

# 2018 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10326	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	4930
<b>Institution:</b>	The University of Montana Western		
<b>Unit:</b>	School of Education, Business and Technology		

## 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 2016-2017 ?

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>

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>

Total number of program completers 85

<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 2016-2017 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable

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  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements  
No Change / Not Applicable

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

## 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://registrar.umwestern.edu/enrollment-institution-research.html>

**Description of data accessible via link:** University of Montana Western Graduation & Retention Rates

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2

**Link:** <https://w.umwestern.edu/section/accreditation/>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Employers satisfaction surveys; Survey of Completers' satisfaction, Licensure & Hiring 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?

The data demonstrates that Montana Western teaching candidates consistently meet expectations for teacher preparation. UMW

teaching candidates are highly regarded by their supervising teachers and employers. All candidates that successfully complete our programs are eligible for teaching licenses. Upon graduation, a high percentage of candidates locate teaching jobs within the first year.

Three-year cycle for assessing the impact of our in-service teachers on P-12 student learning: In 2015, the Montana Council of Deans of Education, in collaboration with the Montana Office of Public Instruction, formed a Task Force to collectively address CAEP Standard 4. The result of these efforts is a state-wide plan to execute standardized “Completer” and “Employer” surveys on a three-year rotation. The Task Force is also developing a model for meeting CAEP Standard 4.1 and 4.2, by developing a protocol for observing in-service teachers in their classrooms, and for evaluating the impact of these teachers on P-12 learning.

The university has a new Accreditation website, on which we have attached performance data that address the Annual Reporting Measures. This will make it easier for stakeholders and future students to review that data.

## 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.

**CAEP:** Areas for Improvement (ITP)

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

There is a lack of co-constructed policies and procedures surrounding partnerships for clinical preparation.

The University of Montana Western (UMW) is one of four Montana institutes of higher education that are part of the Montana Office of Public Instruction team associated with the CEEDAR initiative. The CEEDAR Center (Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform) is a US Department of Education-funded initiative. The Center awarded \$200,000 in intensive technical assistance funds to Montana. Funds distributed to UMW were used to support three collaborative professional development projects. 1: Dillon Middle School–UMW Project: In AY 2015-2016, the UMW Department of Education partnered with administrators and faculty at Dillon Middle School (DMS). This partnership was used to co-construct a collaborative professional development program to benefit university education faculty and K-12 faculty members alike, creating rich education opportunities and outcomes for the students served by both faculty groups. The initiative began with the formation of collaborative teams, each team consisting of UMW faculty and DMS faculty. Each team prepared a presentation on evidence-based practices applicable to disciplinary literacy, as viewed through the lens of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). The teams gave presentations at five separate monthly sessions, attended by over 60 UMW faculty members and K-12 teachers from the Dillon elementary, middle, and high schools. UMW faculty members did not simply present for their assigned session; they stayed as attendees for all sessions. The process of co-construction of learning was shared between K-12 and university faculty. All attendees were asked to apply the practices they learned to the work they were doing in their classes, and to report back on their reflections at the following session. In a post-program survey of participants' satisfaction, attendees expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the model and with the learning they gained from the experience. 2. Beaverhead County Rural Schools-UMW Project: Modeled on the DMS–UMW project, a similar partnership project was conducted during Fall 2017. UMW faculty members partnered with teachers from rural one-and two-room K-8 schools in Beaverhead County, in collaboration with the Beaverhead County Superintendent of Schools. The partnership was tied to work being done at the state-level and IHE-level with the CEEDAR Center. That work had evolved to a focus on the 19 high-leverage practices for general educators identified by TeachingWorks at the University of Michigan, and the 22 high-leverage practices for special educators, identified by the CEC, in partnership with the CEEDAR Center. The rural school teachers and UMW faculty members worked together as a single team in this case. Pairs of teachers presented to the team, focusing on three TeachingWorks HLPs which were selected during an initial needs-assessment meeting. Presentations were given over 6 sessions, and participants applied their learning to their own classrooms and reflected back at the next session concerning their insights. 3. Twin Bridges K-12 Schools–UMW Project: A third iteration of this model is currently underway. A team of UMW faculty members has partnered with teachers from the K-12 school system in Twin Bridges, Montana.

In 2016-2017 UMW used Federal Work Study funding earmarked for school support to provide school partners with reading and mathematics tutors for K-12 children in an after-school program held at local schools. Six UMW candidates were assigned to elementary or middle school classrooms. They provided approximately 1800 hours of classroom support to Dillon Public Schools.

The UMW Department of Education entered a formal partnership this year with Blackfeet Community College and the Browning Public Schools under a US Office of Indian Education grant. This partnership is enabling UMW to provide support to Blackfeet Community College in jointly delivering an Elementary Education degree to Native American college students on the Blackfeet Reservation. Of 28 Elementary Education candidates in this program, 75% work in schools as paraprofessionals, certified language/culture teachers, provisional educators, and substitute teachers. Teachers from Browning Public Schools teach some of the UMW courses. Course content is co-constructed by aligning outcomes, content, texts, and assignments with Browning Public Schools curricula. Instructors embed Blackfeet pedagogy and ways of knowing within pedagogical content. As part of this partnership between UMW, Blackfeet Community College, and Browning Public Schools, the partners meet formally and informally to develop and implement a practice-based pilot model to prepare certified indigenous Pre-K-Grade 3, and Elementary Education teachers for Blackfeet Schools. Collaboration includes: Scheduling of courses; Coursework aligned teaching opportunities; Alignment of coursework with public school curriculum; Enrichment of courses with indigenous practices; Hiring faculty from school district to teach courses; Arranging placement of candidates; Coaches within schools provide weekly

observations of candidates in field; Co-placing candidates in capstone field experiences.

In 2017, the UMW Department of Education elected to pivot away from its traditional annual meeting with its Advisory Council of school partner representatives, moving to a model of sending pairs or trios of UMW faculty members on visits to each of the partners' respective schools. An interview protocol was developed to guide these meetings and the conversations which were held with the groups at each site, consisting usually of the school superintendent, principal(s), and several teachers. Rather than having a large on-campus meeting which is often difficult for school leaders to fit into their demanding schedules, it was thought that it might be better to bring the meeting to them. The visits were planned to occur throughout AY 2017-18, and are currently being concluded by UMW faculty.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

Field experiences, particularly in secondary education, do not consistently prepare candidates to demonstrate a positive impact on all P-12 students learning and development.

Plan for tracking the Field Experience placements of our candidates: As a part of the Statewide Rural Teachers' Shortage Task Force, multiple reports were generated, providing a means of tracking field experience placements. These reports were generated using legacy documents.

The faculty are examining, and plan to implement, the use of Chalk & Wire (our assessment software) for tracking Field Experience placements. This will greatly improve our ability to ensure that teaching candidates are engaged in diverse Field Experiences, that consistently prepare them to demonstrate a positive impact on P-12 learners.

This year, the UMW Education Department revised its post-baccalaureate program designed to prepare secondary education and K-12 education teaching candidates. In doing so, the program increased the field experience requirements by 250% (from 96 hours to 240 hours). Four out of six courses will require 60-hour field experiences. Following completion of these courses, students will complete a student teaching or internship experience.

Pilot Course for an Intensive, Culturally-Responsive Urban Field Experience for UMW Teacher Candidates: In Spring 2018, three UMW Department of Education faculty members worked together to offer two education courses in an out-of-state location. Known for their rich cultural, ethnic, religious, and linguistic diversity, the Seattle, Washington public schools provided the venue for this new effort. Eleven students registered for the unique 8-credit experience, which combined EDU 311 Cultures, Diversity, and Ethics in Global Education, and EDU 352 Field Experience. This combination of two courses was designed to be relevant for students in P-3, K-12, K-8, and secondary programs. Of the 11 students who took part in this pilot project, two were secondary education majors, and it was clear that the experience they received would go far to address the CAEP AFI related to field experiences. The students in this project took part in a 14-day field experience, providing them with day-long experiences in classroom instruction with linguistically and ethnically diverse students. Many late afternoons and evenings were spent in field trips to religious and cultural centers. Teacher candidates listened to presentations at each of these centers, and engaged in valuable discussions with representatives of a wide range of religious and cultural groups. Other late afternoons and evenings were spent in lecture/discussion/activity sessions provided by the three UMW faculty members who were with the eleven students, teaching EDU 311 and EDU 352. Culminating projects for the students included a Teacher Work Sample, a research paper, and presentations at the UMW 2018 Annual Research Symposium.

This pilot project provided the eleven teacher candidates with an extremely rich field experience which informed their teaching practices immeasurably. It also provided the participating UMW faculty members with an excellent basis for further development of this model. It is hoped that additional experiences of this type can be offered to more UMW teacher candidates. There are many venues within the state of Montana, particularly in Montana's Native American reservation schools, where similar experiences could be attained. Additionally, the Seattle-based model could be returned to on an every-other-year basis. Clearly, a project such as this one does an excellent job of addressing CAEP Standard 2.3 "Partners design high-quality clinical experiences."

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning

The EPP's Plan for Documenting Impact on Student Learning, as presented, only partially addresses the components of Standard 4.

Three-year cycle for assessing the impact of our in-service teachers on P-12 student learning: In 2015, the Montana Council of Deans of Education, in collaboration with the Montana Office of Public Instruction, formed a Task Force to collectively address CAEP Standard 4. The result of these efforts is a state-wide plan to execute standardized "Completer" and "Employer" surveys on a three-year rotation. The Task Force is also developing a model for meeting CAEP Standard 4.1 and 4.2, by developing a protocol for observing in-service teachers in their classrooms, and for evaluating the impact of these teachers on P-12 learning. CAEP has approved this process as a credible means of demonstrating the impact of in-service teachers on P-12 student learning. The new Completer survey will be distributed spring 2018; The new Employer Survey will be distributed Spring 2019.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

The EPP's data-driven decision-making process for continuous improvement is not consistent across programs.

programs to collect performance data. Chalk and Wire enables the faculty to aggregate and disaggregate data as needed. Early Childhood Education has only recently been recognized in Montana as a licensure area. Early Childhood educators may now attain a teaching license for Pre-Kindergarten to Grade Three. In the past two years, the Early Childhood Education programs have implemented the use of Chalk and Wire as a means of collecting data in every Early Childhood Education course. Chalk and Wire enables all programs to assess performance against the InTASC standards, and, for Early Childhood Education, to assess performance against the NAEYC standards.

Attendance at the 2018 Annual Conference of the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACTE): Three UMW Education Department faculty members attended the AACTE annual conference in early March of 2018. At that conference, two of the faculty members attended sessions related to CAEP accreditation. Additionally, informal conversations were held with representatives of Chalk & Wire, the Learning Assessment System used by the UMW Education Department. Those conversations were extended into a series of training sessions provided to one of Montana Western's education faculty members, regarding ways that the department can use this system in more robust ways to improve its capability for data-driven decision-making across all programs. Efforts are underway to use Chalk & Wire to more effectively assist teacher candidates with meeting requirements for Gateways 1 and 2 of the Teacher Education Program. Additionally, efforts are planned to better scaffold students' introductions to the UMW Teacher Work Sample in courses taken by candidates in all programs, with data collection occurring in those courses. This will result in improved alignment and capability for data-driven analysis of the effectiveness of all programs.

## 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?

In preparing for the 2015 CAEP site visit, the UMW Department of Education developed various plans to address new CAEP requirements. Here is a list of progress made toward implementing those plans, from 2016-2018, in addition to various initiatives described above.

Plan for recruiting diverse students, & students for high-need subject areas: The Post-Baccalaureate committee worked on a proposal to streamline teacher certification for those candidates holding a bachelor's degree in an endorseable subject area.

Montana is increasingly affected by the nationwide teacher shortage, particularly in rural areas. The number of post-baccalaureate candidates enrolling in UMW and serving or preparing to serve in high needs subject areas, and in high need schools, has increased dramatically from 2016 to 2017. These high need subjects include: Special Education, Mathematics., Sciences, English, History, and Social Sciences. Other subjects experiencing teacher shortages include: Business Education, Art, Physical Education, and Health.

Education faculty recently met with UMW Admissions staff to discuss a potential collaboration in recruitment of minority students from Southern Idaho, a highly diverse population that is very close to the Dillon campus.

The faculty have discussed the need to ensure that UMW has sufficient supports in place, including social and academic supports for diverse candidates: to that end, faculty have served as advisors to the Native American club and have participated in the creation of a Multicultural Center in the UMW Student Union Building.

Office of Indian Education Federal Grant: A personnel grant has been attained that has facilitated collaboration with the Blackfeet Community College, to certify 40 Indigenous teacher candidates in the UMW Pre-Kindergarten to Grade 3, and Elementary Education programs. As a result of this grant, UMW has enrolled 12 Pre-K to Grade 3 indigenous teacher candidates; 28 Elementary Education indigenous teacher candidates. In addition, UWM hired three Indigenous adjunct faculty to teach in these programs. Five indigenous Blackfeet Public Schools educators have been hired as coaches for UMW teacher candidates. UWM hired two Indigenous University Supervisors to supervise student teachers.

Plan for recruiting diverse faculty: In 2017, the Education Department hired a male mathematics educator. This hire improved the female to male ratio in the Education Department from 8% to 16%.

From 2016-2018 five elementary education courses have been offered through UMW by indigenous adjunct faculty. Multiple faculty searches are currently underway, with the goal of hiring more diverse qualified faculty.

Plan for ensuring inter-rater agreement (reliability) of our assessment instruments: A new Teacher Work Sample course was designed and approved through the university curriculum approval process. This enables two faculty to co-teach the 2-credit course, completed in conjunction with Student Teaching, in order to score Teacher Work Samples independently and thus calculate inter-rater agreement scores. The Fall 2017 Teacher Work Samples were analyzed, yielding inter-rater agreement data.

New assessment instruments have been implemented for candidate writing and presentation/teaching skills, using multiple assessments across courses. There are two levels of inter-observer agreement that may be calculated from these multiple assessments:

A. Agreement of scores across faculty who score students' writing/presentation in multiple classes

B. Agreement of scores on these assessments within a course may be conducted to determine point-in-time determination of reliability

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
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 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
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 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
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
- x.1 Diversity

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or service activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

---

## 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 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

### Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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 completion 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