end.

Performance Indicator Rating: 3
Performance Indicator Comments: Recruiting career switchers benefits the University as well as the individual candidates. I think it applies to the ones that are marked in the proposal.

Documentation of Need Rating: 3
Documentation of Need Comments: Similar to the other proposals, the evidence matches that we need to think about preparing teachers different than we do now. The compelling narrative that the career of teaching itself is changing and we need to make it easier to be prepared to be a good teacher. I applaud the program for looking at these ideas.

Literature Review Rating: 3
Literature Review Comments: #NAME?

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments: Woodrow Wilson is one of the best programs to look at for career switchers, I was glad to see that reviewed. Tapping into employment networks that are less about staffing, but more about careers is key to get the right candidates into these programs.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2
Contextual Constraints Comments: There are two constraints listed but no solutions listed. Seems to me that the two that are listed are exactly right, we've seen that in other states. There are ways to mitigate, but the proposal doesn't talk about them in detail. I'd like to see recruitment and the work with the standards board spelled out as how you would tackle those concerns. They seem like big deals and are critical activities for success of the project.

Risk Assessment Rating: 3
Risk Assessment Comments: It seems the risks listed are consistent with the other two proposals. Helping the faculty understand how to shift their instruction and techniques will be critical. Career switchers will only be interested in what they need to learn to actually teach in the classroom. The general ED courses should be looked at to ensure they all are necessary for career switchers. / Recruiting isn't addressed through the budget or the narrative. I think the proposal should outline how you will get access to these potential career changers.

Funding Rating: 2
Funding Comments:I'd budget directly for recruiting, I think it's absolutely essential for this project. / I do think this budget is more realistic than the other two proposals. / I like including money for stipends on the front end, versus incentives on the back end. /

Narrative Comments: The narrative is clear, and it sets up a good process for engaging career switchers. I think the proposals are a good package together. I'd like to see more attention to the budget, and more detailed plan for recruitment of individuals. /

Summary Comments: Overall, the three proposals together paint a complete picture. I think the narrative for this proposal is good. I'm unsure that the budget conveys the scope of what's needed to complete the work. I also think the recruitment of individuals into this program requires more detail, and the budget represents the size of the recruitment challenge.

Response Representing: Nat Review

Innovation Rating:2
Innovation Comments: This is very much like what is occurring through the Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows program...and even has similarities to other programs such as Teach for America (e.g., the use of intensive summer professional training) and Building a Pipeline of Student Teachers for Bay Area Charters. / / I see that they have reviewed other IHE programs that created programs for helping career professionals with degrees in STEM areas secure certification to teach (e.g., Georgia State)...but I have two cautions... / / First, my own experience with transition programs is that the candidate yield of SUCCESSFUL candidates is low...that is, a LOT of people sign up but a lot who sign up are not right for the program BECAUSE... / / Problem 1: They have not really worked enough with kids to determine if they enjoy being with kids and if kids are responding positively to them as adults in their lives...So my suggestion is to make certain that you build into the selection process some means of measuring or assessing whether the candidates are a good fit!! You might suggest that candidates have to show proof of a certain amount of time spent in working relationships with young people before they are admitted to candidacy...this could be time they have taught in church or after school programs....or that they have served in some time of mentoring role..what would be really innovative is your ability to create a selection process that ensured that candidates could PROVE that they have already had some type successful set of experiences with students/young people! / / Problem 2: They do possess the content background that you want the candidates to possess in order to teach, especially in a STEM area....you will be amazed at the types of people who show up claiming to be math majors (e.g., people with psychology degrees with statistics courses) or biology degrees (e.g., people with general education degrees with a couple of biology classes) and wanting to teach in STEM areas...My point is that you need to make certain that you define what you mean by "strong content mastery" because this IS going to be an issue... / / So, I like the approach...it is not innovative so please try to learn all that you can from programs such as the Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows Program...asked the WWTF program administrators to identify for you their best practice sites and connect with a couple of those before you move this too far forward...

