

Site Review Information

**Self Study Report (SSR) : Section I. EPP Overview and Standard R6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity:
 Site Review Information**

Site Review Information

Begin Date	End Date	Type	Initial Type	Adv	Semester	Year	Team Type	Team Size	(Team Size (Stat
4/8/25	4/10/25	Continuing Review	Continuing Review		Spring	2025	Joint	4	1
		Continuing Review	Continuing Review		Spring	2031	Joint		

Assigned Evaluation Team

Assigned

First Name	Last Name	Email	User Role	Assignment Role
Beth	Kubitskey	kubitske@umich.edu	EvaluationTeamMem	EvaluationTeamMem
Crystal	Andrews	Crystal.andrews@mt.State	ConsultantRepr	StateConsultantRepr
David	Crowe	kimbrow@auburn.ed	EvaluationTeamLead	EvaluationTeamLead
Elizabeth	Allison	elizabeth.allison@wg	EvaluationTeamObse	EvaluationTeamObse
Holly	Ripley	hripley@nnu.edu	EvaluationTeamMem	EvaluationTeamMem
Malina	Monaco	Malina.Monaco@cae	CAEPAccreditation	CAEPAccreditation
Melissa	Awenowicz	Awenowicz@Rowan.	EvaluationTeamMem	EvaluationTeamMem

Items per page:

10 ▼

1 7 of 7



EPP Overview

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section I. EPP Overview and Standard R6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity: EPP Overview

a. Context and Unique Characteristics

Nestled below the Rimrocks overlooking Montana's largest city, Montana State University Billings (MSUB) is a regional public institution within the Montana University System. MSUB was first conceptualized as a Normal School when it was established in 1927. In 1949, the Normal School was renamed as the Eastern Montana College of Education and continued to provide quality teacher education. With the addition of other colleges, due to expanding enrollment, the institution became Eastern Montana College (EMC) in 1965. Finally, in 1994, EMC became Montana State University Billings when the university became affiliated with Montana State University Bozeman. MSUB's current mission is "to deliver a transformative education that empowers students from diverse backgrounds to succeed." MSUB continues to serve the Billings community and surrounding region by providing an opportunity for students to pursue a career in education.

Accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), MSUB has five academic colleges: the College of Education, the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, the College of Business, the College of Health Professions and Science, and City College, an embedded two-year college. With a student enrollment of 4,092, MSUB attracts students from across Montana, 43 states, and 26 countries. MSUB has many clubs and service opportunities that encourage students to get involved beyond the classroom. With 49.2% of students full-time and 50.8% of students part-time, MSUB supports students to pursue a flexible education that fits their lifestyle by offering a variety of in-person, hybrid, HyFlex, and online course and program offerings.

MSUB believes it is necessary to honor the unique cultural heritage with a land acknowledgement: "We acknowledge and honor, with respect, the Indigenous Nations on whose traditional homelands Montana State University Billings now stands and whose historical and cultural relationships with the land continue to this day. Many Indigenous peoples thrive in this place alive and strong."

MSUB also maintains a diversity statement that aims "to promote a diverse and inclusive campus where all students, faculty, staff, and alumni feel supported, connected, and valued in a

welcoming campus community. The university is proud to serve these numerous dimensions amongst people, which include but are not limited to ability, age, appearance, athletic and student organization involvement, ethnicity, family/marital status, gender, gender expression, immigration status, language, military/veteran status, nationality, political ideology, race, religion, spirituality, sex, sexuality, socioeconomic status, as well as other personal identities and experiences."

The land acknowledgement and the diversity statement lay a foundation on which MSUB faculty and staff help students from all backgrounds succeed. Through student support resources and a variety of academic offerings, the MSUB faculty and staff offer holistic, wraparound services to help students make successful progress toward degree completion. The College of Education (COE), including the Department of Educational Theory and Practice (ETP), uphold these principles by offering curriculum that prepares educators to be compassionate, inclusive, empathic, as well as knowledgeable about content, pedagogy, and the diverse students they serve.

The ETP presents a comprehensive programmatic overview underscoring its commitment to developing competent, caring professionals poised to make significant contributions to Montana's educational landscape. Its mission and vision are rooted in the preparation of educators who are compassionate, inclusive, empathetic, and deeply knowledgeable, equipped to meet the diverse needs of their students through effective differentiation and robust support mechanisms. The ETP emphasizes nurturing P-12 educators capable of forming genuine relationships with students and mastering content, pedagogy, and an understanding of diverse student backgrounds. This commitment extends across various specializations. Fundamental to its ethos are the principles and core values advocating for holistic development, critical thinking, social consciousness, ethical integrity, and a dedication to lifelong learning. The ETP is dedicated to advancing professional development and societal betterment by fostering an academic culture that prioritizes excellence, inclusivity, and innovative solutions, ensuring its graduates are well-prepared to navigate and influence the evolving educational challenges of the future.

Montana State University Billings was originally a Normal School and it now offers the third largest teacher preparation program in the state of Montana. The Education and School Counseling programs are located within the Department of Educational Theory and Practice (ETP) in the College of Education. Secondary education majors complete their selected major courses in the respective departments in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences or the College of Health Professions and Science. They complete their education courses in the ETP. Teacher preparation programs are offered at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The School Counseling program is offered at the graduate level.

b. Description of Organizational Structure

See attached document located in Standard 1: #0.1 COE Org. Chart.

c. Vision, Mission, and Goals

College Mission: The College of Education is dedicated to empowering educators to inspire learning, foster innovation, and lead transformative change in education across Montana and beyond.

College Vision: The College of Education prepares educators to be compassionate, inclusive, empathic, as well as knowledgeable about content, pedagogy, and the diverse students they serve. These educators are prepared to differentiate effectively to support the success of all students. This is accomplished by being knowledgeable and responsive to our community, offering programs through different delivery models, and creating meaningful field experiences.

College Goals:

- " Preparing competent, caring, and committed professionals for Montana's schools;
- " Conducting socially significant research to improve the human condition;
- " Providing community service aimed at improving the quality of life experienced by Montanans; and
- " Providing a graduate education designed for the continuing development of professionals.

Department of Educational Theory and Practice's Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation:

Operating Principles: To successfully implement the university's mission, the faculty and staff adhere to the following operating principles:

- " All people are entitled to educational programs committed to assisting everyone develop self-knowledge and to promote physical, social, mental, intellectual and spiritual health in a manner enhancing dignity and respect.
- " Educational programs enable students to think critically and analytically, make independent decisions, develop social consciousness, and recognize the importance of making productive contributions to a multicultural society.
- " Education programs are committed to the concept of equal opportunity.
- " Educators are committed to the ethical principles of the profession.
- " Teachers are facilitators of learning, able to assist and direct the natural learning processes of their students.
- " Professionals in education have the skills and understanding necessary to assist people from different cultures and those with disabling conditions.
- " Professional preparation programs are interdisciplinary in nature.
- " Professionals in education have a comprehensive foundation in the liberal arts.
- " Professional preparation programs have sequential and increasingly intense supervised field experience to allow for the guided demonstration of clinical skills.
- " Research conducted by the academic community searches for solutions to specific human problems.
- " Faculty are actively engaged in community education programs to assist with the implementation of current, empirically validated practices.
- " In support of lifelong learning by professionals in education, the faculty are committed to providing regular in-service education.

Advanced Program Overview:

School Counseling is the only advanced program within the COE. This program is designed to equip candidates with the essential competencies for successful school counseling. It emphasizes integrating theoretical knowledge and ethical considerations into evidence-based action plans that promote student success, ensuring candidates can practically apply what they have learned. A significant focus is placed on developing the skills necessary for establishing collaborative relationships with diverse populations, a cornerstone for creating inclusive educational environments. The program also fosters the cultivation of professional behaviors and a robust professional identity relevant to school counseling, ensuring graduates are well-prepared to support student achievement in academic settings. Additionally, it hones candidates' abilities to analyze assessment data, enabling them to address students' unique needs effectively. Overall, the School Counseling advanced program aims to produce well-rounded professionals equipped with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to make meaningful contributions to student success.

Principles:

To successfully implement the MSUB's mission, faculty and staff within School Counseling adhere to the following operating principles:

- " All people are entitled to educational programs committed to assisting each individual develop self-knowledge and to promote physical, social, mental, intellectual, and spiritual health in a manner enhancing dignity and respect.
- " Educational programs enable students to think critically and analytically, make independent decisions, develop social consciousness, and recognize the importance of making productive contributions to a multicultural society.
- " Education programs are committed to the concept of equal opportunity.
- " Educators are committed to the ethical principles of the profession.
- " Teachers are facilitators of learning, able to assist and direct the natural learning processes of their students.
- " Professionals in education have the skills and understanding necessary to assist people from diverse cultures and those with disabling conditions.
- " Professional preparation programs are interdisciplinary in nature.
- " Professionals in education have a comprehensive foundation in the liberal arts.
- " Professional preparation programs have sequential and increasingly intense supervised field experience to allow for the guided demonstration of clinical skills.
- " Research conducted by the academic community searches for solutions to specific human problems.
- " Faculty are actively engaged in community education programs to assist with the implementation of current, empirically validated practices.
- " In support of lifelong learning by professionals in education, the faculty are committed to providing regular in-service education.

School Counseling Advanced Program Outcomes:

The Graduate Catalog currently lists the following as Learning Outcomes for the School Counseling Program:

Upon successful completion of this program, students will be able to:

- " Demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of a school counselor
- " Follow the ethical codes applicable to the profession
- " Implement school counseling practices that are evidence and researched based
- " Understand the need to be a life-long learner in the school counseling profession

However, these program outcomes have recently been revised and approved by the ETP faculty during the Spring 2024 semester. They are as follows:

1. Candidates will be able to apply school counseling ethics and theory into evidence-based action plans for promoting student success. (Knowledge)
2. Candidates will be able to establish collaborative relationships with diverse populations. (Skills)
3. Candidates will practice professional school counselor behaviors in academic settings that promote student success. (Dispositions)
4. Candidates will have a professional identity relevant to school counseling. (Knowledge)
5. Candidates will be able to analyze assessment data to address unique student needs within a school setting. (Skills)

School Counseling Mission Statement:

The School Counseling Program's mission is to provide future school counselors with a solid foundation in ethics and theory, enabling them to transform their knowledge into evidence-based action plans that foster student success. Through comprehensive training, the program is dedicated to honing candidates' abilities to build collaborative relationships with diverse populations, analyze assessment data to address the unique needs of students, and exhibit professional behaviors in academic contexts. Emphasizing the cultivation of a professional identity in school counseling, the School Counseling Program ensures its graduates are well-equipped to navigate their future educational environments with integrity and expertise.

School Counseling Vision Statement:

The School Counseling Program's vision is to be recognized as a leading program in school counseling education, where candidates not only learn but excel in applying ethical standards and theoretical knowledge to create impactful strategies for student achievement. The program aspires to foster a community of school counselors who collaborate with diverse communities, are skilled in data analysis for personalized student support, and are committed to professional excellence. By focusing on these core competencies, faculty aim to contribute to the evolution of educational systems where qualified, compassionate, and innovative school counselors nurture every student's success.

Special circumstances of the formative feedback review, if any

Insert text here ...

EPP Details

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section I. EPP Overview and Standard R6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity: EPP Details

Please review the information below and make changes as necessary.

Organization Name

Montana State University-Billi

EPP Name

College of Education

Carnegie Classification

Master's Colleges & Univer

Control of Organization

Public

Population Served

Not Applicable

Degree of Urbanization

Urban

Language of Instruction

English

Religious Affiliations

Undenominational

Organizational Accreditation

Northwest Commission or

Degree Granting

Yes

No

Address

1500 University Drive

Address 2

City

Billings

State

Montana ▼

Zip

59101-0298

Country

United States ▼

Phone

406-657-2011

Website

www.msubillings.edu

EPP Accreditation Status

**Self Study Report (SSR) : Section I. EPP Overview and Standard R6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity :
EPP Accreditation Status**

Is the EPP nationally or regionally accredited (e.g., SACSCOC, HLC, MSCHE) at the institutional level?

Yes No

Please upload a PDF copy of the award of accreditation here.

[Choose Files](#) No File Selected

Name	size	Action	Uploaded Date
Commission_Letter-Montana State University - Billings-1_18_2022.pdf	0.2 MB	View Download	06/28/2024

EPP Locations

**Self Study Report (SSR) : Section I. EPP Overview and Standard R6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity :
EPP Locations**

EPP Locations

Location Type	Campus Name
Main Campus	

Items per page: 1 of 1 [<](#) [>](#)

EPP Programs

**Self Study Report (SSR) : Section I. EPP Overview and Standard R6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity :
EPP Programs**

Program(s)

Please ensure that the below program information is accurate. All questions within each program should be answered accurately.

Please take special care to select the correct answer for the "Selected Program Review Option for CAEP Review" as that will impact other questions you will need to answer for each program. For any programs that have the "Other accrediting agency" answer for this question, please note whether or not they will be exempted from the CAEP review. If exempted, please leave the Assign checkmark blank.

Program Name	Program/SpecialtDegree Level	Licensure Level	Status	Program Review	
Master of Education Reading	Reading and Literacy	Endorsement Only	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Bachelor of Science in Education Degree Broadfield Major in Elementary Education	Elementary Education	Baccalaureate	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Teaching Endorsement in Special Education (P-12)	Special Education and Exceptional Needs	Endorsement Only	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Master of Education School Counseling	School Counseling	Master's	Advanced Level	Active	c. State Review
Endorsement in Early Childhood, P-3	Early Childhood Education	Endorsement Only	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Post Bacc Teacher Certification	Alternative Certification	Post-Baccalaureate	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Master of Science in Special Education Generalist option	Special Education and Exceptional Needs	Master's	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Bachelor of Arts Degree Major in Music Teaching Licensure Option	Music Education	Baccalaureate	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Bachelor of Science Degree Major in Health and Human Performance - Teacher Licensure Coaching Option	Health and Wellness, Physical Education and Coaching	Baccalaureate	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Master of Education					

Curriculum and Instruction Teacher Licensure	Curriculum and Instruction	Master's	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Bachelor of Science in Education Degree Major in Special Education P-12	Special Education and Exceptional Needs	Baccalaureate	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Bachelor of Arts Degree Major in Art Teaching Licensure Option	Art Education	Baccalaureate	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Bachelor of Science Degree Major in Mathematics Teaching Licensure Option	Mathematics	Baccalaureate	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Special Education Supervisor Endorsement	Special Education and Exceptional Needs	Endorsement Only	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Bachelor of Arts Degree Major in English Teaching Licensure Option	English/Language Arts Education	Baccalaureate	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Bachelor of Arts Degree Major in History Teaching Licensure Option	History, Social Studies, and Social Sciences	Baccalaureate	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review
Bachelor of Science Degree Major in Broadfield Science Teaching Licensure Option	Science Education	Baccalaureate	Initial-Licensure Level	Active	c. State Review

Items per page: 1 17 of 17 < >

EPP-based Clinical Educators

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section I. EPP Overview and Standard R6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity : EPP-based Clinical Educators

Faculty

First Name	Last Name	Highest Degree
Melanie	Reaves	Doctorate or Professional
Chad	Jackson	Master's
Karen	Washburn	Doctorate or Professional
Robin	Cormier	Doctorate or Professional
Elaine	Westbrook	Doctorate or Professional
Shena	Wald	Doctorate or Professional
Traci	Sgrignoli	Master's
Roxanne	Jeppesen	Master's
Kari	Dahle-Huff	Doctorate or Professional
Melissa	Sullivan-Walker	Doctorate or Professional
Austin	Waldbilig	Master's
Dolly	Jahn	Bachelor s
Maggie	Brink	
Sandi	Shawhan	Master's
Betty	Rainey	
Rachael	Waller	Doctorate or Professional
Susan	Gregory	Doctorate or Professional
Shu-Chen	Tsai	Doctorate or Professional
Dan	Charlton	Master's

GayLynn	Robertus	Bachelor s
Items per page: <input type="text" value="10"/> 1 20 of 20 < >		

If you choose not to use the above faculty list, please upload a list with the relevant categories included.

No File Selected

Capacity Table

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section I. EPP Overview and Standard R6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity: Capacity Table

Capacity Table

Please upload a capacity table in the style of the example below. Any supplemental evidence/documentation should be uploaded here as well.

Capacity Dimension	EPP description of metric(s)	EPP data	Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each dimension
Facilities			
Fiscal Support			
Administrative support			

No Files Selected

Name	Size	Action	Uploaded Date
MSUB COE-CAEP Capacity Table.docx	0.03 MB	View Download	06/28/2024

Evidence Room

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence: Evidence Room

Site Review Evidence

Evidence Title	Caep Component	Evidence Type	File
Pilot Assessment of Content Knowledge	Component R1.2 - Content	Site Review Evidence	Pilot Elementary Assessment c
Technology Use Grid	Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice	Site Review Evidence	MSUB COE EPP Teacher Canc
Content Knowledge MACK EC and Elementary	Component R1.2 - Content	Site Review Evidence	2023 Assessment of Content Kr
Spring 25 Data Dip	Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement	Site Review Evidence	4.8.25.docx
Advisory Meeting March 18 2025	Component RA5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	Site Review Evidence	COE Advisory Council Meeting
Pilot Secondary Knowledge	Component R1.2 - Content	Site Review Evidence	PILOT Secondary K-12 Content
Content Knowledge Rubric SPED, K12, Secondary	Component R1.2 - Content	Site Review Evidence	2023 Assessment of Content Kr
Spring 25 Data Dip	Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement	Site Review Evidence	4.8.25.docx

Items per page: 10 1 8 of 8 < >

SSR Addendum Evidence

Addendum Evidence Limit: Maximum 50 files

SSR Addendum Evidence

Evidence Title	Caep Component	Evidence Type	File
1.1.1 InTASC Alignment Chart		Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning,Component R1.2 - Content,Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice,Component R1.4 -	

Professional Responsibility	SSR Addendum Evidence	1.1.1 INTASC Alignment Chart Evidence
4.1.7 IRB Approval Email	Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness	SSR Addendum Evidence 4.1.7 IRB Approval Email.pdf
4.3.3 MEPP CIC Crosswalk	Component R4.3 - Satisfaction of Completers, Component R5.2 - Data Quality	SSR Addendum Evidence 4.3.3. MEPP CIC Crosswalk.doc
5.1.5 Advisory Board Invitation	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System, Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	SSR Addendum Evidence 5.1.5 Advisory Board Invitation.c
5.2.4 Inter-rater Reliability in Faculty TWS Training	Component R5.2 - Data Quality	SSR Addendum Evidence 5.2.4 Inter-rater Reliability Facul
5.3.1 Committee List	Component RA5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	SSR Addendum Evidence Committee Assignments.docx
1.1.15 Key Assessment_Teacher Work Sample Data	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning, Component R1.2 - Content, Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice, Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility, Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences, Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression, Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion, Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Addendum Evidence 1.1.15 Key Assessment_Teach
1.2.4 MACK Scores	Component R1.2 - Content, Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Addendum Evidence All Inital Program MACK Scores
1.1.12A SCOU Candidate Cohort Evaluation Growth Document	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA3.2 - Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully	SSR Addendum Evidence 1.1.12A SCOU Candidate Coho
1.1.15A Elementary and Secondary Evaluation Data	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA3.2 - Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to	

Complete Preparation Successfully		SSR Addendum Evidence	1.1.15A SCOU Candidate Elementary an
5.1.6 Additional Meeting Minutes	Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Addendum Evidence	5.1.6 Additional Meeting Minute
3.1.2A SCOU Montana Counseling Shortage Documentation		SSR Addendum Evidence	3.1.2A SCOU Montana Counsel
3.3.1A Candidate Plan of Improvement	Component RA3.3 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Addendum Evidence	3.3.1A SCOU Evaluation Plan o
3.1.5 Program Diversity Upon Entrance	Component R3.1 - Recruitment,Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Addendum Evidence	3.1.5 Program Diversity Upon Er
5.4.3 Curriculum Change Rationale	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System,Component R5.2 - Data Quality,Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement,Component R5.4 - Continuous Improvement	SSR Addendum Evidence	Rationale for EDU 381, 343 & 3
2.1.2A SCOU Candidate Clinical Hour Log Documentation	Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences	SSR Addendum Evidence	2.1.2A SCOU Candidate Clinica
4.1.6 IRB Application Case Study	Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness	SSR Addendum Evidence	4.1.6 IRB Application Case Stud
4.2.6 Updated Employer Survey Growth Chart	Component R4.2 - Satisfaction of Employers	SSR Addendum Evidence	4.2.6 Updated Employer Survey
5.1.4 Lawshe Panel List	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System,Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement,Component R5.4 - Continuous Improvement	SSR Addendum Evidence	5.1.5 Lawshe Panel Members .c
5.2.8 MSUB Dispositions with Standards Alignment	Component R5.2 - Data Quality	SSR Addendum Evidence	MSUB Dispositions Continuum v
5.1.3 Stakeholder Contribution Chart	Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Addendum Evidence	
4.1.6 IRB Application Case Study		SSR Addendum Evidence	4.1.6 IRB Application Case Stud
4.2.5 2023-2024 Employer Survey Results	Component R4.2 - Satisfaction of Employers	SSR Addendum Evidence	4.2.5 2024 2023-2024 Employe
4.3.5 Completer Growth Chart	Component R4.3 - Satisfaction of Completers	SSR Addendum Evidence	4.3.5 Completer Growth Chart.d
4.1.5 MCDE CIC Regeneration Plan		Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness,Component R4.2 - Satisfaction of Employers,Component R4.3 - Satisfaction of	

Completers	SSR Addendum Evidence	4.1.5 MCDE CIC Regeneration Plan .doc
4.2.4 2021-2022 Employer Survey Results	Component R4.2 - Satisfaction of Employers	SSR Addendum Evidence 4.2.4 2021-2022 Employer Survey Results
4.3.4 Fall 2018 Completer Data	Component R4.3 - Satisfaction of Completers	SSR Addendum Evidence 4.3.4 Fall 2018 Completer Data
5.1.8 Petitions Committee	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System,Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	SSR Addendum Evidence 5.1.8 Petitions Committee.pdf
5.1.3 Stakeholder Contribution Chart	Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Addendum Evidence
5.4.2 Final PBE Report	Component R5.4 - Continuous Improvement	SSR Addendum Evidence 5.4.2 Final Report PBE (1).pdf
5.1.7 Superintendents' Meeting Minutes	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System,Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	SSR Addendum Evidence 5.1.7 Superintendents' Meeting Minutes
5.1.11 Curriculum Changes	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Addendum Evidence 5.1.11 Curriculum Changes.pdf
5.3.1 Committee List	Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	SSR Addendum Evidence 5.3.1 Committee List (1).xlsx
1.1.16 Key Assessment_Dispositions Data	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning,Component R1.2 - Content,Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice,Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility,Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences,Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression,Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion,Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Addendum Evidence 1.1.16 Key Assessment_Dispositions Data
1.1.1A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Chart	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities,Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation,Component RA3.2 - Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully	SSR Addendum Evidence 1.1.1 A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Chart

<p>1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle</p>	<p>Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA3.2 - Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully</p>	<p>SSR Addendum Evidence 1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean</p>
<p>1.1.16A SCOU Site Placement Diversity Documentation</p>	<p>Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences</p>	<p>SSR Addendum Evidence 1.1.16A SCOU Site Placement I</p>
<p>2.1.3A SCOU Candidate Elementary and Secondary Clinical and Secondary Hour Log Raw Data</p>	<p>Component R2.2 - Clinical Educators, Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences</p>	<p>SSR Addendum Evidence 2.1.3A SCOU Candidate Clinical</p>
<p>4.1.1A SCOU Employer/Completer Survey Form</p>	<p>Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences, Component RA4.1 - Satisfaction of Employers, Component RA4.2 - Satisfaction of Completers, Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System, Component RA5.2 - Data Quality, Component RA5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement, Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement</p>	<p>SSR Addendum Evidence 4.1.1A SCOU EmployerComple</p>
<p>1.1.14 Key Assessment_Observation Data</p>	<p>Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning, Component R1.2 - Content, Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice, Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences, Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression, Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion, Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System</p>	<p>SSR Addendum Evidence 1.1.14 Key Assessment_Observ</p>
<p>1.1.17 Praxis Scores</p>	<p>Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning, Component R1.2 - Content, Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System</p>	<p>SSR Addendum Evidence All Praxis Disaggregated Scores</p>

1.1.10A SCOU Disaggregated Praxis Data	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA3.2 - Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully	SSR Addendum Evidence	1.1.10A SCOU Disaggregated F
5.1.9 Heatmap	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System, Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Addendum Evidence	Heatmap.xlsx
3.2.12 Additional GPA Data	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Addendum Evidence	3.2.12 Additional GPA Data.pdf
1.1.14 A SCOU Candidate Initial Evaluation Data	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA3.2 - Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully	SSR Addendum Evidence	1.1.14A SCOU Candidate Initial
5.1.3 Stakeholder Contribution Chart	Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Addendum Evidence	5.1.3 Stakeholder Contribution C
3.1.1A SCOU Candidate GPA at Program Application Documentation	Component RA3.1 - Recruitment	SSR Addendum Evidence	3.1.1A SCOU Candidate GPA a
5.4.1A SCOU Data Analysis Program Summary	Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System, Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement	SSR Addendum Evidence	5.4.1A SCOU Growth Plan for 2
3.1.4 5-Year Recruitment Plan	Component R3.1 - Recruitment	SSR Addendum Evidence	3.1.4 EPP 5-Year Recrutiment F
5.3.2 Stakeholder Contribution Chart	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System, Component R5.2 - Data Quality, Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement, Component R5.4 - Continuous Improvement	SSR Addendum Evidence	5.3.2 Stakeholder Contribution C
MSUB Dispositions Continuum with Standards Alignment	Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility	SSR Addendum Evidence	1.4.2 MSUB Dispositions Contin

1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric	<p>Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation, Component RA3.2 - Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully</p>	SSR Addendum Evidence	1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric
1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA Checkpoint Progress Documentation	<p>Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation, Component RA3.2 - Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully</p>	SSR Addendum Evidence	1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA
2.1.1A SCOU Advisory Panel Documentation	<p>Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation, Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System, Component RA5.2 - Data Quality, Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement</p>	SSR Addendum Evidence	2.1.1A SCOU Advisory Panel D
2.1.4A SCOU Spring 2024 Employer Survey Results	<p>Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation, Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences, Component RA4.1 - Satisfaction of Employers, Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System, Component RA5.2 - Data Quality, Component RA5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement, Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement</p>	SSR Addendum Evidence	2.1.4A SCOU Spring 2024 Emp

4.1.2A SCOU Spring 2023 Employer/Completer Pilot Survey Results	Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences, Component RA4.1 - Satisfaction of Employers, Component RA4.2 - Satisfaction of Completers, Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System, Component RA5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement, Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement	SSR Addendum Evidence	4.1.2A SCOU Fall 2023 Employ
2.2.4 University Supervisor Training	Component R2.2 - Clinical Educators	SSR Addendum Evidence	Univeristy Supervisor Training.p
5.1.6 Additional Meeting Minutes	Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	SSR Addendum Evidence	5.1.6 Additional Meeting Minute

Items per page: 1 58 of 58 < >

SSR Evidence

A maximum of 90 evidence documents may be uploaded for a Site Review based on just one level of accreditation. For a Site Review of both levels of accreditation, a maximum of 135 evidence documents may be uploaded.

Evidence Title	Caep Component	Evidence Type	File
1.1.3 Application Sample	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning	SSR Evidence	1.1.3 EPP Application Sample.p
1.1.9 Dispositions Tool	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning, Component R1.2 - Content, Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice, Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility	SSR Evidence	1.1.9 Dispositions Tool.pdf
1.1.12 MACK Worksheet	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning	SSR Evidence	1.1.12 MACK Worksheet.pdf
1.2.3 Syllabus, EDU 433	Component R1.2 - Content	SSR Evidence	1.2.3 Syllabus, EDU 433.pdf

2.1.1 DOJ Manual	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning	SSR Evidence	2.1.1 DOJ Manual (1).pdf
2.1.5 COE Appeals and Petitions Committee Roster	Component R2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	SSR Evidence	2.1.5 COE Appeals and Petition
2.2.3 Student Teaching Guidebook	Component R2.2 - Clinical Educators,Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences,Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	2.2.3 Student Teaching Guidebo
2.3.4 Diversity Charts	Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences	SSR Evidence	2.3.4 Diversity Charts.docx
3.2.1 Tracking Student Progress	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	3.2.1 Tracking Student Progress
3.2.6 Observation Scores	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	3.2.6 Observation Scores .docx
3.2.11 Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	3.2.11 Academic Affairs Policies
3.3.3 Enrollment and Completer Data	Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion	SSR Evidence	3.3.3 Enrollment and Completer
4.1.3 MEPP Case Study Guide	Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness	SSR Evidence	4.1.3 MEPP Case Study Guide
4.2.3 Growth Areas As Indicated on Completer Survey	Component R4.2 - Satisfaction of Employers	SSR Evidence	4.2.3 Growth Areas As Indicate
5.1.2 Data Collection Cycle	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Evidence	5.1.2 Data Collection Cycle.doc
1.1.2 EPP Transition Points	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning	SSR Evidence	1.1.2 EPP Transition Points .pdf
1.1.4 EPP Admission Requirements	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning	SSR Evidence	1.1.4 EPP Admission Requirem
1.1.10 Observation Form	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning,Component R1.2 - Content,Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice,Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility	SSR Evidence	1.1.10 Observation Form .pdf
5.2.3 TWS Lawshe Content Validity	Component R5.2 - Data Quality	SSR Evidence	5.2.3TWS-Lawshe Content Valid
5.2.7 Rater Agreement Disposition	Component R5.2 - Data Quality	SSR Evidence	5.2.7 Rater Agreement Dispositi
1.1.1A SCOU Data Framework	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities	SSR Evidence	

1.1.1.1. InTASC Alignment Chart	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning, Component R1.2 - Content, Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice, Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility	SSR Evidence	
1.1.5 PEPPS Screenshot	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning	SSR Evidence	1.1.5 PEPPS Screenshot.png
1.1.7 TWS	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning, Component R1.2 - Content, Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice, Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility, Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness	SSR Evidence	1.1.7 TWS.pdf
COE Org. Chart	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning, Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice	SSR Evidence	COE Org Chart (1).docx
1.1.6 Crosswalk PEPPS Danielson	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning	SSR Evidence	1.1.6 Crosswalk PEPPS-Danielson
1.1.8 TWS Rubric	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning	SSR Evidence	1.1.8 TWS Rubric.pdf
1.1.5A SCOU Assessment Chart	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	SSR Evidence	#1.1.5A SCOU Assessment Chart
1.1.9A Evaluation Plan of Improvement	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	SSR Evidence	
3.4.1 SCOU Retention Rates	Component RA3.4 - Competency at Completion	SSR Evidence	#3.4.1 SCOU Retention Rates.p
5.1.1A Quality Assurance System of the School Counseling Program	Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Evidence	
1.3.3 Standaard 1.3 Worksheet	Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice	SSR Evidence	1.3.3 Standard 1.3 Worksheet.d
1.2.2 Syllabus, EDU 397A	Component R1.2 - Content	SSR Evidence	1.2.2 Syllabus, EDU 397A.pdf
1.3.2 Syllabus EDCI 572	Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice	SSR Evidence	1.3.2 Syllabus, EDCI 572.pdf
2.1.4 University Supervisor Agreement	Component R2.2 - Clinical Educators, Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences	SSR Evidence	2.1.4 University Supervisor Agree
1.2.1 Chapter 58 Rules Screenshot	Component R1.2 - Content, Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness	SSR Evidence	1.2.1 Chapter 58 Rules Screens
1.3.1 Syllabus, EDU 270	Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice	SSR Evidence	1.3.1 Syllabus, EDU 270.docx

2.1.3 P-12 Partner MOUs	Component R2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	SSR Evidence	2.1.3 P-12 Partner MOUs.pdf
2.2.1 ETP Vision Screenshot	Component R2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation,Component R3.1 - Recruitment	SSR Evidence	2.2.1 ETP Vision Screenshot.png
2.3.3 Graduate Practicum Syllabus	Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences	SSR Evidence	2.3.3 Graduate Practicum Syllabus.pdf
3.2.2 Elementary Junior Field	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	3.2.2 EDU_353_Elem_Jr_Field.pdf
2.2.2 Cooperating Teacher Agreement	Component R2.2 - Clinical Educators	SSR Evidence	2.2.2 Cooperating Teacher Agreement.pdf
2.3.2 Junior Field Syllabus	Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences	SSR Evidence	2.3.2 Junior Field Syllabus.docx
3.1.2 Critical Quality Educator Report	Component R3.1 - Recruitment	SSR Evidence	3.1.2 Critical Quality Educator Report.pdf
3.2.4 Dispositions Scores	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	
3.2.8 Petitions Forms	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	3.2.8 Petitions Form.pdf
3.3.1 Praxis Subject Assessment Information	Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion	SSR Evidence	3.3.1 Praxis Subject Assessment Information.pdf
4.1.1 Statewide Protocol for Continuous Improvement	Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness,Component RA4.1 - Satisfaction of Employers	SSR Evidence	4.1.1 Statewide Protocol for Continuous Improvement.pdf
4.2.1 CIC 2019 Employer Satisfaction Survey	Component R4.2 - Satisfaction of Employers	SSR Evidence	4.2.1 CIC 2019 Employer Satisfaction Survey.pdf
4.3.2 Growth Areas as Indicated by Completer Survey	Component R4.3 - Satisfaction of Completers	SSR Evidence	
3.2.5 TWS Scores	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	3.2.5 TWS Scores.docx
3.2.9 Petition Dates	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	3.2.9 Petition Dates.png
3.3.2 Assessment of Content Knowledge	Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion	SSR Evidence	3.3.2 Assessment of Content Knowledge.pdf
4.1.2 Initial MEPP CIC Protocol	Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness	SSR Evidence	4.1.2 Initial MEPP CIC Protocol.pdf
4.2.2 CIC Employer Satisfaction Survey Results	Component R4.2 - Satisfaction of Employers	SSR Evidence	4.2.2 2023 CIC Employer Satisfaction Survey Results.pdf
5.1.1 QAS	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Evidence	5.1.1 QAS.docx
5.2.2 Faculty Feedback Responses	Component R5.2 - Data Quality	SSR Evidence	Response to Faculty Feedback.pdf

5.2.6 Observation Video Rating	Component R5.2 - Data Quality	SSR Evidence	5.2.6 Observation Video Rating.
5.4.1 Data Dip Document	Component R5.4 - Continuous Improvement	SSR Evidence	5.4.1 Data Dip Document.pdf
1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences	SSR Evidence	
1.1.8 Lawshe Panel Table	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	SSR Evidence	#1.1.8A Lawshe Panel CVR Tab
2.2.1 Employer Survey	Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences, Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement	SSR Evidence	
1.1.11 Professional Dispositions Policy Procedure	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning, Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility	SSR Evidence	1.1.11 Professional Disposition
1.1.3 Syllabus, EDU 270	Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice	SSR Evidence	1.3.1 Syllabus, EDU 270.docx
2.1.2 Articulation Agreements	Component R2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	SSR Evidence	2.1.2 Articulation Agreements.pdf
2.1.6 Petitions Committee Procedure	Component R2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	SSR Evidence	2.1.6 Petitions Committee Procedure
2.3.1 Graduated Clinical Experiences	Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences	SSR Evidence	2.3.1 Graduated Clinical Experiences
3.1.1 MSUB Student Demographics	Component R3.1 - Recruitment, Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion	SSR Evidence	3.1.1 MSUB Student Demographic
3.4.4 SCOU Enrollment Rates	Component RA3.4 - Competency at Completion	SSR Evidence	#3.4.4A SCOU Enrollment Rate
1.1.13 Standard 1.1 Worksheet	Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning	SSR Evidence	1.1.13 Standard 1.1 Worksheet.
3.2.3 TWS Longitudinal Data	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	3.2.3 TWS Longitudinal Chart (1
3.2.7 MACK Scores	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	3.2.7 MACK Scores.docx
3.2.10 Student Handbook	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting		

Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence		3.2.10 Student Handbook.pdf
5.2.1 ETP Meeting Minutes 1.30.20	Component R5.2 - Data Quality	SSR Evidence	5.2.1 ETP Meeting Minutes 1.30.20
5.2.5 Inter-rater Activity	Component R5.2 - Data Quality	SSR Evidence	5.2.5 Inter-rater Activity (1).pdf
5.4.2 Final Report PBE	Component R5.4 - Continuous Improvement	SSR Evidence	
3.3.4 Grad Data Flyer	Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion	SSR Evidence	
4.1.4 Completer Case Study Spring 2021	Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness	SSR Evidence	4.1.4 Completer Case Study Sp
4.3.1 2021-2022 Completer Preparation Survey	Component R4.3 - Satisfaction of Completers	SSR Evidence	4.3.1 2021-2022 Completer Per
5.1.3 Advisory Board Minutes	Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System,Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	SSR Evidence	5.1.3 Advisory Board Minutes.doc
5.2.4 Inter-rater Reliability Faculty TWS Training	Component R5.2 - Data Quality	SSR Evidence	
5.3.1 Committee List	Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	SSR Evidence	
1.1.2A SCOU Program Standards Benchmark Chart	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities	SSR Evidence	
1.1.6A 5 Years of Praxis Data	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA3.3 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	SSR Evidence	1.1.6 SCOU 5 years of Praxis S
1.1.10A Diversity Report	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	SSR Evidence	#1.1.10A Diversity Report (MSU
3.4.3 SCOU Graduation Rate Comparison	Component RA3.4 - Competency at Completion	SSR Evidence	
5.1.3 SCOU Data Dip	Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System	SSR Evidence	#5.1.3A SCOU Data Dip.pdf
1.4.1 Standard 1.4 Worksheet	Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility	SSR Evidence	1.4.1 Standard 1.4 Worksheet.d
1.1.3A SCOU Internship Guidebook	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical		

Preparation,Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences	SSR Evidence	#1.1.3A School Counseling Internship Gu
1.1.7A SCOU Advisory Panel	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities,Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	SSR Evidence #1.1.7A Advisory Panel Spring 2
1.2.1A Montana State University Billings School Counseling Tereva Manual	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	SSR Evidence #1.2.1 Montana State University
3.4.2 SCOU Graduation Rate Comparison	Component RA3.4 - Competency at Completion	SSR Evidence
5.1.2 Advisory Panel PowerPoint	Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System,Component RA5.2 - Data Quality,Component RA5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	SSR Evidence #5.1.2A Advisory Panel PP (1).p

Items per page: 1 93 of 93 < >

All Tasks and Review Schedule

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence: All Tasks and Review Schedule

All Tasks

Component ↑	Status	Task Questions
Component R1.1	Unresolved	R.1.1 (A) - Does the EPP have evidence of disaggregated data across speciality areas as well as other demographic factions demonstrating candidates ability within the category of "The Learner and Learning?" R.1.1 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation that was reportedly contained within Evidence 1.1.1. InTASC Alignment

Chart? R.1.1 (C) - Can the EPP provide evidence of data analysis across "The Learner and Learning" for all program areas?		
Component R1.2	Unresolved	R.1.2 (A) - Does the EPP have evidence of disaggregated data across speciality areas as well as other demographic factions demonstrating candidates ability within the category of "Content?" R.1.2 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation that was reportedly contained within Evidence 1.1.1. InTASC Alignment Chart? R.1.2 (C) - Can the EPP provide evidence of data analysis across "Content" for all program areas? R.1.2 (D) - How does the EPP ensure Candidates have sufficient (breadth & depth) knowledge to demonstrate the Content for their assigned teaching fields?
Component R1.3	Unresolved	R.1.3 (A) - Does the EPP have evidence of disaggregated data across speciality areas as well as other demographic factions demonstrating candidates ability within the category of "Instructional Practice?" R.1.3 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation that was reportedly contained within Evidence 1.1.1. InTASC Alignment Chart? R.1.3 (C) - Can the EPP provide evidence of data analysis across "Instructional Practice" for all program areas?
Component R1.4	Unresolved	R.1.4 (A) - Does the EPP have evidence of disaggregated data across speciality areas as well as other demographic factions demonstrating candidates ability within the category of "Professional Responsibility?" R.1.4 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation that was reportedly contained within Evidence 1.1.1. InTASC Alignment Chart? R.1.4 (C) - Can the EPP provide evidence of data analysis across "Professional Responsibility" for all program areas?
Component R2.1	Resolved	Verification of partnerships with P-12 partners

<p>Component R2.2</p>	<p>Unresolved</p>	<p>R2.2(A) - Verification of Criteria from P-12 Clinical Educators and IHE Clinical Educators. R2.2(B) - What evaluations are completed as part of P-12 Clinical Educators and IHE Clinical Educators? R2.2 (C) - How is results from evaluations shared with all parties? R2.2 (D) - What training do Clinical Educators receive from the EPP (both P-12 clinical educators and IHE Clinical Educators) on evaluations and assessments conducted during clinical placements and culminating student teaching?</p>
<p>Component R2.3</p>	<p>Resolved</p>	<p>R2.3 (A) - Can the EPP share evidence collected through Tevera platform based on tracking clinical placements? R2.3 (B) - How does the EPP ensure that each candidate has a diverse range of placements throughout their program? R2.3 (C) - Can the EPP share how technology is addressed to prepare candidates for their responsibilities on the job?</p>
<p>Component R3.1</p>	<p>Resolved</p>	<p>R.3.1 (A) - What are the EPP s goals towards admitting candidates to initial programs from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations? R.3.1 (B) - What data can be shared related to the candidates admitted related to diversity of the groups towards meeting EPP goals? R.3.1 (C) - What is the systematic and strategic recruitment plan designed to meet the goals of the EPP s recruitment goals?</p>
<p>Component R3.2</p>	<p>Resolved</p>	<p>R.3.2 (A) - What are the assessment criteria for Junior Field and Student Teaching related to the transition points? R.3.2 (B) - What aggregate data can be shared related to admissions on the student demographics? R.3.3 (C) - What aggregate data can be shared related to assessment criteria by program during each of the transition points? R.3.2 (D) - The EPP shared that Elementary Cohort consistently meet the cohort GPA of above 3.0. What about other programs? Can data be shared about other programs? If below the 3.0 Cohort for other programs, what plans does the EPP have to address candidate GPA at the identified</p>

transition point?		
Component R3.3	Unresolved	<p>R.3.3 (A) - Can the EPP provide disaggregated data by program (with appropriate N s) to verify candidate quality at completion to teach diverse P-12 students for each assessment? R.3.3 (B) - Can the EPP provide a mapping from the assessments to the expected level of proficiency at completion across (A) content Knowledge, (b) pedagogical knowledge, (c) pedagogical skills, (d) critical dispositions, (e), professional responsibilities, and (f) ability to integrate technology effectively. R.3.3 (C) - Can the EPP provide disaggregation dated across programs (with appropriate N s) to verify candidates effective teaching, including positive impacts on diverse P-12 students learning and development?</p>
Component R4.1	Resolved	<p>Can you provide additional evidence beyond the one case study provided to demonstrate three cycles of data?</p>
Component R4.2	Resolved	<p>Please clarify the timeline of employer surveys. The MEPP timeline and the results reported are different. The EPP provided 2019 (although not attached) and 2023 data but the data collection cycle indicates 2022, 2024. Also, please include the spring 2024 employer survey results. Please provide 2019 survey results as the provided link did not have employer survey results. (#4.2.1 2019 CIC Employer Satisfaction Survey Results.) How is it demonstrated that the employer surveys have met the criteria for evaluation of EPP created surveys? Can you provide disaggregated data by program or other?</p>
Component R4.3	Resolved	<p>Please provide comparison chart of completer survey data from 19-20 and 21-22. Please provide a third cycle of data. Please include disaggregated data and analyses. Please provide evidence that survey meets CAEP criteria.</p>

Component R5.1	Unresolved	<p>R.5.1(A) - Can the EPP share the discrepancy between the eight data sources mentioned as part of the QAS, but only identifying six assessment evidences? R.5.1(B) - Is the 4/18/2024 meeting the only meeting of an advisory council over the previous four calendar years? R.5.1(C) - Can the EPP provide assessment evidences? R.5.1(D) - Can the EPP provide disaggregated data across programs at various transition points? R.5.1(E) - Can the EPP align key assessment data to decisions about programmatic improvement?</p>
Component R5.2	Unresolved	<p>R.5.2 (A) - Based on the evidence provided, it is unclear if all the assessments measure what was intended to be measured. Could the EPP provide evidence of relevance towards CAEP component R1.1- R1.4? R.5.2. (B) - Could the EPP provide disaggregated data across all programs offered? R.5.2 (C) - Can the EPP provide actions taken as a result of a specific data source?</p>
Component R5.3	Resolved	<p>R.5.3 (A) - Can the EPP provide additional evidences of external stakeholder involvement? R.5.3 (B) - Can the EPP provide recommendations from various internal and external stakeholders related to program design, evaluation, and the continuous improvement process?</p>
Component R5.4	Unresolved	<p>R.5.4 (A) - Can the EPP provide actions taken as a result of a specific data source? R.5.4 (B) - Can the EPP provide recommendations from various internal and external stakeholders related to program design, evaluation, and the continuous improvement process? R.5.4 (C) - Can the EPP highlight data review and decisions within any meeting minutes for programs? R.5.4 (D) - Can the EPP provide any documentation of what occurs during data dip and assessment retreats? Minutes, agendas, etc.</p>

Component RA1.1	Unresolved	RA1.1(A) - Can the EPP identify and provide assessments for the School Counseling program as well as the alignment of those assessments to the six areas identified in the 2022 CAEP Workbook? RA1.1 (B) - Can the EPP provide candidate data across three cycles disaggregated across relevant demographic variables? RA1.1(C) - Can the EPP provide an analysis of that data that leads to continuous improvement? RA1.1(D) - Can the EPP provide further detail on the Summary of Praxis data presented in evidence 1.1.6 SCOU 5 years of Praxis Scores?
Component RA1.2	Unresolved	RA1.2 (A) - How does the EPP know candidates know the specialized content of their field? RA1.2 (B) - What data does the EPP have that candidates know this content? RA1.2 (C) - What analysis and subsequent program improvements have been made to improve candidates knowledge of their specialized content? RA1.2 (D) - How does the EPP know candidate are able to apply their specialized knowledge in educational settings? RA1.2 (E) - What data does the EPP have that candidates are able to apply this knowledge? RA1.2 (F) - Subsequently, what analysis and program improvements have been made to improved candidates application of knowledge to specialized settings? RA1.2 (G) - What evidence can the EPP present that candidates in school counseling create effective environments for diverse P-12 students?
Component RA2.1	Resolved	RA2.1 (A) - Have other meetings been held to that document a continuous process or what this one in isolation due to something that occurred at a placement site? RA 2.1 (B) - What were the roles of the individuals that were on the Advisory Panel?

Component RA2.2	Unresolved	RA2.2 (A)-What opportunities have candidates had to prepare in diverse settings and to work in their specialized field of study? RA2.2 (B)-What features of clinical experiences allow candidates to demonstrate their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research? RA2.2 (C)-How has the EPP studied clinical experience data to improve candidate outcomes? RA2.2 (D)-What clinical experiences have enhanced completers understanding of diversity and equity issues and their readiness to use that understanding in employment situations? RA2.2 (E)-How are clinical experiences effective in preparing candidates for the chosen proficiencies in RA1.1?
Component RA3.1	Resolved	Provide evidence of goal setting for recruitment. Provide evidence of progress monitoring on those goals. Provide evidence of the success or shortcomings of the strategies employed. How do you know your recruiting strategies are effective?
Component RA3.2	Resolved	Please provide evidence of GPA or other tracking data that is reviewed. Please provide disaggregated Praxis data. Please provide any other data that is reviewed at admission. Disaggregate that data.
Component RA3.3	Resolved	Please provide evidence of your tracking systems and how you have analyzed student data at each checkpoint. Disaggregate all data. Additionally, please provide performance reviews, remediation efforts, student support and progress monitoring evidence, documentation of complaints
Component RA3.4	Resolved	Please provide 3 cycles of disaggregated data and subsequent analyses of the assessment results. Please provide examples of the assessments demonstrating competence. Provide disaggregated Praxis data
Component RA4.1	Resolved	Please provide three cycles of data, the employer survey, comparison between cycles, and evidence of analysis. Also please provide disaggregated data and analyses.
Component RA4.2	Resolved	Please provide three cycles of data, the employer survey, comparison between cycles, and evidence of

analysis. Also please provide disaggregated data and analyses.

<p>Component RA5.1</p>	<p>Unresolved</p>	<p>RA.5.1 (A) - Can the EPP provide the intended document for the School Counseling Quality Assurance System? RA.5.1 (B) - Can the EPP provide the measures for the QAS as well as the rationale for the selection of those measures? RA.5.1 (C) - Can the EPP share the data from school counseling used in decision making and across all key assessments identified by the program? RA.5.1 (D) - Can the EPP align data from the QAS and any programmatic change or adjustment in the program?</p>
<p>Component RA5.2</p>	<p>Resolved</p>	<p>RA.5.2 (A) - Can the EPP provide a clear link between what is being measured and what the EPP intends to measure including alignment with relevant standards and CAEP indicators from RA1.1? RA.5.2 (B) - Can the EPP provide evidence of the assessments used throughout the program? RA.5.2 (C) - Can the EPP provide evidence that the assessments are valid and reliability (other than Praxis)? RA.5.2 (D) - Can the EPP provide additional data from the assessments identified in the previous question disaggregated by graduating class across three cycles? RA.5.2 (E) - Can the EPP provide evidence that linkages assessment evidence and programmatic changes/innovations?</p>
<p>Component RA5.3</p>	<p>Resolved</p>	<p>RA.5.3 (A) - Can the EPP submit additional meeting minutes, agenda, with attendees and designated roles from meetings with internal and external partners related to program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes? RA.5.3 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation of the process the EPP uses to involve stakeholders in data driven decision making? RA.5.3(C) - Can the EPP provide documentation of how clinical partners are included in the continuous improvement process?</p>

Component RA5.4	Unresolved	RA.5.4 (A) - Can the EPP identify goals and relevant standards for the EPP and how those are aligned to the assessments used in the school counseling program? RA.5.4 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation of performance (candidates/graduates) over three cycles? RA.5.4 (C) - Can the EPP provide documentation of modifications over-time and how those changes are linked to meetings and/or data collected from candidates/graduates? RA.5.4 (D) - Can the EPP provide data analyses from data collected over time from candidates/graduates of the program? RA.5.4 (E) - Can the EPP provide examples of changes in courses, clinical experiences, other candidate experiences that represent the continuous improvement efforts?
-----------------	------------	---

Items per page: 10

1 31 of 31

Standard R1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Initial-licensure Level Programs)

**Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence :
Standard R1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Initial-licensure Level Programs)**

SSR Evidence - Standard R1

a. Component R1.1 The Learner and Learning

The Department of Educational Theory and Practice's (ETP) curriculum consists of coursework in pedagogy and content. Coursework is aligned to the Danielson Framework and Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards. Both are integrated throughout the entire program; InTASC standards and assessments are tracked in each course. The **#1.1.1 InTASC Course Alignment Chart** demonstrates how InTASC standards are met at the course level.

Candidates must demonstrate content knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions at

specific transition points across all licensure programs in the Educator Preparation Program (EPP). The EPP's assessment system measures growth across all levels of learner development, beginning with the first transition point admission to the EPP. Admission requirements include an overall GPA of 2.65 (undergraduate) and 3.00 (graduate), a content core GPA of 2.65, a general education GPA of 2.65 (undergraduate), completion of a minimum of 45 credits, and a completed criminal background report (CBR). From this point on, key assessments, including a dispositions assessment, a teacher work sample (TWS), and field observations are used to track candidates during sophomore practicum, Junior Field experience/Graduate Practicum, and Student Teaching. These following evidences explain the process in more depth: **#1.1.2 EPP Transition Points; #1.1.3 EPP Application Sample; #1.1.4 EPP Admission Requirements.**

The EPP has developed a protocol for the administration of key assessments. The three key assessments used across transition points are:

- " Dispositions Continuum for Teaching & Learning Tool
- " Teacher Work Sample (TWS)
- " Observation Tool

The **#1.1.2 EPP Transition Points** include:

1. Admission to the EPP
2. Sophomore practicum (EDU 220L)
3. Junior Field experience (EDU 353/354/355, EDSP 404), Graduate Practicum (EDCI 519), and
4. Student Teaching (EDU 495/EDSP 495/EDCI 584, 585, 586).

The three key assessments are aligned with the Danielson model, Professional Educator Preparation Standards for Montana (**#1.1.5 PEPPS Screenshot** and the InTASC standards. (See: **# 1.1.6 Crosswalk PEPPS/Danielson/INTASC/CAEP**). In the following sections, each tool will be described in the context of the relevant InTASC standards.

The **#1.1.7 TWS** was developed by the ETP faculty and community partners as a tool to assess candidates' abilities to plan effective instruction, monitor student progress and adjust, and reflect on their teaching. The TWS aligns with the Danielson Teaching Framework, InTASC standards, and the PEPPS Standards. Candidates choose a topic of study based on standards and unit instructional outcomes and administer a pre-assessment before designing a 3-5 lesson unit. After each lesson within the unit, candidates conduct a formative assessment to adjust their instruction as needed. At the end of the unit, they administer a summative assessment, analyze the resulting data, and reflect on the assessments and their instruction. The final step is to design a continual growth plan for their own professional development. The lesson and unit plan components of the TWS addresses InTASC standards 1, 2, and 3 by including sections that address culturally responsive/revitalizing practices, trauma-informed practices, positive behavior supports, and lesson differentiation. The teacher work sample is completed during the Junior Field experiences and Student Teaching. Students are evaluated using a 3-point scale: Needs Improvement, Sufficient, and Proficient using the **#1.1.8 TWS Rubric**. The TWS has strong alignment to the InTASC Standards and to the Danielson Framework. (See also **#1.1.6 Crosswalk PEPPS/Danielson**).

The **#1.1.9 Dispositions Tool** measures professional attitudes, values, and understandings, all supporting teaching and learning. The tool is used in sophomore practicum, Junior Field/Graduate Practicum, and Student Teaching. It allows for reflection concerning the teacher candidates' dispositional development. The Dispositions Tool includes eight dispositions, each

comprised of several components. Two dispositions specifically address learner development, learner differences, and the learning environment: belief in growth and respect for difference. The Dispositions tool also measures personal biases through the self-awareness component. Using the dispositions tool, faculty, Cooperating Teachers, and University Supervisors evaluate students using a four-point scale: Unacceptable (1), Developing (2), Proficient (3), and Professional (4). Candidates are required to achieve a minimum of a 2 (Developing) in each of the areas to complete the experience successfully and to progress in the program. It is not expected that teacher candidates will achieve a professional level because these attributes are more likely to be visible after completion of two years of in-service teaching.

The **#1.1.10 Observation Tool's** purpose is to facilitate the observation and evaluation of candidates' teaching skills. Paired with the TWS, supervisors can holistically evaluate candidates' planning, instruction, and assessment. This tool is aligned to the Danielson Framework for Teacher Evaluation and focuses on three of the four domains within the Danielson Framework: Classroom Environment (Domain 2), Instruction (Domain 3), and Professional Responsibilities (Domain 4). In the framework, each domain is divided into several smaller components. Each component is rated on a three-point scale: Proficient (3); Sufficient (2); or Needs Improvement (1). Candidates are required to achieve a minimum of a 2 (Sufficient) in each of the areas to complete the experience successfully and to progress in the program. The following components in the tool demonstrate an understanding of diversity of student needs. Within the tool, the Domains of Classroom Environment and Instruction contain components that focus on diversity (See also **# 1.1.6 Crosswalk PEPPS/Danielson**) including Component 2a, Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport, and Component 2e, Organizing Physical Space.

In addition to the requirements and assessments at each transition point, candidates must also successfully complete EDSP 204 Introduction to Teaching Exceptional Learners and NASX 105 Introduction to Native American Studies or EDU 315 IEFA (Indian Education for All) in the Montana Classroom. These courses are required for state licensure and help prepare candidates to work with diverse populations, including students with varying needs and abilities, and Montana's Native American communities. During earlier coursework, students learn about learner developmental needs and stages. In methods courses, they learn more specifics about development in different disciplines (e.g., language arts, math, science, social studies). Finally, in Junior Field, Graduate Practicum, and Student Teaching, they apply what they have learned in greater complexity through applied practice, measured by the TWS and Observation of Teaching. (**#1.1.1 InTASC Course Alignment Chart**).

Candidates also work with families in the on-campus Reading and Learning Clinics. EDU 438 Literacy Assessment, Diagnosis, Instruction (Reading Clinic) is required for all elementary education majors; candidates tutor children from the community in a one-on-one setting. As a part of the course, the candidates communicate with the family during drop-off and pick up times. They also compile a clinical report at the conclusion of the course and lead a parent-teacher conference. Special education majors have an added opportunity in that they take the Learning Clinic course (EDSP 402 Individualizing Curriculum). In this experience, candidates work with families in a similar way to the Reading Clinic, by tutoring children in math, reading or writing, depending on the student needs. Although secondary majors do not have direct experience working with families, EDSP 204 Introduction to Teaching Exceptional Learners and the graduate equivalent, SPED 540 Education of Exceptional Learners, address working with

families. (**#1.1.1 InTASC Course Alignment Chart**).

Candidates are evaluated using all three instruments at a variety of checkpoints in the program. Currently, the dispositions assessment is conducted during sophomore practicum, Junior Field/Graduate Practicum, and Student Teaching. The faculty recognize that the assessment should be given earlier and more frequently, and plan to implement a new procedure beginning Fall 2024 in which candidates are assessed twice a semester across all courses. (**#1.1.11 Professional Dispositions Policy Procedure**)

Observations and the TWS are completed during Junior Field/Graduate Practicum and Student Teaching as well. The fourth and final checkpoint is upon program completion. The EPP uses a state assessment rubric to determine eligibility for licensure and as evidence of content and pedagogical knowledge that impacts P-12 student learning, which is The Montana Assessment of Content Knowledge (MACK). The MACK verification rubric includes three components evidencing content knowledge: the Praxis Test, the candidate's Content Knowledge GPA, and an Assessment of Content Knowledge form completed by the Cooperating Teacher during the candidate's Student Teaching experience (**#1.1.12 MACK Worksheet**). The Director of Field Experiences and Licensure ensures all components are completed before sending applications for licensure to the state Office of Public Instruction (OPI) for review.

The Standard **1.1 Worksheet (#1.1.13)** demonstrates the proficiencies of students across three cycles of data. By the completion of Student Teaching, most students are performing at the proficient or sufficient level in InTASC standards 1, 2 and 3, as demonstrated by the triangulated data in all three tools: the Dispositions Tool, the Observation Tool, and the TWS through three cycles of data: Fall 2022, Spring 2023, and Fall 2023.

FFRa. Narrative Analysis - Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning

The EPP reports curriculum in pedagogy and content is aligned throughout the programs through the Danielson Framework and InTASC standards and are tracked across courses. Evidence **#1.1.1 InTASC Course Alignment** did not appear to be attached to the Self Study report. Therefore, this cannot be confirmed at present.

Similarly, the EPP presents three key assessments used across transition points (a) Dispositions, (b) Teacher Work Sample, and (c) Observation Tool. Both the Observation Form and the Teacher Work Sample are aligned to InTASC components related to the Learner and Learning. However, the Dispositions assessment does not appear to be aligned to this CAEP component.

During review of the evidences, there was no evidence of disaggregated data but included three cycles of data and analyses of the assessment results. Similarly, the EPP reported, "Due to the challenges and inconsistencies of our data collection systems, not all candidate scores were reported and, of those who were reported, not all components for each key assessment have scores. Therefore, the n indicated in each component is the number of

students who received scores."

SSR Addendum a. Component R1.1 The Learner and Learning

R.1.1 (A) Does the EPP have evidence of disaggregated data across specialty areas as well as other demographic factions demonstrating candidates ability within the category of "The Learner and Learning?"

The EPP has now provided the following evidences:

Evidence #1.1.14 Key Assessment_Observation Assessment Data.In this evidence, the EPP aligned all components of the Observation Tool with several standards: Montana ARM, InTASC, Danielson, and CAEP. Further, each item on the assessment is disaggregated by gender (male; female; prefer not to answer) and race (white; non-white). Due to the small n for non-white students, the EPP disaggregated across the band of non-white, rather than further delineation. This data also includes a break-down of students through student teaching, graduate student teaching, and junior field experiences. The data is disaggregated by program: elementary, secondary and special education. Teaching minor information is included within their primary major.

Evidence #1.1.15 Key Assessment_TWS Assessment Data has been added. The data is disaggregated as described in the Observation Data section.

Evidence #1.1.16 Key Assessment_Dispositions Data has been added. The data is disaggregated as described in the Observation Data section.

Evidence #1.1.17 Praxis Scores has now been added. The data is disaggregated as described in the Observation Data section.

R.1.1 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation that was reportedly contained within Evidence 1.1.1. InTASC Alignment Chart? R.1.1 (C) - Can the EPP provide evidence of data analysis across "The Learner and Learning" for all program areas?

The **Evidence #1.1.1 InTASC Alignment Chart** is now added. This chart describes how InTASC standards are met across the program, beginning at the sophomore level and continuing into student teaching.

SSR a. Narrative Analysis - Component R1.1 - The Learner and Learning

The EPP reports 16 programs at the Initial Licensure level, however, in reporting data and discussing programs it only disaggregates data into Elementary, Secondary & P-12, and Special Education; the SSR and Addendum generally do not provide data, analysis, interpretation of data, nor continuous improvement measures by program area nor are data

analyses and interpretation for CAEP Standard components provided with data tables or in the narrative. The EPP provides an InTASC Course Alignment Chart (1.1.1) to indicate how candidates are trained relative to each InTASC standard, however the identified assessments are not provided as evidence in the SSR and the degree to which the courses and assessments address the indicated components are unknown; it is also unclear which candidates in which programs take the courses identified. Consequently, the value of this evidence is questionable. Three key assessments are used to collect data to demonstrate candidate competencies of Standard R1.1: Teacher Work Sample (1.1.7), Dispositions Tool (1.1.9), and an Observation Tool (1.1.10). The rubric indicators for these key tools are either aligned with multiple InTasc Standards [& CAEP components], loosely aligned with 2013 Danielson Framework for Teaching indicators, or in the case of the Disposition Tool not tagged at all, making analysis and interpretation of candidate competencies and skills relative to standard difficult. Alignment to CAEP components is questionable in numerous instances due to co-mingling and what appears as inconsistent alignment: i.e. TWS indicator-Preparation through Collaboration aligned to INTASC 9 and 10, Danielson 4, but CAEP 1.1? (1.1.7). Data means are presented* with inaccuracies and without score ranges making interpretation of candidate competency difficult. *Due to "challenges and inconsistencies of our data collection systems, [the EPP reports in the SSR] not all candidates scores were reported&and not all components for each key assessment have scores" which makes the validity and reliability of the data questionable. On-site interviews with representatives from Assessment and Accreditation office explain that prior to the implementation of Tervera [data management system in 2024] no systematic way was used to collect and report data, resulting in idiosyncratic, "paper and pencil" and manual data entry and reporting. Anecdotally, faculty began noticing missing data. When data is provided, it generally lacks significant information: range of possible scores, n, % passing, reported by CAEP standard and component, CAEP sufficiency criteria, and disaggregated by program. During the on-site visit, a demonstration of the Tervera data management system was provided to several site team visitors and it appears it will greatly enhance the EPP's abilities to provide and use data in the future.

R1.1 The Learner and Learning

The EPP posits that the TWS addresses component R1.1 "by including sections that address culturally responsive/revitalizing practices, trauma-informed practices, positive behavior supports, and lesson differentiation." The TWS rubric is not tagged to specific indicators, providing data that support this claim. In Standard 1.1 Worksheet (1.1.13) 3 cycles of data (Fall22, Sp23, Fall23) are presented for 6 items from the TWS: Preparation through Knowledge of Students, Relevance, Knowledge of Skills & Differentiation, Coherent Instruction, Instructional Procedures and Resources, and Reflecting on Student Data- some appear to be more consistent evidence of R1.3 than R1.1. Though raw and summary data is presented, no analysis and interpretation are provided in SSR or Addendum and no evidence of using data for candidate monitoring or continuous improvement is provided. Of the 8 dispositions measured, two are cited as addressing R1.1: "Belief in Growth" and "Respect for Difference". Though these are 2 dispositions, they are assessed using 5 indicators- 1.1.13 indicate effective ratings for all candidates, however, candidate dispositions are assessed by faculty, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors and it is unclear if the data represent a combined score, an average score for each candidate, or a score from one stakeholder. Again, there are no analyses or interpretations prepared. The third tool used to collect data for R1.1 is an Observation tool, which "is aligned to Danielson's three of the four

Domains" excluding Domain 1. In 1.1.13 the EPP cites 5 indicators supporting R1.1: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport, Managing Classroom Procedures, Managing Student Behavior, Organizing Physical Space, and Engaging Students in Learning. Data indicate proficient/sufficient candidate performance, but raw data provided lack score range and indicate a mismatch in standard alignment. Superficially, it appears that candidates understand learner development, learning differences, and can create supportive learning environments, however, it is unclear how much data is not reported, analyzed, or interpreted due to issues in Quality Assurance.

b. Component R1.2 Content

Specialty areas within the EPP are approved through a state accreditation process by the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI). Through this process, programs are responsible for ensuring alignment to the Administrative Rules of Montana, Chapter 58 (**#1.2.1 Chapter 58 Rules Screensho**). The state accreditation process is administered alongside the CAEP process; the last state review was in 2017 and the upcoming state review will occur in April 2025.

Equity, diversity, and accessibility are cornerstones of the EPP, and these principles are integrated throughout the program. The EPP also supports community involvement and field experiences which allows candidates to have diverse experiences in the Billings and surrounding area. Beginning in freshman or early sophomore year, candidates are required to take the course, EDU 105 Education and Democracy, which prepares them for teaching in a democratic society, viewing education through a broad lens, and focusing on the importance of education within the community. In the required course, EDSP 204 Introduction to Teaching Exceptional Learners, candidates gain a deeper view of inclusivity for children with special needs in a least restrictive environment. Candidates understand central principles of inclusion and practice implementation of these skills via field experiences in community settings such as Eagle Mount, an adaptive recreational program, and Special Olympics. As candidates progress through the program and into their methods courses, diversity and inclusion are also addressed. For example, in the required literacy courses, EDU 397A Methods: K-8 Language Arts and EDU 433 Reflective Practices in Teaching Reading, candidates are required to understand and apply principles of culturally relevant instruction within authentic teaching experiences in local schools. In EDU 433, they learn various approaches to support culturally responsive instruction which is assessed using the literacy development unit. (See **#1.2.2 Syllabus, EDU 397A** and **#1.2.3 Syllabus, EDU 433**:

Additional examples are included in the **#1.1.1 InTASC Course Alignment Chart**.

Use of key assessments assure candidates grasp these concepts of diversity and inclusion. The **#1.1.7 TWS** measures student application of content knowledge in field experiences. There is a focus on diversity and inclusion by including components such as Indian Education for All and trauma-informed instruction. The **#1.1.10 Observation Tool** measures knowledge of content by examining four areas: culture for learning, communication with students, engaging in student learning, and flexibility and responsiveness. These key areas are then observed within a live lesson. The **#1.1.9 Dispositions Tool** also measures candidates' dispositions in ten areas, including Area #2, Respect for Difference. Candidates are required in all methods courses to

successfully create learning experiences in the target content areas (**#1.1.1 InTASC Course Alignment Chart**). Several of these courses also require candidates to implement those lessons into a school setting or out-of-school setting (such as Boys and Girls Club or Eagle Mount for children with special needs) with P-12 students. The dispositions tool is introduced to sophomores during their sophomore practicum and then is formally administered during Junior Field and Student Teaching. The ETP will also begin collecting this data twice a semester in each course which will help faculty better understand where individual students are thriving and needing improvement.

The **#1.2.4 Standard 1.2 Worksheet** displays triangulated data collected through all three key assessments (TWS, Observation Tool, and Dispositions Tool) through three cycles of data: Fall 22, Spring 23 and Fall 23. From this triangulated data, it can be noted that candidates are performing at sufficient or proficient levels at the conclusion of Student Teaching, with noted growth from Junior Field/Graduate Practicum. Faculty reviewed this data during a data dip (a meeting in which faculty and staff review a segment of data) on April 16, 2024, and noted that additional training may be needed for Cooperating Teachers (CTs) who complete the dispositions data for Student Teaching, which may improve inter-rater reliability. Faculty also noted more consistency with Junior Field/Graduate Practicum data, which is assessed by University Supervisors and the Director of Field Experiences and Licensure, who have been trained.

In addition to these tools, content knowledge is also evaluated by the MACK at the conclusion of the program. This three-pronged assessment measures includes three areas: Content GPA, Assessment of Content Knowledge (completed by a Cooperating Teacher) and Praxis score. When examining this data, scores have been relatively consistent throughout the entire data cycle, which the ETP began tracking in 2017. **(See #1.2.5 MACK Scores).**

FFRb. Narrative Analysis - Component R1.2 - Content

The EPP reports the state approval process through the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI). Similarly, the EPP provided document of teaching through EDU 105 & EDSP 204, central concepts to all teaching including applying content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 learners. The IHE reports the use of the Teacher Work Sample, Observation Tool, and Dispositions assessment as evidence for Content assessments however, #1.2.4 Standard 1.2 worksheet was not located in the evidence submitted. Similarly, it is unclear how candidates are assessment on central concepts for the teaching field they are assigned to teach.

SSR Addendum b. Component R1.2 Content

R 1.2 (A) Does the EPP have evidence of disaggregated data across specialty areas as well as other demographic factions demonstrating candidates ability within the category of "Content?"
Disaggregated data across speciality areas and demographic factions is included in **Evidence**

#1.1.14 Key Assessment_Observation Assessment Data; Evidence #1.1.15 Key Assessment_Teacher Work Sample Data; and Evidence #1.1.16 Key Assessment_Dispositions Data.

R.1.2 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation that was reportedly contained within Evidence 1.1.1. InTASC Alignment Chart?

Evidence #1.1.1 InTASC Alignment Chart has now been uploaded .

R.1.2 (C) - Can the EPP provide evidence of data analysis across "Content" for all program areas?

In addition to the evidence provided by the key assessments, a summative assessment is given to all candidates at the end of student teaching. This assessment, called the Assessment of Content Knowledge (Early Childhood/Elementary and Special Education, Secondary 5-12 and K-12 Placements) measures content knowledge. **Evidence #1.2.4, MACK Scores** provides data about students' proficiency of content in their programs.

R.1.2 (D) - How does the EPP ensure Candidates have sufficient (breadth & depth) knowledge to demonstrate the "Content" for their assigned teaching fields?

The Key Assessment Evidences (**#1.1.14 Key Assessment_Observation; #1.1.15 Key Assessment_Teacher Work Sample; and #1.1.17 Praxis Scores**) provide proficiency data about students across program areas.

SRRb. Narrative Analysis - Component R1.2 - Content

Component R1.2 Content Knowledge

In the SSR narrative for component R1.2 the EPP discusses methods courses candidates take to teach diverse learners (EDSP 204) and to implement culturally responsive teaching (EDU 433); without key assessment rubrics and data that demonstrate candidates can use and apply competencies, this information lacks substance and would be better suited for R1.1. The TWS is also cited as a measure of application of content knowledge, but no data was provided, analyzed, nor interpreted for this component. Similarly, the Observation Tool is identified as providing evidence for R1.2: indicators cited are culture for learning, communication with students, engaging in student learning, and flexibility and responsiveness. These indicators a. do not clearly align with 1.2 and b. no analysis nor interpretation were provided in the SSR nor Addendum relating to how these support R1.2 and how candidates demonstrated content knowledge competencies through these specific indicators. From the Disposition Assessment: Respect for Difference was also cited as evidence for R1.2, but it is more likely aligned with R1.1. The EPP cites 1.2.4 Standard 1.2 Worksheet as evidence that specifically outlines indicators and data that connect to R1.2, provided during the on-site visit. Indicators from the 3 key assessments [including those previously identified from the TWS] include: reflecting on assessment data, establishing a culture for learning, and implementing instructional procedures [from the Observation tool and Disposition Assessment] which questionably demonstrate content knowledge. MACK scores [which combine content GPA, Assessment of Content Knowledge completed by

cooperating teacher, and Praxis Score] do reveal data for R1.2, however, data provided in 1.2.4 provides unclear and insufficient information regarding how MACK data is collected [particularly CT ratings], combined, and what scores reveal. No analyses nor interpretations are provided. During the on-site interviews, with Initial Program Faculty, the procedures for deriving MACK scores were provided and rubrics for the CT scores of content knowledge were shared). Rubrics (created by the EPP and used for the CT scores) were provided during the on-site visit and reveal unreliable means of assessing candidate content knowledge. [These rubrics have since been revised and standardized by a Council of Deans to be implemented in future iterations see evidence provided on-site]. Exhibit 3.2.7 provides 7 years of MACK scores, however, the EPP does not indicate n, program or demographic disaggregation, % of candidates demonstrating competency at completion, range of scores. Similarly, 1.1.17 provides a table, disaggregated by program and demographic, which provides n, mean, and % pass rates, of Praxis II exam scores to demonstrate content knowledge. Pass rates vary from "too small to report to low pass rates in Mathematics Content Knowledge (5161 and 5165) and Elementary Education (5018) to 100% in Music (5113). Based upon the data presented or R1.2, insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate candidates know and are able to apply their content knowledge in developing equitable and inclusive learning environments.

c. Component R1.3 Instructional Practice

Candidates have multiple opportunities to implement best practices using assessment, planning for instruction, and instructional strategies in their methods courses and field experiences. Near the beginning of the program, candidates take EDU 381 Curriculum Theory and Design or EDCI 500 Curriculum Development, which delves into basics in designing instruction. Another required course for all undergraduate elementary and most secondary majors is EDU 383 Assessment in Education, which addresses the design and implementation of assessment in education. Further in the program, candidates take a variety of methods courses. For elementary education majors, this entails coursework in core subject areas of literacy, math, science, and social studies, in addition to coursework in art, music, and physical education/health methods. Secondary majors take a methods course in their specific content area, and each of these courses embeds instruction and assessment into the content of the course. To further address assessment, all elementary and special education majors take EDU 438, Literacy Assessment, Diagnosis, Instruction (Reading Clinic), in which they gain practice administering assessments and then use the data to make informed decisions about instruction. The **#1.1.1 InTASC Course Alignment Chart** further addresses how the EPP meets InTASC Standards 6, 7 and 8.

Learning increases in complexity throughout the program. (**See #1.1.1 InTASC Course Alignment Chart**). During methods courses, candidates are provided heavy support in designing and implementing instruction. In Junior Field/Graduate Practicum courses, candidates are provided with mid-level support in designing and implementing instruction, and they are always supervised by the Cooperating Teacher. During Student Teaching, candidates are expected to design and implement instruction with minimal support and engage in a minimum of one week of full-time teaching in which they are solely responsible for the classroom. As

candidates move closer to becoming a licensed teacher, they should have more responsibility, again embracing the gradual release of responsibility model.

Candidates use technology throughout the program. All candidates must complete an educational technology course in which they are formally and informally evaluated through completion of assignments. In EDU 270 Instructional Technology and EDCI 572 Introduction to Educational Technology, candidates are introduced to the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards. The course is also aligned to the ISTE standards and incorporates Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, Redefinition (SAMR) modeling. (**#1.3.1 Syllabus, EDU 270** and **#1.3.2 Syllabus, EDCI 572.**)

The instructor for EDU 270 is one of a few ISTE certified instructors listed for the state of Montana. To receive the certification, the instructor submitted course materials for EDU 270 and EDCI 572 to ISTE to ensure alignment to ISTE standards. The ETP has been working towards further integration of technology in coursework and assessment. For instance, this ISTE certified faculty member offers technology talks at each of the ETP faculty meetings, and many faculty members embrace technology in their classes. Further implementation of the ISTE Standards is a goal of the ETP moving into the 2024-2025 school year. In addition, candidates are expected to implement technology when completing their **#1.1.7 TWS.**

Inclusive practices are integrated throughout the curriculum, beginning with EDU 105 Education and Democracy, where candidates embrace concepts of a just and equitable society and in EDSP 204 Introduction to Teaching Exceptional Learners and SPED 540 Education of Exceptional Learners, where candidates learn about inclusion. These topics are continually addressed in a variety of ways, such as the inclusion of multicultural literature in EDU 331 Literature and Literacy for Children, or in EDU 397B Methods: K-8 Social Studies, where candidates learn more about culture and biases as demonstrated in **#1.1.1 InTASC Course Alignment Chart.**

Concepts of assessment and instruction are measured with each of the key assessments. Students are expected to identify potential biases and adapt instruction for diverse populations. The **#1.1.9 Dispositions Continuum for Teaching & Learning Tool** (Disposition #2); the **#1.1.7 TWS Rubric** (see 3.2 in rubric: and the Observation Tool (2a) provide evidence of equity and inclusive practices. The TWS sets expectations for use of Indian Education for All (a state law requiring the inclusion of Native American heritages, histories, and cultures in schools) and technology, in addition to more general assessment and instructional practices. For example, candidates must provide evidence of pre- and post-assessment in their lessons, and consequently, are using data-based decision making. **The Observation Tool #1.1.10** also measures concepts related to assessment and instruction.

Data indicates the candidates within the EPP can demonstrate proficiency in the areas of instruction and assessment through the following results as measured by the three key assessments. (**#1.3.3 Standard 1.3 Worksheet**). In addition, TWS data shows the following proficiencies in the areas of technology and cultural integration.

FFRc. Narrative Analysis - Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice

The provider presents multiple methods of assessment in the observation Tool #1.1.10, the Teacher Work Sample #1.1.7 TWS Rubric of alignment to Instructional Practice. It is unclear how the Dispositions assessment is aligned to "Instructional Practice" due to the missing #1.1.1 InTASC course alignment chart. Three cycles of data were provided for component 1.3: Instructional Practice for the Teacher Work Sample, Observation Tool, and Dispositions; however, data was not disaggregated by program area or any relevant student data. Similarly, the EPP reports, "Due to the challenges and inconsistencies of our data collection systems, not all candidate scores were reported and, of those who were reported, not all components for each key assessment have scores. Therefore, the n indicated in each component is the number of students who received scores."

There did not appear to be an analysis of the data presented to identify any strengths, weaknesses, or potential areas for continuous improvement identified by the program. Application of technology standards appear to be addressed through specified coursework in EDU 270 and EDCI 571 that are aligned to ISTE standards. The EPP reports that candidates are expected to implement technology in their Teacher Work Sample.

SSR Addendum c. Component R1.3 Instructional Practice

R.1.3 (A) - Does the EPP have evidence of disaggregated data across specialty areas as well as other demographic factions demonstrating candidates ability within the category of "Instructional Practice?"

These evidences are now provided in **Evidence #1.1.14 Key Assessment_Observation Data; #1.1.15: Key Assessment, Teacher Work Sample Data; #1.1.16 Key Assessment_Dispositions Data; and #1.1.7 Key Assessment_Praxis Data.**

R.1.3 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation that was reportedly contained within Evidence 1.1.1. InTASC Alignment Chart? R.1.3 (C) - Can the EPP provide evidence of data analysis across "Instructional Practice" for all program areas?

These evidences are now provided in **Evidence #1.1.14 Key Assessment_Observation Data; #1.1.15: Key Assessment, Teacher Work Sample Data; #1.1.16 Key Assessment_Dispositions Data ; and #1.1.7 Key Assessment_Praxis Data.**

SRRc. Narrative Analysis - Component R1.3 - Instructional Practice

Component R1.3 Instructional Practice

The SSR identifies several courses candidates take relating to R1.3: EDU381 Curriculum Theory and Design, EDCI 500 Curriculum Development, EDU270 Instructional Technology, EDCI 572 Introduction to Educational Technology, and EDU 383 Assessment in Education,

however, taking these and "a variety of methods courses&in core subject areas &and specific content areas" does not necessarily document candidates are proficient in the elements of R1.3. as the EPP has decided to use the TWS, Observation Instrument, and Dispositions Assessment rather than key assessments from any of these courses. 1.1.1 InTasc Course Alignment Chart, which provides a structure which aligns standards to courses which the content is covered, does not provide data and evidence of candidate competency. The SSR generally states that "concepts of assessment and instruction are measured with each of the key assessments [referencing TWS, Dispositions Assessment, and Observation tool], however, specific indicators from rubrics, data, analyses, and interpretations are not provided specifically as evidence of R1.3. Standard 1.3 Worksheet (1.3.3) provides overarching data related to InTASC Standards 6, 7, and 8 and although it appears candidates are demonstrating effective performance on the selected indicators, the indicators are co-mingled across standards [ie: TWS 2.3 reflecting on assessment and TWS 1.2.2 knowledge of students differentiation indicators was cited for standard R1.1 and for Standard 1.3] and score ranges and analyses/interpretations of data are not provided. As previously indicated, the EPP acknowledges that "not all candidates scores are reported&for not all components for each key assessment" making the provided data unreliable. As CAEP R1.3 focuses on candidates ability to assess, plan for, and implement instruction and technology, the disposition assessment does not provide sufficient, relevant data of candidate competency.

d. Component R1.4 Professional Responsibility

The EPP requires undergraduates to successfully complete the course EDU 406 Philosophical, Legal and Ethical Issues, and graduates to complete the course EDF 515 Social and Philosophical Issues in Education. Candidates must achieve a grade of C or higher in these courses to progress in the program. In the course EDSP 410 Supporting Diverse Learners Through Collaboration, candidates learn about working with a team of both special and general education professionals within a school setting. (**See #1.1.1 Standards Alignment Char t**).

Candidates are provided with feedback regarding their professional learning and ethical practice at several checkpoints within the program through the **#1.1.9 Dispositions Tool**. Candidates are expected to receive a rating of 2 or higher on a scale of 1-4. There is also a red flag component to alert faculty and supervisors to immediate issues. Candidates receiving less than a 2 or a red flag are given counsel by the faculty and action is taken to remediate the problem. On the tool, the following sections address professional responsibility:

- " Section 3: Humility Candidates strive to learn from others.
- " Section 5: Self-Awareness Candidates reflect and examine their own perceptions and behaviors on others.
- " Section 6: Reflection Candidates take responsibility to reflect and incorporate feedback.
- " Section 7: Honesty and Ethics Candidates exhibit integrity and behave ethically.

Data is collected at the three checkpoints and examined across the candidates' level in the program. Candidates are given formative and summative feedback using the tool. The **#1.1.11 Dispositions Policy Procedure** further outlines the intended procedure. In Fall 2024, we intend to implement training for Cooperating Teachers.

The **#1.1.7 TWS** also informs professional responsibility. In section 1.1, Preparation through Collaboration, candidates write a reflection about their collaboration with their Cooperating Teacher to develop their unit. In section 1.2, Creating the Continual Growth Plan, candidates choose an area from the Danielson Framework they would like to develop more. Candidates develop reflective questions and then answer the questions using resources and research. Finally, as candidates complete their lesson, they engage in a written reflection. Data is aggregated across learning levels and by question. Data indicated proficiency or sufficiency in all areas (See **#1.4.1 Standard 1.4 Worksheet**).

FFRd. Narrative Analysis - Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility

The EPP claims and supports through the documentation of multiple syllabi that undergraduates and graduates achieve a high level of professional responsibility through EDU 406, EDF 515, and EDSP 410. While the #1.1.1 Standards Alignment chart was missing, it appears that professional responsibility for both special and general education professionals within a school setting are addressed through structured coursework.

Similarly, candidates are provided feedback related to professional responsibility through the Disposition Tool #1.1.9. This assessment is completed at several points throughout the program. The IHE indicates that students given a "red flag" are given counsel by the faculty and action is taken to remediate the program. It is unclear how this process is documented. Three cycles of data were provided for component 1.4: Professional Responsibility for the Teacher Work Sample, Observation Tool, and Dispositions; however, data was not disaggregated by program area or any relevant student data. Similarly, the EPP reports, "Due to the challenges and inconsistencies of our data collection systems, not all candidate scores were reported and, of those who were reported, not all components for each key assessment have scores. Therefore, the n indicated in each component is the number of students who received scores."

There did not appear to be an analysis of the data presented to identify any strengths, weaknesses, or potential areas for continuous improvement identified by the program.

SSR Addendum d. Component R1.4 Professional Responsibility

R.1.4 (A) - Does the EPP have evidence of disaggregated data across specialty areas as well as other demographic factions demonstrating candidates ability within the category of "Professional Responsibility? "

The area of professional responsibility can be measured in a variety of ways. The **Evidences 1.1.14 Key Assessment: Observation; 1.1.15 Key Assessment_TWS and 1.1.16 Key Assessment Dispositions** includes components of 1.4. This data is also disaggregated across programs and gender and race demographics.

R.1.4 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation that was reportedly contained within Evidence

1.1.1. InTASC Alignment Chart?

This evidence is uploaded as **Evidence #1.1.1 InTASC Alignment Chart** is now uploaded.

R.1.4 (C) - Can the EPP provide evidence of data analysis across "Professional Responsibility" for all program areas?

The area of professional responsibility can be measured in a variety of ways. **The Evidences 1.1.14 Key Assessment: Observation; 1.1.15 Key Assessment_TWS and 1.1.16 Key Assessment Dispositions** includes components of 1.4. This data is also disaggregated across programs and gender and race demographics.

SRRd. Narrative Analysis - Component R1.4 - Professional Responsibility

R1.4 Professional Responsibility

The SSR indicates candidates complete EDU406 Philosophical, Legal, and Ethical Issues, and EDF 515 Social and Philosophical Issues in Education though completion of these courses does not necessarily provide evidence of candidates' abilities to act ethically, collaborate with others, or take responsibility for student learning without any key assessments and data from the courses. The Disposition Tool is cited as the primary vehicle to assess R1.4. There are 12 of 21 indicators on this instrument that are tagged as related to professional behaviors, attitudes, and practices; data indicate candidates demonstrate professionalism though questions exist regarding the representativeness of data as previously discussed. Also, although the disposition data is collected from a variety of stakeholders [candidates, supervisors, and cooperating teachers] and multiple checkpoints, it is unclear what dispositional data is presented in the data charts progressive data of dispositions over time or final dispositions, a composite score or a score of one of the constituents? TWS has several indicators that measure the candidates' receptivity to feedback, developing a professional growth plan, and collaborating with others. As with all data provided, no analysis or interpretation has been provided.

Throughout the SSR for R1 the only continuous improvement plan identified was additional training needed for Cooperating Teachers for completing the Disposition Assessment to improve inter-rater reliability. There is no rationale or data to explain what this decision was based upon.

The initial candidates interviewed during the on-site visit spoke highly of the EPP and program. The implementation of Tervera should benefit the EPP in collecting, analyzing, and reporting data in meaningful and systemic, systematic ways. The EPP should also be commended for its "Data Dips" as a positive step in analyzing data; codifying these and decision-making using data is encouraged. From the on-site visit, a sample agenda and outline of "416 Data Dip Outline" was provided which clearly demonstrates the intention to engage faculty in discussions around Standard 1 data, however, minutes, notes, reflections were not provided from the meeting.

In on-site interviews with current candidates and alumni, participants report strong relationships and support from EPP faculty, who are described as "compassionate", "empathetic", and "professional." Classroom management, particularly from alumni, is seen as an area that is in need of further development, particularly "de-escalation strategies" and

"developing a skill set with positive behavior.

AFIs for Standard 1 are primarily captured in Standard 5 as they are related to data quality, continuous improvement, and systemic quality assurance that have yet to be achieved.

Standard RA1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Advanced Level Programs)

**Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence:
 Standard RA1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Advanced Level Programs)**

SSR Evidence - Standard RA1

Evidence Title	Caep Component	File
1.1.2A SCOU Program Standards Benchmark Chart	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities	
1.1.6A 5 Years of Praxis Data	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA3.3 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	1.1.6 SCOU 5 years of Praxis Scores.pdf
1.1.10A Diversity Report	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	#1.1.10A Diversity Report (MSUBILLING)
1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences	
1.1.8 Lawshe Panel Table	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities,Component RA5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement	#1.1.8A Lawshe Panel CVR Table.pdf
1.1.1A SCOU Data Framework	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities	
1.1.5A SCOU Assessment Chart	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	#1.1.5A SCOU Assessment Chart.docx
1.1.9A Evaluation Plan of		

Improvement	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	
1.1.3A SCOUC Internship Guidebook	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation, Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences	#1.1.3A School Counseling Internship Gu
1.1.7A SCOUC Advisory Panel	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities, Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	#1.1.7A Advisory Panel Spring 2024.pdf
1.2.1A Montana State University Billings School Counseling Tereva Manual	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions, Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	#1.2.1 Montana State University Billings_

Items per page: 1 11 of 11 < >

a. Component RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

The School Counseling Program (SCOUC) ensures that students are proficient in applying their knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes in school counseling. Candidates show competency in data literacy and research and are skilled in analyzing data. Students assume leadership roles through a curriculum that prioritizes leadership development, team collaboration, and effective communication. Students receive training to work with educators, parents and community members to establish nurturing environments conducive to student achievement. The application of technology is a focus. Candidates use technological tools and resources to enhance their counseling practices, improve data collection and analysis, and facilitate more effective communication with students, families, and colleagues. This includes using educational software, digital communication platforms, and data management systems to deliver counseling services and program management.

Positive dispositions in SCOUC means manifesting professional conduct that mirrors the principles and ethical standards of the counseling field. This encompasses displaying empathy, respect, and a dedication to diversity and equity. Candidates cultivate reflective practices, consistently assessing their own behaviors and attitudes to confirm their alignment with professional norms. Professional SCOUCs are required to adhere to the laws, policies, and ethical standards relevant to their profession. Candidates receive in-depth instruction on the legal and ethical structures, including confidentiality, informed consent, and the rights of minors within educational environments. They are trained to apply guidelines in their practice, guaranteeing their actions are both legally compliant and ethically sound.

Candidates undergo evaluations across all facets of RA1.1 throughout their educational journey. Detailed assessment milestones are outlined in the **#1.1.1A SCOUC Data Framework & #1.1.2A SCOUC Program Standards Benchmark Chart**. Evaluations occur at the program's

inception within designated SCOU courses (SCOU 505 Theories of Counseling, SCOU 507 Ethical and Professional Issues School Counseling and Family Therapists, and SCOU 527 Counseling in the Elementary and Middle School), midway through their studies during the Practicum (SCOU 506 Practicum: Counseling and Therapy Techniques), during both their elementary and secondary internships (SCOU 590A Internship School Counseling Elementary and SCOU 590B Internship School Counseling Secondary), and finally, as they complete their program during SCOU 597 Capstone in School Counseling. All principal assessments conform to standards set by CAEP, ASCA, MSCA, PEPPS, and the Danielson Framework, ensuring a comprehensive and aligned evaluation process.

Evaluations are conducted by the SCOU faculty and staff, who understand relevant laws, policies, and ethical codes for school counseling. The alignment of CAEP, ASCA, MSCA, PEPPS, and Danielson Framework with each assessment is detailed in the **#1.1.2A SCOU Program Standards Benchmark Chart**. Candidates engage with program outcomes and assess their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions throughout all course components, including the SCOU Practicum, both SCOU Internships, and the concluding SCOU Capstone course. Information regarding program outcomes, assessment of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions is available in the **#1.1.3A SCOU Internship Guidebook** and through all course-related tasks within the MSUB SCOU Tevera software program, ensuring a thorough understanding and adherence to assessment criteria and objectives.

The School Counseling Program also prepares candidates in attaining the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions through assessment. This includes six key assessments with corresponding outcomes: **#1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric** (used for SCOU Elementary Evaluation Rubric, SCOU Secondary Evaluation Rubric, SCOU Practicum Evaluation Rubric, SCOU Exit Evaluation Student Survey) and **#1.1.5A SCOU Tevera Hour Logs**, found in the **#1.1.3A SCOU Internship Guidebook** for all clinical engagements. These assessments are designed to measure 19 professional competencies encompassing knowledge, skills, and dispositions at least three times throughout the program to monitor and encourage candidate growth from the beginning to the completion of their training.

Candidates are evaluated during their coursework through course evaluations. The course evaluation data aligns directly with the program outcomes, offering a comprehensive view of student performance and learning achievement. The evidence gathered from these evaluations, along with the six key assessments, demonstrates that candidates consistently perform at a "competent" or "proficient" level in the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions relevant to the school counseling profession. For a more detailed understanding, reference is made to the **#1.1.1A SCOU Data Framework** and **#1.1.2A SCOU Standards Benchmark Chart**. These documents list the key assessments and the courses where each is administered, ensuring CAEP alignment.

The **#1.1.5A SCOU Assessment Chart** represents the SCOU Program Assessment Milestones and the evaluation process at key junctures of the program. The tools used for assessment are the self-evaluation rubric, the SCOU evaluation rubric, the Praxis Exam, the Elementary Internship Tereva Hour Log, the Secondary Internship Log, and the Tereva hours log. (See **#1.1.3A SCOU Internship Guidebook** and **#1.1.4A, SCOU Evaluation Rubric**.) The positioning of these assessments at critical junctures throughout the candidate's program of study enables ongoing tracking of progress and the timely provision of support, enhancing the likelihood of

successful program completion.

The **#1.1.7A SCOU Advisory Panel** played a pivotal role in developing these key assessments. Comprising faculty, staff, and key stakeholders from the school counseling profession, this panel employed a consensus-based approach (Lawshe method) to ensure assessments are in alignment with CAEP Advanced Standards, and the ASCA, MSCA, PEPPS, the Danielson Framework standards. This collaborative process ensures a high level of content validity, meaning they effectively measure what they are intended to assess within the context of professional school counseling standards.

The SCOU program integrates and assesses the competencies essential for the SCOU profession. Knowledge, skills, and dispositions are included in course syllabi. To validate and continuously improve the curriculum and its outcomes, the program underwent a thorough review process involving state officials, content experts from other universities within Montana, and the Continuous Improvement Coalition (CIC) team. This collaborative review scrutinized syllabi, course sequencing, assignments, key assessments, and the structure of course exams, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of the program's effectiveness. The feedback is included in the evidence documents (**# 1.1.8A SCOU Lawshe Panel CVR Table**). Assessment of candidate competencies includes several critical components: *Praxis Exam*: Candidates must pass the 5422 Professional Praxis Exam with a minimum score of 159 during their Capstone course; *GPA Requirement*: Maintaining a minimum overall GPA of 3.0 is mandatory for graduation;

Clinical Hour Logs via Tevera Software: Candidates must complete and log their 100 hours during the SCOU Practicum course and 300 hours each during the Elementary and Secondary Internship courses. Faculty members review these logs monthly to verify that candidates meet the necessary hours in diverse school settings; *Course Exams*: Course exams evaluate candidates' understanding of course content and their ability to apply knowledge in practical scenarios. Exams align with the program's learning outcomes, offering another layer of competency assessment.

#1.1.9A Evaluation Plan of Improvement Form: If candidate concerns arise, support is provided through program faculty, University Supervisors, and academic advisors summative and formative feedback. Candidates' specific data is housed in Tevera software making it accessible immediately to candidates for their review upon completion of an assessment. The program is committed to continuous improvement, especially in areas where there has been limited data collection. The SCOU program faculty actively collects data to identify growth areas for individual candidates and the overall effectiveness of the program. This endeavor is particularly significant in the areas of diversity and inclusivity, where data collection efforts have been identified as needing strengthening. The program will be using site placement demographic data in our next cycle to ensure diverse placements. In addition, the program has added American School Counseling Diversity mindset assignments to all coursework including practicum and capstone.

At the conclusion of each semester, program faculty analyze assessment data to pinpoint areas for improvement for individual candidates and to evaluate and enhance the program's comprehensive effectiveness. When specific gaps are found, a structured plan for improvement is collaboratively developed between the candidate and faculty, ensuring targeted interventions are put in place. The program has intensified its efforts to gather and analyze data more

comprehensively. This includes a renewed focus on the **#1.1.10A Diversity Report** where the advanced SCOU faculty use Tevera software for collection and examination of demographic data and profiles of internship placement schools. Demographic data are also gathered by the university's Institutional Research Office. This enhanced approach to data collection aims to deepen the program's understanding of diversity of candidates and their communities. The program addresses programmatic challenges identified through data analysis by engaging an advisory panel. This panel plays a pivotal role in identifying gaps.

FFRa. Narrative Analysis - Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

The EPP identified the School Counseling program as the sole advanced certification program at the IHE. The provider reports that candidates undergo evaluations across all facets of RA1.1 throughout the program with milestones outlined in #1.1.1A SCOU Data Framework & #1.1.2A SCOU Program Standards Benchmark Chart. Unfortunately, it appears that both pieces of evidence were not included in the Self-Study Report Evidence and cannot be verified. Therefore, it was not possible to identify the different types of data that exists, evaluate the appropriateness and sufficiency of the data, or assess the analysis and synthesis of data into meaning forms that guide decisions. The actual assessments of candidates were not presented in order to determine sufficiency of EPP created assessments with respect to the CAEP Framework.

SSR Addendum a. Component RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

RA 1.1 There was no evidence for school counseling demonstrating proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to the field across the six identified areas in the 2022 CAEP Workbook for advanced certification programs.

The **#1.1.1A SCOU Data Framework** has now been uploaded. The framework has several components. The first is program growth measurement points. The highlighted components are data included in the report. These include: the initial self-reflection evaluation, the elementary and secondary internship evaluations, clinical hours, Praxis scores, GPA, the employer/completer surveys, and the Advisory Panel feedback. Next, the EPP is now able to provide a description of proficiency points in order to understand and apply knowledge and skills in the field by the six areas in the CAEP workbook. This is on pages 3-4, and labeled "CAEP Accreditation Benchmarks for Advanced School Counseling Program." The next chart, on page 5, the "Advance School Counseling Program CAEP Alignment Table" further describes of key assessments are used to measure CAEP standards. This is broken down by component. On pages 5-6, the EPP also includes the Evaluation Rubric, demonstrating further where standards are measured.

The **Evidence #1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric** evaluates candidate's proficiencies aligned to the CAEP workbook standards.

The **Evidence #1.1.10A SCOU Disaggregated Praxis Data** demonstrates summative performance of the candidates.

The **Evidence #1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle** contains the following information: Initial Mean score (from the self-evaluation), Elementary Mean Score (from internship evaluation) and Secondary Mean Score (from internship evaluation.) This also demonstrates three cycles of data. This also includes a summary of findings that delineates candidate strengths and potential areas of growth for each of the six standards.

The **Evidence #1.1.12A SCOU Candidate Cohort Growth Documentation** contains the following information: Initial Mean score (from the self-evaluation), Elementary Mean Score (from internship evaluation) and Secondary Mean Score (from internship evaluation.) This also includes a summary of findings that delineates candidate strengths and potential areas of growth for each of the six standards. This is for a cohort of 21 students in the programs; this demonstrates performance on all three of the evaluations, providing their mean growth.

The **Evidence #1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA Checkpoint Progress Documentations** shows disaggregated GPAs across checkpoints; this data is disaggregated by gender and race.

The **Evidence #1.1.14A SCOU Candidate Initial Evaluation Data** is the raw evaluation data of the initial self-reflection which is aligned to the CAEP standards (also SCOU outcomes and Montana PEPPS standards).

The **Evidence #1.1.15A SCOU Candidate Elementary and Secondary Evaluation Data** is the raw evaluation data of the elementary and secondary internships which is aligned to the CAEP standards (also SCOU outcomes and Montana PEPP standards.)

SSRa. Narrative Analysis - Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

The Advanced SSR indicates School Counseling as the only advanced licensure program provided by the EPP. The narrative in the SSR claims six key assessments provide evidence of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions [seven, including the Praxis II exam], however, evidence [the narrative or addendum, prompts/rubrics/data for these six key assessments] are not clearly and distinctly provided. It is unclear of what competencies "hour logs" are used to demonstrate mastery; they are, in fact, of no use without explanation or commentary. 1.1.1A, School Counseling Framework and Alignment Chart, indicates several key assessments not discussed in the narrative: initial self-reflection evaluation, work samples, competency at completion assignments [capstone], school counseling work samples [capstone] and rubrics/data which are not provided as evidence, nor are data from these provided. Although courses are identified in the SSR and in 1.1.1A, data from course assessments are not provided to demonstrate candidate performance, skills, competencies related to A1.1. The EPP claims "course exams evaluate candidates' understanding of course content and their ability to apply knowledge in practical scenarios. Exams align with program's learning outcomes" but no information regarding this alignment nor data relating

to candidate exam scores have been provided. Neither rubric nor data is provided to illustrate how candidates dispositions in the Counseling program are assessed. The EPP provides an Alignment chart: ADVANCED SCOU Evaluation Rubric CAEP Standards that serves to align CAEP 1.1A 6 indicators with Evaluation indicators, but the rationale for explaining the alignment is not obvious [often illogical] and data is not provided to demonstrate competency of standard components. 1.1.4A provides the Advanced School Counseling Evaluation Rubric used to assess candidates during their practicum, elementary, and secondary internships; it does not meet CAEP Sufficiency Criteria as indicators are tagged to multiple standards [CAEP and CACREP], it does not provide actionable feedback, and organization is confusing. Evidence 1.1.14A and 1.1.15A provide data from this rubric for Fall 2023, Spring and Fall 2024 by rubric indicator, but as CAEP indicators/skills are co-mingled, it is difficult to ascertain candidate proficiency, strengths and weaknesses; the data chart also lacks data range, target score, and analysis and interpretation of data. Finally, the EPP does not provide data to demonstrate candidate competency for any of the advanced Standard 1 components.

Evidence 1.1.11A-Advanced SCOU Evaluation Data Initial Self Reflection to Internship Evaluation provides candidate means but appears to be aligned to CAEP R1 Initial standards and provides no information regarding what instrument was used, how these scores were obtained, or how the "findings provided" are related to the data. 1.1.12.A-Candidate Cohort Evaluation Growth Table was provided; the data is confusing as no explanation is provided as to how "average growth" was calculated, what criteria determined whether a category was deemed a "strength" or an "area of growth," and what data was used for comparisons in the summary section. During the on-site interview with the faculty of the School Counseling program, it was explained that each candidate is initially self-assessed with a rubric [rubric and data not provided] and at the end of the program each candidate is rated by their CT and Supervisor [rubric and data unknown]. These are then "calculated" into an average growth number: 0= no growth to 3= much growth. Exhibit 1.1.12 identifies 25 indicators as "areas of growth" and 16 indicators as "strengths" little narrative was provided regarding next steps.

Generally, some data was provided, however, it was, overall not possible to identify the examples and types of data that exist, evaluate the appropriateness and sufficiency of the data, or determine the analysis and interpretation of data to guide continuous improvement.

b. Component RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

The School Counseling program is committed to upholding the highest standards of education in the field of school counseling. It ensures that program completers are not only proficient in specialized content and discipline knowledge, adhering to approved state and/or national standards, but also demonstrates a proactive approach to progress monitoring. This approach is pivotal for maintaining the quality and efficacy of the educational experience provided to candidates.

The program employs a rigorous system of assessments, course assignments, and evaluation data to monitor the progress of its candidates. This system includes:

Regular Assessments and Course Assignments : These are designed to align with the specialized content and discipline knowledge as defined by standards from the Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs), individual state standards, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and accrediting bodies such as the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Through these assessments and assignments, candidates' understanding, and application of critical knowledge and skills are evaluated, providing timely feedback for improvement.

Use of Evaluation Data for Progress Monitoring : The program systematically analyzes evaluation data from course assignments and assessments to track each candidate's progress throughout their study. This data-driven approach enables the identification of both strengths and areas for growth, ensuring that candidates receive the support and guidance needed to achieve their full potential.

Continuous Feedback Loop : Feedback from assessments and course assignments is integral to the program's progress monitoring efforts. This continuous feedback loop allows for the timely adjustment of teaching strategies, course content, and support services to better meet the needs of candidates. It also facilitates a personalized learning experience, where candidates' progress towards meeting the approved state and/or national discipline-specific standards is closely monitored and fostered.

Documentation and Improvement Plans: The program emphasizes the importance of documenting candidates' mastery of content knowledge and professional competencies. When gaps are identified through progress monitoring, personalized improvement plans are developed in collaboration with the candidate. These plans are designed to address specific areas of need, ensuring that all candidates achieve the level of proficiency required by their professional specialty.

The Advanced School Counseling Program uses standards from the Montana School Counseling Association (MSCA), the American School Counseling Association (ASCA), CAEP, the Montana Professional Educator Preparation Program Standards (PEPPS), and the Danielson Framework. This integration ensures a holistic development for candidates, equipping them with both theoretical knowledge and practical skills necessary for effective school counseling. Through its curriculum and assignments, the program embeds MSCA and ASCA standards to focus on core competencies such as advocacy and the development of comprehensive counseling programs, while CAEP standards emphasize evidence-based practices and data-informed decision-making. The incorporation of PEPPS ensures candidates are well-versed in Montana's specific educational expectations, including legal and ethical standards. Meanwhile, the Danielson Framework's adaptation to counseling highlights the importance of creating supportive environments and engaging teaching practices.

Assessment strategies within the program are varied and strategic, employing self-assessments, peer evaluations, and supervisor feedback aligned with these comprehensive standards. This approach facilitates detailed progress monitoring, allowing for the adjustment of program components to better meet candidate needs and uphold high standards of practice. The use of evaluation data is pivotal in tracking candidates' growth over time, ensuring they are prepared to support student achievement in diverse educational landscapes.

The program prepares school counselors capable of designing and implementing data-driven counseling programs that promote equity, access, and success for all students. By preparing candidates to work effectively across diverse settings and to be culturally competent, the program not only adheres to but exceeds the expectations of modern educational standards. This multifaceted approach ensures graduates are not only theoretically informed but also adept at fostering positive outcomes in various educational environments.

The School Counseling program employs a comprehensive approach to develop assessments and course content that meet the highest standards in the field. This approach involves collaboration with a **#1.1.7A SCOU Advisory Panel** and the use of a consensus based (Lawshe) **#1.1.8A SCOU Lawshe Panel Table** method to ensure that all assessments are in line with CAEP Advanced Standards, as well as standards set by ASCA, MSCA, PEPPS, and the Danielson Framework. This rigorous process ensures the content validity of the program's assessments, aligning them with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates are expected to demonstrate through their coursework in the program.

To guarantee that the curriculum is both current and relevant, the program undergoes regular external reviews. This includes an examination of syllabi, course sequencing, assignments, and key assessments by state officials and content experts from other universities within the state of Montana, as well as members of the CIC team. Such reviews ensure that the program's content remains aligned with professional standards and the needs of today's educational landscape.

A crucial component of the program is the Praxis Exam (**See #1.1.6A 5 Years of Praxis Data**). Candidates must take this Professional Praxis Exam during their Capstone course, achieving a score of 159 or above to qualify for graduation. This requirement underscores the faculty's commitment to ensuring graduates meet the rigorous professional standards expected in the field. Furthermore, all course syllabi are aligned with the standards of ASCA, MSCA, PEPPS, and the Danielson Framework, with ongoing efforts to incorporate the final CAEP standards fully.

By the end of the program, candidates must demonstrate competency or proficiency in the knowledge and skills relevant to the school counseling profession, as outlined in the assessment plan. For detailed information on how the assessments and courses align with professional standards, please refer to the **#1.1.1A SCOU Data Framework** and **#1.1.2A SCOU Program Standards Benchmark Chart**. These documents provide a comprehensive overview of the assessments, the courses in which they are administered, and how each aligns with CAEP standards and components.

Beyond the structured coursework, the program emphasizes the importance of self-reflection and the application of knowledge in addressing diversity, equity, and inclusion within a K-12 student population. Candidates engage in self-reflection assessments and guidance lesson planning and are required to maintain a reflective journal during all clinical experiences. These journals are reviewed by University Supervisors and instructors during practicum, elementary internship, and secondary internship phases, ensuring continuous feedback and personal growth.

Additionally, candidates are required to log their clinical hours using Tevera software,

meticulously documenting the specific activities undertaken. This log is an essential component of the program's commitment to providing transparent and accountable clinical training, as detailed in the **#1.2.1A Montana State University Billings School Counseling Tevera Manual**. This comprehensive approach to training and assessment ensures that graduates of the School Counseling program are well-prepared to contribute positively to the educational and personal development of students across diverse settings.

FFRb. Narrative Analysis - Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities

The EPP reports that it ensures program completers are proficient in specialized content and disciplinary knowledge and upload state and national standards. They also claim a rigorous system of assessments, course assignments and evaluation data to monitor the progress of candidates that includes: Regular Assessments and Course Assignments; Use of Evaluation Data for Progress Monitoring; Continuous Feedback Loop; and Documentation of Improvement Plans. While these are described in the narrative, there is no evidence of the rigorous system of assessments provided in the evidences submitted in the Self Study Report. Similar to RA1.1, the provider reports that candidates undergo evaluations across all facets of RA1.2 throughout the program with milestones outlined in #1.1.1A SCOU Data Framework & #1.1.2A SCOU Program Standards Benchmark Chart. Unfortunately, it appears that both pieces of evidence were not included in the Self-Study Report Evidence and cannot be verified. Therefore, it was not possible to identify the different types of data that exists, evaluate the appropriateness and sufficiency of the data, or assess the analysis and synthesis of data into meaning forms that guide decisions.

The EPP did provide evidence of Praxis scores for school counseling in evidence 1.1.6 SCOU 5 years of Praxis Scores, however, it is unclear how this data is used to make continuous improvement or how the EPP aligns Praxis evidence with one or more of the six identified areas of the 2022 CAEP Workbook for advanced programs.

SSR Addendum b. Component RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

RA1.2 (A) - How does the EPP know candidates know the specialized content of their field?
Progress monitoring takes place throughout various checkpoints in the program, evidenced by the the **Evidence #1.1.1A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Charts**. **Evidence #1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation of Candidate Rubric Form** is used as growth measure as described in RA 1.1. Further measures includes:

- " **Evidence #1.1.10A: SCOU Disaggregated Praxis Data**
- " **Evidence #1.1.11A: Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle**
- " **Evidence #1.1.12A: SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation**
- " **Evidence #1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA Checkpoint Progress Documentation**

" **Evidence #1.1.14A SCOU Candidate Enrollment Demographic Documentation**

Included in the evidence are the assessment, analysis, and synthesis of data for program decision-making. Also note there is alignment to the CAEP standards in each of these evidences.

RA1.2 (B) - What data does the EPP have that candidates know this content?

Progress monitoring takes place throughout various checkpoints in the program, evidenced by the the Evidence #1.1.1A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Charts. Evidence #1.1.4A, SCOU Evaluation of Candidate Rubric Form is used as growth measure as described in RA 1.1. Further measures includes:

- " **Evidence #1.1.10A: SCOU Disaggregated Praxis Data**
- " **Evidence #1.1.11A: Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle**
- " **Evidence #1.1.12A: SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation**
- " **Evidence #1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA Checkpoint Progress Documentation**
- " **Evidence #1.1.14A SCOU Candidate Enrollment Demographic Documentation**

Included in the evidence are the assessment, analysis, and synthesis of data for program decision-making. Also note there is alignment to the CAEP standards in each of these evidences.

RA1.2 (C) - What analysis and subsequent program improvements have been made to improve candidates knowledge of their specialized content?

Progress monitoring takes place throughout various checkpoints in the program, evidenced by the the Evidence #1.1.1A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Charts. Evidence #1.1.4A, SCOU Evaluation of Candidate Rubric Form is used as growth measure as described in RA 1.1. Further measures includes:

- " **Evidence #1.1.10A: SCOU Disaggregated Praxis Data**
- " **Evidence #1.1.11A: Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle**
- " **Evidence #1.1.12A: SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation**
- " **Evidence #1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA Checkpoint Progress Documentation**
- " **Evidence #1.1.14A SCOU Candidate Enrollment Demographic Documentation**

Included in the evidence are the assessment, analysis, and synthesis of data for program decision-making. Also note there is alignment to the CAEP standards in each of these evidences.

RA1.2 (D) - How does the EPP know candidate are able to apply their specialized knowledge in educational settings?

Fieldwork is comprised of three components: practicum, elementary internship, and secondary internship. Data is collected in all three experiences, and included in the addendum is the **Evidence #1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle**. While the practicum data has not been included, the EPP is in the process of collecting data for Spring 2025 (as the course is only offered in spring.)

RA1.2 (E) - What data does the EPP have that candidates are able to apply this knowledge?
Fieldwork is comprised of three components: practicum, elementary internship, and secondary internship. Data is collected in all three experiences, and included in the addendum is the Evidence #1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle. While the practicum data has not been included, the EPP is in the process of collecting data for Spring 2025 (as the course is only offered in spring.) Also, the **Evidence #1.1.12A SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation** shows that candidates can apply their content knowledge in the field from their initial program evaluation into the elementary and secondary internship.

RA1.2 (F) - Subsequently, what analysis and program improvements have been made to improved candidates application of knowledge to specialized settings?

All of the aforementioned evidence include improvement plans in the documentation.

RA1.2 (G) - What evidence can the EPP present that candidates in school counseling create effective environments for diverse P-12 students?
The **Evidence #1.1.16A Site Placement Diversity Documentation** shows the diversity within the site placements and mentors, as well as candidate diversity. Note that this document also includes a summary and analysis of this diversity data.

SRRb. Narrative Analysis - Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities

"The School Counseling program is committed to upholding the highest standards of education in the field of school counseling&adhering to approved state and national standards." In the SSR, the EPP cites CACREP as well as CAEP, MSCA [the Montana School Counseling Association], the American School Counseling Association [ASCA], and Montana Professional Educator Preparation Program Standards [PEPPS] as sources for standards though in examining the data and rubrics provided, alignment was demonstrated to CAEP, CACREP, and PEPPS specifically. The SSR describes "regular, external reviews" to ensure the curriculum is current and relevant, including an examination of syllabi, course sequencing, assignments and key assessments, however, no evidence has been presented of such reviews, findings, and recommendations. Evidence for R1.2 in the form of GPA, Praxis II scores, and Clinical Hours log sheets were provided. 1.1.13A demonstrates strong GPA, disaggregated by gender and ethnicity, at various points throughout the Counseling Program with a note that "GPA dips at the practicum or capstone states indicating potential challenges that should be assessed further" no indications for further plans are provided. 1.1.6A provides documentation of Praxis II scores with 100% pass rates for the 3 data cycles though 4 candidates did take the exam multiple times. It is unclear how Praxis data is used to make continuous improvement decisions or how the EPP aligns this evidence with any of the CAEP A1.1 components. Though the School Counseling Intern/Practicum Final Evaluation is aligned to CACREP standards, data, analysis, and interpretation are not presented to discuss candidate specialized knowledge, content, or skills related to counseling. It is unclear how the Time Logs demonstrate specialized content knowledge. Though the addendum cites a number of pieces of evidence of "specialized content

knowledge", 1.1.12A Candidate Growth Documentation, 1.1.11A Candidate Mean Score Data. Evidence 1.1.14A and 1.1.15A are problematic for reasons cited previously in this report. Throughout the SSR, data is reported by their 22 evaluation indicators and not by ASCA or CACREP standard which makes determining specified content knowledge difficult. AFIs for A1.2 are captured in A5.

Standard R2: Clinical Partnership and Practice (Initial-licensure Level Programs)

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence: Standard R2: Clinical Partnership and Practice (Initial-licensure Level Programs)

SSR Evidence - Standard R2

a. Component R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

The Education Theory and Practice Department (ETP) has built clinical partnerships with Learning Education Agencies (LEAs). ETP faculty and LEAs coordinate clinical experiences. The Director of Field Experiences and Licensure (DFEL) works with these partners to place candidates in their required field experiences for all Junior Field/Graduate Practicum and Student Teaching experiences.

Candidates must clear a Department of Justice Criminal Background Report (CBR) before engaging in clinical experiences. This process involves candidates completing an initial fingerprint based national FBI background check that requires a notarized self-disclosure document indicating they will immediately disclose any new criminal arrest(s) and/or conviction(s). These CBRs are valid for two years, and it is the responsibility of the student to complete a new CBR should theirs expire before finishing all field experiences. A break in attendance of one year or more in the EPP requires the candidate to complete the fingerprint process to obtain a new CBR to re-enter the EPP or to take pre-program coursework involving field experiences. The Field Experience office in the COE monitors the background checks prior to all field experiences as well.

An additional CBR is completed and required to apply for Student Teaching, regardless of proximity of the last CBR conducted for the student. The only students exempt from the pre-Student Teaching CBR are those candidates who are a licensed teacher in MT and who are actively working in a school and have completed a CBR for employment. For this purpose, licensed teachers are identified as: provisionally licensed in the state of Montana with a Class 5 provisional license, or fully licensed Class 1 or 2; or they are an educator participating in an

Office of Public Instruction (OPI) teaching internship.

MSUB ETP adheres to all procedures to ensure privacy and security of candidates' Criminal History Record Information (CHRI) to meet the Montana Department of Justice (DOJ) along with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) rules. Regular audits are performed by the MT DOJ and can be performed by the FBI. The DFEL also maintains close relationships with the DOJ and MT OPI to ensure that determinations of eligibility for students with a mark on their record are handled the same as it would be for licensure and employment in school districts as evidenced in the **#2.1.1 DOJ Manual**.

Partnerships between EPP advisors and discipline-specific advisors from the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences as well as the College of Health Professions and Science have been established. These disciplinary partners often collaborate with the DFEL for clinical placements. Also, any curriculum changes proposed by the disciplinary partners are discussed with the EPP.

The ETP has co-constructed partnership agreements (PAs) with many Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) in the state and region. MSUB works to resolve student transfers even when articulation agreements have expired. The following Tribal College and Community Colleges in the state have current formal 2+2 partnership arrangements that allow students to move seamlessly from the two-year colleges to MSUB and EPP coursework and clinical preparation: Chief Dull Knife College, Miles Community College, and Dawson Community College (**#2.1.2: Articulation Agreements**).

Teacher candidates who begin their academic journey with these partners are engaged in clinical work comparable to MSUB's curricular requirements. When the agreements are constructed, MSUB and the two-year colleges collaborate on these experiences to meet course requirements. These partnerships also provide opportunities for the EPP to work with culturally, economically, and academically diverse candidates that also can lead to clinical placements in tribal communities and rural areas, particularly in Eastern Montana. They have mutual benefits; MSUB benefits by having teacher candidates who are well-prepared for their work at the upper division levels and two-year colleges benefit by having teacher candidates who return to their home communities.

In addition to LEA partnerships for foundational work, the EPP has also co-constructed several Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) with P-12 clinical partners to support candidates' clinical preparation. (**#2.1.3 P-12 Partners MOUS**).

- Billings Public Schools
- Boys and Girls Club
- Corvallis School District
- Eagle Mount
- Explorer's Academy
- Frenchtown School District
- Friendship House
- Hardin Public Schools
- Havre Public Schools
- Helena School District
- Hellgate Elementary School District

- Huntley Project Public Schools
- Laurel Public Schools
- Lockwood Public School
- Sentinel High School
- Sheridan WY
- Sidney School District
- Special Olympics Young Athletes
- St. Ignatius School District
- United Way
- West Ada ID
- Wibaux School District 6

These collaborations include partnering with district administrators, school administrators, teachers, and other school and district staff. The DFEL communicates regularly with clinical partners prior to, during, and after clinical experiences. For example, before setting up the clinical placements, the DFEL and school district leaders work together to select Cooperating Teachers (CTs) and determine preparation needs, such as training for new CTs and clarifying expectations of both the school district and MSUB. During the placements, the DFEL, the University Supervisors (USs), and the CTs meet regularly to identify issues of concern and celebrate milestones of teacher candidates. If there are serious concerns, a plan of improvement is created and implemented by all involved. After clinical experiences are completed, the DFEL and P-12 partners finalize assessments and discuss areas needing improvement if necessary.

The COE aims to ensure that partnerships with our collaborating schools and community organizations are mutually beneficial. For example, CTs may learn innovative practices through their teacher candidate and of course the candidate learns best practices from an expert teacher. P-12 students benefit from having an additional teacher in the room for support and teacher candidates learn critical skills in developing respectful relationships with students. CTs are also offered a stipend or course credits for mentoring a candidate which can be used toward continuing education units for licensure.

As mentioned above, USs serve an essential role as liaison and communicator between the EPP and the school sites they visit. As clinical educators themselves, they are in frequent communication with the CTs who host the student teachers they observe. In turn, USs maintain regular contact with the DFEL and are often on the frontline regarding advocacy for the student teachers they supervise. Common points of advocacy may include the need for support, remediation, or even disciplinary review, in some instances. Should the need arise for a formal plan of improvement, USs also play a vital role in monitoring and assessing improvement plans and progress of teacher candidates (**#2.1.4 University Supervisor Agreement**). USs receive a stipend and benefit professionally as a leader in an educational setting while giving back to their chosen profession.

The EPP is prepared for instances of candidates petitioning to move through the program using alternatives to the program guidelines, including rules and regulations that govern clinical preparation (e.g., alternative requirements around Junior Field, Graduate Practicum, or Student Teaching). The Petitions Committee is comprised of teachers, administrators, and COE faculty and staff (**#2.1.5 COE Appeals and Petitions Committee Roster AY 2023-2024**). This committee reviews requests for deviations from plans of study or teacher licensure

requirements monthly, including clinical preparation requirements, except during months that fall in a university break (winter and summer). If a petition need arises during a break, they are then reviewed by the Department Chair and Dean. Due to changes in state licensure requirements, petitions to waive pre-service clinical practice have become frequent. For example, some undergraduate students have been offered and have accepted Emergency Authorization Employment contracts, meaning they are teachers of record in their own classroom. This requires them to have a different placement and supervision situation than is the normal practice. Upon careful review of the petitions, the committee makes a recommendation to the Dean of the COE who reviews the decision and indicates support for or in opposition to the decision. The petitioner is notified of the decision through a formal letter. Should a petition be submitted during a university break that needs a decision before the next scheduled meeting, the petition process is escalated to the Department Chair (if available) and/or the Dean of the College of Education for decisions. Members of the Petitions Committee receive satisfaction from their ongoing involvement with the EPP and their ability to ensure the requirements are met, and the teacher candidates complete their program prepared to meet the needs of their future students. Committee by-laws can be found here: (**#2.1.6 Petitions Committee Bylaws**).

Finally, there are three state-wide partnerships that help support candidates' clinical experiences. The first is the Montana Council of Deans of Education (**MCDE: #2.1.7 MCDE Screenshot**). The MCDE is comprised of all the public and private EPPs in Montana and meets quarterly through in-person or virtual meetings. The MCDE provides support and feedback to the EPPs regarding assessment of clinical preparation, and accreditation in Montana. One of the roles of the MCDE is to inform public policy and accreditation standards related to education and educator preparation including clinical preparation in Montana. The group also develops shared vision, goals, and model processes and programs, while recognizing and honoring the unique contribution and strengths of each EPP. The MCDE also conducts joint communication with OPI and the Montana Board of Public Education related to clinical preparation. Partnerships through MCDE have facilitated shared clinical assessments and field placements for candidates who wish to student teach in other areas of the state.

A second state-wide partnership is the Higher Education Consortium . HEC is a community of general and special education faculty and administrators from all EPPs in Montana, including MSUB. In fact, two MSUB faculty have served as co-leaders of HEC from 2021 to the present. HEC meets twice a year to discuss critical issues and share ideas in clinical preparation and other areas of shared interest. A significant aspect of HEC is the collective engagement of the group in connecting general and special education areas of focus. HEC conversations have a positive impact on the EPP through collaborative problem solving of shared challenges, including challenges in clinical preparation and effective methods for assessing clinical experiences.

The third state-wide partnership is a collaboration with the Montana Association of School Superintendents (MASS). The EPP attends the monthly Region 3 MASS meeting and often presents issues important to the EPP. Through this partnership, the EPP gains insight into issues in clinical preparation pertinent to P-12 in the region. The EPP shares with P-12 partners developments in clinical preparation. The relationships created through decades of participation with MASS assists with co-constructing clinical practices and requirements, facilitates placements in field services, assists in addressing licensure issues, and facilitates professional

placements for EPP candidates.

FFRa. Narrative Analysis - Component R2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

The EPP documents partnership through co-constructed Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) with P-12 clinical partners to support candidates clinical preparation. The IHE narrative lists 22 partnerships with various organizations including organizations outside of P-12 school settings. Based on evidence 2.1.3 P-12. Partnership MOUs, the MOU is in effect for one calendar year and reviewed agreements are amended as necessary. The MOU outlines what will occur when placements are part of a (1) field experience and (2) when the placement is student teaching. In addition, the MOU does outline what MSUB COE agrees to do for the District/School/Agency. In addition, LEA's appear to have a role in COE Appeals and Petitions as noted in SSR evidence 2.1.5 & 2.1.6.

The EPP reports, "The DFEL, a department within the EPP, communicates regularly with clinical partners prior to, during, and after clinical experiences. For example, before setting up the clinical placements, the DFEL and school district leaders work together to select Cooperating Teachers (CTs) and determine preparation needs, such as training for new CTs and clarifying expectations of both the school district and MSUB. During the placements, the DFEL, the University Supervisors (USs), and the CTs meet regularly to identify issues of concern and celebrate milestones of teacher candidates. If there are serious concerns, a plan of improvement is created and implemented by all involved. After clinical experiences are completed, the DFEL and P-12 partners finalize assessments and discuss area needing improvement if necessary." Similarly, it appears that the P-12 partnerships have benefitted in various ways including, but not limited to: (1) learn innovative practices through teacher candidates, (2) having an additional teacher in the room for support, and (3) offered a stipend or course credit for mentoring candidates to be used towards continuing education.

SSR Addendum a. Component R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

R2.1 Verification of partnerships with P-12 partners

Verification of P-12 partnerships should be provided within the MOUs (**Evidence# 2.1.3 P-12 Partners MOUs**). Further documentation can be provide during the site visit if needed.

SRRa. Narrative Analysis - Component R2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

The EPP has partnerships for placements of students teachers and clinical experiences as described above and evidenced through the MOUs provided in the addendum and also has partnerships with non-LEAs such as St. Johns United Center for Generations, Boys and Girls Club of Yellowstone County, United Way of Yellowstone County Out of School Programs, and

MSUB Autism Club where candidates have early field experience, although mostly relationship-based as shared in the onsite interviews ((Non-LEA Clinical Partners). The EPP provided examples of partnering with LEA and NON-LEA alike to provide robust clinical experiences for their candidates.

Cooperating Teachers, or Initial Advisory Board were not able to provide evidence of formalized robust co-construction of clinical experiences during interviews at the site visit. However, there was a clear mutual respect amongst partners, EPP and candidates. The formation of a formalized advisory board suggests that this may be the direction the EPP is heading. This will be addressed in standard 5, stakeholder participation.

b. Component R2.2 Clinical Educators

The vision of the Department of Educational Theory and Practice (ETP) embraces inclusivity and diversity within the community. "Diverse students" means P-12 educators have an appreciation for ability, age, citizenship status, creed, cultural background, ethnicity, family model, gender identity and expression, health status, national origin, political ideology, race, religious affiliation, sexual orientation, spiritual affinity, size, socioeconomic class, and veteran status **(#2.2.1 ETP Vision Screenshot)**.

The definition of diversity is critical to the discussion of clinical experiences because the EPP hold candidates to professional dispositions that value and respect diverse students while they are in the field. The EPP also continually teaches students in their coursework to work with diverse students, which they demonstrate during their clinical experiences as well. The MSUB EPP relies upon the expertise of clinical educators University Supervisors (trained, affiliated, and compensated under the auspices of the EPP) and Cooperating Teachers (trained, affiliated with the EPP's partner schools, and compensated under the auspices of the EPP) **(#2.2.2 Cooperating Teacher Agreement)** to oversee, supervise, and nurture the EPP's candidates during field experiences, Student Teaching, and internship placements.

Cooperating Teachers are selected based upon agreed-upon criteria, co-established by the Director of Field Experiences and Licensure and partner school districts. The following criteria exemplify the considerations used in this process:

The Cooperating Teacher:

- " Demonstrates excellence in teaching, as documented by district evaluations.
- " Maintains a positive classroom environment characterized by proactive interpersonal skills and effective management techniques.
- " Structures a functional instructional program that features initial planning, comprehensive delivery, formative and summative evaluations of students, and adjustments of curriculum materials and instructional methods to meet students' needs.

The Cooperating Teacher must:

- " Be certified in the field(s) in which the student teacher is seeking certification.
- " Be employed as a full-time teacher during the term the student teacher is assigned to him/her.

" Have at least three years of experience (or is tenured) and other qualifications as required by the district.

The Cooperating Teacher must:

- " Look upon sponsorship of a student teacher as a contribution to the profession.
- " Demonstrate flexibility and a willingness to share responsibility for the classroom.
- " Demonstrate ability to objectively assess the student teacher's instructional performance.
- " Demonstrate ability to provide frequent, specific performance feedback.
- " Demonstrate ability to help the student teacher become a reflective practitioner.

The role of the University Supervisor is also explained in the **#2.2.3 Student Teaching Guidebook** and the **#2.1.4 University Supervisor Agreement**.

University Supervisor roles are filled by:

- " Retired educators (former P-12 teachers, principals, and superintendents)
- " Onsite administrators
- " MSUB College of Education Faculty
- " MSUB Director of Field Experiences and Licensure

This important clinical educator role provides the EPP with an essential link to the field, sharing critical feedback in the process of continuous improvement. University Supervisors are trained on an annual basis, to support program consistency. University Supervisors also attend Student Teaching Seminars two per semester to stay abreast of any changes in the guidebook, assessments, etc. Video training and webinars on key assessments and programs are also available at-will for University Supervisors to reference as needed or desired.

University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher Training and Support. Until three years ago, the ETP had a core group of University Supervisors and CTs that had been trained in mentoring and administering key assessments. Within the last three years, the ETP has had several transitions that are now resulting in revisions to the training. Transitions include the following:

- " Large numbers of teachers have retired;
- " Significant staffing changes to due retirement/moving onto other positions;
- " Creation of new key assessments;
- " Adoption of a new assessment management system (TEVERA) that all CTs, USs, and students are learning.

The ETP is working to implement the following:

- " Offering asynchronous key assessment training within the Tevera system that CTs and USs can complete on their own schedule.
- " Inviting CTs and USs to Junior Field and Student Teaching workshops.
- " Continue intentional communications between the DFEL and CTs and USs to answer ongoing questions.

FFRb. Narrative Analysis - Component R2.2 - Clinical Educators

The EPP documents that they work with Local Education agencies and partnership school districts to identify the selection of P-12 Clinical Educators and has established criteria that each cooperating teacher must meet. Similarly, the EPP has documented criteria that IHE Clinical Educators (University Supervisors) must have in order to participate as a University Supervisor. These criteria for P-12 Clinical educators were co-established between the partnership school districts and the Director of Field Experiences and Licensure. However, it is unclear what training university supervisors and cooperating teachers receive prior to engaging in that role.

Similarly, documentation was missing on how EPP's conduct a triangulation of evaluation between the university supervisor and cooperating teacher. While both Clinical Educators (p-12 and IHE) must complete evaluations on the candidates, the evaluation methods for the clinical educator is not defined.

The EPP clearly defines and embraces the concept of inclusivity and diversity within communities. From the Self-Study Report narrative, the EPP defines, "Diverse students" means P-12 educators have an appreciation for ability, age, citizenship status, creed, cultural background, ethnicity, family model, gender identity and expression, health status, national origin, political ideology, race, religious affiliation, sexual orientation, spiritual affinity, size, socioeconomic class, and veteran status (#2.2.1 ETP Vision Screenshot). The definition of diversity is critical to the discussion of clinical experiences because the EPP hold candidates to professional dispositions that value and respect diverse students while they are in the field. The EPP also continually teaches students in their coursework to work with diverse students, which they demonstrate during their clinical experiences as well.

SSR Addendum b. Component R2.2 Clinical Educators

R2.2(A) - Verification of Criteria from P-12 Clinical Educators and IHE Clinical Educators.
Verification of P-12 partnerships should be provided within the MOUs (# 2.1.3 P-12 Partners MOUs). Further documentation can be provide during the site visit if needed.

R2.2(B) - What evaluations are completed as part of P-12 Clinical Educators and IHE Clinical Educators?

Candidates complete a qualitative survey regarding their experiences with their Cooperating Teacher(s) and University Supervisor each semester. These can be shared during the site visit. The Director of Field Experiences and Licensure engages each Cooperating Teaching and University Supervisor in ongoing conversations to address concerns and integrates feedback into future trainings.

R2.2 (C) - How is results from evaluations shared with all parties?

Results from the qualitative evaluations indicated above are integrated into the next set of trainings for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors as needed.

R2.2 (D) - What training do Clinical Educators receive from the EPP (both P-12 clinical

educators and IHE Clinical Educators) on evaluations and assessments conducted during clinical placements and culminating student teaching?

Trainings for University Supervisors are held each semester. Topics covered include:

- " Candidate placement specifics, including specific needs or considerations of each placement
- " Expectations of candidates as outlined in the Student Teaching Handbook
- " Tevera: how to use Tevera to fill out key assessments, overview of the University Supervisor Tevera Manual, changes to Tevera platform
- " Expectations around professional conduct, overview of assessment, including criteria for evaluations and the role of the Cooperating Teachers.
- " Updates on any changes to key assessments, review of key due dates and submission processes, discussion of consistency and fairness in evaluations; and opportunities for University Supervisors to share questions and concerns.
- " See **Evidence #2.2,4 University Supervisor Training**.

SRRb. Narrative Analysis - Component R2.2 - Clinical Educators

The EPP has provided evidence of the requirements for both university supervisor (US) and school based cooperating teacher (CT) during the interviews at the site visit; however the MOU (the document pointed towards as evidence, merely asks for the tenure status of the CT and doesn't mention the requirement of tenure, as shared in the interview. The EPP failed to provide evidence of a robust evaluation system of university supervisors or cooperating teachers, depending on a more informal review process per interviews. It is clear from the interviews that the university-based Director of Field Experience and Field Experience Technician are incredible supports for both the USs and CTs. The Director and Technician ensure the US and CT are well supported and able to provide mentorship to and evaluate the candidates. Although there was evidence presented showing formal professional development was offered to the university supervisors (#2.2,4 University Supervisor Training), in interviews they were not able to discuss these. There were only two cooperating teachers in the interview and neither was able to recall professional development and when pressed could only refer to directions on navigating Tevera, the online platform. However, all commended the support of the Director and Technician and individualized attention. Lacking is a system of support with professional development in place, although plans for this seem to be discussed as CT and US continue to be supported by the Director and Technician.

c. Component R2.3 Clinical Experiences

The MSUB ETP implements a gradual immersion approach to clinical experiences for teacher candidates. Faculty and staff work in collaboration with community partners to develop beneficial experiences for the community partners and MSUB students. Each experience is co-created by faculty/staff and community partners. Undergraduate field experiences begin with observations in lower-division courses, such as EDU 220/220L Human Growth and

Development/Lab and EDSP 204 Introduction to Teaching Exceptional Learners in which students are placed in a LEA partner location to make connections and reflect upon course concepts and practice. This is followed by several undergraduate upper-division/graduate methods-based clinical experiences in which students teach individual lessons or units of learning with P-12 students in tutoring, small group, or whole class experiences (**# 2.3.1 Graduated Clinical Experiences**)

As students near the end of the program, they are more fully immersed into clinical practice during the Junior Field/Graduate Practicum courses in which they are placed in clinical settings for 65 hours with a Cooperating Teacher and formally assessed with the EPP Key Assessments Teaching Observation Evaluation, Disposition Observation Evaluation, and Teacher Work Sample Rubric. Finally, teacher candidates are fully immersed in Student Teaching as their final clinical experience, which involves full-time placement with a Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor (**#2.3.2 Junior Field Syllabus** and **#2.3.3 Graduate Practicum Syllabus**).

To monitor progress between early experiences through Student Teaching, aspects of the TWS and Observation Evaluation are embedded within course assignments. A bi-semester Dispositions Check-in has recently been developed (to be implemented beginning Fall 2024) that all faculty will use to evaluate each student in their courses. This will aid in identifying students who may need improvement along the way.

All Junior Field/Graduate Practicum experiences, Student Teaching, and internship placements are made through the COE's DFEL who communicates regularly with partner schools, to ensure that candidates are prepared to visit the school and the school knows what type of field experience is appropriate for each course.

Candidates attend a Student Teaching Application Workshop the semester before they plan to student teach. During this session candidates learn the application process, general placement information, and are reminded of licensure requirements, including the need to take the Praxis exams associated with their desired license/endorsements before Student Teaching. There are also two seminars one at the beginning of the placement, and one at the end during the Student Teaching semester that candidates are required to attend. Candidates who are outside the 250-mile radius are allowed to attend virtually to avoid overnight travel. In the first seminar, candidates are made aware of all requirements as outlined in the **#2.2.3 Student Teaching Guidebook** including where to access necessary forms, as well as instructions on licensing, after placement is complete. In the second seminar, candidates are coached on best practice interviewing skills and final preparations for licensure, in addition to reflection and evaluation of their experience.

Candidates' field and clinical experiences are evaluated using key assessment rubrics (two observations, one dispositions evaluation, and one teacher work sample) which are completed by university faculty members, the DFEL, University Supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers.

The culminating clinical experience for all EPP candidates is a one-semester Student Teaching experience. In addition, MSUB has recently joined OPI's Teacher Residency program to offer year-long Student Teaching experiences (begins Fall 2024). Student Teaching is limited to seniors or post-baccalaureate candidates who have successfully completed all content coursework for their endorsement area(s) and all professional education courses, prior to the

clinical experience. Candidates apply and meet with the DFEL to discuss placement preferences and availability of sites. Although preferences are considered, they are not guaranteed. The priority on placement is that students are placed in contexts that match their licensure area(s) with CTs that meet the criteria and in schools where MOUs have been established. Placements can include those found on the list below.

Placement Examples:

- " Public P-12 settings, including small, rural schools;
- " Private schools, if properly accredited;
- " Out-of-state placements meeting the same criteria as Montana schools, if appropriate, supervision can be arranged, and if approved by the faculty advisor and Director of Field Experiences and Licensure. Candidates need to have a 3.0 GPA to complete their Student Teaching out-of-state;
- " Alternative settings, provided they meet program and accreditation requirements (e.g., alternative high school settings);
- " Overseas placements through the Department of Defense School System; and
- " Overseas placements, arranged through cooperating universities or with schools directly, and that meet program and accreditation standards.

For all proposed placements, the DFEL partners with the relevant school district, which reviews candidate applications and determines whether a suitable placement is available. They also draw up a MOU if one does not already exist. Student Teaching placements are governed by a set of reasonable restrictions within which candidates may not make a placement for request. Those restrictions are:

- " Placement in a high school where the candidate attended within the last eight years;
- " Placement in a school or district where a relative is an administrator;
- " Placement in buildings where parents or other close relatives are employed, or where their children or close relatives attend; nor may a relative serve as a candidate's Cooperating Teacher or University Supervisor.

