

2017-11 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: National Expert Reviewer

Innovation Rating: 2

Innovation Comments: The program would create a coaching laboratory for teachers. The authors talk about expanding the reach of the College of Education around the state and providing equitable access to quality instruction for all Wyoming students, but the proposal is for only two school districts: Laramie and Riverton/Powell. There is no attention to special populations of students (e.g. rural, Native American), nor is there attention to recruiting people for the program who have a demonstrated commitment to equitable instruction. There is no criteria for the selection of program participants, a fact that is most problematic for the selection of model instructional coaches. The innovative aspects of this program is its attention to pre-service teachers and the extension of the program over the course of an entire year.

Performance Indicator Rating: 2

Performance Indicator Comments: The PIs suggest alignment to two of these indicators, 1 and 3. I agree that the proposal addresses indicator 3, Continuous improvement protocols for field and clinical experiences, developed and implemented in partnership with school district partners. The lack of a broad, statewide program proposal makes it difficult to make a case that it also aligns with indicator 1, Statewide perceptions of the University of Wyoming College of Education, because only two districts are proposed. In addition, the PIs suggest that expanding the practicum and field experience will introduce new performance indicators and will enhance the College of Education's profile for national accreditation through CAEP. This might be so, but it is not fully clear from the proposal how exactly that might work. There is also a new key performance indicator suggested by the PIs: "Advanced learning opportunities for graduate and post-graduate learners." Again, this is not a part of the narrative or the budget, so it is unclear what that might look like, but it has potential.

Documentation of Need Rating: 2

Documentation of Need Comments: The focus in the proposal is how the WY-COLA program would benefit the University of Wyoming. In that respect, it seems that it would strengthen the College of Education's CAEP national accreditation profile around clinical partnerships for pre-service teachers. However there is no indication that the authors intend to scale the program throughout Wyoming after the grant runs out, nor is there any indication that this project will eventually be self-sustaining without the funding. The partnership with local school districts is limited to two, so the project does not extend throughout Wyoming.

Literature Review Rating: 2

Literature Review Comments: The literature review focuses on books that were written about instructional coaching, not the peer-reviewed research behind it. I encourage the authors to read *Coaching for Coherence: How Instructional Coaches Lead Change in the Evaluation Era* by Sarah L. Woulfin and Jessica G. Rigby in *Educational Researcher* August/September 2017 46:6, 323-328. This article also references multiple peer-reviewed journal articles describing research on instructional coaching: something that was missing in the proposal's literature review. I also encourage the authors to read the work from the Education Alliance at Brown University on the literature behind instructional coaching: https://www.brown.edu/academics/education-alliance/sites/brown.edu/academics/education-alliance/files/publications/TL_Coaching_Lit_Review.pdf No explanation is given for why the WY-COLA program will be limited to elementary schools. After reading the research, the PIs may re-consider and expand it to all of K-12. The What Works Clearinghouse from the IES provides resources, particularly around coaching in the STEM fields. I recommend the following: <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/dropout/instructionalcoaching092414.pdf> and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/EvidenceSnapshot/635>. Instructional coaching is an excellent idea whose time has come. But the current literature review does not provide enough background to know what models will be used by the team if they were funded.

Leading Programs Rating: 1

Leading Programs Comments: The authors believed that this section of the proposal did not apply to them because their project deals with pre-service teachers. However, they missed an opportunity to learn about other universities that offer an Instructional Coaching program and the types of curriculum and activities that are offered elsewhere. For example, the University of Virginia's leadership academy program (<https://curry.virginia.edu/curry-leadership-academy-coaching-change>), Northwestern University (<https://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/msed/certificate-for-advanced-study-education/instructional-coaching.html>), Viterbo University (<http://www.viterbo.edu/innovative-teacher-leadership-and-instructional-coaching>) or Temple University (<http://education.temple.edu/leadership/certificates/instructional-coaching>)

2017-11 Feedback and National Reviews

endorsement). Earlier in the proposal, the authors talk about the program at the University of Michigan, but they do not describe the evidence they gathered from their evaluation of these programs in this section of the proposal.

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments: The proposal is for two years of support, where the first year project is in Laramie and the second is in either Riverton or Powell. There is no documentation to support a partnership with the school districts in these towns. Will more pre-service teachers be placed in these school districts as a result of the WY-COLA project? One of the potential constraints would be the need for a collaboration with the school districts. Support from district school boards and superintendents was not addressed. The reuse of core resources is a good idea, but it is unclear what manipulatives or texts would be purchased. Later in the proposal, the authors describe the use of cube cameras. I recommend that the authors learn more about the My Teaching Partner program at the University of Virginia to see specifically how video cameras might be used as a coaching tool in a partnership between the university and the school district: <http://curry.virginia.edu/research/centers/castl/mtp>

Risk Assessment Rating: 4

Risk Assessment Comments: The authors wrote "None" for all but the fourth category: "Potential risks to the UW Trustees Education Initiative." The authors believe that WY-COLA's expansion in Year 2 to other locations in the state would mitigate the perception of UW being focused only on Laramie. I disagree. The expansion is to just one other district, albeit one that is hours from Laramie. The authors missed the opportunity to propose a project that would make use of technology and partners in rural areas around the state to expand further around the state, particularly in districts with vulnerable populations of children (i.e. Native American).

Funding Rating: 4

Funding Comments: The budget request and supporting narrative are complete.

Narrative Comments: The proposal could be greatly strengthened by the inclusion of a partnership with the University of Wyoming's Educational Leadership program. The research on instructional leadership is strong in the field of Educational Leadership, and both pre-service principals and aspirational coaches would benefit from the WY-COLA program. Consider converting the triangle on page two of the proposal into a square, where aspiring building leaders can participate in the coaching experience. Ultimately, principals will be selecting teachers to serve as coaches in the building. How will they select them? What are the characteristics of an excellent coach? There is a missed opportunity here to include the educational leadership students in this proposal. More importantly, if the authors could consider how to use technology to expand the program beyond Laramie and Riverton/Powell, it would have the potential to be truly innovative. Rural schools are desperate for the kind of training that the program proposes. Cameras are mentioned only in the budget. I encourage the team to dive deeper into the ways they might use cameras as tools for coaching and consider how this kind of technology has the potential to open up the program to other districts around the state. This also will strengthen the author's argument that the program has the potential to address issues of equitable access. The "My Teaching Partner" program at the University of Virginia may provide some guidance. The University of Wyoming has mostly likely trained teachers in almost every school district in the state. Why not leverage that vast network to create a statewide cadre of mentor coaches who meet monthly online, or who maintain an active blog about coaching? Why limit it to elementary schools? In particular, the research on the effectiveness of coaching in the STEM fields in high school suggest it would be a more powerful approach to the program to expand it K-12.

Summary Comments: I encourage the authors to learn more about the specific curriculum and instructional strategies used in Instructional Coaching programs around the country. Several states now have special certification for teacher coaches, so programs are more prolific than ever. I realize that WY-COLA's use of pre-service teachers is unique, but they have not established a research-based explanation for why it would be appropriate to market the program to pre-service teachers and not pre-service leaders or in-service teachers looking to expand their skill set. What is the theory of action around creating the WY-COLA for pre-service teachers? The next iteration of this proposal should include a more detailed logic model where the inputs and outputs are more specific. What is the mechanism by which pre-service teachers will be enriched? Why should aspiring coaches work with pre-service candidates rather than in-service teachers in their district with specific, contextual needs? What are the specific long-term outcomes for the program, including sustainability past the grant years? The lack of clinical partnership agreements with Wyoming School Districts also really hurts this application. This Key Performance Indicator would have been easy to meet, and I imagine it was just an oversight by the PIs not to discuss current placement agreements for pre-service teachers in the clinical phase of the program. Give the reviewers a sense that this partnership is already well established with clinical placements, so that the

2017-11 Feedback and National Reviews

project will appear feasible. Similarly, there is a missed opportunity to make use of graduates from the program as potential partners, which could have addressed another Key Performance Indicator and strengthened the application.

2017-11 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: Continue to believe that the state is willing to fund education at a high level. More work is necessary to prove that the investment is well spent and that UW and districts are open to cost saving ideas.

2017-11 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 4

Innovation Comments: Though loosely replicating an existing program it is unique to Wyoming's needs.

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: 4

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 4

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-11 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 2

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 2

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2

Documentation of Need Comments: Although only two regions outside of Laramie are mentioned, it seems that this work needs to start on a small scale

Literature Review Rating: 2

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: This seems like a reasonable and valuable proposal.

2017-11 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: Stakeholder Feedback Group

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 3

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 3

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 3

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 3

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-11 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: OVERALL AVERAGE RATING

Innovation Rating: 2.8

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 2.6

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2.6

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 2.6

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 2.4

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3.4

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3.4

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments:

2017-11 Feedback and National Reviews

Response Representing: STAKEHOLDER AVERAGE RATING

Innovation Rating: 3

Innovation Comments:

Performance Indicator Rating: 2.75

Performance Indicator Comments:

Documentation of Need Rating: 2.75

Documentation of Need Comments:

Literature Review Rating: 2.75

Literature Review Comments:

Leading Programs Rating: 2.75

Leading Programs Comments:

Contextual Constraints Rating: 3

Contextual Constraints Comments:

Risk Assessment Rating: 3.25

Risk Assessment Comments:

Funding Rating: 3.25

Funding Comments:

Narrative Comments:

Summary Comments: