

**Attachment 15a:  
Noyce Evaluation Questions and  
Subquestions**

## EVALUATION QUESTION

**1. What does the STEM teacher preparation field perceive could be funded by the Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program? (Framework alignment: Background/Context - Socioecological Model)**

### SUBQUESTION

1a. Which specific areas of the STEM teacher preparation and teacher leadership field do stakeholders believe should be emphasized overall? (Framework alignment: Background/Context - Socioecological Model)

1b. Who and/or what are the facilitators that impact how likely it is that applying for Noyce Program funding is considered? (Framework alignment: Burden)

1c. How accessible is the Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program? Are there possible barriers that impact how likely it is that applying for Noyce Program funding is considered? (Framework alignment: Burden)

1d. Is there something that could be learned and applied to other programs? (i.e., What learnings from the Noyce Program could be applied to other similar programs?) (Framework alignment: Potentially aspects of all)

## EVALUATION QUESTION

**2. What are the perceptions from the field/stakeholders regarding the Noyce Award, Noyce recipients, and the impact of the award?)**

### SUBQUESTION

2a. What are the perceptions from the field/stakeholders regarding the Noyce Award overall? (Framework alignment: Affective Attitude)

2b. What are the perceptions from the field/stakeholders regarding the current Noyce scholars/fellows? (Framework alignment: Affective Attitude)

2c. What are the perceptions from the field/stakeholders regarding the former Noyce scholars/fellows? (Framework alignment: Affective Attitude)

2d. What are the perceptions from the field/stakeholders regarding the impact of the award (i.e., after implementation)? What are the perceived gaps in the Noyce Program's reach and impact? (Framework alignment: Affective Attitude)

## EVALUATION QUESTION

**3. How have substantial changes to the solicitation over the past 10 years impacted the perception of the program by the field (e.g., change**

**in participant support allocation, cost sharing elimination, etc.)?  
(Framework alignment: Affective Attitude)**

**SUBQUESTION**

3a. In what ways has the recruitment and application process changed?  
(Framework alignment: Burden, Ethicality, Coherence, Opportunity Costs)

3b. In what ways did these changes impact the likelihood of representatives from eligible institutions applying for Noyce funding?  
How does this vary by (a) Track and (b) institution type, if at all? (Framework alignment: Coherence)

3c. What are potential barriers to applying to the solicitations?  
Do these barriers vary by institution characteristics (e.g., region, size, public, private, HBCU, MSI)? By individual characteristics? By Track? If so, in what ways?  
(Framework alignment: Burden)

3d. What are the reasons why institutions apply for a Noyce award?  
Do these vary by institution type? Do these vary by individual characteristics? If so, in what ways? (Framework alignment: Affective Attitude, Ethicality, Perceived Effectiveness, Self-Efficacy)

**EVALUATION QUESTION**

**4. How does the merit review process of Noyce impact outcomes of funded projects? (Framework alignment: Coherence)**

**SUBQUESTION**

4a. What has been communicated to applicants about the merit review process?  
(Framework alignment: Coherence)

4b. What are the applicants' perceptions of the feedback received during the negotiation process?  
How, if at all, did this impact their final project? (Framework alignment: Opportunity Costs, Perceived Effectiveness, Ethicality, Self-Efficacy)

**EVALUATION QUESTION**

**5. What are the lessons learned? Growth opportunities? (Framework alignment: Potentially aspects of all)**

**SUBQUESTION**

N/A