Performance Indicator Rating: 4
Performance Indicator Comments: I agree that this addresses several of the defined TEI performance indicators... / / The program should draw attention to the work of the UW College of Education and it should be a great way to connect with second career individuals who want to explore and pursue a career in teaching...in addition, because many of the participants in this program will already have established lives as adults, most will likely want to stay in Wyoming...my own experience with two different programs like the one proposed through UW T3 is that the candidates who complete the program will want to stay in the community that they are already located within...SO, I gave this high marks on the TEI indicators evidenced scale.... / / The real issue is with how you are going to select the candidates...this is going to be so critical to the success of this program...BELIEVE me, I have coordinated two programs that look very much like UW T3....and in both we had the same problem....finding the right candidates (we found lots of interested people, but a lot of interested folks are either not suited to teaching or not in possession of the content background that you want)...Spend lots of time thinking through the selection process!! / / I also have concerns with the heavy focus on character education and K 12 persistence...this makes sense if you are going to try to identify candidates with the right dispositions but it makes no sense if you are not clear about what type of person you are going to enroll...character education and fostering growth mindsets in students is one thing with adults with student friendly dispositions, but quite another with adults who fail to understand the craft nature of the teaching act... / /

Documentation of Need Rating: 2
Documentation of Need Comments: Has there been a supply and demand study for teachers in Wyoming?....I can't see that in the documentation that they provide in this proposal....I have no doubts that they are having some teacher shortages in the STEM areas because this is a national issue, but when I checked on what I could find about teacher shortage issues in Wyoming I found mixed signals with some even suggesting that the shortage issues are not as bad as they have been projected: http://wyomingpublicmedia.org/post/wyoming faces impending teacher shortage. / / ....or that there may not be shortage at all: http://billingsgazette.com/news/state and regional/wyoming/teacher shortage looms but not in wyo/article_c0e2d081 143f 59dc ab2a 73c6736101a2.html / / These both are a bit dated, but so, too, are several of the references that are provided such as the Williams and Forgasz (2009) and the Ingersoll and Strong (2011)... / / Other states have documented their shortage areas and then have put together specific programs for dealing with the areas of need....here is an example:http://tea.texas.gov/About_TEA/News_and_Multimedia/Correspondence/TAA_Letters/2016 2017_Teacher_Shortage_Areas_and_Loan_Forgiveness_Programs/ / / My point is that I have no doubts that there are or will be some teacher shortage issues in Wyoming because many states that are not "over producers" are having this problem, but I don't really see that there is a clear documentation of the real and projected shortage areas...and if you are

going to create a specific program to attract second career individuals to teaching, which is what I see with UW T3, then you need to make certain that there are going to be jobs for these people who leave one career to enter teaching... / / I am also unclear as to the grounding for the assertion that is made on page 4 relative to: "effectiveness in addressing achievement gaps particularly in STEM subjects in high need schools through teaching fellowship models for career changers." What research are they using to ground that claim? / /

Literature Review Rating: 2
Literature Review Comments: I am really not convinced that the necessary review of the literature has occurred with this program. / / I like the fact that they have reviewed the Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows program but I really think that they need to look in detail at some of the specific high performing WWTF sites....I have heard great things about the Montclair State program from several people and would encourage a closer look at it:http://www.montclair.edu/cehs/academics/wwnjtf/...and look at a couple of the Indiana sites also, especially Ball State: http://cms.bsu.edu/academics/collegesanddepartments/teachers/academicprog/wwfellows / / I also think that you need to talk to some of the people who have spent a LOT of time working with WWTF institutions for the purpose if getting their input and advice...for example, connect with Jim Frazier, who used to be with the Woodrow Wilson Foundation...here is the most recent email that I have for Jim: fraser@woodrow.org...Another person you should connect with is Ellen Moir (emoir@newteachercenter.org). No one knows this "space" better than Ellen and I think she can help you avoid a lot of mistakes....you don't have to hire her as a consultant, just spend an hour with her on the phone! / / I would have also liked to see some references to the old Transition to Teaching programs...we had one at my IHE and it had modest success...here are a couple of citations:https://www2.ed.gov/programs/transitionteach/index.html and http://ohiot2t.org/ / / My point is that there have been a lot of efforts to do UW T3 type programming and I am not certain that the some of that experience is being leveraged effectively as this program is being developed... / / I would especially ask the program developers to identify the research support that they have relative to preparing teachers to support character development in P 12 students....I think I know the literature fairly well but I could not find anything that really fit here....there is a LOT on character development but I could not find much at all on the idea that they are proposing...did they look at the What Works sites?...https://www2.ed.gov/programs/charactered/resources.html / / In essence, I think the evidence provided is weak...

