

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 2

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments: This proposal is a new and innovative idea for the University of Wyoming and rural settings. It mirrors other things happening across the US in terms of ECE but is new for our region.

Performance Indicator Rating: 3

Performance Indicator Comments: The proposal has potential to improve statewide perceptions by reaching out to rural communities and by creating a degree program in Early Childhood Education. The creation of the degree program could increase enrollment. There is a strong indication of partnering with many various state and local entities.

Documentation of Need Rating: 3

Documentation of Need Comments: The only thing keeping this from a "4" is that it all tends to remain housed at UW with outreach occurring from home base. There is substantial evidence of outreach that should not be discounted, however.

Literature Review Rating: 4

Literature Review Comments: Research supports the proposal being presented.

Leading Programs Rating: 4

Leading Programs Comments: There is evidence of evaluation of leading programs in the area of educator preparation and ECE.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 1

Contextual Constraints Comments: The discussion of contextual constraints is limited.

Risk Assessment Rating: 4

Risk Assessment Comments: The proposal identifies very low risk. The discussion and identification of risk is quite limited, though.

Funding Rating: 3

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: The proposal addresses and area of need and provides evidence of some innovation in terms of positive growth to the program and to the university.

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments: While the proposal is very good and provides insight into development of a quality program it still has the outside appearance of what education has always been. Some of the components which would make maybe a stronger program is to develop liaisons for the communities who have established instructional centers. We should not and can't go in to the rural areas and create a threatening environment for their program but establish a relationship with them and then work to align their instruction and commitment to the goals and values of the district so there is established continuity and trust between all. We can't appear to have all the answers for all the situations out there. The true learning takes place when the trained actually are faced with the reality of working in the community.

Performance Indicator Rating: 3

Performance Indicator Comments: I see great attempts to address probably 4 of the indicators but there are some which are not valuable to this movement. National accreditation is not valuable to our state as much as getting our students employed in our state and developing the quality relationships between what is currently there and the future. I am not sure of the value of State of the art College of Education organizational structure and all the indicators.

Documentation of Need Rating: 4

Documentation of Need Comments: Clearly there is a need for help in this area.

Literature Review Rating: 4

Literature Review Comments: Definitely plenty of resources supporting the suggested outcomes.

Leading Programs Rating: 4

Leading Programs Comments: Plenty of evidence gathered.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments: There are probably other constraints but until the program runs some may not be easily identified.

Risk Assessment Rating: 3

Risk Assessment Comments: I am not sure it is risk as much as inconveniences. .

Funding Rating: 3

Funding Comments: There was narrative in some of the proposal but I did not see it clearly and it was reasonable.

Narrative Comments: Nice work by the committee.

Summary Comments: There is promise to the proposal but there are a lot of outliers when it comes to working with this program and there will be difficult challenges as it is implemented.

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 2

Performance Indicator Comments: Although this proposal addresses two indicators, it seems to be a huge risk to start a program in light of the financial straits of Wyoming at this time. To start a program with the knowledge that outside funding would be required to continue the program is very risky....particularly without specific funding being identified.

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: Although some contextual constraints were addressed, this reviewer does not feel that the authors are being realistic in the massive constraint of starting a program with out first securing funding for continuation

Risk Assessment Rating: 2

Risk Assessment Comments: Again, risk has been identified, but without seeming to understand the immensity of continuation risk.

Funding Rating: 2

Funding Comments: Continued funding is the concern

Narrative Comments: Reasonable

Summary Comments: extreme concerns about funding

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

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: 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:

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

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:

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

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:

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments: You may want to look at the ECHO system, which is here on the University of Wyoming campus, for delivery of face to face communication. It is highly innovative and shows extreme promise in working with rural communities.

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: 2

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:

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

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:

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 2

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: 4

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 4

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments: The use of existing services to support implementation is innovative from my perspective.

Performance Indicator Rating: 4

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 4

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 4

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 4

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments: Effective early childhood education is critical for Wyoming's children with their overall well-being and academic growth.

Summary Comments: Thank you!

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: OVERALL AVERAGE RATING

Innovation Rating: 2.875

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3.125

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3.125

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3.25

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3.25

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2.625

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 2.875

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-08 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: STAKEHOLDER AVERAGE RATING

Innovation Rating: 2.875

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3.125

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3.125

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3.25

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3.25

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 2.625

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 2.875

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: