

# 2019 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10322	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	3205
<b>Institution:</b>	University of Montana-Missoula		
<b>Unit:</b>	Phyllis J. Washington College of Education and Human Sciences		

## Section 1. AIMS Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure <sup>1</sup>	154
2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.) <sup>2</sup>	160

**Total number of program completers** 314

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

<sup>2</sup> For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?**

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP. \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements \_\_\_\_\_
- Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:
- 3.6 Change in regional accreditation status \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.7 Change in state program approval \_\_\_\_\_

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4   A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3   A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4   A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

**Link:** <http://coehs.umt.edu/about/accred/CAEP%20Annual%20Reporting%20Measures/default.php>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Data at this link will address the Annual Reporting Measures

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

*What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?  
 Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?  
 Are benchmarks available for comparison?  
 Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

As will be discussed throughout this report, the most significant annual highlights are: (1) the completion of the state-wide employer survey, (2) the completion of the completer survey, and the implementation of a pilot program for candidates working with students who are ELL. In the previous report a detailed description was provided about programmatic changes for our one AFI. The recent completion of the completer survey made it clear we still have work to do in that area. On the other hand, it could be that our data have not caught up to our effort--either way, we continue to work toward a program that offers thorough preparation and experiences with diverse populations. We are anxious to analyze the results from our in-progress survey candidates complete immediately upon completion of student teaching (this is another recently refined instrument that aligns with the completer survey that will be conducted every three years).

Also as previously reported, our measures are shared across the state with all EPPs. Additionally, the results are shared with our Professional Education Unit (PEU). When possible results are also shared with the local press.

## Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

**NCATE:** Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

- 1. Candidates have limited opportunities to work with diverse P-12 students. (ITP) (ADV)

In last year's report, a thorough description was given of efforts within coursework that are focused on diversity. Although we do not yet have related data to determine impact, we are confident those efforts were a step in the right direction. More recently, a pilot project was launched where our candidates worked with recently displaced refugee children who are also ELL. Information is still being collected about the project but we are happy to report that all nine students in this project won a student leadership award from the University. An immediate next step is to scale up these efforts so all of our candidate can receive a similar experience. A more thorough description of this project will be provided in our next annual report (the project is just now wrapping up).

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

### CAEP Standard 5

*The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.*

### CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

*The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.*

#### **6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.**

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs  
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

As previously reported, a major improvement to how we assess candidates has taken place by having capstone projects for each semester within our elementary education program. Recent analyses have used the capstone project from the first semester (or Level 1) of the elementary program and the applied research project that is completed by candidates during student teaching. Both of these assessments have been developed by faculty in collaboration with staff, school partners, and members of the Professional Education Council. Both assessments use indicators from the Danielson Framework. The Level 1 capstone is not as broad as the applied research project but it does allow for comparisons of some indicators. See attachments for more details.

An exciting achievement that has resulted in probably the best example of continuous improvement was described earlier with the work with English Language Learners. More specifically, the completer survey showed nearly 40% of our Completers did not feel like they were prepared to work with the English Language Learners. While we knew our candidates did not received in-depth training in this area, we were surprised that this was, by far, from the perspective of our completers, our largest area of weakness. Interestingly, this correlates with our only area for improvement from our last review. Although we were moving in this general direction of providing a clinical experience focused on diverse learners, these findings created a sense of urgency within our faculty. Our next annual report will contain a thorough description of this program and its results.









Along similar lines, the employer and completer surveys resulted in what data collection often does, allows for reflection and points

toward specific areas where efforts and resources should be pointed. This is the essence of continuous improvement. For a benchmark, programs across the state decided to highlight results where 15% of employers believed candidates were not adequately prepared. With our completer survey, we use that same logic and determined where there was overlap and where there were unique areas indicated by completers. Ways in which we address the issues vary from changing or adding coursework, adding a clinical experience, or addressing more discrete issues within student teaching seminars. More details are provided in an attached table.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- x.1 Diversity
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **COMPLETER\_and\_EMPLOYER\_SURVEYS.docx**
-  **Completer\_Results.docx**
-  **EXAMPLES\_OF\_CONTINUOUS\_IMPROVEMENT.docx**
-  **LEVEL\_1\_and\_LEVEL\_4\_DATA.docx**
-  **LEVEL\_1\_Capstone\_Project.pdf**
-  **LEVEL\_1\_STAR\_CAPSTONE\_RUBRIC(2).docx**
-  **LEVEL\_4\_CAPSTONE.docx**
-  **LEVEL\_4\_Description.docx**

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s

activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes  No

### 6.3 Optional Comments

Were are considering submitting a proposal on addressing diversity in a frontier state.

## Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress in addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

Not applicable

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Yes  No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

**Preparer's authorization.** By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2019 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

### Report Preparer's Information

Name: Trent Atkins

Position: Professor, Chair, & Accreditation Director

Phone: 406.243.4978

E-mail: trent.atkins@umontana.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

### **Policy 6.01 Annual Report**

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount complete data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

### **Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements**

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

**Acknowledge**