Leading Programs Rating: 4
Leading Programs Comments: They clearly identified some other programs that are in place around the country and that are focused on transitioning working adults into teaching careers...my question relates to the process that they used to select these "programs to study."... / / I understand the selection of the WWTF programs because they mirror what they are trying to do with UW T3...I would have liked for them to also have looked at some of the transition to teaching programs that have been in place for years in lots of different states....this one is from Indiana: http://www.doe.in.gov/licensing/transition teaching / / I understand why they focused on the ASU Sanford Inspire program....makes great sense given the emphasis that they are going to have on character development in the UW T3 program... / / The focus on an international program such as Finland makes some sense, though Finland is SO selective that I question whether it is the right one to look at...still, understandable... / / My question related to the use of Piedmont College....according to NCTQ the secondary prep programs there are not particularly strong: http://www.nctq.org/teacherPrep/2016/findings/programRanking.do?universityId=346&programId=3 / / If you are going to select institutions to study and learn about, I would go with places like Montclair State in New Jersey, which, I believe, also have WWTF program: http://www.nctq.org/teacherPrep/2016/findings/programRanking.do?universityId=834&programId=4 / /

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3
Contextual Constraints Comments: I agree that the identification of the individuals who have a mastery of the content and want to teach will be both critical and difficult...indeed, if this program proceeds this contextual issue should be the one that is the real focus of the program administrators' efforts...I have a lot of experience with these types of alternative preparation programs and have run both transition to teaching programs and a WWTF program...and in both instances the BIGGEST issue that we confronted was recruiting the right candidates...lots of people were interested...some with failed first careers, some with serious personal mental health issues, some who wanted their summers off....getting the right people to apply and stay with the program is the BIG issue that will need to be addressed... / / I agree that some of the program completers may decide to teach elsewhere, but my experience is that this is not a major issue....most of the candidates already will have settled homes and they are not looking for ways to leave the state...so, I don't see this contextual factor as a big risk... / / Not sure that I understand the contextual factor on page 5 about developing and implementing the multi pronged UW P3 model....should this read UW T3....or am I missing something? / / I agree that

revising requirements of the college's academic programs will foster challenges, which is why I would want to make certain that the Provost is clearly on board with this UW T3 effort...he/she cannot make things happen, but he/she and other senior administrators should be able to facilitate the course revision process!! /

Risk Assessment Rating: 2
Risk Assessment Comments: I absolutely agree that the biggest risk is recruiting a cadre of acceptable and viable candidates...the experience that I have had with these types of UW T3 programs is that getting viable candidates into and through the programs is a BIG challenge...indeed is THE biggest challenge! / / I found the next risk that they identify as a bit troubling...that is, having the faculty embrace and implement the model with fidelity...it led me to question the degree to which the faculty is buying into (or may buy into) this approach...is it being imposed?...OR, are faculty owning (or being encourage and incentivized to own) the innovation? If there is reasonable faculty buy in, then I think this risk will be mitigated, but if the faculty are not, within reason, all in, then I think that this is, as they indicate in the proposal, a RISK! The faculty will not see it as a loss of control IF they are actively involved in designing it and implementing it. This is going to take some administrative acumen to engage the faculty in ways that they clearly see that this program is THEIR program and that they still own and control it even if there is a reliance on more regional faculty...you will need to find ways to connect the regional faculty with the regular faculty... / / I agree with the data access risk...sad to see that this is the circumstance in Wyoming, but it is not the only state that approaches access to student data in this way...that means that more focus needs to be placed on the other ways in which teacher performance is being evaluated...use this as a reason to enhance the quality and fidelity of the other measures that are available to assess teacher performance....you might want to look at some of the NCTQ materials that are posted relative to evaluating teacher performance...here is an example: http://www.nctq.org/docs/70 07.pdf / / I absolutely agree that keeping UW leaders apprised is essential...but I think it is MORE THAN keeping them apprised...they need to embrace and buy into this work! I am not optimistic that you can be successful UNLESS that occurs. / /

Funding Rating: 3
Funding Comments: As I indicated earlier, my big concern is with the identification of the right candidates for this program and that is going to take marketing and recruitment dollars...they have allocated $2500 for this purpose, which is really like allocating NO dollars for marketing....please think seriously about how you are going to go about identifying and recruiting candidates for this program...and then determine dollars needed to achieve that goal...I suggest talking with others who have created these types of transition programs to determine the marketing funds that you might need to have allocated for UW T3... / / I am glad to see that you have set aside some dollars for the Fellows' scholarships...my own experience is that you will need those dollars and probably more in order to get the candidates that you want. The cost of living stipends are essential, but you are also going to need scholarship dollars...the students who show up for these programs are typically financially challenged and the scholarship dollars are essential! / / To me the big challenge here is not the curricular implementation but the recruitment of the right candidates...without the right candidates the program loses its viability...SO, figure out how to invest more dollars on the two things that are most connected with the program's success: marketing to get the message out to candidates and scholarship dollars to actually get them to enroll and complete the program... / / The dollar allocations for all the other program elements (e.g., faculty consulting and district mentor stipends) appear to make sense or at least seem to be reasonable...

