Coordinating Council
Friday, June 9, 2017 • 11 a.m. to 2 p.m.
University of Wyoming • Wyoming Hall • Room 312
(North on 15th Street from Grand; West on Lewis Street from 15th to Parking Lot Entrance;
Park in lot north of Wyoming Hall)

Via Videoconference: https://zoom.us/j/495503689, Phone 408-638-0968 or 646-558-8656

1. 11 a.m. – Agenda and Proposal Disposition Timeline Overview ............................................ Rebecca Watts
2. 11:10 a.m. – Discussion and Consensus of Disposition for Proposal 2017-01.............................. All
3. 11:50 a.m. – Discussion and Consensus of Disposition for Proposal 2017-02............................. All
4. 12:30 p.m. – (Box Lunches Served).......................................................................................... All
5. 12:40 p.m. – Discussion and Consensus of Disposition for Proposal 2017-03.............................. All
6. 1:20 p.m. – Discussion and Consensus of Disposition for Proposal 2017-04............................. All
7. 2 p.m. - Adjourn......................................................................................................................... All
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Leading Progress Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Comments on Leading Progress Review</th>
<th>Comments on Context Constraints</th>
<th>Comments on Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments on Funding</th>
<th>Comments on Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>This proposal is very much in line with the objectives of the TEI. It takes currently available technology and integrates that technology into our educational system.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Very thorough!</td>
<td>Very thorough narrative in regards to the problem, proposal, desired outcomes, and implementation plan.</td>
<td>This is an interesting and innovative approach to providing pre-service teachers with opportunities to work on classroom management skills. It is an area that is tough to teach, and without actual experience it is tough to improve. The Mursion program appears to be an avenue that through simulations would provide ample opportunities for students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>This proposal addresses indicators 3, 4, 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I'm impressed with this proposal</td>
<td>Need more understanding / homework on my part, hard for me to visualize how the experience will be; however, I'm impressed particularly for rural areas and the scalable factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>interesting proposal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I need to do more research on this myself, would like to know more about results</td>
<td>I believe this is still emerging technology but relatively broad based as far as pilots and testing</td>
<td>lost risk approach, easy access utilization barrier I expect would be low for students vs. the first experience being in the classroom</td>
<td>I expect low risk to most stakeholders, some students may need more human interaction/ coaching</td>
<td>scalable is a strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposal is very much in line with the objectives of the TEI. It takes currently available technology and integrates that technology into our educational system. Provides strong evidence of the need. The use of Mursion helps with the burden of flooding schools in Albany County with practicum students. There appears to be ample opportunity for pre-service teachers to observe, analyze, and receive feedback through the use of the Mursion program. There is extensive evidence of the programs use/success at the University of Mississippi, Auburn University, and University of Maine, Orono. This is an interesting and innovative approach to providing pre-service teachers with opportunities to work on classroom management skills. It is an area that is tough to teach, and without actual experience it is tough to improve. The Mursion program appears to be an avenue that through simulations would provide ample opportunities for students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Comments Leading Progress</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Comments: Ldg Progra</th>
<th>Comments Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Solutions to restraints were not outwardly evident. Confidentiality was mentioned. Also, the ability to collect data seemed to be less than optimal. While there was short time frame to develop the proposal, I feel that this needs to be clearly articulated before moving forward.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Proposal uses the wording “provide access” throughout but has no mention of accountability. There is the $1000 incentive also, yet the investment into this proposal has not guarantee of usage. The overall concept sounds great but without accountability may end up being a waste of resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidentiality was mentioned. Also, the ability to collect data seemed to be less than optimal. While there was short time frame to develop the proposal, I feel that this needs to be clearly articulated before moving forward.
This proposal clearly satisfies the indicator of continuous improvement protocols for field and clinical experiences. It also satisfies state of the art college of education technological capabilities as measured by faculty and candidate collaboration and innovation. The other indicators may be satisfied with a more overt evaluation protocol.

The author(s) suggest that the opportunities for early practicum experiences are limited at UW due to the overburden of number of candidates having to utilize Albany County School District #1. These simulation opportunities may provide an effective tool to augment these early practicum experiences in both the undergraduate and leadership programs. It is unclear from the proposal how Mursion will be used across multiple sites in Wyoming with a simulation specialist. How this simulation will be implemented across the state needs to be clarified more clearly.

The author(s) contacted three institutions of higher education in the US regarding their perceptions of the Mursion system. Question prompts related to how long they have used the program, how it is utilized and benefits and drawbacks of the system. The system was generally used in the early parts of the undergraduate preparation program in a slow rollout situation with one main coordinator. Undergraduates seem generally to be attracted by the use of the innovation and educators reported that Mursion support was very good. The challenge seems to be the hiring of the simulation specialists that are required within each simulation.

The lack of inclusion of an evaluation protocol is listed as a risk to the TEI.

This is a proposal that has some worth in relation to the TEI indicators. The use of technology advances to augment practical learning experiences for early year undergraduates has merit. My main concern with this proposal is its lack of formal evaluation protocol in terms of its effect on teacher learning. The author(s) need to revisit this section to provide how research questions will be posed and empirical data collected related to this goal. The author(s) also need to provide more information on the faculty who will be involved in this pilot project and how this simulation system will be utilized across different school districts in the state.

The proposal directly addresses four key performance indicators. As evidenced by the feedback from the TEI Town Hall Meetings and the results from the TEI Stakeholder Group Baseline Survey, a need has been articulated to provide candidates with more extensive field and clinical experiences prior to student teaching. This proposal would directly address that need.

The Literature Review supporting the proposal shows a strong evidence base for the intervention.

The proposal identifies risks that can be addressed through development of an evaluation system and through outreach to Wyoming P-12 School Districts.

The proposal narrative is detailed and provides good information on the proposed technology and how it would be used in LWCOE programs. The sole concern I have is the proposal to provide faculty a $1,000 annual stipend as an incentive to use the system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documented Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments: Ldg Progr</th>
<th>Commercial Constraints</th>
<th>Comments: Context Constraints</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evidence is provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>On balance, this seems like a very solid proposal. To someone NOT in the education field, this idea seems novel and an excellent use of technology. UW seems to have some unique challenges in teacher education, and this proposal seeks to expand the opportunities for students to practice their craft. This proposal appears to be well thought out, insightful, and an excellent use of funding dollars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 TOTAL</td>
<td>28 TOTAL</td>
<td>24 TOTAL</td>
<td>32 TOTAL</td>
<td>22 TOTAL</td>
<td>24 TOTAL</td>
<td>30 TOTAL</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 MEAN</td>
<td>3.50 MEAN</td>
<td>3.00 MEAN</td>
<td>4.00 MEAN</td>
<td>2.75 MEAN</td>
<td>3.00 MEAN</td>
<td>3.75 MEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research work group has provided a unique proposal for offering students the opportunity to participate in virtual scenarios. The pilot implementation is thoroughly described, supported by existing research, and the budget is adequate. Overall, the proposal is complete and very well done. The use of the Mursion virtual reality system appears to be a very creative solution for our program, providing our students with the opportunity to have experiences that they otherwise might be unable to have. In addition, I appreciate that will allow partner schools to share some of the purchased time. I do recommend that they develop an ongoing evaluation of the pilot program. Recommendation: I wholeheartedly support this proposal.

I very much like this proposal. It clearly addresses a need, and has unique implications for Wyoming's teacher education. Getting students in the classroom has always been a challenge, and this proposal tries to address that problem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Leading Programs, Research</th>
<th>Comments: Ldg Progra</th>
<th>Comments Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments Risk Assmnt</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proposal utilizes state of the art technology to simulate classroom management scenarios and actions. This has potential to provide continuous improve and to produce highly qualified confident graduates.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a clearly presented proposal with strong potential for positive results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Comments on Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>Comments Documented Need</td>
<td>Comments Lit Review</td>
<td>Comments: Leading Programs Research</td>
<td>Comments: Contextual Constraints</td>
<td>Comments: Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Comments Narrative</td>
<td>Summary Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The proposal will improve opportunities for University of Wyoming graduates in Wyoming schools by meeting a critical need for simulation experiences in the undergraduate teacher education program. Providing access to school districts will establish a critical alignment between the the University of Wyoming College of Education and Wyoming School Districts.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The need for this type of clinical simulation exists in Wyoming, but also extends beyond the CoE and the State of Wyoming. Significant potential exists for this type of simulation to be scaled up within the CoE and with other programs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is significant evidence to be found regarding the value of simulation for the education profession. This proposal provides the CoE with the opportunity to extend the simulation to teaching candidates prior to student teaching.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Issues are identified and solutions proposed. I do believe that developing partnerships with Wyoming School districts to create scenarios is critical.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>While the confidentiality issue is understanda ble, it is certainly minimal from my perspective. Teaching in our district is public and feedback from peers occurs regularly. If Wyoming school districts are included in the pilot of this program from inception, I believe the risk will be low in</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Budget request and narrative are clear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

2

3

3

3

3

3

2

3

I continue to believe it is important to keep the best and brightest young educators in the State of Wyoming. Too much of our top performing home grown talent is leaving the state to seek employment elsewhere.
I think the idea of the virtual classroom is good, but wonder as with any make-believe scenario if the writers of the software are accurate in their situations. Wyoming is different in # of students, culture, and economy drivers than Maine, Alabama or any other state that has a testimonial to this program. I do not think there is a replacement for real life, and would not do an "all in" on this, but maybe apply it to a small group first to see its effectiveness. I would also recommend having a current educator in Wyoming review it for its application and accurateness in real life situations. I do not think it addresses all of the performance indicators.

All examples are not similar in location or culture to Wyoming. Would have liked to see some examples from the Western States. Also, they all seemed to be new to the program and not enough long term results given.

The costs do not seem outrageous. So it could be worth testing with a small group.

It seemed fine and described the intent and purpose of the software for use to achieve the goals. However, I am skeptical on the situations being true to real-life in Wyoming.

Again, seems fine. Same as last comment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documented Need</th>
<th>Comments Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Leading Programs, Research</th>
<th>Comments: Ldg Progra</th>
<th>Commercial Constraints</th>
<th>Comments: Context Constraints</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments: Risk Assmnt</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments: Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Keep moving forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the researchers argue for more connection to indicators, it appears that this study would specifically relate to #3 and #7. In this reviewers opinion, #3 is of crucial importance.

Evidence supports the inclusion of technology in early field teaching experiences - even though it was difficult (impossible) to identify which studies specifically used this program. Three programs were included in the review. The most apparent contextual constraint is personnel to manage the system and faculty to implement the system. These constraints have been considered. The minimal risks have been addressed. The specific budget needs for three years have been addressed. Although initially skeptical when reading this proposal, the authors provided a solid argument for how this system could enhance the CoE program. This is a worthwhile proposal that needs to be considered as relevant to the project.

The amount of work that went into this proposal is intense and I feel it meets the needs of all Wyoming stakeholders.
As stated in the proposal, this addresses 4 Key Performance Indicators. However, I believe that the strongest connections with these indicators are numbers 3 and 7.

While this proposal does provide evidence of need, as reported through several town halls and interviews with 55 principals, I did not get a strong indication of the communities/regions that are represented in the study. I would have liked a bit more detail about how they determined who to survey and where.

The proposal’s evidence gathered through evaluation include 4 universities, all within rural areas and representing different regions in the United States. Each university provide unique and valuable evaluation of their use of Mursion in their respective College of Education.

The proposal only provides one constraints, with no proposal for a solution.

This is an excellent and thorough budget. But, given the risk that the university may not receive commitment from school districts in Wyoming, a budget line to visit districts and assess their need might be useful.

I think that the Mursion technology and method is a very valuable program in helping College of Education students in both undergraduate and graduate level classes learn the very necessary skills of classroom management, as well as communication with colleagues and parents. I would have like a more description of what a simulation might look like. After researching this online I have a much better understanding of how university students actually do teach a class and deal with very real classroom issues.
Research Work Group Proposal Form

Initiative Research Objectives

- Identify highly effective evidence-based educator preparation practices
- Identify which highly effective evidence-based practices can be implemented with fidelity and rigor in Wyoming
- Adapt and refine highly effective evidence-based practices for implementation in Wyoming

Initiative Research Definitions

- **Candidate** – an individual enrolled in a professional educator preparation program
- **Completer** – an individual who has successfully complete a professional educator program
- **Educator Preparation Practices** – professional training, including courses, fieldwork in schools (including student teaching), and other experiences designed to equip prospective educators with the knowledge, attitudes, behaviors and skills needed to support the success of pre-school through grade 12 (P-12) students in their classrooms, schools and wider communities
- **Evidence-Based Practice** – practice developed by integrating the best available evidence including quantitative (numerical) and qualitative data. Data for evidence-based educator preparation practice include but are not limited to:
  - current educator preparation literature
  - meta-analyses (combined data from multiple studies)
    - historical research
    - experimental research
    - non-experimental research
    - exploratory, descriptive, and explanatory (cause and effect) research
  - outcomes data of P-12 students taught by program completers
  - employment outcomes of program completers, including persistence through induction programs and persistence in the profession
  - candidate perceptions of program effectiveness
  - employer (school district) perceptions of program effectiveness
Problem Statement: Classroom management skills, collegial interaction, and collaboration skills have been identified as a major need of educator prep candidates. Although the theory behind these skills can be taught, they are really only learned with experience and practice. Current courses offer few opportunities to practice other than role-play, and field experiences are necessarily limited. In order to increase practice opportunities and improve these skills, the College of Education Research Work Group proposes to pilot the use of the Mursion virtual reality simulation system.

Proposal: Use funding from the University of Wyoming Trustees Education Initiative to conduct a three-year pilot of the Mursion simulation system. This pilot is composed of the following elements:

1. 3 year access to the Mursion simulation system
2. Access to a library of scenarios including classroom management situations, content instruction, and adult to adult interaction (e.g., parent teacher conferences, evaluation meetings, coaching, interactions with colleagues),
3. The development of 2 customized scenarios each year (4 total) developed in conjunction with UW faculty and partner school district input
4. 60 hours of access time per year apportioned as follows: 30 hours to methods courses (EDST 3000, EDCI 4000), 15 hours to school leadership courses (e.g., EDAD 5030, EDAD 5150), and 15 hours available for partner school districts to use for teacher professional development
5. Technology equipment upgrades as needed
6. Training for faculty on how to use the system and facilitate feedback and reflection activities
7. On-site system manager
8. The development of a partnership with several school districts to gather input on new scenarios, to identify high needs areas aligned with evaluation models, and to explore ways that a school district could potentially use the simulation system for professional development and purposes

Outcomes:

1. Provide opportunities for educator prep candidates to practice, receive feedback on, and reflect on classroom practices (e.g., classroom management, content instruction)
2. Provide opportunities for educator prep and education leadership candidates to practice, receive feedback on, and reflect on adult to adult interaction (e.g., with colleagues, parents, community, and in evaluation and coaching situations)
3. Provide opportunities for school districts to experiment with a method for providing individual and targeted professional development.

Description of Intervention:

Mursion is a virtual training environment in which educator candidates practice complex instructional skills, including classroom management, content area instruction, interactions with adults, including other professionals and parents, and working with students with special needs in a safe, simulated environment. Mursion was developed as part of the TeachLivE research project at the University of Central Florida with funding from the Gates Foundation. Currently, Mursion is in use in 65 universities and k-12 school systems as well as healthcare systems, hospitality businesses, and other business settings.

Mursion uses a computer based mixed reality environment in which candidates interact with avatars representing small classes of students (up to five at a time), other professionals, parents, school leadership, or community members. The computer controls the physical movements and appearance of the avatar. A human actor, or simulation specialist, controls the interactions. The simulation specialists are selected and highly trained to provide as authentic a learning experience as is possible. The mixed reality approach enables each simulation to be hyper-responsive to the unique live performance of each individual learner, allowing learners to fully immerse themselves and thus produce significant and lasting changes in practice.
The blended model also enables Mursion to provide highly customized and cost-effective simulation experiences. Each week Mursion works with educator preparation faculties across the country to design, embed into coursework, and consistently deliver mixed-reality simulations for preservice teachers. Mursion currently has hundreds of scenarios specific to education settings in its library. New scenarios are added to the system on a regular basis. The system also allows for custom development of scenarios. Mursion can be used one on one with candidates or in a lab setting, with candidates taking turns to interact and other candidates viewing and reflecting on the experience. UW faculty would be there in all cases to manage the experience as well as provide feedback and guide reflection.

The Mursion system is designed to focus on discrete skills and force common performance errors from which trainees can learn. It can also be personalized to the individual candidate’s current level of skill by increasing or decreasing the difficulty of the interactions. The system also allows for multiple rounds of practice and feedback provided by UW faculty without having to arrange for field experiences.

The current proposal is to pilot the use of the Mursion simulation system in three areas: 1. An undergraduate methods course, 2. An education leadership course, and 3. District use for targeted professional development. The pilot will use the existing library of scenarios and the development of custom scenarios. The University would purchase access time from Mursion. Data on the use of the Mursion system will be collected from a variety of sources including school and faculty surveys, number of simulation hours used, evaluation of candidates using existing assessment tools, and the number of additional experiences and pieces of feedback that students have received, among others. In addition, the Research Work Group will reach out to other schools using the system for evaluation tools the school may have developed.

In the future, should the pilot prove successful, the University of Wyoming College of Education could purchase a license to the system, train its own simulation specialists, and provide access to the system to other schools in the University and to the school districts around the state. The College of Education could charge for access to the system, recouping the cost of licensing, and maintaining the system.

Proposal’s Alignment to Key Performance Indicator(s)\(^1\)

*(Check all that apply.)*

- ☒ Statewide perceptions of the University of Wyoming College of Education
- ☐ Enrollment of Wyoming residents in University of Wyoming College of Education

\(^1\) List complete as of February 2017. Research Work Groups will introduce additional Key Performance Indicators for Governing Board review and action.

*Please email completed form to TEI Executive Director upon completion.*

*Version 2.0: February 22, 2017*
Continuous improvement protocols for field and clinical experiences, developed and implemented in partnership with school district partners

Executed, active clinical partnership agreements with Wyoming School Districts

Employment of University of Wyoming graduates in Wyoming schools

National accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), with no Areas for Improvement or Stipulations related to CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact, Component 4.3: Satisfaction of Employers.

State-of-the-art College of Education organizational structure, facilities, and technological capabilities as measured by faculty and candidate collaboration and innovation, candidate perceptions of their experiences, and operational efficiencies as measured by resource monitoring and reporting.

Funding Request to Support Pilot Implementation (by Academic Year)

2017-2018 Total Request: $34,430
- Subtotal Amount: $10,000  Purpose: Access to simulation system hours
- Subtotal Amount: $4,000  Purpose: Custom scenario development
- Subtotal Amount: $2,000  Purpose: Equipment upgrades
- Subtotal Amount: $2,880  Purpose: Faculty professional development
- Subtotal Amount: $6550  Purpose: System Manager
- Subtotal Amount: $9000  Purpose: User Stipend

2018-2019 Total Request $36,550
- Subtotal Amount: $13,000  Purpose: Access to simulation system hours
- Subtotal Amount: $4,000  Purpose: Custom scenario development
- Subtotal Amount: $2,000  Purpose: Equipment upgrades
- Subtotal Amount: $2,000  Purpose: School District partner meetings
- Subtotal Amount: $6550  Purpose: System Manager
- Subtotal Amount: $9000  Purpose: User Stipend

2019-2020 Total Request $36,550
- Subtotal Amount: $15,000  Purpose: Access to simulation system hours
- Subtotal Amount: $4,000  Purpose: Custom scenario development
Subtotal Amount: $2,000  Purpose: School District partner meetings
Subtotal Amount: $6550  Purpose: System Manager
Subtotal Amount: $9000  Purpose: User Stipend

Budget Narrative to Support Funding Request:

For each of the academic years presented in this proposal, we provide the following rationale to support our funding request.

Access to 60 hours of Mursion’s classroom and individual simulation system: $10,000 during year 1; $13,000 during year 2; $15,000 during year 3.

Access to 60 hours of Mursion simulations will be divided across specified courses in both the undergraduate teacher education program and the graduate principal preparation program, as well as school districts who request access, with priority given to the CoE programs, during the first year. Students and instructors in those specified classes will plan and implement either individual or group simulation sessions, as described below.

**Individual Simulation Sessions:**

Learners individually experience unique scenarios focused on one or two discrete skills with live feedback. Each session is recorded for reflection and coaching. Designed for private practice, self-reflection, and spaced learning. There is a package of three simulation sessions with video of each interaction for feedback and coaching. The cost of scenario design is included. Price: $100/learner.

**Virtual Group Workshops:**

Learners are grouped together in teams of 3-5, each experiencing at least one scenario directly with the avatar(s). Mursion (or our own facilitator) can facilitate workshops. Each session is recorded for reflection and coaching. Designed to promote peer-to-peer learning. Session is one, interactive virtual workshop lasting approximately one hour. The cost of scenario design is included. Price: $200/workshop.

The increase in hours purchased during years 2 and 3 is based on the assumption that additional school districts and/or faculty members will wish to use the system and allows us to purchase additional hours of access as needed.

**Custom scenario development: $4000 per year during years 1 and 2; $2000 during year 3**

Mursion provides already-developed simulation scenarios that are available to use within the cost of the hourly or per-learner access described above. However, it is quite likely that instructors will want to design scenarios that are specific to course outcomes and/or program standards. Custom scenarios are built on an individual basis, with the support of Mursion staff. Mursion then trains its own staff to provide the custom scenario for specified audiences. Development of each custom scenario costs approximately $1000, so this portion of the budget provides for 4 custom scenarios per year for the first two years of the pilot, which may be used by the specified course instructors or by the districts receiving approval to use the system. We anticipate less demand for custom scenarios in the third year of the pilot.
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Equipment upgrades: $2000 per year during years 1 and 2

Classrooms in which the Mursion simulation system is used will need some equipment upgrades, to ensure the smooth working of the system. In addition, as districts request and are approved to use the system, some equipment may be needed at the school site. This budget category allows for purchase of the necessary equipment for classrooms in which the Mursion system is used. We anticipate no demand for equipment upgrades in the third year of the pilot.

School district partner meetings: $2000 per year during years 1 and 2

As both the College of Education and our school district partners will be engaged in using the Mursion simulation systems, it is crucial that individuals engaged in the pilot meet to share best practices, resolve problems, and suggest ways in which the system might be used to best advantage. This budget category provides for travel expenses and meals for CoE and school district participants to meet in a central location in the state for 2 days out of each academic year. During the third year of the pilot, the expectation is that the university and school district partners will evaluate the success of the system and develop a recommendation regarding the use of the system going forward.

Faculty/school personnel professional development: $2880 per year

Training for using the system takes approximately two hours and costs $160/hr. Any faculty or school personnel using the system would need to take part in the training. This budget category includes training for 3 personnel from each of our three pilot participants: undergraduate teacher education, graduate principal preparation, and partner school districts.

System manager: $6550 per year

One faculty member from the College of Education will be provided with a one-course buyout per semester to serve as the manager of the Mursion simulation system, which will include working with faculty members or teachers using the system, scheduling, coordinating with Mursion, and other responsibilities as needed.

User stipend: $9000 per year

College of Education faculty members will receive a $1000 annual stipend as incentive to invest time and energy in use of the system.
Literature Review

Reviewed and analyzed relevant current literature on the best practices for preparing professional educators

Literature Citations:


Summary of Literature Review:

The research reviewed below illustrates the central role that experience, practice, and effective feedback must play for pre-service teachers to effectively learn complex skills such as classroom management, collaboration, and collegial interaction. Moreover, technology can serve as a powerful tool for learning these complex skills. Finally, preliminary research findings indicate that users of the system not only improve targeted skills with multiple short practice sessions, but also transfer these skills to the classroom setting.

Learning to manage the many complex demands of teaching (e.g., planning and implementing lessons, assessing student learning, reflecting on lesson effectiveness, etc.) is a complex undertaking for pre-service teachers. And, of all the complex demands placed on pre-service teachers as they learn to teach, managing student behavior can be one of the most daunting. In fact, classroom management is a longstanding concern, and oftentimes a serious pre-occupation, for pre-service teachers (Kaufman & Moss, 2010). Scholars (e.g., Yılmaz & Çavaş, 2010) have shown that effective practice can help pre-service teachers learn to thoughtfully manage student behavior during instruction. For example, in a study designed to enhance pre-service
teachers’ development of classroom management skills, Tal (2010) found that the thoughtful use of in-depth case studies helped to improve pre-service teachers’ classroom management skills. As well, meaningful practice working with students and then thoughtfully reflecting on that practice also improves pre-service teachers’ classroom management skills (Yilmaz & Cavas, 2007).

Whether helping pre-service teachers learn to manage student behavior or engage in the other myriad aspects of teaching, a host of scholars argue that immediate, effective feedback plays a central role in fostering deeper and more meaningful student learning (Capizzi, Wehby, & Sandmel, 2010; Mueller & Hindin (2011). For example, using videotape analysis with structured expert coaching and self-evaluation, Capizzi, Wehby, and Sandmel (2010) noted significant improvement in pre-service teachers’ instruction and classroom management. Using a variety of other means to provide immediate and effective feedback (e.g., bug-in-ear eCoaching; webcams and Bluetooth™ technology), other scholars noted similar improvement in pre-service teachers’ quality of instruction and management (Google, Rahn, & Ottley, 2015; Scheeler, McKinnon, & Stout, 2012).

In addition to the use of meaningful practice and effective and immediate feedback, a number of scholars have explored how technology can be used as a tool to help pre-service teachers learn to teach. Studies of the use of online simulation systems in teacher preparation have found that candidates perceive them to be of great value, and that students that used these systems to practice scored higher on assessments of teaching practice (Mahon, Bryant, Brown, & Kim, 2010; McPherson, Tyler-Wood, McEnturff Ellison, & Peak, 2011). Other studies have used blogs, enhanced podcasts and video-based case examples to help pre-service teachers learn to manage the complex demands of instruction and classroom behavior (Stover, Yearta & Sease, 2014; Kennedy, Hart, & Kellems, 2011; Sun & van Es, 2015; Gale, Trific & Lengel; 2010). Other scholars (e.g., Bell, Maeng, & Binns, 2013) have studied ways to meaningfully integrate technology into student teaching experiences. Bell et al. (2013) found that the following practices improved pre-service teachers’ abilities to meaningfully integrate technology into instructional practices: participating in lessons in which technology integration was modeled, collaborating with peers, and myriad opportunities for feedback and thoughtful reflection.

Ongoing evaluation studies of the TeachLivE system (the grant funded precursor to the Mursion system) have consistently revealed that repeated short practice sessions using the simulations improved targeted teaching behaviors, and more importantly, that the improvement in practice was transferred to the classroom settings (Straub, Dieker, Hynes, & Hughes, 2014; Straub, Dieker, Hynes, & Hughes, 2015).

Analysis of Current UW Teacher Program and Practice

Collected and analyzed relevant evidence from current educational practice and current educator preparation practice

Evidence Collected and Analyzed

1. 2015 UW College of Education Principal Survey
2. 2016 UW College of Education Principal Survey
3. TEI Town Hall Meeting Response Analysis 2017
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**Summary of Analysis of Current UW Teacher Program and Practice**

When asked how well teacher education graduates from UW manage their classrooms, 22 of 55 principals in 2016 (41.5%) stated either extremely well or very well. Another 25 (47.2%) stated moderately well, 5 (9.43%) indicated slightly well, and 1 (1.89%) stated not well at all. When asked how UW teacher education graduates compared with others of similar teaching experience 18 of 53 (34%) principals said they were more able or significantly more able. Twenty-eight principals (52.8%) said there was no difference, and 7 (13.21%) said they were less able.

These are similar to results in 2015 where 22 of 39 principals (56.4%) stated graduates from UW were well or very well at managing the classroom effectively, 12 (30.8%) were average, and 5 (12.8%) were poor or very poor. When asked how UW teacher education graduates compared with others of similar teaching experience 12 of 39 (30.8%) principals said they were more able or significantly more able. Twenty principals (51.3%) said there was no difference, and 7 (17.9%) said they were less able or significantly less able.

An analysis of responses made during the series of town hall meetings between February and March 2017 indicated that several attendants negatively viewed the classroom management philosophies and skills of University of Wyoming-prepared novice educators. However, individuals stated there was also a need for greater funding sources and structure regarding the use of social workers to mitigate student issues beyond the scope of classroom management skills. Comments on page 14 of the town hall summary report focus exclusively on student teaching experiences (as opposed to recent graduates). However, they indicated limited preparation in effective classroom management prior to these experiences, particularly to defuse “emotional situations” and work with students that have special needs. Recommendation three from the report on these town hall meetings (p. 3) suggests that UW evaluate pre-service teachers regarding their knowledge and application of classroom management practices. Furthermore, they recommend that UW develop strong partnerships with school districts to provide field experiences that establish and maintain “a strong classroom environment with clear expectations for students.”

Although not directly related to classroom management, several town hall participants desired more online and outreach offerings to increase access to teacher education programs (pp. 19-21).

To a lesser extent, town hall meetings also focused on educational leadership experiences. Based on feedback provided in these meetings, UW was encouraged to strengthen educational leadership preparation regarding collaboration models, collaboration and support strategies with veteran teachers, and the development of a collaboration culture (p. 3). Quotations on pages 17 and 18 of the report provide additional details. Individuals claimed administrator interns needed more experience dealing with difficult employees, working with plans of assistance, and supervising/evaluating employees.

Current practice for classroom experiences prior to the student teaching semester requires undergraduate teacher education students to have phased practicum experiences, beginning the freshman or sophomore year. For the bulk of the approximately 650 undergraduate students, this means that their practicum experiences occur in Albany County School District #1 and (to a lesser extent) Laramie County School District #1. Because the majority of the undergraduate teacher
education students live in Laramie, this puts a burden on local schools and teachers; it also limits the number of classroom teaching experiences that we can provide for students. Our hope is that the opportunity to experience simulations through Mursion’s system will provide additional, high-quality opportunities to work on specific kinds of strategies, with substantial feedback, without putting additional load on local schools.

**Evaluation of Regional and Leading Teacher Prep Programs**

*(Check all that apply.)*

**Programs Reviewed:**

- Traditional educator preparation programs in public and private universities across the United States

  **Names and Locations of Traditional Programs studied:**
  - University of Mississippi
  - Auburn University
  - University of Maine, Orono

**Data Analysis**

**Qualitative Data Analyzed**

- Interviews with educator preparation programs currently using the system

**Summary of Data Findings**

The Mursion simulation system is currently in use in 65 university educator preparation programs for teacher candidate preparation and K-12 school systems for targeted teacher professional development. In order to obtain information from educator preparation programs that have used Mursion’s simulation system, we first requested information from Mursion on contact information from universities that are rural in nature. We received contact information for Auburn University (Alabama), University of Mississippi (Mississippi), and University of Maine (Maine). In this section, we provide information obtained from those administrators, using common questions. Note: The TeachLivE system referred to in the below comments is the first-generation system. Mursion was developed out of TeachLivE.

1. **How long have you been using the TeachLivE/Mursion simulation system?**

   - **Mississippi:** Four years.
   - **Alabama:** August 2017 will be a year. They are in the pilot phase.
Wrote a grant for $47,000. (License for a year + training of two specialists) All of the universities that she spoke with are in the process of going from pay by the hour to a full license.

She is glad that she wrote the grant for a full year. Their College of Business wants to use it, so she will charge the folks from the College of Business, if there are any free simulation times, etc. She has three different tiers (CoEd. 1st tier); Second tier, university gets priority. 3rd tier, outside businesses (e.g., Law enforcement, Best Western, etc. She is exploring how to deal with difficult customers, etc.)

Kate’s goal: To make this self-sustaining. Most universities have been charging student fees. She is trying to avoid this. Businesses have more money than education, so that is why she has the third tier she mentioned.

They hired 2 simulation specialists. (Licensing contract and another contract that deals with the training of your specialists. Mursion will advertise, recruit, and train the simulation specialists; Kate didn’t have to do this.) Mursion sends a Google document showing their hires. Mursion strives to hire people in the A and B range. (Grade range is A through D.) The training takes 2 weeks, and trainers need to pass a Mursion test. (This is where the grades come from.) Mursion is very flexible in figuring out what is needed and not needed. Your simulation is only as good as your actor and simulation specialist.

Maine: Year 2 of a 4-Year Project Commitment (Maryellen Mahoney O’Neil, Assoc. Dean for Academic Services). Mary found out about TeachLivE/Mursion at AACTE after talking with Dianne Hoff from University of West Georgia who was using it successfully within its COE.

4-Year Commitment: The Univ of Maine COE made a 4-Year commitment to building a TeachLivE Simulation Lab for use with its pre-service teachers and administrators. Maine also committed to covering all TeachLivE Lab use costs for the first 3 years. At the start of Year 4, Maine’s COE will charge a $15 service fee that students pay for each course in which they’re enrolled that utilizes the TeachLivE Lab. After less than 2 years of implementation, Maine’s COE staff is confident that it will have no problem with this fee requirement due to the excitement and successful learning for them that the TeachLivE Lab has already provided.

Success by Year 2: Maine’s COE is almost to the end of its 2nd Year and is extremely pleased with the ease of use, responsiveness of the company, and the importance of providing such a learning opportunity to practice in front of a classroom prior to field experiences and student teaching. Maine’s COE course instructors as well as its participating students feel that the opportunity to hone their communication skills and receive feedback from instructors and peers before appearing in front of a real classroom is invaluable. In fact, Mary reported that Maine’s COE’s recruitment numbers for their teacher training programs have increased by 29% since the implementation of this technology-rich simulation learning tool. There are other teacher training college programs in Maine, however, when pre-service teachers were surveyed about what helped in making their choice for attending the University of Maine (Orono) for their training, the presence of the Mursion/TeachLivE Lab as part of their training was highly valued. Students valued how the simulation allowed them to be the leader of the classroom with no mentor teaching guiding them through
situations yet provided the opportunity to practice, make mistakes, and correct. Being able
to observe their peers in practice was also important No other universities in Maine offer
this learning tool.

**Staffing:** Maryellen Mahoney-O’Neil, UMaine Associate Dean of Academic Services,
spearheaded the implementation of building the TeachLivE Training Lab. After looking back
on Year 1, Mary was surprised that in terms of staffing for this additional service, she only
needed to secure one COE graduate assistant for scheduling use of the Lab and 2 faculty
members who embedded the use of this simulation into their teacher training course
outlines. She remarked several times that what her faculty needed to know in order to use
the TeachLivE Lab was very minimal. After the initial introduction to the TeachLivE Lab
concept and the running the simulation software connection in the lab, the faculty said they
could take over both the troubleshooting of technology and use of the lab by themselves as
long as there was still a point person to schedule the lab visits. The University’s IT
Department was involved with the initial TeachLivE Lab conversations, but wasn’t needed
after the correct computer and TV screen had been purchased and installed on the network.
A plus is that the TeachLivE Lab doesn’t need technology purchased directly from the
company. Only needs a large TV screen along with minimum computer specs for successful
simulation of a teacher – classroom environment.

2. **In what ways is the TeachLivE/Mursion simulation system utilized at your university? If used
within the College of Education for field experience and/or during course work, please provide
specifics.**

**Mississippi:** Went all in. Through NCATE, supposed to have a variety of experiences. Did
everything to provide candidates with different types of experience. Typical first experience
-- send the student out to a placement, they would observe for 25 hours. In such a rural
area, had trouble finding 800-100 placements within 60-70 miles. Students saying they were
learning what not to do. So they did a pilot with TeachLivE, and it went very well. They have
now put TeachLivE into first required course, before they get into teacher education (in
their junior year). Students love to teach with TeachLivE. The experience was very popular.
In this required course prior to teacher ed -- students teach a 10-15 minute lesson, 4
students at a time with a retired principal as a coach. It is a type of micro-teach. Even with
four students at a time in the room, the experience changes every single time. The next step
was to put it in place so that every student has to teach with TeachLivE. So in the second
semester, TeachLivE is implemented in a second required course. They have implemented
an option to have an ESL student in the class as well. This guarantees that every student has
this experience. Candidates love it. The first time they are terrified. Afterwards, they talk
about the students as if they are real. Sometimes they get more shots at it.

**Alabama:** Many of their classes have moved to online. It is hard, if not impossible, to teach
behavior management online. She couldn’t figure out a way to do this. She is using
simulations for the gradual release of responsibility model with respect to behavior
management. The simulation helps with this. She wants to see her students go through
five steps of a verbal reprimand and other behavior management techniques/issues.
Methods courses: A big focus here for them right now is lesson planning. They focus on the intro, middle and ending of a lesson. The next scenario design might be a lesson with 2 to 3 pushbacks in terms of behavior problems during a lesson. Their SpEd folks have used Mursion for running an IEP meeting with two co-teachers. The College of Business wants to do interviews, deliver a high-stakes sales pitch. If you can dream of it, you can make a simulation. Counseling program using it for high-risk suicide prevention, etc.

Kate and colleagues went to visit Ole Miss. They have a retired principal who runs the lab 24/7. She has it designed so that the professor is the one who gives the feedback. Kate prefers her approach because she and her colleagues don’t think that one person has the appropriate content or disciplinary background for all subjects. Kate and her colleagues are drawing on Teach Live Proceedings as their research base. Five to 8 minutes in the typical length for most of their sessions, but they have found that students need immediate feedback. Counseling sessions will last longer, etc.

**Maine:** *Teacher Training* – Currently uses the TeachLivE Lab simulation during the first two years of their elementary/secondary/early childhood teacher training programs which involve field experiences and student teaching internships in actual classrooms. It supports the coursework that contains components of classroom management and the art of teaching in real time. It doesn’t replace the pre-service teacher’s time in a school or take away from valuable instruction time. Instructors embed practice in the Lab within their courses as a prompt for discussion and performance feedback. Another application is to gain experience in conducting meaningful parent/teacher conferences. It’s a great tool for preparing pre-service teachers for on-the-floor situations they’ll experience while participating in field experiences and student teaching. U of Maine sees strong applications for TeachLivE in Educational Leadership programming where pre-service administrators can practice mentoring new teachers as well as terminating contracts. TeachLivE is also embedded within other education programs such as RtI, Special Education, and Counseling.

3. **What is working best with the TeachLivE/Mursion simulation system at your university? How do you ascertain this?**

**Mississippi:** Goal -- to make sure that the first two experiences are great (both in the junior year. Highly recommend that you send multiple students into the room with TeachLivE. At UM, they always send in at least 3 students into the room, to get the most out of the coaching experience. They have hired a retired principal who is a great coach. He goes out into the hall. He talks them like it’s a pep rally, then brings them into the room. First person up and turn it on. As the system has grown, have hired a teacher in the schools, to do her doctorate. Paid her a stipend to do it -- principal and teacher. Highly recommends having some kind of coach in there. Uses the same rubric for student teaching. Addresses those same rubrics.

Collect data on that. Scored for that and for everything. Looking at growth. First time they teach, they’re not seasoned teachers, so it’s important that someone can give them proper feedback. Doesn’t hurt them. Evaluated using the same instrument over time.
**Alabama:** You want to do a slow rollout and you want to do it right. This is CRUCIAL! They have decided to give one free simulation hour for partner schools. These schools will bring their weak teachers in to try the simulations. Some schools want to do SpEd training with teachers. Kate got a classroom for their Mursion lab. She recommends this. This way the faculty can do a lecture and then run a simulation in the same room. Kate recommends thinking about what you want to do and how you want to do it and then working backwards from there.

**Maine:** Most important in the success of the TeachLivE Simulation tool has been the building of a high quality interactive lab environment in which to conduct the simulations. U of Maine COE designated a special room for the TeachLivE Lab so that it represented the feel of a classroom in their K-12 schools as much as it could. As a result, a great amount of excitement grew around it. It’s definitely been a draw to the University of Maine’s teaching program – a great recruitment tool. When potential students come on campus and inquire about UMaine’s teaching program, the TeachLivE Lab short video (linked above) is shown during each recruitment open house to promote the innovative work that is being done in places like the TeachLivE mixed-reality laboratory. It demonstrates how U of Maine is breaking new ground in educator preparation.

**Starting small** (2 faculty embedding TeachLivE laboratory experiences in their courses) has worked best. Use the first year of implementation to learn and figure out best way in which to incorporate into key coursework. Be sure use of TeachLivE isn’t just technology “hype” for teacher preparation. Incorporate it as a valuable learning tool within the courses that focus on classroom management and/or on teacher practice. Bringing 5-6 students at a time into the TeachLivE Lab works best. More is too intimidating when pre-service teachers are practicing. This gives students the opportunity to make mistakes in a non-threatening environment as well as interact, pause, reflect, and try again. The current faculty at U of Maine using TeachLivE, feel that although you can record the classroom response portion of the simulation, there is really no need to. The best learning takes place during the time pre-service teachers are in the simulation lab as a small group interacting.

Because of starting small and strategically implementing the simulation lab concept into key courses for the teacher training program only, U of Maine is expecting to triple the number of courses using it next fall! Expansion to Ed Leadership and other COE program areas will occur plus reaching out to school district superintendents and inviting them to the Lab so they can get a feel for how it might enhance their district’s new teacher mentor programs or the interview process for new hires.

**Mursion’s Pre-Designed Packages:** Even in Year 4, the U of Maine envisions continuing to use Mursion’s interactive avatar simulation packages. They don’t expect to venture into the customization world of simulations; this would mean a lot more work and possibly more staffing due to having to locate and train your own actors. Very pleased with the current middle school simulation packages that are applicable to 9-12 and upper elementary when focusing on classroom management or introducing a class or lesson. Maryellen just recently saw that the aspects of autism and very low IQ have been added to the simulations. She thought an elementary simulation was coming soon, but hasn’t heard of its release date.
4. **What is problematic with the TeachLivE/Mursion simulation system at your university? How do you ascertain this?**

**Mississippi:** Have purchased the site license. The issue becomes, as you grow, you are scheduling so much with Mursion, with the site-license, you have to hire your own simulation people. Have station set up in office. They have had trouble finding people that Mursion approves of to hire. About to do another round of interviews, because they will only let someone they approve be the simulation person. They want a theater person. Now trying to get some of the best graduate assistants and people in the theater department involved. They suggest two people in a rotation. UM wants to send four people.

Dean Rock is a huge, huge supporter. Have placed a lab at every satellite classroom. Simulation person can be in Laramie or in Casper. Charging a student fee, even that, doesn’t come close to covering. Covers the site license through the Dean’s office. Department of Teacher Education covers the cost of personnel. Also looking at hiring a clinical person to cover TeachLivE.

**Alabama:** Kate hasn’t had any bad experiences with any of the Mursion folks. Mursion has been amazing to work with. She has worked with lots of different Mursion people, and all of them have been great. Carrie, Robin and their IT people have been outstanding. Ole Miss, West Georgia, etc. Have had huge problems with their own universities in terms of getting the paperwork completed in their own universities. Since Kate’s university hired their simulation specialists as part-time people, they didn’t have lots of problems working within their university. (That is, it isn’t typically as difficult to hire part-time folks at a university. Kate recommends this approach.)

**Maine:** Maryellen couldn’t say enough about the ease of implementation and success of use within their teacher preparation programs. However, they have stuck with Mursion’s – pre-designed simulations and are not hiring their own actors which could definitely present problems, especially in a rural setting. Scheduling of the TeachLivE Lab was the only aspect that was considered possibly problematic due to its need of continuous support by a person other than faculty using the program. Like I mentioned before, Maine utilized a graduate assistant to schedule the TeachLivE Lab in conjunction with the availability of Mursion’s avatar actors and requested use during the college’s designated courses. Because a high-quality simulation lab was created, Mary had virtually no complaints about the whole experience from technology setup to implementation of lab use. In fact, she pointed out that one time the software program needed to update for a classroom visit and the faculty member had forgotten to request it. Even though Mursion TeachLivE is on PST, their company had the update completed before the class started at 9:00 AM EST with only 15 minutes notice. Jokingly, Mary says that the hardest part of using this simulation program is making sure the TV’s set to the correct channel for viewing!
Contextual Constraints to Implementation Identified

- Identified Potential Risk to Research Subjects
  - ☐ Release of proprietary information
  - ☑ Loss of faculty or candidate confidentiality

  *One use of the Mursion system is its use in a workshop with other candidates. In these circumstances, candidate performance will be public, with feedback provided in public.*
  - ☐ Loss of national accreditation or program recognition
  - ☐ Loss of state approval or recognition
  - ☐ Other (Please describe.)

- Identified Potential Risk to Trustees Education Initiative
  - ☑ Insufficient Data for College and Program Continuous Improvement Purposes
    *The RWG acknowledges that the collection of data in this pilot is critical. The short time frame for developing this proposal did not allow the group time to develop a comprehensive evaluation plan.*
  - ☐ Insufficient Access to Student Success Data of P-12 Students Taught by College of Education
  - ☑ Insufficient Commitment to Collaboration from Wyoming P-12 School Districts
    *We are proposing to work with districts to develop scenarios that districts could use for targeted professional development. It is possible that districts may not be interested in using the system. Although this would not be a threat to the pilot, it could affect long term sustainability of the use of the Mursion system*
  - ☐ Other (Please describe.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments: Lit Progra</th>
<th>Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments: Context Constraints</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments: Risk Assmnt</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments: Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The narrative is very understandable.</td>
<td>The TEI is intended to provide innovation in the education system. This proposal is more of something that should be the responsibility of the College of Ed rather than included in the TEI. I do not believe that this proposal innovates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There are connections to items 1, 3, 6, &amp; 7</td>
<td>There is a stated need for program coherence and the need for work with curriculum mapping and alignment. As well as vertical and horizontal articulation.</td>
<td>The summary of data findings discussed process and potential benefits and alluded to Akron Universities processes.</td>
<td>Collaboration between and review of both General Education and Special Education programs.</td>
<td>Challenges faculty independecne. This may be a good thing in that it might encourage more interdepende nce.</td>
<td>Straight forward budget. There may be an error in the total budget of $25,500 as it doesn't appear to include the facilitator prep of $1,000 in year one. I wonder if there needs to be more information provided for year two. Such as how many participants will split the $10,000?</td>
<td>Very thorough review of the literature, analysis of the current program at UW, the need for program coherence and alignment, and the analysis of stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>I believe work such as this is needed to keep the College of Education relevant in what programming is offered to students, so they are well prepared to enter schools to do their practicum and residency experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6/8/17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documented Need</th>
<th>Comments Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Comments: Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments: Ldg Progra</th>
<th>Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments Context Constraints</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments Risk Assmnt</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Would like to see external resources in the workshop</td>
<td>inference that better integration / alignment is better for the program and the state. I would like to see more on results e.g. educator effectiveness / graduates then look at alignment...</td>
<td>extensive</td>
<td>again results then alignment would be my recommendation without an assessment of results not sure if alignment is on the right initiatives</td>
<td>clearly addresses concerns but are they just internal</td>
<td>Risk depends on the outcome are we getting the right outcome, then align and deliver even stronger. Do we need to adjust the outcome, then redirection might be needed then align</td>
<td>risk assessment</td>
<td>good summary of costs, recommend adding evaluation first then an external resource e.g. U of Akron to monitor and provide some perspective</td>
<td>well done, appears too internally focused given the gravity of our current situation</td>
<td>as noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Outcomes seem vague: *#1 &amp;#2 Review and align- How? With what process? Program? *#3 What kind of special education curriculum? To what extent? The next 3 proposal seems to play into this one. *Is January the optimal time for this to happen? Why specifically this target? *Page 5: &quot;To attract a broad cross-section of our faculty...&quot; - Why is this not a targeted effort to ensure cross &amp; regional representation?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Outcomes seem vague: *#1 &amp;#2 Review and align- How? With what process? Program? *#3 What kind of special education curriculum? To what extent? The next 3 proposal seems to play into this one. *Is January the optimal time for this to happen? Why specifically this target? *Page 5: &quot;To attract a broad cross-section of our faculty...&quot; - Why is this not a targeted effort to ensure cross &amp; regional representation?</td>
<td>This seems like a great idea and obviously useful/needed to conduct a curriculum and program review, just seems broad in the process area and in terms of who will be present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Comments on Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Documentation of Need</td>
<td>Comments: Literature Review</td>
<td>Comments: Programs Research</td>
<td>Comments: Ldg Progra</td>
<td>Contextual Constraints</td>
<td>Comments: Contextual Constraints</td>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Comments: Risk Assmnt</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments: Funding</td>
<td>Comments: Narrative</td>
<td>Summary Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This proposal meets the key performance indicator of maintaining national accreditation from CAEP. It may also contribute to continuous improvement protocols for field and clinical experiences.</td>
<td>No overt documentation was provided on how this curricular revision program would directly influence the multiple regions in Wyoming.</td>
<td>The author(s) provide some background literature on the value of ongoing curriculum analysis in maintaining teacher program standards and accreditation requirements. A rationale is also provided for the inclusion of special education learning outcomes within the general education program requirements.</td>
<td>The author(s) had an on-site visit to Akron University in Ohio. Anecdotal evidence provided some indication of the process of curriculum review and how it re-shaped the infusion of special education learning objectives within a symbiotic curriculum.</td>
<td>o contextual constraints were identified. Although unlikely, there may be a threat to national accreditation. It is important that a member of the review team is an expert in CAEP assessment such that any changes to the curriculum coincide with these accreditation requirements.</td>
<td>The risk identified was to faculty independence of current course offerings.</td>
<td>The proposed budget includes a faculty stipends for 25 faculty to attend the curriculum retreat in January 2018 and Fall 2018. Rationale for this stipend is warranted due to the retreat taking place outside of regular semester time.</td>
<td>Anecdotal student and faculty surveys have highlighted the potential need for vertical and horizontal curriculum analysis of the UW teacher preparation program. There was also concern that graduates of the program were ill-prepared to teach and assess the needs of students with special needs within integrated classroom settings. The proposal has merit.</td>
<td>I am supportive of this proposal but have concerns regarding who will facilitate this curriculum review process. A facilitator from CAEP, or who has extensive knowledge of CAEP assessment needs to be paid and used in this process to maintain the development of an aligned and accredited program. The review process could also be staggered across multiple retreats with different stakeholders involved. I would suggest an initial facilitated retreat with representatives from the Elementary and Special education program to discuss some of the main ideas of a curricular framework and current CAEP assessment tools. This group need to come up with a working plan that provides a broad framework for horizontal and vertical revision which is then brought to the faculty as a whole. The second retreat should include all 25 faculty who can move into working groups to align content within this framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal states that it addresses three key performance indicators, although it is not clear how it addresses continuous improvement protocols for field and clinical experiences designed in partnership with school districts, as the proposed curriculum review process does not include external stakeholders.

The documentation of survey results of student teachers, mentor teachers, and faculty provided sufficient evidence of the need for curriculum review.

The literature cited strongly supports the need for curriculum review to assure that candidates are prepared for the current realities of P-12 classrooms.

The proposal reflects the review of only one program, and does not correctly cite the name of the university. It is listed as "Akron University" instead of the University of Akron. While technical in its shortcoming, this error suggests that this Research Work Group did not deeply engage with the external program.

This proposal identifies only faculty stipends and materials. There is no request for an external facilitator, meals, or other requisite supports needed for a meaningful retreat that delivers significant changes to the program.

The proposal does not identify any contextual constraints.

The proposal identifies a timeline that spans two years that still fails to yield a changed program of study.

The proposal narrative identifies a routine part of continuous program improvement. This is not a strong proposal and is not aligned with the level of innovation that supports the TEI Vision and Mission. While it is the case that a program cannot be pre-eminent if it is outdated, this proposal is an exceptionally slow approach to remediating and outdated program.

I do not recommend this proposal for approval.

The faculty retreat that is proposed includes all 25 faculty; it may be more productive to approach this in a different way - one that could include all faculty but in a variety of roles. Recommendation: revise the proposal.

Recommendation: revise the proposal.
There really are no significant contextual constraints. The one, small constraint is easily managed. The high score here is really about the fact that there really are no significant contextual constraints that I see.

To me, this proposal is about paying teachers to attend a retreat to review curriculum. One thousand dollars per teacher is not very much. I think the proposal fits the general guidelines, but does not seem like a profound contribution.

As stated above, I think curriculum review is very important. However, in a typical academic unit faculty do this as part of a standard assessment process. Here, faculty are not paid to do this work or to attend the retreat. I like the idea, but I’m not sure it’s a great use of limited resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documented Need</th>
<th>Comments Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Leading Programs</th>
<th>Comments: Ldg Progra</th>
<th>Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments: Context Constraints</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments: Risk Assmnt</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments: Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Great work has been done!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Although three indicators were listed, it seems that two indicators were most relevant. And these two are VERY relevant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Only one program was cited, but this is acceptable.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Utilizing between semester time to work on this project solves the 'time' problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>limited risk - mostly to territorial egos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>funding requests seem reasonable</td>
<td>The proposal was clear.</td>
<td>This work is essential to a quality program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With respect to Performance Indicators perceptions from the Wind River reservation share an awareness of UWYO and their Education program, this based on the fact that greater numbers of qualified instructors are needed. The unfortunate piece here is that community members are not enrolling at UWYO. Field experiences (educational) on the Wind River reservation (local LEA’s) by students from UWYO will greatly improve relationships and may very well yield a new cadre of high school graduates to seriously consider education as a field of study. More importantly, it will serve...

Field experiences (educational) on the Wind River reservation (local LEA’s) by students from UWYO will greatly improve relationships and may very well yield a new cadre of high school graduates to seriously consider education as a field of study. More importantly, it will serve...

The proposal addresses number 3 as it will provide continuous improvement; number 6 and number 7 would be strengthened by this activity.

The TEI College Goals and Program Goals are truly unique and obtainable and will greatly benefit Wyoming students.
Initiative Research Objectives

- Identify highly effective evidence-based educator preparation practices
- Identify which highly effective evidence-based practices can be implemented with fidelity and rigor in Wyoming
- Adapt and refine highly effective evidence-based practices for implementation in Wyoming

Initiative Research Definitions

- **Candidate** – an individual enrolled in a professional educator preparation program
- **Completer** – an individual who has successfully complete a professional educator program
- **Educator Preparation Practices** – professional training, including courses, fieldwork in schools (including student teaching), and other experiences designed to equip prospective educators with the knowledge, attitudes, behaviors and skills needed to support the success of pre-school through grade 12 (P-12) students in their classrooms, schools and wider communities
- **Evidence-Based Practice** – practice developed by integrating the best available evidence including quantitative (numerical) and qualitative data. Data for evidence-based educator preparation practice include but are not limited to:
  - current educator preparation literature
  - meta-analyses (combined data from multiple studies)
    - historical research
    - experimental research
    - non-experimental research
    - exploratory, descriptive, and explanatory (cause and effect) research
  - outcomes data of P-12 students taught by program completers
  - employment outcomes of program completers, including persistence through induction programs and persistence in the profession
  - candidate perceptions of program effectiveness
  - employer (school district) perceptions of program effectiveness
### Initiative Research Work Group Name

Elementary Education with support from Special Education

**Submitted by**  
David Yanoski (on behalf of the El Ed and SpEd RWGs)

**Contact Email**  
david.yanoski@marzanoresearch.com

**Contact Phone**  
3037669199 ext. 306

**Submission Date**  
5/23/2017

### Research Work Group Member Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Education</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pete Moran</td>
<td>Tiffany Dobler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb Marquer</td>
<td>Jenny Krause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Padesky</td>
<td>Dawn Scarince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Mitchell</td>
<td>Rick Woodford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Gauntner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal for Pilot Implementation (please provide narrative):

#### Problem Statement:

It has been several years since the teacher education program last met to engage in the systematic review and alignment of our program curriculum. Moreover, the last time the faculty from teacher education met to review national standards and align our program outcomes and common assessments with those standards was almost a decade ago. We view this work as critical to the direction and mission of our programs as well as crucial to meeting CAEP accreditation requirements and believe that a focused retreat of this nature is well overdue.

#### Proposal:

Use funding from the University of Wyoming Trustees Education Initiative to convene a faculty retreat over a 4-day period in January 2018 for the purposes of program review, alignment with accreditation requirements and educator preparation standards, and horizontal and vertical curriculum alignment within our program. In addition, the faculty would look for opportunities to integrate Special
Education content into the Elementary Education curriculum. This retreat would include representation from both the Elementary Education department and the Special Education Department. The Special Education TEI Work Group feels strongly that the faculty in Special Education should work alongside the Elementary Education faculty in reviewing the content of current programming. In so doing, these faculty members can simultaneously look for holes, overlap, and areas of collaborative opportunities between the teaching of Elementary Education and Special Education. This TEI Work Group advocates for the review of curriculum within both Elementary Education and Special Education. As Akron University demonstrated (see report of visit below), it is recommended that course content be stripped from actual course numbers and the focus for this review be placed initially on the content that students are currently being offered within these programs. In so doing, the faculty of these programs can again, uncover areas of need, deficit, and the opportunities for meaningful collaboration.

This retreat would be followed by a meeting of representatives from both department in the fall of 2018 to review the alignment process and results, and to make recommendations for a formal curriculum revision following current University processes.

Outcomes:

1. Review current program standards and alignment our program outcomes with CAEP, PTSB and SPA requirements, including review and alignment of common assessments currently in place for accreditation documentation.
2. Align program curriculum horizontally and vertically. Ensure that curriculum across courses, as well as major objectives within courses, reinforce program outcomes and provide for high quality teacher preparation. A systematic review and alignment of our curriculum will be instrumental in ensuring continuity across the program as well as a unifying vision and coherent structure that provides for the development of teacher candidates knowledge, skills and dispositions.
3. Integrate Special education content into general education curriculum

We believe that these three goals are essential to improving the perception of our program across that state, meeting CAEP accreditation requirements, and preparing high quality teachers for employment in Wyoming schools.

Description of Intervention:

The faculty retreat will be planned for 4 days in January 2018 during the University’s winter holiday. Meeting space will be arranged on campus. The retreat will be facilitated by a faculty representative or administrator. In carrying out this work, we anticipate devoting 1.5 to 2 days to reviewing
existing program standards and aligning our program with current accreditation requirements. We anticipate dedicating 2 to 2.5 days to reviewing our existing curriculum and program structure and engaging in horizontal and vertical alignment of our program and integrating special education content.

In year 2, the EI Ed RWG proposes that a smaller faculty committee, composed of representatives from the elementary education and special education department meet to review to work done at the faculty retreat and to recommend next steps for curriculum modification following established University processes.

Proposal’s Alignment to Key Performance Indicator(s)¹

(Check all that apply.)

☒ Statewide perceptions of the University of Wyoming College of Education

☐ Enrollment of Wyoming residents in University of Wyoming College of Education

☒ Continuous improvement protocols for field and clinical experiences, developed and implemented in partnership with school district partners

☐ Executed, active clinical partnership agreements with Wyoming School Districts

☐ Employment of University of Wyoming graduates in Wyoming schools

☒ National accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), with no Areas for Improvement or Stipulations related to CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact, Component 4.3: Satisfaction of Employers.

☐ State-of-the-art College of Education organizational structure, facilities, and technological capabilities as measured by faculty and candidate collaboration and innovation, candidate perceptions of their experiences, and operational efficiencies as measured by resource monitoring and reporting.

Funding Request to Support Pilot Implementation (by Academic Year)

2017-2018 Total Request: $25,500

Subtotal Amount: 25,000 Purpose: Faculty Stipends (25 x$1,000)

Subtotal Amount: 500 Purpose: Materials

Subtotal Amount: 1000 Purpose: Facilitator prep time

¹ List complete as of February 2017. Research Work Groups will introduce additional Key Performance Indicators for Governing Board review and action.

Please email completed form to TEI Executive Director upon completion.

Version 2.0: February 22, 2017
2018-2019 Total Request: $10,000
Subtotal Amount: 10,000  Purpose: Faculty Stipends

Budget Narrative to Support Funding Request:

Year 1
Faculty Stipends: The program review and curriculum alignment work proposed here is to be carried out during January 2018 during the University’s winter holiday. This is a vacation period for faculty members and it is reasonable for faculty members to be compensated for giving up vacation time to engage in this work. We are hoping to attract wide faculty participation. In order to attract a broad cross-section of our faculty, we would like to offer stipends that faculty will recognize as appropriate compensation for their time.

Materials: This line item would pay for any needed materials for the alignment process

Facilitator prep time: This line item would pay for prep time for the facilitator of the alignment process.

Year 2:
Faculty stipends: This line item would pay for a fall meeting of representatives of the programs to review the results of the alignment retreat and to make recommendations for formal review.

Literature Review

Reviewed and analyzed relevant current literature on the best practices for preparing professional educators

Literature Citations:


Please email completed form to TEI Executive Director upon completion.

Version 2.0: February 22, 2017


Summary of Literature Review:

There is a considerable body of literature which indicates that program review and curriculum alignment is crucial in maintaining a shared programmatic vision and a coherent organizational structure in teacher preparation programs. The literature suggests that successful teacher preparation programs are integrated, coherent programs with strong links among courses and across between clinical experiences and formal coursework. These links are strengthened through periodic program reviews and focused curriculum alignment.

The literature supports a process of continual renewal for teacher preparation programs. Programs and curriculum need to be periodically revisited to correct deviations from approved
curriculums as well as to update curriculum offering to keep them up to date. (Lit, Nager, & Snyder, 2010; Mueller & File, 2015; Vogel, Weiler, & Armenta, 2014). Furthermore, periodic review of curriculum offerings is essential to maintain alignment with current teacher program standards, educator preparation program standards and accreditation requirements (Kubitskey, Rutherford, Wylo, & Liggit, 2011; Papanastasiou, Tato, & Neophytou, 2012).

Internally, in order to produce the highest quality of teacher candidates, coursework and the challenges faced by candidates during field experiences must be closely aligned (Capraro, Capraro, & Helfeldt, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2014). More specifically, methods courses must be designed to specifically prepare candidates for experiences in the field placements (Santoyo & Zhang, 2016).

There is considerable support in the literature for the integration of literacy skills throughout all preparation courses (McCombes-Tolis & Spear-Swerling, 2011; Sampson et al., 2013). This includes the necessity to prepare candidates for meeting the needs of students with widely varying literacy needs (Copeland, et al., 2011). An alignment process can ensure that important literacy skills are integrated in coursework and field experiences.

The inclusion of content traditionally reserved for special education coursework into all courses, especially methods courses, receives considerable support from the literature. Collaboration between special education faculty and general education faculty encourages the development of candidates who collaborate in schools (Altieri, et al., 2015; Frey et al., 2012). Furthermore, this collaboration, in the form of co-planning and co-teaching methods courses increases candidates comfort with a variety of student needs (Strieker, Gillis, & Zong, 2013). The inclusion of special education content in general education courses also results in candidates that are better prepared to meet the needs of all students (Taliaferro, et al. 2015; Taylor & Ringlaben, 2012; Welton & Vakil, 2010; Grskovic & Trzcinka, 2011). A curriculum review process allows faculty to integrate these important skills and knowledge without adding additional courses and repeating content across multiple courses.

Analysis of Current UW Teacher Program and Practice
Collected and analyzed relevant evidence from current educational practice and current educator preparation practice

Evidence Collected and Analyzed

1. Survey of current student teachers
2. Survey of current mentor teachers
3. Survey of partner district facilitators
4. Survey of elementary education faculty at UW

Summary of Analysis of Current UW Teacher Program and Practice

In March and April 2017, the elementary education research group conducted a series of surveys targeting specific populations that have extensive experience with and/or understanding of the elementary program. Feedback from current student teachers, mentor teachers, UW elementary education faculty, and UW partner district facilitators indicates that there are a few areas where our programs would benefit from improved curriculum alignment. In particular, the feedback revealed fairly widely shared agreement that the science and math seminars are ineffective. A significant number of student responses indicated that they were concerned about content preparation and that experiences in different sections of the same course differ considerably depending upon the instructor.

Faculty Survey: Comments specifically referenced vertical and horizontal alignment and the need for opportunities to re-examine, revise and align standards, course content, content and assessments and look for duplication of content. It was noted that there has been a “great deal of drift in terms of what happens in different sections of the same course”. Multiple comments specifically mention literacy as an area that needed to be better integrated. The survey also revealed multiple area in which curriculum needs to be enhanced, including working with families, child development, more classroom management. Exposure to physical education and special education is critical. Common assignments and assessments are mentioned as a need. Four out of thirteen surveys specially referenced a curriculum mapping and alignment process, while 2 out of the 13 commented on the need for vertical and horizontal articulation. The four responses discussing a curriculum review process represented the highest number of common responses in the survey.
Student Teacher Survey: Several student teachers specifically mentioned the need for better preparation for working with special education students. Several students mentioned that classes, (especially the seminars) need to better monitored for content, and that these classes do not seem to match the course description.

Evaluation of Regional and Leading Teacher Prep Programs
(Check all that apply.)

☐ Employed a mixed methods approach to evaluate quantitative and qualitative data from educator preparation programs across the United States

Programs Reviewed:

☐ Traditional educator preparation programs in public and private universities across the United States

Names and Locations of Traditional Programs studied:

• Akron University - Akron, OH

Data Analysis

Qualitative Data Analyzed

• Results of an on-site visit to Akron University, Akron Ohio

Summary of Data Findings

In an effort to create a program that would enhance the training of all pre-service teachers within their college, Akron University committed itself to an in-depth, strategic, and systematic curriculum review. In conducting this evaluation, all course work including courses provided in Elementary, Secondary, Early Childhood, and Special Education were opened for review. In fact, rather than look specifically at courses, this analysis began with an evaluation and review of the curriculum being taught and or needing to be taught. Course numbers were ignored and the ownership of classes was disregarded. Instead, the faculty at Akron focused solely on content. In so doing, they were able to combine courses, determine where current/past coursework...
overlapped, and pinpoint curriculum holes within their current program. This also allowed the faculty to collaborate within and between courses.

This broad review demonstrated areas where course content could be clustered and provided simultaneously. It also established various curriculums that would support one another. This shift further elicited the opportunity for students majoring in general education to develop skills and a solid knowledge base in the teaching of students with disabilities and at risk youth.

Because course content was grouped strategically, pre-service teachers within the Akron program currently learn the skills necessary to teach all of their future students. An example of this collaboration lies within Akron’s undergraduate assessment course. Within this class, students learn not only about the foundational skills of formal and informal assessments, but they learn how to give and interpret assessments when evaluating students for special education eligibility. Furthermore, they learn how to utilize test results in the development of an IEP (Individualized Education Program). It is exciting to note that this course is taught by two instructors (one from general education and another for special education).
Contextual Constraints to Implementation Identified

☑ Identified Potential Risk to Research Subjects

☐ Release of proprietary information
☐ Loss of faculty or candidate confidentiality
☐ Loss of national accreditation or program recognition
☐ Loss of state approval or recognition
☐ Other (Please describe.)

☐ Identified Potential Risk to Trustees Education Initiative

☐ Insufficient Data for College and Program Continuous Improvement Purposes
☐ Insufficient Access to Student Success Data of P-12 Students Taught by College of Education Completers for

☐ Insufficient Commitment to Collaboration from Wyoming P-12 School Districts
☒ Other (Please describe.)

This proposal is asking for a review of currently offered curriculum. As a result, there is a threat to faculty independence and current course designs. In addition, the proposal calls for the integration of special education content, which necessarily changes current offerings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documented Need</th>
<th>Comments Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Comments Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments: Ldg Progra</th>
<th>Comments Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments Context Constraints</th>
<th>Comments Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is some narrative language that sounds suspicious- top of page 3, first paragraph &quot;It is important to note, however, that this group envisions that much of the coursework taken would include general education practices and study&quot;- so is the content changing or not really? How much is the same? How much is different? Overall this sounds like a great concept. Having a dual and stand-alone options sounds appealing but what will ultimately differentiate them? Will they be significantly different in content? If so, will they also be different in outcomes- licensure, job placement, etc.? The &quot;grow your own&quot; is great, and the discussion that &quot;all our students are all our students&quot;. The lack of budget and implementation plan is limits the overall picture of this positive concept. More concrete information/planning would be useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Comments on Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Documented Need</td>
<td>Comments Documentation of Need</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>Comments Lit Review</td>
<td>Comments Leading Programs Research</td>
<td>Comments: Ldg Progra</td>
<td>Comments Contextual Constraints</td>
<td>Comments Risk Assmnt</td>
<td>Comments Funding</td>
<td>Comments Narrative</td>
<td>Summary Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No contextual contraints were identified.</td>
<td>No potential risks to the TEI initiative were identified.</td>
<td>No funding request was included within the proposal document.</td>
<td>The proposal clearly describes the need for the UW college of education program to prepare teachers who are skilled in special education and can be used to meet the shortage of these teachers across Wyoming. The proposal was limited in several areas in that there was no clear plan as to how the endorsement, dual or stand alone major in Special Education would be developed. The author(s) need to think more clearly about the resources required to enact this development and how this may best fit within the four year undergraduate model. As a reviewer it is challenging to evaluate the proposal as it is not clear what resources the author(s) require for this to take place.</td>
<td>There is a need for this type of program development but more collaboration is required with the working group who are planning to embark on curriculum review and revision. This group needs to provide the curricular revision group the template of the provision of a dual major/endorsement in special education from the offset such that horizontal and vertical alignments can be made with special education learning objectives are embedded from the outset of this process. This revision will enable the working group to decide how to integrate/separate these objectives and assessments. This will also produce some more tangible and realistic requirements for supplemental classes/mentors/resources. I would suggest that a proposal resubmission embeds both of these objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal is to develop a dual major option in Special education addresses the indicators of enrollment of Wyoming residents in the UW College of Education, Statewide perceptions of the program by addressing the need for Special Education teachers in the state and employing these graduates in Wyoming.

Stakeholders across the State provided feedback that UW need to develop a robust undergraduate special education program. The majority of stakeholders across the State suggested if UW offered either a dual major or endorsement program it would help ameliorate the shortage of special education teachers within the rural contexts of Wyoming. This would be particularly applicable thorough distance offerings of this program.

Multiple empirical sources are provided to support the inclusion of an integrated special education curriculum within the general education program and the candidates ability to enact inclusive practices.

Representatives from the working group visited Akron University, Ohio and Utah State University. Akron University is an integrated program where many students are able to get a dual major and licensure in both special and general education. This program may have real value in the development of the program at UW as the working group are challenged with putting together a dual major that can be completed in four years. Utah State has a longer history of being a specialist program for special education and this program may have utility for the development of a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documented Need</th>
<th>Comments Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments: Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments: Lit Progra</th>
<th>Comments Context Constraints</th>
<th>Comments Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would recommend returning this proposal to the Special Education Research Work Group for refinement and a much stronger focus on the development of an undergraduate Special Education Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Well written and understandable.</td>
<td>This something that can be very beneficial to UW and the state. It is however a change to current practice. It needs to provide more innovation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal addresses three key performance indicators.

There is strong evidence of the statewide need for an undergraduate program in Special Education.

The literature review provides strong evidence for the effectiveness of an undergraduate Special Education program.

The proposal cites the results of visits to the University of Akron and Utah State University.

No contextual constraints were identified.

The proposal does not identify any risks to success in implementation of the proposal.

While the budget request is sufficient, I have concerns related to the size of the proposed consultancy, travel and the salaries and benefits budget request. The consultancy and travel budgets are larger than what would be needed and it is unclear what the salaries and benefits would be used for. A current UW Presidential Directive does not allow for faculty overload. Therefore, if there are funds needed for salaries and benefits, it would need to be for course release and faculty backfill.

The proposal narrative is confusing, as it includes information regarding dual licensure, enhanced practicum and field experiences, and discusses collaboration on curriculum/program of study design with "general education" faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documented Need</th>
<th>Comments Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments: Ldg Progra</th>
<th>Comments Context Constraints</th>
<th>Comments Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>This proposal meets indicators 1-6.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is a critical need to have an undergraduate option for Special Education at UW. Finding qualified and capable applicants for special education positions has been a challenge for many years in Wyoming.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>With the need to offer an undergraduate &amp;/or dual major option, the research supports the need to be versatile in the programming that is offered to potential and currently enrolled students.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The reviews of the University of Akron and Utah State University provide a nice comparison and target of where the UW College of Education could be headed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very thorough narrative of the problem, proposal, and plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I really like this proposals ability to reach a broad group of educators and in their environment. The dual degree provides opportunities for young professionals that might change focus after a few years. It is also practical leveraging synergies, well done</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>as noted</td>
<td>I would like to know more about the effectiveness of surveys for evaluation. I had attended classrooms where evaluations were being performed and felt that was very effective. Literature review appeared to be adequte</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I was very impressed with the summary from U of Akron and Utah State.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>adecqute</td>
<td>I feel this is a low risk option, partnering with Utah State should be an accelerator for us. Distance learning should be effective for most of the curriculum again recommend more on site in class observations vs. survey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I did not get a feel for actual budget/cost on this proposal. Dual degree should be very effective</td>
<td>I like this and feel it has a high probability of success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6/8/17
This proposal is to develop two undergraduate majors in special education and is certainly needed. Offering the programs for distance students is also very important for our constituents in Wyoming. The proposal is lacking in details but does provide a broad overview.

Even though the merits of this proposal are evident and we do need to consider and very likely develop an undergraduate option in special education, and one that includes distance delivery, this proposal is not yet complete. Not only is the budget not provided but also it would be helpful to see more rationale for the two majors being proposed, particularly the Special Education major without an Elementary or Secondary. Overall, the proposal needs more details. The work group might want to first consider and implement proposal #2 prior to developing this proposal further.

Recommendation: Return to the special education work group for revision/expansion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments on Leading Programs</th>
<th>Comments on Research</th>
<th>Comments on Ldg Programs</th>
<th>Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments on Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments on Funding</th>
<th>Comments on Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal does not address contextual constraints, but it is also difficult to assess what those might be. UW is not in a position to add additional programs given recent budget reductions. However, this program might be an exception. I see the UW budget as a contextual constraint.

As the authors note, they do not have the expertise to include a budget for this proposal. As a result, I cannot evaluate this dimension.

Overall, this seems like an important proposal. Unfortunately, the proposal lacks (understandably) a budget and some other key features. There seems like an important need in the state for this; however, I wonder if this is the right time. I would be supportive in having the authors continue to move forward as it seems there is a significant need in the state.

This seems like an important idea, but unfortunately the proposal (understandably) is missing a few key features. I would encourage the authors to move forward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments: Lit Review</th>
<th>Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three indicators presented are very important to the TEI work. This seems to be an area of need throughout the state of WY. Enough literature was presented...not an overabundance. Both programs seem to be of very high quality and would provide assistance in terms of consultants to UW CoE. It would appear that the contextual constraints would be of primary importance, but these were not identified or addressed. None were identified. None was provided. It seems that consultants and time to structure and restructure the curriculum and program will be of most cost. There were important components missing from this proposal. Once those gaps are filled, it will be a very worthwhile proposal and project that fills much need in WY.

This is an important proposal and project. The authors are encouraged to complete specifics such as funding and the method to be followed to construct such an ambitious undertaking.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Comments on Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments on Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments on Comments: Ldg Progra</th>
<th>Comments on Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments on Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments on Funding</th>
<th>Comments on Funding</th>
<th>Comments on Funding</th>
<th>Comments on Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There is no harder area to fill these days than special education teachers, and few classrooms that don’t include students with learning disabilities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>This proposal would strengthen our educational system.</td>
<td>This is incomplete without further input.</td>
<td>This proposal would strengthen the teacher education program and improve expertise in the classroom.</td>
<td>I hope this is affordable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 29 TOTAL | 33 TOTAL | 31 TOTAL | 31 TOTAL | 22 TOTAL | 30 TOTAL | 20 TOTAL | GRAND TOTAL |
| 3.22 MEAN | 3.67 MEAN | #3 MEAN | 3.44 MEAN | 2.75 MEAN | 3.33 MEAN | 2.50 MEAN | 196 |
Initiative Research Objectives

• Identify highly effective evidence-based educator preparation practices
• Identify which highly effective evidence-based practices can be implemented with fidelity and rigor in Wyoming
• Adapt and refine highly effective evidence-based practices for implementation in Wyoming

Initiative Research Definitions

• **Candidate** – an individual enrolled in a professional educator preparation program
• **Completer** – an individual who has successfully complete a professional educator program
• **Educator Preparation Practices** – professional training, including courses, fieldwork in schools (including student teaching), and other experiences designed to equip prospective educators with the knowledge, attitudes, behaviors and skills needed to support the success of pre-school through grade 12 (P-12) students in their classrooms, schools and wider communities
• **Evidence-Based Practice** – practice developed by integrating the best available evidence including quantitative (numerical) and qualitative data. Data for evidence-based educator preparation practice include but are not limited to:
  o current educator preparation literature
  o meta-analyses (combined data from multiple studies)
    ▪ historical research
    ▪ experimental research
    ▪ non-experimental research
    ▪ exploratory, descriptive, and explanatory (cause and effect) research
  o outcomes data of P-12 students taught by program completers
  o employment outcomes of program completers, including persistence through induction programs and persistence in the profession
  o candidate perceptions of program effectiveness
  o employer (school district) perceptions of program effectiveness

Please email completed form to TEI Executive Director upon completion. Version 2.0: February 22, 2017
Proposal for Pilot Implementation (please provide narrative):

Problem Statement:

For the past 16 years, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) has reported to the United States Department of Education (USDOE) that Special Education is a teaching shortage area in Wyoming.

In addition, the Wyoming Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, revised June 5, 2015 and submitted by Jillian Balow, WDE State Superintendent, identified the lack of highly qualified special education teachers as one area of equity concern for the state of Wyoming.

Proposal:

Wyoming stakeholders (i.e. district personnel, Wyoming Department of Education, Professional Teaching Standards Board, current and potential UW students) have made it clear that a program option in special education is critically needed at the University of Wyoming. The Wyoming Department of Education has reported to the United States Department of Education (USDOE) that there is a critical shortage of teachers licensed in this field residing in Wyoming. As the sole university in the state, it has become increasingly problematic that our current system provides special education licensure options for only graduate students. As a result, the TEI Special Education Research Work Group is proposing that the University develop and implement a four-year dual major option for pre-service teachers in either Elementary or Secondary Education and Special Education.
Additionally, a stand-alone option be offered as well. This would allow undergraduate students the option to major solely in special education. **This option would place emphasis on preparing prospective teachers to meet the unique educational, independent living, social and behavioral needs of our students with severe or low incidence disabilities.** It is important to note, however, that this group envisions that coursework would include the essential general education practices and study necessary to prepare prospective special education teachers for a successful career in the modern-day inclusive school environment.

This TEI work group recommends the design, development, and implementation of an efficient and effective practicum and student teaching program. Providing robust practicum and student teaching experiences is essential to preparing highly confident and effective educators. Designing and monitoring a system that ensures ample supervision and support to university students can be difficult in rural Wyoming. The community colleges located throughout the state are a potential resource for building partnerships and supporting the University of Wyoming in this effort.

Finally, the TEI Special Education Research Work Group recommends that options be made for distance students to seek their undergraduate dual or stand-alone degree as well. This group recognizes that many non-traditional students are interested in becoming qualified to teach special education, yet due to proximity and personal responsibilities, this is not an option. Were the College of Education to provide a distance option for the above programs, local districts in the state would have the option to “grow their own” special education teachers. It has been reported by several district special education directors and superintendents that many of their paraprofessionals would be very interested in this option.

Through the development of the above undergraduate special education programs and multitude of options, candidates would either be eligible for licensure in Elementary or Secondary Education along with a K-12 generalist special education certification or be eligible for licensure in special education alone. Either way, these candidates would be qualified to teach special education in the state of Wyoming, which in turn would begin to ameliorate the special education teacher deficit in the state.

The TEI Special Education Research Group proposes a collaborative effort with the general education TEI Research Groups in order to build a preeminent undergraduate Special Education program leading to licensure as a Special Education K-12 Generalist through the Wyoming Professional Teaching Standards Board (PTSB). It is our premise to break down the historically perceived silos of special education and general education. Modeling this interdisciplinary practice for potential teacher candidates must start at the university level.
The TEI Special Education Research Group acknowledges the current reality in public school education, that “all our students are all our students.” We can no longer perpetuate the myth that special education is a “place” where students with disabilities “go” to be educated, separate from general education teachers, a standards-based curriculum, and the general education environment. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act was enacted by the United States Congress in 1975. From the beginning, PL 94-142 established public education for all students with disabilities in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) as a prime directive. This mandate has remained strong through every reauthorization of the law, including the current Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

We propose utilizing the TEI resources available to employ knowledgeable and experienced consultants, convene productive committee meetings utilizing both virtual and on-site visits, revise current courses of study, redistribute course content, and design state-of-the-art practicum and student teaching experiences, which will ultimately produce a preeminent undergraduate Special Education teacher preparation program at the University of Wyoming.

Outcomes:

- The creation of a dual major option for undergraduate students majoring in Elementary/Secondary Education and Special Education.
- The creation of a standalone Special Education Major, with emphasis on preparing prospective teachers to successfully teach students with severe or low incidence disabilities, with a high level of collaboration between General and Special Education.
- UW undergraduate candidates eligible for licensure in Elementary/Secondary Education as well as a K-12 Generalist certification in Special Education.
- UW undergraduate candidates eligible for licensure in Special Education.
- The option for students to take classes and complete programming from a distance (i.e. from remote Wyoming towns and locations).
- The amelioration of the special education teacher deficit in the state.
- The demonstration of good faith efforts to meet the needs of local school districts in the state of Wyoming.
- The building of collaborative relationships and the development of unified efforts between the General Education and Special Education faculty.
- The opportunity for Special Education and General Education faculty members to co-teach courses, and in so doing, demonstrate best practice and inclusive teaching strategies and theory to undergraduate students.
- The creation of highly effective special education teachers in the state of Wyoming.

Description of Intervention:

Please email completed form to TEI Executive Director upon completion.

*Version 2.0: February 22, 2017*
• Dual Major:
  o Students would major in both Special Education and Elementary Education or Special Education and Secondary Education.
  o Program would complete program within 4 years.
  o Students would engage in practicum experiences that include both special education and general education settings.
  o Undergraduate students would student teach in both special education and general education settings or solely in inclusion classrooms, which support both students with and without disabilities.
  o Upon graduation, UW undergraduate students would be eligible for licensure in both Elementary/Secondary Education and Special Education.
  o Non-traditional students would have the option to complete the program from a distance, through the use of technology and collaboration with local school districts and community colleges.

• Special Education Major:
  o Students would major in Special Education.
  o Students would complete program within 4 years.
  o Upon graduation, UW undergraduate students would be eligible for licensure as a K-12 Generalist in Special Education.
  o Students would engage in practicum experiences that include a wide range of disability categories.
  o Additional emphasis would be placed on students with severe or low incidence disabilities.
  o Students would continue to take coursework heavy in general education curriculum and practices.
  o Upon graduation, UW undergraduate students would be eligible for a generalist license in k-12 Special Education.
  o Non-traditional students would have the option to complete the program from a distance, through the use of technology and collaboration with local school districts and community colleges.

Proposal’s Alignment to Key Performance Indicator(s)\(^1\)
*(Check all that apply.)*

☒ Statewide perceptions of the University of Wyoming College of Education
☒ Enrollment of Wyoming residents in University of Wyoming College of Education

\(^1\) List complete as of February 2017. Research Work Groups will introduce additional Key Performance Indicators for Governing Board review and action.

Please email completed form to TEI Executive Director upon completion.

Version 2.0: February 22, 2017
☐ Continuous improvement protocols for field and clinical experiences, developed and implemented in partnership with school district partners
☐ Executed, active clinical partnership agreements with Wyoming School Districts
☒ Employment of University of Wyoming graduates in Wyoming schools
☐ National accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), with no Areas for Improvement or Stipulations related to CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact, Component 4.3: Satisfaction of Employers.
☐ State-of-the-art College of Education organizational structure, facilities, and technological capabilities as measured by faculty and candidate collaboration and innovation, candidate perceptions of their experiences, and operational efficiencies as measured by resource monitoring and reporting.

Funding Request to Support Pilot Implementation (by Academic Year)

$285,000  2017-2018 Total Request
Subtotal Amount: $150,000  Purpose: Contracted services, including consultation
Subtotal Amount: $10,000  Purpose: Equipment, Supplies and Materials
Subtotal Amount: $50,000  Purpose: Travel
Subtotal Amount: $60,000  Purpose: Salaries and Benefits
Subtotal Amount: $15,000  Purpose: Purchased services

$275,000  2018-2019 Total Request
Subtotal Amount: $150,000  Purpose: Contracted services, including consultation
Subtotal Amount: $20,000  Purpose: Equipment, Supplies and Materials
Subtotal Amount: $30,000  Purpose: Travel
Subtotal Amount: $60,000  Purpose: Salaries and Benefits
Subtotal Amount: $15,000  Purpose: Purchased services

$170,000  2019-2020 Total Request
Subtotal Amount: $50,000  Purpose: Contracted services, including consultation
Subtotal Amount: $20,000  Purpose: Equipment, Supplies and Materials
Subtotal Amount: $30,000  Purpose: Travel
Subtotal Amount: $60,000  Purpose: Salaries and Benefits
Budget Narrative to Support Funding Request:

For the 2017-18 school year the Special Education TEI Research Workgroup is asking for a total of $285,000. These funds would support consultation, collaboration and program development. Specifically, the workgroup envisions utilizing $150,000 for contracted services with a well-versed and highly experienced consultant, who would facilitate program development efforts between general education and special education faculty members. This person would orchestrate collaborative practices between current programs, provide a neutral, non-biased outside perspective, and support faculty members in developing an undergraduate program that meets the needs of the state, as indicated above. Additionally, the workgroup recognizes the need to create a budget for equipment, supplies, and materials (i.e. $10,000). Such items may include technology for faculty members, supplies and materials for on and off-campus meetings, as well as material development for program promotion. The Special Education TEI Research Workgroup is asking for $50,000 in travel expenses. This would not only be utilized for contracted personnel, but also for faculty travel around the state, stakeholder travel expenses, and faculty member visits to similarly situated universities (e.g. Utah State, Akron University, etc.). In an effort to supplement the work provided by faculty members, the workgroup is advocating for $60,000. This would allow for the collaboration between 10 faculty members (4 special education, 3 elementary education, & 3 secondary education). These faculty members would be awarded $3,000 per semester for their work in program research and development. Finally, the workgroup is asking for an additional $15,000 for miscellaneous expenses. Such expenses may include additional contract work, program fees, consultation expenses with various experts, etc.

For the 2018-19 school year the Special Education TEI Research Workgroup is requesting a total of $275,000. This request includes funding for continued collaboration and support by the consultant hired in the previous year. The TEI workgroup envisions that much of this school year would involve the training of faculty and district staff in program implementation efforts. This may include student teacher mentor training, faculty member observation and training, training of faculty/district member coaches, as well as the collaboration with various districts and their personnel in creating robust student teaching and practicum placements. A request for $20,000 is proposed for equipment, supplies and materials. Again, these funds may be utilized for technology, on and off-campus meetings, program marketing materials, etc. The workgroup again recognizes the importance of creating a budget for faculty, district, and consultant travel. Therefore, the group is requesting $30,000. It is expected that less travel will be needed within this year, as much of the initial legwork and feedback between UW faculty members and stakeholders will be complete. An additional $60,000 is being requested to supplement faculty members. As in the year prior, these funds will provide 10 faculty members (4 special education, 3 elementary education, & 3 secondary education) with a stipend of $3,000 per semester. Finally, an additional $15,000 is being requested for similar miscellaneous items.

For the final year, the Special Education TEI Research Workgroup is requesting a total of $170,000. This would include $50,000 for the previously hired consultant. Within this year, the
workgroup envisions the transition of these services from the consultant to university faculty members and district personnel. It is anticipated that this work will include training staff and faculty, who can in-turn train others and continue the development and expansion of the newly implemented program. Again, $20,000 is requested for equipment, supplies, and materials, as well as $30,000 for consultant, faculty, and mentor teacher travel. The same $60,000 would be utilized to supplement the work of faculty members (i.e. 4 special education, 3 elementary education, & 3 secondary education) and $10,000 for miscellaneous expenses.

Literature Review

Reviewed and analyzed relevant current literature on the best practices for preparing professional educators

*Literature Citations:*


*Summary of Literature Review:*

As dictated through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) students with disabilities are to be educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Throughout the continued development of this law and the alignment of teaching practices, more and more students with disabilities are being educated in the general education classroom.
This inclusivity dictates a need for the development of pre-service educator skills and attitudes toward teaching all students (Frey, Andres, McKeeman, L. & Lane, 2012; Voss & Bufkin, 2011). A study conducted by Altieri, Colley, Daniel, and Dickenson (2015) supports this claim and further pushes for collaboration between general and special education. Their study indicated that undergraduates who had completed their pre-service teacher education preparation at a medium-size university where a high level of collaboration between general education and special education was taught, modeled, and expected, resulted in a higher level of retention of these new teachers within the field.

Furthermore, Taylor and Ringlaben (2012) determined that preservice teachers participating in a teacher training program that integrated general education curriculum with special education curriculum yielded teacher candidates, who were more open and and felt more prepared to enact inclusive practices within their own classrooms.

Williams, Martin, and Hess (2010) recognize the need to provide rural personnel preparation in the field of special education. As, a rural state, it is critical that the university remain versatile in the programming offered to potential and enrolled students. As a result, any undergraduate special education program must utilize distance educational practices such as web-based instruction, wikilinks, and video conferencing to support the development of special education teachers residing in rural settings (O’Brien, Aguinaga, Hines, & Harshorne, 2011; Williams, Martin, and Hess, 2010). This is particularly important for non-traditional students.

Analysis of Current UW Teacher Program and Practice

Collected and analyzed relevant evidence from current educational practice and current educator preparation practice

Evidence Collected and Analyzed

1. UW Special Education Programming Feedback Survey (administered by the Sp Ed RWG in March of 2017)

Summary of Analysis of Current UW Teacher Program and Practice

Feedback from stakeholders throughout the state, at the Wyoming Department of Education, PTSB (Professional Teaching Standards Board) and within our local school districts, clearly indicate the need for UW to develop a robust undergraduate special education program. Of those district respondents to the UW Special Education Programming Feedback Survey (Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Directors, HR Directors, Other) 77.05% are in support of a dual program in special education and elementary or secondary education, 82.81% are in support of an endorsement program in special education at the undergraduate level, and 65.63% support the development of a special education major. When asked if the development of the above programs would mitigate the special education teacher shortage in Wyoming, 60.94% reported that the dual major would be successful in supporting these efforts; 75% felt the endorsement would mitigate this issue, and 67.19% felt this shortage would be greatly rectified through the offering of a special education major at the undergraduate level.
One respondent from the UW Special Education Programming Feedback Survey stated: "We need MORE undergraduate options (i.e. 4-year program of study) for Special Education at UW other than a Master's Degree. Our neighboring states offer dual majors with SPED and education degrees with SPED endorsements. We have a shortage, and I'd love to refer individuals interested in SPED to our home state for a degree/endorsement."

Another respondent wrote: "I fully support UW providing a teacher certification program for special education. At this time, I hire most staff from Black Hills State University as their graduates have the opportunity to be duly certified." One participant reflected on his/her personal experience commenting, “When I was an undergraduate, I went through a dual licensure program, and it was helpful to prepare me for the inclusion model and teaming with other teachers.” Another person commented, “The dual major is attractive because it does provide staffing flexibility once hired in a k-12 setting.” Finally, one respondent shared, “Knowledge of Special Education is becoming a lost Art. Increasing awareness and improving the education of the general population would definitely improve student success.”

It is as a result of these comments and others that our task force has focused seriously on the development of an undergraduate special education program and is making the recommendation that faculty and staff in the College of Education spend the next school year developing it.
Evaluation of Regional and Leading Teacher Prep Programs
(Check all that apply.)

☐ Employed a mixed methods approach to evaluate quantitative and qualitative data from educator preparation programs across the United States

Programs Reviewed:

☒ Traditional educator preparation programs in public and private universities across the United States

Names and Locations of Traditional Programs studied:

- University of Akron Akron, OH
- Utah State University Logan, UT

Data Analysis

Summary of Data Findings

University of Akron

On April 12-13, 2017, three members of the TEI Special Education Research Group (Wendy Gauntner, Tiffany Dobler, and Dawn Scarince) visited the University of Akron in Ohio.

The Goal of the University Of Akron – Integrative Teacher Preparation Model (UA-ITPM) was “to restructure the existing general and special education teacher licensure programs so teacher candidates are more effectively trained to meet the instructional needs of all learners, including students with a disability (SWDs), English Language Learners (ELLs), and other traditionally marginalized groups of learners (TMGLs) (e.g., students from racial/ethnic minority populations, learners from low socioeconomic backgrounds, etc.)”.

In order to accomplish this goal, the University of Akron committee worked collaboratively within the University’s education department, beginning with their early childhood program then expanding to elementary and secondary programs, to accomplish specific objectives relative to the university’s coursework, program(s) of study, and the Ohio licensure requirements. The team developed a comprehensive Logic Model, Framework and Evaluation tools, specifically designed to address the objectives necessary to achieve their vision within 2 years.

Upon completion of the University of Akron teacher preparation program, all students are eligible to receive a Dual Licensure such as, General Education licensure combined with Intervention Specialist: Mild/Moderate (K-12) in Ohio. Most students are able to complete their prescribed program within 4 years.

- Objective 1: Restructure the UA core courses taken by candidates in all teacher licensure programs to align with the UA-ITPM project.
• Objective 2: Restructure literacy courses required for licensure to align with the UA-ITPM project.
• Objective 3: Redesign the UA mild/moderate licensure program to expedite the pathway to dual licensure.
• Objective 4: Redesign the UA mild/moderate licensure program to provide opportunities for Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT).
• Objective 5: Develop products including course content, syllabi, on-line modules, instructional materials, readings and performance assessments for the UA-ITPM Restructured Core and literacy courses to meet the needs of pre-service teacher candidates in the areas of cognitive disabilities and learning disabilities, struggling learners, culturally diverse learners, and English language Learners to sustain their effectiveness in inclusive classrooms. (The above products will be shared with faculty to enhance pedagogical knowledge and skills in the content areas (e.g. language arts, science, math, social studies).
• Objective 6: Develop and cultivate clinical/field experiences to promote collaborative networking between general and special education pre-service teacher candidates.
• Objective 7: Collaborate with school partners to promote increased inclusive practices and collaborative networking between practicing teachers and teacher candidates during student teaching.
• Objective 8: Develop a matrix that connects course competencies, instructional materials and readings extracted from the UA-ITPM framework (e.g. research based knowledge & applications, dispositions & professional standards) as guide by other Ohio IHE considering restructuring their existing teacher licensure programs.
• Objective 9: Develop a matrix based on a reexamination of the current clinical/field experiences, of which the breadth and depth will be recommended ensuring teacher dispositions in the UA-ITPM framework will be met.
• Objective 10: Conduct analysis, assessment, and evaluation of the restructured core, literacy courses, the redesigned moderate licensure programs as a pathway to dual licensure and the format allowing mild/moderate teacher candidates access to HQT.

Dr. Bridgie Ford, Dr. Shernavaz Vakil, and Dr. Lynn Kline, along with other members of the University of Akron education department, enrolled student candidates, and the cooperating school district personnel gave generously of their time, experience, and knowledge during our fact-finding visit. The University of Akron faculty wholeheartedly supports our efforts to bring the University of Wyoming Education Department to preeminence. They are willing to provide further consultation to guide the University of Wyoming through the collaborative process of curriculum review, restructuring of identified coursework, and implementation of the revised program. In addition to developing undergraduate courses, the Akron faculty emphasized the importance of enhancing particular course syllabi to make the class applicable to both undergraduate and graduate students.

The University of Akron established strong working relationships with local school districts. TEI Special Education Research Group members visited one local elementary school, where candidates received practicum experience and methods courses were simultaneously taught by university faculty at the cooperating school. This partnership provided a cohesive working
relationship with the University and the local school districts, which has heightened the program’s overall effectiveness and improved teacher, placement opportunities upon graduation.

During our visit, TEI Special Education Research Group members also met with the director of curriculum and instruction for the Akron school district, Dr. Ellen McWilliams. She expressed her appreciation for the strong partnership developed and nurtured through the Akron University program and faculty. All the stakeholders we met, involved in the University of Akron teacher preparation system, agreed and emphasized the importance of identifying and meeting current needs, establishing systems for clear communication, maintaining strong collaboration among all stakeholder groups, and establishing true partnerships in their endeavor to provide high quality, well trained teachers to serve in the Akron School District.

Wyoming is unique in that our state has only one 4-year university; this poses both challenges and opportunities. Ultimately, the University of Wyoming teacher preparation program is charged with meeting the needs of local school districts so districts, in turn, can ensure high levels of learning for all students enrolled in the Wyoming public school system. Being responsive to and meeting the expressed needs of the 48 Wyoming school districts should remain paramount as the University of Wyoming moves forward with developing a preeminent education department.

**Utah State University**

On May 18, 2017, three members of the TEI Special Education Research Group (Rick Woodford, Tiffany Dobler, and Dawn Scarince) visited Utah State University in Logan, UT.

The TEI Special Education Research Group members met with Dr. Timothy Slocum, Darcie Peterson, and Dr. Karen Hager Martinez. The University staff gave generously of their time and shared valuable information gleaned from years of experiences. Utah State University was different from University of Akron in that Utah State University has developed a longstanding and prolific Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation. According to their website, “The Special Education program at USU consistently ranks in the top 20 education programs by U.S. News and World Report.” While the University of Akron faculty were eager to share their triumphs and lessons learned shaping a new dual-major special education program, the faculty at Utah State University were tantalized by the opportunity to help the University of Wyoming build a preeminent undergraduate special education program from scratch, without having to retrofit best practices into pre-existing structures. The faculty at Utah State University offered to provide further consultation and encouraged additional on-site visits as the project moves forward.

Utah State University offers a wide variety of undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral programs in the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation. Undergraduate programs include standalone special education majors as well as dual major programs, both attainable within 4 years of enrollment. At Utah State University, pre-service undergraduate candidates select from a variety of undergraduate programs using Degree Maps readily available on the University’s website ([http://catalog.usu.edu/content.php?catoid=12&navoid=3925](http://catalog.usu.edu/content.php?catoid=12&navoid=3925)), which are sample 4-year plans. Once a student has declared a program, the student is encouraged to meet with an advisor to create a student-specific degree plan. Undergraduate Degree Maps include:
• Special Education: Birth to 5 Emphasis - BA, BS
• Special Education: Birth to 5 Emphasis/Early Childhood Education Dual Major - BA, BS
• Special Education: Birth to 5 Emphasis/Elementary Education K-6 Dual - BA, BS
• Special Education: Mild/Moderate & Birth to 5 Dual Emphasis - BA, BS
• Special Education: Mild/Moderate Emphasis - BA, BS
• Special Education: Mild/Moderate Emphasis/Elementary Education Composite - BA, BS
• Special Education: Mild/Moderate Emphasis/Elementary Education K-6 - BA, BS
• Special Education: Mild/Moderate Emphasis/Secondary Education Dual - BA, BS
• Special Education: Severe Emphasis - BA, BS
• Special Education: Severe Emphasis/Elementary Education Composite - BA, BS
• Special Education: Severe Emphasis/Elementary Education K-6 - BA, BS
• Special Education: Severe Emphasis/Secondary Education Dual - BA, BS
• Special Education: Severe/Birth to 5 Emphasis - BA, BS

Utah State University employs both Mentors and Site Supervisors to support student teachers. Because USU has such a long-established program, many of the Cooperating Teachers, Mentors and Site Supervisors are former Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation graduates. Mentors are familiar with the program and work with student teachers on required assignments. They provide emotional support and bridge communication between the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and USU faculty. Supervisors receive specific training on the required evaluation tools and procedures mandated by the University.

USU offers 3 tracks in their Special Education Master’s program 1) Administrative, 2) Transition, and 3) Board Certified Behavior Analyst coursework designed to prepare candidates to sit for the National Board Certified Behavior Analysis (BCBA) exam. A University of Wyoming program designed to prepare Behavior Analysis is one area specifically identified and requested on the Needs Survey conducted by the TEI Special Education Research Group. The Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation at Utah State University has highly developed and well-utilized Distance Degree and Licensure Programs for many courses of study, including most of their Graduate level programs. Further collaboration with Utah State University faculty in the area of distance education would be beneficial and applicable to the University of Wyoming’s initiatives considering the rural nature of both states.
Contextual Constraints to Implementation Identified

☐ Identified Potential Risk to Research Subjects
  ☐ Release of proprietary information
  ☐ Loss of faculty or candidate confidentiality
  ☐ Loss of national accreditation or program recognition
  ☐ Loss of state approval or recognition
  ☐ Other (Please describe.)

☐ Identified Potential Risk to Trustees Education Initiative
  ☐ Insufficient Data for College and Program Continuous Improvement Purposes
  ☐ Insufficient Access to Student Success Data of P-12 Students Taught by College of Education Completers for
  ☐ Insufficient Commitment to Collaboration from Wyoming P-12 School Districts
  ☐ Other (Please describe.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documented Need of Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments on Literature Review</th>
<th>Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments on Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments on Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments on Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments on Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Well done.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Best of the four.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The narrative is clear and understandable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal is highly desirable and needed. My question again - is this something that innovates or is it something the CoE should be doing anyway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Listed Akron University but didn't provide any information.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No information provided.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>While it is a very thorough budget request.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great information in the rationale for the proposal, as well as the elements of the four phases of implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>This proposal addresses indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, &amp; 7.</td>
<td>It is hard to find candidates for special education positions. The undergraduate certification is a high need and dual certification would be a huge benefit.</td>
<td>Nice focus on mentorship, collaboration, and data analysis. The co-teaching model is something we need more exposure to and experience with.</td>
<td>Listed Akron University but didn't provide any information.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No information provided.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>While it is a very thorough budget request.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great information in the rationale for the proposal, as well as the elements of the four phases of implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I need to learn more about the Mursion simulation system, however I'm impressed with what I have read and like the idea of simulating the classroom environment in a non threatening way e.g. low risk</td>
<td>I like the approach of the proposals. Benchmarking U of Akron and Utah State and looking to continue the relationship I feel is a good idea particularly Utah State who felt starting fresh was a great opportunity.</td>
<td>I like the approach of the proposals. Benchmarking U of Akron and Utah State and looking to continue the relationship I feel is a good idea particularly Utah State who felt starting fresh was a great opportunity.</td>
<td>Listed Akron University but didn't provide any information.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No information provided.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>While it is a very thorough budget request.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great information in the rationale for the proposal, as well as the elements of the four phases of implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Comments on Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Documentation of Need</td>
<td>Comments Lit Review</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>Comments: Leading Programs Research</td>
<td>Comments: Contextual Constraints</td>
<td>Comments Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments Narrative</td>
<td>Summary Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>how will mentors be identified and qualified. What standards and criteria will we set for mentors. will they be within Wyo or external e.g. U of Akron or Utah State... how is curriculum special e.g. top tier in USA?</td>
<td>appear to be limited in ability to reach rural areas e.g. selection of candidate in residency (will this be a limited / year enrolment, therefore impact)</td>
<td>appears to be comprehensive on literature reviews.</td>
<td>I felt this proposal could use more external benchmarking</td>
<td>I felt this proposal addressed special needs, reads like a Wyoming solution vs. validate we have the right approach e.g. more external reviews of best practices</td>
<td>low risk to individuals, I'm sure they will get value from the experience. High risk to us based on the cost and number of candidates we will be able to accommodate. I would like to know more about successful programs that we can learn more from, then proceed with what is best for our teachers</td>
<td>Very nicely developed and presented, relatively high cost, it top notch experience I'm sure it will move the needle</td>
<td>I'm concerned that the impact will be limited by ability to move large numbers of candidates through each year as noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Comments on Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Documented Need</td>
<td>Comments Literature Review</td>
<td>Comments Lit Review</td>
<td>Leading Programs/Research</td>
<td>Comments: Lit Progra</td>
<td>Comments Literature Review</td>
<td>Comments Literature Review</td>
<td>Contextual Constraints</td>
<td>Comments: Contextual Constraints</td>
<td>Comments Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Comments Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There could have been more in this. Looking at the other proposals I know there is a statewide need, but this proposal provides little documentation.

The literature page was sloppy, with extra numbers, and only a brief summary.

The summary of data for this did not fully explain the programs. I am aware of the Akron program from the previous proposal, but not limited information is given with this one. Page 13 has two different colored fonts as well.

The budget narrative could have better explained the $1.9 million dollar request. The itemized page was good but accompanying narrative could have further explained this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Documented Need</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments: Ldg Progra</th>
<th>Comments Context Constraints</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This proposal has the potential to meet several of the key performance indicators but none were checked within the proposal document. It specifically addresses continuous improvement protocol for field and clinical experiences, developed and implemented in partnership with school district partners. The proposal also aligns with active clinical partnership agreements with Wyoming school districts.</td>
<td>2. Three residency sites are proposed including Cheyenne, Riverton and Sheridan. The proposed residency programs will provide sustained change in special education delivery in all of these sites. To meet the needs of more rural contexts in Wyoming there may be the need for the expansion of the project in year 3 to place qualified residents in different school contexts. This would be similar to a residency program within the medical field.</td>
<td>3. Minimal description is provided of relevant empirical data that has been generated to support mentorship and the residency model of education. There is an abundance of contemporary literature in education on induction and the role of mentors/mentees. There is also some relevant literature in the medical field on how to facilitate effective residency programs. I would suggest that the author(s) more fully access and describe this evidence to warrant their 3 year program model.</td>
<td>2. Akron University is stipulated as a comparator external program but no data is provided on their residency program?</td>
<td>1. Contextual constraint analysis is not addressed in the proposal</td>
<td>4. Little supporting narrative is provided for the detailed line-by-line budget proposal. The budget request has been developed as part of a large funding request from the US Department of Education. This request seems very large in relation to the TEI resources. If funding does not come through from the US DoE then this proposal needs to be reworked such that the payment for mentors would be reduced to be more aligned with payment for co-operating teachers. The school districts would also have to find some matching funds for placement of qualified residents within the schools.</td>
<td>2. The idea of an extended student teaching experience within a residency program is a good one. The proposal as it currently is written seems incomplete. These one year clinical/practicum based residency models of certification exist in the rest of the world. These models include formal coursework at the university site but also distance modules of coursework while embedded within the residency program. I would encourage the author(s) to think about how this program could potentially coincide with the Masters certification program in special education that currently operates at UW. The author(s) need to revise the budget requirements should this be the TEI be the only funding agency pursued.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Comments on Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Documented Need</td>
<td>Comments Literature Review</td>
<td>Comments Literature Review</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>Leading Programs Research</td>
<td>Comments: Ldg Progra</td>
<td>Comments: Ldg Progra</td>
<td>Contextual Constraints</td>
<td>Comments Contextual Constraints</td>
<td>Contextual Constraints</td>
<td>Comments Risk Assmnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This section of the proposal is not completed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The analysis of Current UW Teacher Program and Practice focuses on the need for a Special Education Program but fails to document the need for an enhanced residency model to prepare effective novice educators.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Literature Review contains errors, e.g. incomplete citations, and it is unclear how some of the citations relate to a redesigned residency model.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The evaluation of the University of Akron (UA) related to an undergraduate Special Education program and a dual licensure program. I see no evidence that UA has a year-long residency program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No contextual constraints are identified.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No risk assessment is provided.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Performance indicators were not addressed. | 3 | Literature review is very limited. | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | Budget was not provided. | The proposal describes three phases: development and training of mentors, student teacher experience, and employment of novice educators in Wyoming. The proposed year long residency program could address a severe and serious shortage of Special Education teachers in Wyoming schools. | The proposal describes three phases: development and training of mentors, student teacher experience, and employment of novice educators in Wyoming. The proposed year long residency program could address a severe and serious shortage of Special Education teachers in Wyoming schools. |

6/8/17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments: Litg Progra</th>
<th>Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments Context Constraints</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments Risk Assmnt</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal does not indicate which performance indicators are relevant.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clearly, there is state-wide need for this.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hard to tell. The proposal only cites the literature with very little overall assessment or review of what that literature supports.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 TOTAL</td>
<td>31 TOTAL</td>
<td>26 TOTAL</td>
<td>19 TOTAL</td>
<td>22 TOTAL</td>
<td>24 TOTAL</td>
<td>18 TOTAL</td>
<td>165 GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.13 MEAN | 3.10 MEAN | 2.85 MEAN | 2.33 MEAN | 2.75 MEAN | 1.42 MEAN | 3.00 MEAN |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comments on Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comments Lit Review</th>
<th>Comments Documentation of Need</th>
<th>Comments Leading Programs Research</th>
<th>Comments Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Comments Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Comments Funding</th>
<th>Comments Narrative</th>
<th>Summary Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boxes were not checked; based decision on overall review of proposal.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>While budget is broken down there is no clear narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When looking at the proposal I did not see any of the boxes checked for the constraints. Reading through the proposal I can see how these were addressed.
Although several indicators are listed, it appears that only 3 would be directly addressed.

3

Performance indicators are listed in the proposal, but there are none checked. If this proposal meets all the indicators, which I believe it does, there is no narrative.

1

The narrative is weak. The strength of this program is that it will address K-12. I have mixed feelings about this proposal. It is funded by the US Dept of Ed. I would feel more favorable. I just didn’t feel that this was really thought through.
Research Work Group Proposal Form

Initiative Research Objectives

- Identify highly effective evidence-based educator preparation practices
- Identify which highly effective evidence-based practices can be implemented with fidelity and rigor in Wyoming
- Adapt and refine highly effective evidence-based practices for implementation in Wyoming

Initiative Research Definitions

- **Candidate** – an individual enrolled in a professional educator preparation program
- **Completer** – an individual who has successfully complete a professional educator program
- **Educator Preparation Practices** – professional training, including courses, fieldwork in schools (including student teaching), and other experiences designed to equip prospective educators with the knowledge, attitudes, behaviors and skills needed to support the success of pre-school through grade 12 (P-12) students in their classrooms, schools and wider communities
- **Evidence-Based Practice** – practice developed by integrating the best available evidence including quantitative (numerical) and qualitative data. Data for evidence-based educator preparation practice include but are not limited to:
  - current educator preparation literature
  - meta-analyses (combined data from multiple studies)
    - historical research
    - experimental research
    - non-experimental research
    - exploratory, descriptive, and explanatory (cause and effect) research
  - outcomes data of P-12 students taught by program completers
  - employment outcomes of program completers, including persistence through induction programs and persistence in the profession
  - candidate perceptions of program effectiveness
  - employer (school district) perceptions of program effectiveness

Please email completed form to TEI Executive Director upon completion.
Initiative Research Work Group Name

Special Education

Submitted by Tiffany Dobler
Contact Email thunt@uwyo.edu
Contact Phone 307-248-1232
Submission Date 4-

Research Work Group Member Names
Rick Woodford, Superintendent, Bighorn 2
Dawn Scarince, Special Education Director, Fremont 14
Jennifer Krause, Continuous Improvement Supervisor, Wyoming Department of Education
Wendy Gauntner, Parent Information Center Outreach Liason, Wyoming Parent Information Center (PIC)
Michelle Buchanan, Faculty, University of Wyoming,
Tiffany Dobler, Academic Professional Lecturer, University of Wyoming

Proposal for Pilot Implementation (please provide narrative):

The TEI Special Education Research Group is proposing the development and implementation of an undergraduate University of Wyoming Teacher Residency Program (UWTRP) in special education to support the human and professional capital development needs of Wyoming LEAs in service of Wyoming’s K-12 learners. In response to an opportunity presented to the TEI Special Education Research Group, we are anticipating USDOE (United States Department of Education) grant funding for this initiative. In partnership with Banks Street and the NNER, the University of Wyoming, College of Education has submitted materials for grant approval.

Built on a strong evidence base and addressing a specific need in Wyoming, the UWTRP program will focus on preparing educators in all areas of Special Education for all grade levels, K-12. For the past 16 years, the Wyoming Department of Education has reported to the United States Department of Education (USDOE) that Special Education is a teaching shortage area in Wyoming. From 2017-2018 through 2020-2021, UWTRP will exclusively include residencies in high need schools of partner LEAs including an elementary school, a middle school, and a high school to reflect the full range of human capital needs in the state’s LEAs. Assuring that the program will address the unique needs of schools in Wyoming, given the state’s expansive land mass and sparse population, the partner LEAs identified for the pilot have proximity to a local community college in order to leverage available distance technologies as well as a population of
community college graduates with a passion for education and a lifelong commitment to the community and the region.

The UWTRP model will represent a redesign of UW’s current educator undergraduate residency program. The proposed new model will be comprised of recruitment and selection, pre-residency professional educator coursework and practicum experiences, full academic year residency, mentor professional development and support, resident support, and induction and mentoring for novice educators.

The elements of the program are organized into four specific phases, (process diagram attached), which include:

• Recruitment and Selection of Candidates and Mentors

• Phase One:
  o Pre-Resident Coursework and Practicum Experiences
  o Resident Mentor Training and Mentor Lead Training
  o Induction Mentor Training

• Phase Two
  o Residency for Full Academic Year
  o Mentors Support Residents
  o Mentor Leads Support Resident Mentors and Residents
  o University Supports Resident Mentors, Mentor Leads and Residents

• Phase Three
  o Novice Educators Are Employed in LEAs
  o Induction Mentors Support Novice Educators
  o Mentor Leads Support Mentors and Novice Educators
  o University Supports Induction Mentors, Resident Mentors, Mentor Leads, and Novice Educators
Based on these and the USDOE grant selection criteria, UW sought and successfully forged partnerships with three Wyoming LEAs: Laramie County School District No. 1 (LCSD1), Cheyenne; Fremont County School District No. 25 (FCSD25), Riverton; and Sheridan County School District No. 2 (SCSD2), Sheridan. The proposed pilot will include engagement with district leaders to leverage each LEA’s human capital management system to identify special education teachers who have demonstrated measurable increases in student academic achievement and exceptional teaching practices. Selected teachers will be provided professional development specific to mentoring resident students. Additionally, a lead mentor educator will be selected for each district. These individuals will also participate in professional development specific to this role.

The Residency and Selection Phase will focus on seeking and identifying potential program candidates and program mentors. In identifying a diverse field of candidates, the process will focus on individuals who demonstrate the foundational talents and dispositions that can be fostered and developed to produce a highly effective educator that can support K-12 students with disabilities in learning, holistic development, and lifelong success. As mentioned above, in identifying mentors, the process will focus on professional educators who have demonstrated effectiveness in part on producing measurable increases in k-12 student academic achievement and who have shown effective teaching practices with students with disabilities.

In Phase One, University of Wyoming College of Education faculty will deliver to pre-residency candidates a targeted coursework sequence with embedded field and clinical experiences to provide pre-residency candidates with robust preparation in advance of their professional educator residency. This stage of professional educator development will include: coursework, assessment of pre-residency candidate knowledge and skills, and extensive practicum experiences in: learning theory; teaching methods/pedagogy specific to students with disabilities; curriculum design; academic content, e.g., mathematics, English language arts, science, social studies; assessment and data literacy to support differentiated instruction; diagnosing and address individual student needs; assistive technology; classroom management; special education law and communication and collaboration with colleagues, parents/families and community members.

Phase One also will include the development and training of Resident Mentors and Mentor Leads. University of Wyoming faculty will focus this process on co-teaching models; instructional facilitation and coaching skills; peer collaboration on formative assessment data analysis, lesson planning and differentiated instruction; and andragogic skills and techniques.

UWTRP Phase Two will be comprised of a full academic year-long student teaching residency supported by specially selected mentor teachers who have completed the targeted professional development provided in Phase One. In Phase Two, Residents will be supported by Resident Mentors and Mentor Leads. University of Wyoming Faculty will support the Residents, Resident
Mentors and Mentor Leads. Residents in each school will form a cohort and in so doing, support each other’s learning as well. All residents in the program (from all three sites) will also meet twice a year at the University. Additionally, Induction Mentors will be selected and provided professional development during this phase.

Finally, in Phase Three, graduates who have completed Phase One and Phase Two will be employed as Novice Educators in Wyoming LEAs. During this Phase, the Novice Educators will receive direct induction and mentoring support from Induction Mentors in their district who have completed the development provided in Phase Two. In addition, the Novice Educators will continue to be supported by the Mentor Leads in their district and by University of Wyoming Faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors in training</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor leads</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction Mentor Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td><strong>138,00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-residency candidates</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency candidates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency graduates with support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td><strong>262,80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors in long-term training (coursework)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents in long-term training (coursework)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td><strong>80,00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PARTICIPANTS</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>105</td>
<td><strong>400,80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stipend Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors in training</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor leads</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / Induction Mentor Training</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / Induction Mentor Stipend</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$88,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-residency candidates</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency candidates</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency graduates in the district</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / Travel for Statewide Convenings</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$113,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors in long-term training (coursework)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents in long-term training (coursework)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors in training</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$46,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor leads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors in long-term training (coursework)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$115,500</td>
<td>$150,500</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$508,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-residency candidates</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency candidates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency graduates in the district</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents in long-term training (coursework)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
<td>$275,500</td>
<td>$440,500</td>
<td>$480,500</td>
<td>$1,424,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors in long-term training (coursework)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COSTS**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$277,500</td>
<td>$395,500</td>
<td>$595,500</td>
<td>$649,000</td>
<td>$1,950,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal’s Alignment to Key Performance Indicator(s)\(^1\)

*(Check all that apply.)*

- **Statewide perceptions** of the University of Wyoming College of Education
- **Enrollment of Wyoming residents** in University of Wyoming College of Education
- **Continuous improvement protocols** for field and clinical experiences, developed and implemented in partnership with school district partners
- **Executed, active clinical partnership agreements** with Wyoming School Districts
- **Employment of University of Wyoming graduates** in Wyoming schools
- **National accreditation** from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), with no Areas for Improvement or Stipulations related to CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact, Component 4.3: Satisfaction of Employers.
- **State-of-the-art College of Education organizational structure, facilities, and technological capabilities** as measured by faculty and candidate collaboration and innovation, candidate perceptions of their experiences, and operational efficiencies as measured by resource monitoring and reporting.

**Funding Request to Support Pilot Implementation (by Academic Year)**

**\(2017-2018\) Total Request**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Amount:</th>
<th>Purpose:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**\(2018-2019\) Total Request**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Amount:</th>
<th>Purpose:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{1}\) List complete as of February 2017. Research Work Groups will introduce additional Key Performance Indicators for Governing Board review and action.

*Please email completed form to TEI Executive Director upon completion.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Amount:</th>
<th>Purpose:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**2019-2020 Total Request**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Amount:</th>
<th>Purpose:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Budget Narrative to Support Funding Request:**

Attached in Budget Narrative Table
Literature Review

Reviewed and analyzed relevant current literature on the best practices for preparing professional educators

Literature Citations:


Summary of Literature Review: The proposed program’s focus is on methods identified to strengthen educator effectiveness through: early field experiences to synchronously connect theory and practice (Conderman et al, 2013; Dorel et al, 2016; Flores, 2015; Hoffman et al, 2016; McDonald et al 2011); assure that faculty and professional educators are providing focused mentoring for student teaching residents.
(Ambrosetti, 2014; Childre & Van Rie, 2015; Mueller & Hindin, 2011; Gareis & Grant (2014); and implement co-teaching models with mentor educators during an academic year-long residency (Yopp, et al, 2014).
Analysis of Current UW Teacher Program and Practice

Collected and analyzed relevant evidence from current educational practice and current educator preparation practice

Evidence Collected and Analyzed

1. UW Special Education Programming Feedback Survey
2. Special Education Director Feedback sought from WASEA Spring Conference 2016
3. Administrator Feedback sought from UW ECHO in Leadership Spring 2016
4. University of Wyoming Trustees Education Town Hall Meetings
5. College of Education Internal Feedback
6. Equity Gap Core Plan and Data
7.
8.
9.
10.

Summary of Analysis of Current UW Teacher Program and Practice

Wyoming stakeholders (i.e. district personnel, Wyoming Department of Education, Professional Teaching Standards Board, current and potential UW students) have made it clear that a program option in special education is critically needed at the University of Wyoming. As mentioned above, the Wyoming Department of Education has reported to the United States Department of Education (USDOE) that Special Education is a teaching shortage area in Wyoming. As the sole university in the state, it has become increasingly problematic that our current system provides special education licensure options for only graduate students. One respondent from the UW Special Education Programming Feedback Survey stated: "We need MORE undergraduate options (i.e. 4 year program of study) for Special Education at UW other than a Masters Degree. Our neighboring states offer dual majors with SPED and education degrees with SPED endorsements. We have a shortage, and I'd love to refer individuals interested in SPED to our home state for a degree/endorsement." Another respondent wrote: "I fully support UW providing a teacher certification program for special education. At this time, I hire most staff from Black Hills State University as their graduates have the opportunity to be duly certified." As a result of these comments and others, our task force has focused seriously on the development of an undergraduate special education program. Within this program, we have focused on the student teaching aspect, and again, are proposing the use of a year long residency to best prepare our graduating students.
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Employed a mixed methods approach to evaluate quantitative and qualitative data from educator preparation programs across the United States

Programs Reviewed:

- Traditional educator preparation programs in public and private universities across the United States
  Names and Locations of Traditional Programs studied:
  - Akron University
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 

- Alternative educator preparation programs
  Names and Locations of Alternative Programs studied:
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 

- International educator preparation programs
  Names and Locations of International Programs studied:
  - 
  -
Data Analysis

Quantitative Data Analyzed

- UW Special Education Programming Feedback Survey
- Undergraduate Student Special Education Programming Feedback Survey

Qualitative Data Analyzed

- University of Wyoming Trustees Education Town Hall Meetings
- Special Education Director Feedback sought from WASEA Spring Conference 2016
- Administrator Feedback sought from UW ECHO in Leadership Spring 2016
- College of Education Internal Feedback
- Undergraduate Student Special Education Programming Feedback Survey
- UW Special Education Programming Feedback Survey

Summary of Data Findings

Feedback from stakeholders throughout the state, at the Wyoming Department of Education, PTSB (Professional Teaching Standards Board) and within our local school districts, clearly indicate the need for UW to develop a robust undergraduate special education program. Of those district respondents to the UW Special Education Programming Feedback Survey (Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Directors, HR Directors, Other) 77.05% are in support of a dual program in special education and elementary or secondary education, 82.81% are in support of an endorsement program in special education at the undergraduate level, and 65.63% support the development of a special education major. When asked if the development of the above programs would mitigate the special education teacher shortage in Wyoming, 60.94% reported that the dual major would be successful in supporting these efforts; 75% felt the endorsement would mitigate this issue, and 67.19% felt this shortage would be greatly rectified through the offering of a special education major at the undergraduate level.

A total of 44.26% of respondents on the UW Special Education Programming Feedback Survey think a full-year internship would better prepare special education undergraduates than
would a traditional student teaching experience. Slightly more than 50% of respondents (52.46%) report that schools across the state would be amenable to providing full-year internships for special education undergraduates. Impressively, 91.80% of respondents believe that teaching/internship opportunities should be available in school districts throughout the state. One respondent stated: "Full year internships would be very beneficial to students..." Another wrote: "Students would obviously benefit from a full year student teaching experience. It would also be beneficial to have them student teach in several different settings if they were doing a full year. Such as an elementary placement, secondary, behavior classroom, etc. It would also be helpful if they could at least visit some of the other placements in the spectrum of educational placements so they know what they're like."

Given this feedback from local school personnel and stakeholders, it is clear that a year long residency in an undergraduate special education program would greatly benefit school districts and special education teacher candidates, and a drive toward this practice is largely supported by stakeholders throughout the state.
Contextual Constraints to Implementation Identified

☐ Identified Potential Risk to Research Subjects
  ☐ Release of proprietary information
  ☐ Loss of faculty or candidate confidentiality
  ☐ Loss of national accreditation or program recognition
  ☐ Loss of state approval or recognition
  ☐ Other (Please describe.)

☐ Identified Potential Risk to Trustees Education Initiative
  ☐ Insufficient Data for College and Program Continuous Improvement Purposes
  ☐ Insufficient Access to Student Success Data of P-12 Students Taught by College of Education Completers for
  ☐ Insufficient Commitment to Collaboration from Wyoming P-12 School Districts
  ☐ Other (Please describe.)