2020 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. EPP 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	◉	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	◉	○
1.1.3 Program listings	◉	○

1.2 [For EPPs seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation]. Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

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

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 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1]

144

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.)[2]

148

Total number of program completers   292

---

[1] For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

[2] 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 2018-2019 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: completer surveys, employer surveys, Title II report summary, licensure eligibility, case study, completer employment data

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	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	☐
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	✔	✔	✔	☐

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 we discussed in the previous report, the most significant annual highlights were: (1) the completion of the state-wide employer survey, (2) the completion of the completer survey, and (3) the implementation of a pilot program for candidates working with students who are ELL. The surveys are being completed as part of a state-wide effort in a three year cycle. We are in the final, third year of the cycle and we are doing a case study of initial and advanced completers. Of course, current affairs have caused us some delays but we are moving forward with doing at least some of the case study while our completers are working in a virtual environment. We believe this phenomenon is fertile ground for inquiry and will provide great insights into how our completers are real-time problem solvers. Additionally, it will provide a unique glimpse at how completers address the certain inequities that exist for diverse groups of P-12 learners.

Since this state-wide process is on a three-year cycle, we do not yet have trend data available relative to Standard 4. That said, and as you will hear from all EPPs in Montana, this process has been invaluable. We look forward to sharing our first trend data and some preliminary results from our case study in the next annual report.

Recent data relative to diversity has been promising. As part of our completion process with student teaching, candidates/completers are surveyed on how prepared they feel working with diverse learners. There are clear and established

trends where more than 90% of respondents report they are prepared to work with under-served populations. These results are a source of pride for us. That said, we know we can continue to embed experiences within our programs that will prepare candidates to work in environments from Montana to India. Our ongoing work in this area is discussed later in the report.

For many of our assessments, previous year results serve as benchmarks. In some cases we are able to compare with other EPPs. There are efforts to expand some of this work using the Danielson Framework. Most EPPs have adopted this framework for clinical evaluations and there are discussions about adopting the same forms across Montana. If that happens, state-wide benchmarks will be easily obtained. In the case of the Praxis exams, we use national benchmarks.

Other data that will be shown on our website indicate stable and consistent trends. Two examples are candidate's average GPA at the time of entry into our program. The average is 3.24 which is significantly higher than the current standards. We are also sharing our ongoing impressive results on the Praxis content exams where 95% of candidates pass on their first attempt and 99% pass on their second attempt.

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. We are currently finalizing the Lawshe Process and reliability assessments with each of our key assessments used in our programs. These results will be shared in our next report.

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)**

Activities addressing the AFI in the area of diversity continue to expand. Last year we reported on the establishment of a program where our K-8 candidates work directly with English Language Learners. We are happy to report the program has expanded to include EVERY K-8 licensure candidate. Current affairs have obviously hindered these efforts but we are confident the activities will resume next fall. We are excited about these developments.

Additionally, with our aforementioned case study, the guiding research questions are both related to serving diverse learners. With our approach, we will learn about our accomplishments and areas of needed growth. It will be interesting to see what trends emerge and which ones become actionable for improvement.

We can continue to engage stakeholders in this process. Stakeholder include teachers, administrators, university faculty, candidates and completers. In fact, this case study process is the best example where each of these stakeholder group have been engaged in the development of this process.

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?

These efforts are addressed in the previous sections.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
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.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
A.3.4 Selection at Completion
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
x.1 Diversity
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses
x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

📎 **Assessment_Matrix_31320.docx**
📎 **FINAL_Modified_Spring_2020_Applied_Research_and_Reflective_Practice.docx**
📎 **University_of_Montana_Completer_Case_Study.docx**
📎 **Teacher_Education_Program_Eval_Data.xlsx**
📎 **Reliability_Study.pdf**

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

Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a succe
transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful r
regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the fo
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 progre
on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may hel
the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial lev
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 a

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 (
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 Stand
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 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

☑ **I am authorized to complete this report.**

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Trent Atkins
Position:	Professor, Chair and 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 completer 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**