Narrative Comments: I like the fact that you are going after candidates who already hold a degree in a content area of high need...make certain that you are clear about what those high need areas are and, more importantly, make certain that you are clear about what the actual degree needs to be...a degree in geology is not a degree in biology EVEN if the geology major has had a couple of biology courses...that is what you are going to find to be true for a lot of the candidates...people with all types of degrees are going to show up and claim that they are eligible....be prepared to deal with this by being clear about the expectations in terms of the content degree that individuals need to possess. / / I am concerned about the intensive pedagogical preparation UNLESS you are crystal clear about the high leverage teaching strategies that you want the candidates to evidence in order for them to be successful in a high need school...so what classroom management skills are they going to learn and then practice during their clinicals (e.g., will they learn interventionist strategies or interactional management techniques, etc.)?.... OR are you going to go with one of the popular "canned" approaches that are now being embraced by school districts:https://www.loveandlogic.com/articles advice/how to create a love and logic classroom / / I agree that the mentor teachers need to learn coaching skills, but you also need to ensure that they can model the practices that your candidates have learned as part of their program matriculation...if you identify a few high leverage teaching strategies your PD with the mentors can focus on those skills and then you can better ensure that what your candidates have learned in the program matches with what they will see modeled in the classrooms that they are a part of in the program....and once they are in schools... / / Unless you are

already doing some of the program elements that you describe in the narrative (e.g., guided fieldwork observations and utilizing virtual reality simulations and simulated parent engagement exercises) I would rethink trying or rolling out all of these innovations...implementing instructional innovations can be costly and VERY time consuming...I am nervous about the ability of the program implementers to do all of these things well...they all sound great, but the delta between an idea and its efficacious implementation can be great...SO, my suggestion is that if you really want your candidates to understand the CRAFT of teaching, do less but do what you do with fidelity... / / I like the idea of the residency and of having the Fellows in cohorts...innovative and doable...and potentially impactful...BUT you need to have someone who oversees that process... and has that been budgeted? I did this with WWTFs (i.e., worked with cohorts) and it really does take at least someone occasionally connecting to make certain that the cohorts are meeting and engaging. / / Again, I like the video conferencing idea BUT I think that you have too much going on...this, in and of itself, is complicated...why add this to a program that already has a lot of complexity...I would focus on the cohorts and enhancing their viability rather than adding something like the video conferencing...the video conferencing also has all sorts of hidden complexity (e.g., release forms, etc.)....again, reconsider if this is really going to get you the ROI you want... / / I think 4 years is too long for the required employment experience in order to forgive the tuition scholarship and cost of living stipend...I would go with what Woodrow Wilson uses....three years...

Summary Comments: Of the three proposals that I have reviewed, this one gives me the most concerns... / / I have been involved in creating and implementing both a Transition to Teaching program and a Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows program and both have similarities to what is being proposed with the UW T3 program...the real issue for these types of programs is attracting viable candidates...and then finding good field placements for the candidates...the second career adults you are trying to attract will bring more to the table and will create very different demands on the program than what you will find with more traditional students or with non traditional students who are older (but not second career)...the transition candidates you are trying to attract have degrees and jobs and lives and attracting the right people is tough...SO, if you proceed with this UW T3, then think seriously about how you are going to comprehensively market the program and select the candidates who respond...THAT TO ME IS THE REAL CHALLENGE...getting the right students and the right placements!!

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: OVERALL AVERAGE RATING

Innovation Rating:3.021
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3.638
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2.809
Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 2.978
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3.444
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2.935
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 2.587
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3.047
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: FACULTY AVERAGE RATING

Innovation Rating:2.625
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3.625
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2.500
Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 2.875
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 2.625
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2.750
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 2.714
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3.375
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: STAKEHOLDER AVERAGE RATING

Innovation Rating:3.139
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3.667
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating:
Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3.029
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3.588
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3.000
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 2.583
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3.000
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-07 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: NATIONAL REVIEW AVERAGE RATING

Innovation Rating:2.667
Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3.333
Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2.667
Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 2.667
Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 4.000
Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2.667
Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 2.333
Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 2.500
Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: