

# 2019 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 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>	102
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>	0

**Total number of program completers** 102

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

Description of data accessible via link:

This link takes the user to the university's accreditation page. CAEP accreditation is described on this page, and various links are provided to data related to topics such as employment rates, data on critical assessments, and satisfaction of completers and their employers.

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 checked="" 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/privacy-and-security/>

Description of data accessible via link:

This link takes the user to a Registrar's page where data about graduation and retention rates are available.

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"/>

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?

#1: Our EPP has learned a number of things from reviewing its annual reporting measures over the past three years. With regard to impact measures, our EPP has continued to place a strong emphasis on our need to put powerful tools in place for measuring our completers' impact on P-12 learning and development. Similarly, we have focused on the need for better ways to identify and assess indicators of our completers' effectiveness as educators. To accomplish these high-priority tasks, we focused on our collaborative work with all of the other EPPs across the state of Montana. The primary reason for placing our focus and attention in

this area is because the statewide adoption of shared impact measures is an approach that all ten EPPs in Montana have agreed is best for everyone. It is our understanding that these tools will be viewed by CAEP accreditation teams as proprietary tools. This state-level work has been reported on in previous University of Montana Western CAEP annual reports. Our statewide efforts have been coordinated by the Montana Council of Deans of Education (MCDE). The MCDE established a standing committee—the Continuous Improvement Collaborative (CIC)—which has been highly deliberative, rigorous, and intentional in its work. In 2017-18, the CIC completed its work on two surveys which meet CAEP Components 4.3 and 4.4 and are thus now going into effect as the statewide tools for impact measures #3 and #4. Also in 2017-18, the CIC continued its work on developing a tool for impact measures #1 and #2. As of this writing (Spring 2019), the work of the CIC on this project is nearing completion.

#2: As we look back over the last three years at trends and changes, the trends in the number of completers who graduate from our EPP are worthy of note. It is particularly interesting to examine the year for which this report is written: 2017-18. During this year, UMW had 102 completers emerge from its teacher preparation programs, an increase of 20% over the previous year. We experienced this substantial increase at a time when fewer and fewer undergraduates, nationwide, were expressing an interest in pursuing careers in education. This was also a time when public scrutiny of the teaching profession seemed especially harsh. Moreover, the entire institution (the University of Montana Western) had been experiencing a decrease in enrollment, as were all of the IHEs in the Montana University System (MUS). If one looks at percentage changes in completers over the past three years, the picture becomes more variable. Prior to the increase of 20% mentioned above, our EPP experienced a 12% decrease in completers, as compared to the previous year. This was preceded by an increase of 5% in the year before that, and a decrease of 18% in the year before that. Clearly, these data are highly variable. Our EPP needs to do more to examine the possible reasons for these changes. In particular, we plan to do whatever we can to assess the reason for our most recent and striking increase in number of completers, with the goal of replicating those results for the coming years.

#3: As a result of examining our data over the past three years, the programmatic change that is most significant is the addition of a post-baccalaureate certificate program. This new program was initiated in 2017-18, and the curriculum proposals necessary for its launch are nearly concluded at the time of this writing. It is our hope that this new certificate will not only increase enrollment and retention of postgraduate candidates, but will also increase the completer rates addressed in the previous paragraph. Furthermore, because this new program is an online program, it is well-designed to help Montana in addressing its ongoing teacher shortage, particularly in highly rural parts of the state. Our EPP, noted for its ability to prepare rural educators, is well-positioned to provide meaningful post-baccalaureate courses and field experiences for candidates who hope to teach in rural Montana.

#4: Benchmarks are available for comparing our data in terms of both our Annual Impact Measures and our Annual Outcome Measures. However, the benchmarks we tend to use are often internal, and consist of year-to-year comparisons, thus treating the previous year as a benchmark for the next, or comparing a “start year” with a “current year.” Some of our data reflect comparisons to statewide benchmarks and/or national benchmarks. It would serve our EPP well to establish a broader set of comparators and benchmarks, to strengthen our data analyses.

#5: Both our Annual Impact Measures and our Annual Outcome Measures are widely shared. They are shared within our programs, and in our EPP as a whole. In 2017-18, we began the process of establishing a University Teacher Education Committee (UTEC), which formalizes our EPP’s interface with faculty representatives from all other departments that help to prepare our candidates. As this committee becomes more firmly instantiated, it is (and will prove to be) an important vehicle for sharing the results of those measures. Furthermore, our measures are widely shared with our academic administrators, and with the university community as a whole. Last, the public has easy access to our Annual Impact Measures and our Annual Outcome Measures via the webpage that is used for this purpose.

## 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.**

For the year 2017-18, the most significant effort undertaken by our EPP was an innovative approach to working with the faculty, principals, and superintendents who comprise the membership of our Advisory Council. Rather than convene an annual meeting with the Council, the EPP decided to divide itself into teams of volunteer faculty members who scheduled visits and traveled to the various partner schools. A data collection tool for structured interviews was devised, based on CAEP Standard 2. Questions in the tool addressed all three components of Standard 2. Approval of this tool was gained at a meeting of the EPP, and the teams set out to collect qualitative data from our LEA representatives. All volunteer teams completed their visits and compiled their qualitative notes. Teams found it very difficult to conduct the structured interviews, as the faculty members and administrators often viewed the three-component-based questions as a constraint, restricting them from discussing topics which they most wanted to discuss. Thus, the process evolved into a more unstructured data collection effort that was still, to be clear, aimed at co-constructing better policies and procedures for our partnered work in the area of clinical preparation.

Analyses of these qualitative data, collected in 2017-18, were completed in the 2018-19 academic year. Here are some of the key findings from those analyses: (a) The qualitative data reveal that additional training is needed by our University Supervisors and our Supervising Teachers to enable them to be more effective in observing their teacher candidates. Recommendations were made to use asynchronous video opportunities, in addition to video conferencing capabilities. The university has recently obtained a site license for a specific video conferencing tool, which will be very helpful in enacting the latter recommendation. All of these steps will assist our EPP in better meeting the technology-based and technology-enhanced aspects of CAEP Components 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3. (b) The qualitative data contain repeated emphases on the need for better and clearer

communication between the EPP and its school partners. Development of clearer written materials to support field placements and student teaching experiences is planned. (c) The qualitative data reveal that school partners would like to strengthen their collaboration with our EPP in helping candidates understand how to demonstrate and hone “the professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students’ learning and development” (CAEP Standard 2). As of this writing, our EPP is considering the inclusion of an instrument to explicitly measure candidate dispositions. Our EPP does not currently use that type of critical assessment. Finally, it was decided that using visiting teams for meeting CAEP Standard 2 was not as effective as the EPP originally hoped, and a return to the use of Advisory Council meetings was planned. Once meetings of the Advisory Council are reinstated, the EPP may add in other forms of small-group visits and co-construction of mutually-beneficial arrangements, policies, and procedures.

#### **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 the 2018 CAEP Annual Report, the EPP wrote about its plan to better track its Field Experience placements of its candidates. This process is still ongoing and an improved tracking system for all field placements has been implemented. Another step taken to address this area for improvement is the EPP’s ongoing work to ensure that all K-12 and secondary education candidates are required to write their first teacher work sample (TWS) in their discipline-based methods courses. The teacher work sample methodology is one which directly asks the candidate to document his/her impact on P-12 student learning. A second teacher work sample is consistently required of all K-12 and secondary education teacher candidates. Data from both administrations of this critical assessment (i.e., teacher work samples) are aggregated in Chalk & Wire, and are analyzed and reported on there. The EPP disaggregates its data by program, and the impact of K-12 and secondary education candidates on P-12 learning is examined and analyzed. One outcome of the recent work our EPP has been doing in this area is to ensure that we conduct more consistent and frequent trainings of TWS evaluation teams, focusing on improving inter-rater reliability and improving the consistency with which we evaluate all teacher work samples. This in turn is leading to improved quality of data collected from administrations of the TWS.

#### **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 the EPP reported in the 2018 CAEP Annual Report, a statewide effort is underway to address CAEP Standard 4 through a set of Annual Reporting Measures which will include assessments that address all four Impact Measures. Considerable progress has been made in the development and implementation of the statewide Completers’ Survey and the statewide Employers’ Survey, which meet the requirements for Components 4.3 and 4.4. Data for the two surveys have been collected, and methods of distribution of those data to the participating EPPs are still being fine-tuned, as of this writing. Currently, the data are being housed in the Qualtrics system of Montana State University, but they are soon expected to be migrated to the Montana Office of Public Instruction. Work is ongoing in the development of a statewide tool currently being referred to as the “MEPP Case Study” (the Montana Educator Preparation Provider Case Study). This assessment is currently planned to include a purposeful sample of completers from each EPP, who will complete a teacher work sample or a form of case study research. The data collected from this assessment will meet the requirements for CAEP Component 4.1, and will be the impact measure used for that component. Additionally, faculty members from each EPP will conduct in-school observations of the same completers, and the data collected from these protocols will comprise the results needed to meet the requirements of CAEP Component 4.2. Thus, this will be the impact measure used for that component. Planning for all of this work began in AY 2017-18, and is continuing to the present moment. The work is being done by the Continuous Improvement Collaborative (CIC) of the Montana Council of Deans of Education (MCDE). At the time of this writing, plans for the “MEPP Case Study” are not yet finalized. We are confident that the tool will be in place in time for us to collect the three cycles of data necessary for us to satisfy requirements for our reaccreditation process with CAEP in Fall of 2022. Furthermore, we have been assured by the MCDE that this statewide tool is being developed in such a way that it will meet CAEP’s expectations for a proprietary statewide assessment instrument. This work will demonstrably address the issue described in our AFI, above, and will be highly effective in fully addressing CAEP Standard 4.

#### **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 the 2018 CAEP Annual Report, the EPP wrote about the fact that use of Chalk & Wire, our data aggregation and analysis system, was being examined and improved. The addition of our Prekindergarten – Grade 3 degree program was noted as a relatively new program. The addition of the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate Program is an even newer development which began in AY 2017-18. Thus, our use of Chalk & Wire across all programs is still being adjusted. During AY 2017-18, the EPP’s adoption of a Writing Assessment and two types of Teaching Performance Assessments were solidified into our programs. These two new assessments were viewed as an important addition to the overall teacher education program. Our CAEP assistant accreditation officer has continued to receive training in the most effective use of Chalk & Wire. All of these developments serve to better position our EPP to address this particular AFI (Area for Improvement). Better and more targeted data collection methods will assist in ensuring greater validity and reliability of our decision-making process across 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?

#1: The EPP regularly assessed data related to its goals and CAEP Standard 5. Particular focus was placed on the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), and on the writing and teaching performance assessments mentioned in an earlier section. Efforts to ensure greater inter-rater reliability and consistency in administration of the TWS were previously discussed.

#2: A stronger review of the data mentioned above needs to be conducted. In addition, data from other key critical assessments needs to be more fully reviewed and assimilated into a data-driven decision-making process which would allow us to make informed decisions about programmatic changes and/or innovations. As mentioned in an earlier section, the EPP does not collect data relative to the direct assessment of candidates' dispositions, and the omission of this data source is one which needs to be addressed.

#3: Progress and results need to be better tracked in a comprehensive quality assurance system that includes data from multiple measures. The EPP has taken strides in moving toward such a system, with the implementation of strong critical assessments (such as the teacher work sample, the writing assessment, and the teaching performance assessment), which are administered more than once in a candidate's progress toward degree.

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
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 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.5.3 Continuous Improvement

A.5.4 Continuous Improvement

A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

x.1 Diversity

x.2 Technology

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 **Notes\_on\_Analyses\_of\_adv\_task\_force\_teams\_9\_Oct\_2018.pdf**

 **Title\_II\_2019\_report\_certified.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 2019 EPP Annual Report.

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

### Report Preparer's Information

Name: Laura P. Straus

Position: Associate Professor of Education & CAEP Coordinator

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 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**