2021 EPP Annual Report

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

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).

https://www.umwestern.edu/department/education/

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 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

`129`

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]

`0`

Total number of program completers 129

---

[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 2019-2020 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: https://w.umwestern.edu/section/accreditation/ https://w.umwestern.edu/section/privacy-and-security/

Description of data accessible via link: These links take the user to a Registrar's Page and to an Accreditation Page. The former is a resource for information about graduation and retention rates, as well as information about student loans, i.e., Annual Reporting Measures 5 and 8. The latter is a resource for information regarding CAEP accreditation, i.e., Annual Reporting Measures 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7.

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?*

Based on our review of the annual reporting measures over the last three years, our Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) has learned a number of things. Our total enrollments have increased over the last three years, which is an encouraging trend. The EPP continues to place a strong emphasis on its ability to put powerful tools in place for measuring the effectiveness of our program and for assessing our completers' abilities to impact the learning of their P-12 students. During the 2019-2020 year, the major focus was on developing a critical assessment plan which is (a) well-articulated and intentional; (b) uses a carefully-selected and well-developed set of assessments which are relatively few in number, but powerful in their application; (c) employs repeated "probes" over time, using the same assessment tool; (d) comprises a quality assurance plan which is valid and reliable.

In 2018-2019, the EPP tried the use of frequent "data dip" meetings which were of shorter duration and greater frequency. This method of continuous improvement and data analysis was not retained, in part because the previous year's data had suggested the need for selecting and refining the key critical assessments which we would be using for our three cycles of data that would be presented and discussed in our CAEP self-study. Thus, the EPP focused its meetings and discussions on the selection,

development, and refinement of those tools. The number of meetings devoted solely to data analysis was not as many as perhaps it should have been. It may be that the EPP should return to the "data dip" approach of using more frequent, short-duration data analysis opportunities.

As we did last year, the accreditation officer maintained a document which tracks the division's data analysis efforts, actions, decisions, and plans. That tracking document—entitled "CAEP Data Analyses & CAEP-related Discussions, Activities, and Decisions (AY 2019-2020) is attached to this CAEP 2021 Annual Report. This document is an important artifact which tracks the division's data analysis meetings, the conclusions drawn from those meetings, and the subsequent actions taken during the year. A companion document, distilled from the minutes of all of the EPP's meetings, is also attached, and is entitled "Action Plans Summary: Fall 2019/Spring 2020." It serves to augment the narrative that is developed in the CAEP tracking document.

Another point which merits note in this report is the fact that our EPP has continued to work very closely with the Montana Council of Deans of Education (MCDE) and with the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI). These partnerships are invaluable to our division, and it is noteworthy that the state of Montana is able to bring all EPPs comfortably together into a collaborative, regularly-occurring meeting. The teamwork, support, and congruence of all EPPs in the state has been invaluable, as has the support of OPI. As of this writing (April, 2021), the MCDE completed an extensive discussion of Montana's definition of advanced programs. It should be noted that the University of Montana Western's Teacher Education Program does not, under Montana's definition, provide any advanced programs. Thus, we now know that our EPP must meet only the CAEP standards for initial licensure programs.

The COVID-19 pandemic, which struck the United States early in 2020, must also be discussed here. For our EPP, this meant a closure of the university on March 23, and a switch to remote-only learning for all courses for the remainder of the academic year. As with all institutions of higher education (IHEs), the impact was tremendous, and we have yet to reckon with all of the effects of the pandemic. Because our IHE is a unique university which operates on a block schedule for all of its face-to-face courses, placing our classes into a fully online delivery mode meant addressing some additional challenges. Eighteen-day-long block courses which meet daily for three hours a day were converted into both remote synchronous and remote asynchronous courses, with only one week of preparation and conversion time in which to make that change. This was a very difficult task to accomplish, and it was stressful for students and instructors alike. Meanwhile, student teachers who were in the middle of their student-teaching experiences were sometimes thrust into a virtual instruction modality, or were simply told that their placements were abruptly ceased. In either case, our EPP found itself responding, sometimes on an hourly basis, to new developments and challenges for which we were largely unprepared.

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.

In Fall of 2019, the EPP developed and finalized a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with its principal school partner, School District 10 in Dillon, Montana. This document lists a number of points of agreement and understanding between the district and the EPP regarding our expectations for our candidates' clinical experiences, and also regarding the district's needs and expectations of us. District 10 is our local elementary school district, and is a highly-valued school partner. This MOU can serve as a model of for other MOUs with school partners. Furthermore, it is representative of the work we do to collaborate, clarify, and improve our P-12 partnerships in mutually beneficial ways.

Additionally, our EPP held its annual meeting with its Advisory Council. Notes/data from that meeting are attached to this report. This meeting focused on addressing our Student Teaching Handbook, and we invited our school partners to not only critique the handbook as it was currently written, but to co-construct new language and parameters for the text, to set into place improved policies and procedures. Clearly, this work directly addresses the AFI listed above, and seeks to instantiate better co-constructed policies and procedures related to clinical preparation.

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.

In our previous CAEP Annual Report (for 2020), we wrote about the formation of a new committee: the University Teacher Education Committee, or UTEC, on our campus. The request to form this committee came from the EPP, and its purpose is to provide a means for strengthening the relationship between the UMW Teacher Education Program and its partners across the campus in each of the departments which help to prepare our students. The committee is structured to meet once per semester, unless greater frequency is needed.

In the Fall of 2019, the UTEC met to discuss problems with course schedules across departments. It was noted that many of our K-12 and secondary education majors were experiencing problems which are unique to an IHE (like ours) which functions on a block scheduling format. Given various departments' rotations of upper-level courses, our K-12 and secondary education majors

stated that they often found themselves taking the online, asynchronous offerings of their Professional Education Core classes, in order to accommodate the need to take certain rarely-offered courses in their disciplines which are offered in blocks which compete with our face-to-face offerings of the education core courses. A rich discussion of these problems ensued, and it was resolved to meet again in the spring, in advance of the deadline for building departmental schedules for the following fall/spring. This meeting was held, and efforts were made to better coordinate our schedules with the departments, and vice versa.

Additionally, a major decision was made by our division to ensure that all K-12 and secondary education majors are required to take a methods course which is currently required only of our elementary and P-3 education majors: EDU 352 Field Experience. This course is similar to a "mini-student teaching experience," and the planned inclusion of this course in the secondary and K-12 education programs directly addresses the AFI stated above.

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.

As was noted in the previous CAEP Annual Report, an effort was made through the Montana Council of Deans of Education (MCDE) to meet CAEP Standard 4 by using a set of statewide reporting measures incorporated into a 3-year cycle of data collection. The assessments used in this effort are: (a) a survey of completer satisfaction; (b) a survey of employer satisfaction; (c) a case study protocol which addresses completers' impact on their P-12 students' learning outcomes. Known as the Montana Educator Preparation Provider Continuous Improvement Collaboration, or MEPP CIC, the assessment plan addresses all four Impact Measures which are part of the eight Annual Reporting Measures required by CAEP. Details of the work done by our EPP in relation to the MEPP CIC are included in the attached Data Analyses tracking report. Within the case study protocol outlined by the MEPP CIC, our EPP worked during 2019-20 to determine the particular nature and design of its specific case study approach.

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.

In last year's annual report, it was noted that the EPP needed to address the following questions: What are the goals of the EPP? What are the inquiry questions driving the EPP? What now informs the EPP's work on continuous improvement, and how is that reflected in its quality assurance program? The document attached to this report, entitled "CAEP Data Analyses & CAEP-Related Discussions, Activities, and Decisions," provides numerous details and descriptions which answer these questions and which document the EPP's progress in developing a data-driven process for continuous improvement across all programs. Here are some key accomplishments which occurred during this year, and which address the EPP's new approach to self-study and continuous improvement: (a) development of a new "Our Promise" statement, which fuels our conceptual framework and which is a combination of both vision and promise for the EPP; (b) adoption of a new Dispositions Tool, which addresses the fact that the EPP had not been intentionally assessing candidates' dispositions, prior to this adoption; (c) adoption of a new lesson plan template and rubric, which will be used as a critical assessment in the EPP's new, streamlined assessment plan; (d) plans to adopt a new writing assessment, which will more accurately reflect the EPP's expectations for writing proficiency. Additional details related to the EPP's efforts related to continuous improvement and self-study can be found in the documents attached to this report.

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 2019-2020, the EPP met regularly to advance its targeted continuous improvement efforts. The "Action Plans--Summary--2019-2020" file (attached below) provides detailed information to support this claim, as does the file entitled "CAEP Data Analyses & CAEP-Related Discussions, Activities, and Decisions." The third attached file, a report on the EPP's Advisory Council meeting during the 2019-2020 academic year, documents the division's work in addressing CAEP Standard 2, and the two Areas for Improvement (AFIs) received during the EPP's previous accreditation visit, related to CAEP Standard 2.1 and CAEP Standard 2.3 (see relevant sections in this report, above).

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
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
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
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

Action_Plans__Summary__20192020.pdf

Data_analyses_and_related_discussions_AY_2019__2020.pdf

Advisory_Council_Meeting_Notes_7_May_2020.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

No additional 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 2021 EPP Annual Report.*

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Laura Straus
Position:	Professor of Education and Accreditation Officer
Phone:	406-683-7040
E-mail:	laura.straus@umwestern.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 reviews.
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 review 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**