The ETP strives for diverse placements, although there are some geographic limitations. In Montana, the majority (76% or more) of K-12 public school students are white. The next largest ethnic group is Native American students, comprising approximately 10% of the public school population. Hispanic students make up roughly 6% of the K-12 student population, and students who consider themselves multi-racial approximately 5%. Black, Asian, and Pacific Islander students together account for less than 2% of the K-12 student population. Though our candidates work primarily with white students, they experience diversity in many other ways. See **#2.3.4 Diversity Charts**.

When making placements, consideration to the school's location (i.e., urban vs. rural), and student characteristics such as special education placement, socioeconomic status, English Language learning, and living situation is given. The ETP places candidates in over 20 districts across the state each semester. Thus, the data that follow are representative of public school students in the state of Montana from Academic Year (AY) 2021-2022 AY to AY 2023-2024.

From Spring of 2022 to Spring of 2024, the Field Experiences office in the ETP made 358 field placements. Of those, 344 were in Montana 165 in the Billings School District and 179 across the rest of the state. The majority of Montana is considered rural. There are only five

metropolitan areas (populations of 50,000 or more) across the state: Billings, Bozeman, Helena, Great Falls, and Missoula. Outside of these areas, placements are considered rural, a characteristic with its own complexities. Candidates are even placed in one- and two-room schoolhouses, of which there are about 100 across Montana.

Students with disabilities and English Language Learners are two important populations to consider within the classroom. Approximately 13% of K-12 public school students in Montana receive special education services. Of those, 57% are in their regular classrooms for 80% or more of the day. Another 30% are in the regular classroom 40% - 79% of the day. English Language learners are another population with unique needs. Between 2.5% and 3% of K-12 public school students in Montana are English Language learners. Thus, our candidates learn to meet the needs of students with disabilities quite frequently in their field experiences and may also be required to support students who do not speak fluent English.

Finally, one of the most frequent ways our candidates experience diversity is through teaching students of varying socioeconomic status. Over the past three academic years, between 37% and 46% of K-12 public school students were eligible for free or reduced lunch. Moreover, roughly 3% of students were experiencing homelessness at any given time. These data indicate candidates are also learning how to appropriately support students of varying socioeconomic status and in challenging living situations.

Beginning in Spring Semester of 2024, an electronic platform, Tevera, was introduced to house and track all assessments, hour logs, observations, and applications for placements. In Spring 2024 Junior Field Students and Student Teachers were introduced to this platform, with all other classes joining in Fall of 2024. This platform houses training for Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, students, as well as the assessments, applications, forms, background check dates, placement information, and syllabi for classes. It will also be able to track all standards, growth, timesheets, and reports for students as they progress through the program at MSUB. This new platform is offering more organized and accessible means for keeping track of data, and so far, feedback from CTs has been positive.

FFRc. Narrative Analysis - Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences

Based on the "Diversity Chart" submitted by the EPP in the SSR evidences, it is clear that the partnership school sites have a diverse range of students across ethnicity, disability status, English Language Learners, and socio-economic status. Similarly, clinical experiences aligned with some coursework appears to target placements for working with students with disabilities. (2.3.1 Graduated Clinical Experiences).

As students matriculate through the program, there appears to be a developmental approach by adding more extensive clinical experiences in addition to specific requirements of candidates completing those clinical experiences. Beginning Spring 2024, Tevera was introduced to house and track all assessments, hour logs, observations, and applications for placements. Technology applications that prepare candidates for their responsibilities on the

job appear to be incomplete from this component.

SSR Addendum c. Component R2.3 Clinical Experiences

R2.3 (A) - Can the EPP share evidence collected through Tevera platform based on tracking clinical placements?

Data has been collated and disaggregated for the four semesters the Tevera platform has been used.

These include Spring 2023, Fall, 2023, Spring 2024, and Fall 2024. The data includes the three key assessments. See **Evidence # 1.1.14 Assessment_Observation Data, #1.1.15 Assessment_Teacher Work Sample Data, #1.1.16 Assessment_Disposition Data.**

R2.3 (B) - How does the EPP ensure that each candidate has a diverse range of placements throughout their program?

In **Evidence #2.3.4 Diversity Charts**, the partnership school sites are outlined which includes a diverse range of students across ethnicity, disability status, English Language Learners, and socio-economic status. Similarly, candidates may take coursework which include target placements for working with students with disabilities. See **Evidence # 2.3.1 Graduated Clinical Experiences** In addition, candidates are interviewed before their fieldwork experiences to determine previous work in a variety of setting to ensure their new placements in these courses continue to provide a diverse range of placements. This may include different grade levels, different music/art domains for those candidates, secondary placements in middle schools and/or at lower/upper high school grades, as well as considerations for rural and city schools. Candidates are also involved in field experiences in tribal schools and rural schools that service primarily Indigenous populations.

R2.3 (C) - Can the EPP share how technology is addressed to prepare candidates for their responsibilities on the job?

The EPP is creating a comprehensive list of how each faculty member is incorporating and teaching candidates to use a variety of technology resources. This will include the following components: Course, Type of Resources, and Type of Assignments/Activities. This will be available during the site visit.

SRRc. Narrative Analysis - Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences

The EPP provided evidence of candidates clinical experience in diverse settings and intentional attending to diverse pedagogy by requiring the Teacher Work Sample to include IEFA (Indian Education for All) and including it in the rubric (1.1.8 TWS Rubric).. The original AFI "While the EPP provides documentation in the implementation of clinical experiences including depth, breadth, coherence, and duration, it is unclear how technology applications are addressed that prepare candidates for their position or how they ensure all candidates receive diverse placements." The EPP shared their technology course and discussed the

outcomes in the interview, while also sharing they were in the process of mapping technology applications across the programs. They submitted the draft of this map as evidence at the site visit (technology use grid), thus addressing this initial concern. In addition, the EPP demonstrated Tevera at the visit and showed the tracking system they have adopted. The diversity of placements happens within the schools and the classrooms through the graduated clinical experiences (Evidence 2.3.1) in diverse settings (2.3.4)

Standard RA2. Clinical Partnership and Practice (Advanced Level Programs)

**Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence:
 Standard RA2. Clinical Partnership and Practice (Advanced Level Programs)**

SSR Evidence - Standard RA2

Evidence Title	Caep Component	File
1.1.3A SCOU Internship Guidebook	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation,Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences	#1.1.3A School Counseling Internship Gu
1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences	
1.1.7A SCOU Advisory Panel	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA1.2 - Provider Responsibilities,Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	#1.1.7A Advisory Panel Spring 2024.pdf
1.2.1A Montana State University Billings School Counseling Tereva Manual	Component RA1.1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	#1.2.1 Montana State University Billings_
2.2.1 Employer Survey	Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences,Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement	

Items per page: 10 1 5 of 5 < >

a. Component RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

The ETP ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practices are central to preparation, so the school counseling candidates develop knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in the school counseling profession. Please, refer to **#1.2.1A MSU Billings Tevera Manual** which includes the site placement process.

The School Counseling program collaborates with partners to jointly create beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation, sharing the responsibility for the ongoing enhancement of candidate preparation in school counseling. The program's field director and faculty utilize the Tevera software to forge high-quality partnerships, ensuring candidate site placements embody the essential knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions central to the school counseling profession.

For both elementary and secondary internship experiences, candidates are mandated to submit internship applications via Tevera software. These applications detail the candidate's site placement preferences, required credit hours, the expiration date of their background checks, and preferred placement locations, as outlined in the **#1.2.1A MSU Billings Tevera Manual**. Candidates have the option to select from a roster of preapproved sites within Tevera or propose an alternative site for consideration by the program's faculty and the Director of Field Experience and Licensure. Only after thorough review and approval by the faculty and field director is a site placement finalized. Furthermore, partner sites are required to complete site mentor and placement documentation within Tevera before a candidate's placement is sanctioned. This ensures a consistent and structured approach to internship placements, crucial for the professional development of candidates. Given the program's national scope, candidates have the flexibility to seek internship placements within their local geographic area, facilitating access to practical experience in settings most relevant to their future professional endeavors.

All school counseling program sites and their mentors must submit the same requisite paperwork, maintaining a standard of quality and consistency across all placements. Prior to the approval of any site placement, candidates, along with their site mentors and administrative staff, must review the **#1.1.3A SCOU Guidebook**, available in Tevera. This step is vital for setting clear expectations and fostering a productive learning environment during the internship. To support both candidates and site mentors, the program offers orientation videos through Tevera's online training dashboard, detailed in the **#1.2.1A MSU Billings Tevera Manual**. These resources are designed to prepare all parties for a successful clinical experience, ensuring candidates are well-equipped to apply their learning in real-world settings and contribute positively to the educational communities they serve.

The School Counseling program ensures the highest standards in candidate preparation, policy impact, and licensing. The program's faculty actively engage in partnerships with state officials, content experts from other universities within Montana, and members of the Continuous Improvement Coalition (CIC) team. Collaboration extends to the local advisory panel and the Montana Office of Public Instruction, facilitating a broad spectrum of stakeholder engagement critical to influencing policy, enhancing candidate preparation, and streamlining the licensing process (**#1.1.7A SCOU Advisory Panel**).

This cooperative framework is not limited to local and state levels. Faculty members also

connect with counterparts at universities across the nation, fostering a dialogue with institutions that host similar advanced school counseling programs. National collaborations are vital for benchmarking the program's effectiveness, exchanging best practices, and identifying areas for growth based on comprehensive feedback.

As an online program, the School Counseling program offers a unique opportunity for candidates to engage with a wide range of school systems, from local and regional to national and international settings. This exposure ensures that internship experiences are richly diverse, encompassing rural and urban schools characterized by varied socio-economic backgrounds and cultural compositions of student and staff populations (**#1.2.1A Montana State University School Counseling Tereva Manual**) This diversity in placement settings is crucial, as it prepares candidates to effectively address the needs of diverse P-12 student populations, equipping them with the experience and sensitivity to operate in any educational environment.

The program places a strong emphasis on ensuring that internship site placements are not only diverse but also of high quality, matching candidates with environments that foster the practical application of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions key to the school counseling profession. Through these concerted efforts, the School Counseling program demonstrates its commitment to producing well-prepared graduates, capable of contributing positively to the field of school counseling and to the diverse educational landscapes students will serve.

FFRa. Narrative Analysis - Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

Similar to initial programs School Counseling programs have document MOU's with partnership sites. These are reviewed annually and addended if necessary. The MOU outlines responsibilities for the parties involved to ensure expectations are clear. Similar benefits are provided as initial certification programs that were identified in R2.1. It appears that the EPP engages P-12 partners in ongoing collaboration through an advisory panel for school counseling. The SSR identifies one Advisory Panel meeting from Spring 2024. Have other meetings been held to that document a continuous process or what this one in isolation due to something that occurred at a placement site?

SSR Addendum a. Component RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

RA2.1 (A) - Have other meetings been held to that document a continuous process or what this one in isolation due to something that occurred at a placement site?

The SCOU program has begun implementing regular advisory board meetings. The first meeting was held in May 2024. Minutes from this meeting are included in **Evidence #2.1.1A SCOU Advisory Panel Document**. This evidence includes the minutes, their role, feedback, and program goals based on the data analysis presented at the meeting. The program plans to meet annually; the next meeting is scheduled for May 2025.

RA 2.1 (B) - What were the roles of the individuals on the Advisory Panel?

This is included in the **Evidence #2.1.1A SCOU Advisory Panel Document**.

SRRa. Narrative Analysis - Component RA2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

The School Counseling Program has MOUs and robust partnerships with local schools, many of which house their candidates. In interviews the faculty shared that most candidates do their clinical experiences in their own school districts. It was also shared that a potential candidate reached out about the program and said other colleagues are interested. As a result, they are working on a cohort model with the school district for multiple candidates. This example of a response shows a willingness to meet the needs of the candidates, but it is not clear if the need is at the partner level. It appears the advisory board is recently constituted. Two people showed up at the interview and the board had only met once. However, both were invited to be on the board because of their engagement with the program and both reported their close work with the lead faculty member and lecturer. They appreciate their practical experience and believe the program is stronger for it. They both noted the faculty come to the buildings and meet with the partners where the candidates are placed, which they appreciate. The lack of consistent advisory board will be addressed in standard 5.

b. Component RA2.2 Clinical Experiences

The School Counseling program collaborates closely with partners to create a spectrum of clinical experiences that are both varied and developmental, enabling candidates to apply the school counseling content knowledge and skills emphasized throughout their coursework, practicum, and internships. These clinical experiences culminate in opportunities for candidates to highlight their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research that reflects the real-world challenges of the school counseling field. Faculty and Director of Field Experiences and Licensure provide essential support to candidates throughout the application and internship placement process, ensuring a seamless transition from theoretical learning to practical application.

Clinical partners are equipped with resources including training videos, the **#1.2.1A SCOU Guidebook** and necessary site mentor paperwork, all accessible through the Tevera software. These materials are available for consultation throughout the clinical experience, ensuring that partners are well-informed about internship requirements and expectations. Regular meetings between University Supervisors, candidates, site mentors, and administration each semester facilitate a comprehensive assessment of candidate performance, offering expert feedback to guide candidates' professional development.

The program's faculty and University Supervisors conduct semester reviews of evaluation data to identify if improvements are needed based on feedback from site mentors and administrators. Additionally, data from the **#1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric** completed by

candidates in their Capstone course, is analyzed each semester to pinpoint potential areas for program enhancement.

The School Counseling program outlines activities for both direct and indirect clinical hours within Tevera software, requiring candidates to complete a minimum of 60 direct and 40 indirect clinical hours during their Practicum, and 150 direct and up to 150 indirect clinical hours during their elementary and secondary internships. Monthly reviews of candidate hour logs and activities by program faculty ensure alignment with program standards. Furthermore, candidates submit monthly reflective journals via their course platform, providing faculty with insights into their practice and experiences. Monthly online meetings with faculty, University Supervisors, and fellow candidates facilitate a supportive community, addressing internship requirements and providing ongoing support.

Candidates in the program serve a diverse K-12 student population across the nation, including both rural and urban districts, and engage with students from a wide range of backgrounds. The SCOU Tevera software houses data on candidate demographics and the demographics of the school populations they serve. Although the program has yet to disaggregate this data for trend analysis, plans are in place to incorporate demographic analysis in the next data cycle in the fall and spring of the 2024-2025 school year.

University Supervisors and site mentors engage in semester evaluations of candidate performance, offering constructive feedback. Annual employer surveys complement this feedback mechanism by assessing the programs and candidates' effectiveness from the employers' perspective. A pilot employer conducted in spring 2023 (**#2.2.1A Employer Survey**) and completer survey (forthcoming in Fall 2024 Addendum) yielded positive feedback affirming the program's success in preparing competent school counseling professionals. This comprehensive approach underscores the School Counseling program's commitment to continuous improvement and excellence in preparing candidates to meet the evolving needs of the school counseling profession.

FFRb. Narrative Analysis - Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences

The EPP reports that the sole program at the advanced levels partners to create a spectrum of clinical experiences that are both varied and developmental throughout coursework, practicum, and internships. Clinical partners are equipped with resources that include training videos, site mentor paperwork that is accessed through Tevera. It is unclear what opportunities candidates have to work in diverse settings based on the documentation provided. While the EPP claims that clinical experiences culminate in opportunities for candidates to highlight their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research that reflects the real-world challenges in the field, it is unclear what these tasks include. The EPP has recently established employer and completer surveys in order to provide additional data related to candidate outcomes, but this is unclear at this time. The EPP reports positive feedback from the 2.2.1A Employer Survey, but this was not attached as part of the SSR evidence. Similar to RA1.1, the narrative and subsequent documentation make it unclear how clinical experiences are related to the six identified areas in the 2022 CAEP handbook

for advanced level programs.

SSR Addendum b. Component RA2.2 Clinical Experiences

RA2.2 (A)-What opportunities have candidates had to prepare in diverse settings and to work in their specialized field of study?

Candidates' field experiences are diverse, as evidenced in **Evidence #1.1.16A: SCOU Site Placement Diversity Documentation.**

RA2.2 (B)-What features of clinical experiences allow candidates to demonstrate their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research?

Evidence #1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric aligns proficiencies to the CAEP standards, including problem-based tasks and research. For example, components such as "using testing and evaluation instruments to evaluate student needs" and "reflecting on assessment data," are further evidenced in course syllabi, which can be provided upon request during the site visit.

RA2.2 (C)-How has the EPP studied clinical experience data to improve candidate outcomes?

As mentioned, all evidence includes summaries of how program faculty work to improve candidate outcomes. Additionally, the Advanced School Counseling Program reviews feedback from employer surveys, as evidenced in **Evidence #2.1.4A SCOU Spring 2024 Employer Survey Results**, and **Evidence #2.1.1A SCOU Advisory Panel Documentation.**

RA2.2 (D)-What clinical experiences have enhanced the completer's understanding of diversity and equity issues and their readiness to use that understanding in employment situations?

RA2.2

As evidenced in **Evidence #1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric**, candidates are evaluated on diversity and equity issues and their readiness during multiple field experiences throughout their program of study.

(E)-How are clinical experiences effective in preparing candidates for the chosen proficiencies in RA1.1?

Candidates are evaluated throughout their program of study, during their coursework, and the fieldwork experiences as evidenced in **Evidence #1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle Documentation**, **Evidence #1.1.12A SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation.**

Additionally, students complete 700 clinical hours during their program of study. 100 hours are completed during their practicum, 300 hours during an elementary school internship, and 300 hours during a secondary school internship, as evidenced in **Evidence #2.1.2A SCOU Candidate Clinical Hour Log Documentation** and **Evidence #2.1.3A SCOU Candidate Clinical Hour Log Raw Data.**

SRRb. Narrative Analysis - Component RA2.2 - Clinical Experiences

The EPP provided evidence that the schools that they work with tend to be diverse in nature (#1.1.16A), however they note that mentor diversity is something they need to work on. They do intentionally place in elementary and high schools for the two clinical experiences, getting age diversity.

The EPP provided a file called "CAEP Documentation" at the visit that included rubrics with additional columns tagged for the proficiencies listed in standard RA1.1 (pg 48). However, just using the rubric as guide, it is impossible to discern how these components of the rubrics measure the particular skills in the clinical experiences.

Standard R3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support (Initial-licensure Level Programs)

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence:

Standard R3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support (Initial-licensure Level Programs)

SSR Evidence - Standard R3

Evidence Title	Caep Component	File
2.2.1 ETP Vision Screenshot	Component R2.1 - Partnerships for Clinical Preparation, Component R3.1 - Recruitment	2.2.1 ETP Vision Screenshot.png
3.2.2 Elementary Junior Field	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	3.2.2 EDU_353_Elem_Jr_Field (1) (1).pd
3.2.5 TWS Scores	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	3.2.5 TWS Scores.docx
3.1.1 MSUB Student Demographics	Component R3.1 - Recruitment, Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion	3.1.1 MSUB Student Demographics (2).d
3.2.3 TWS Longitudinal Data	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	3.2.3 TWS Longitudinal Chart (1).docx
3.2.7 MACK Scores	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	3.2.7 MACK Scores.docx
2.2.3 Student Teaching Guidebook	Component R2.2 - Clinical Educators, Component R2.3 - Clinical Experiences, Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	2.2.3 Student Teaching Guidebook.pdf
3.2.1 Tracking Student Progress	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	3.2.1 Tracking Student Progress.docx
3.2.6 Observation Scores	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	3.2.6 Observation Scores .docx
3.1.2 Critical Quality Educator Report	Component R3.1 - Recruitment	3.1.2 Critical Quality Educator Shortage F
3.2.4 Dispositions Scores	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	

3.2.8 Petitions Forms	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	3.2.8 Petitions Form.pdf
3.2.10 Student Handbook	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	3.2.10 Student Handbook.pdf
3.3.4 Grad Data Flyer	Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion	
3.2.11 Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	3.2.11 Academic Affairs Policies and Pro
3.3.3 Enrollment and Completer Data	Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion	3.3.3 Enrollment and Completer Data, Cc
3.3.1 Praxis Subject Assessment Information	Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion	3.3.1 Praxis Subject Assessment Test Inf
3.2.9 Petition Dates	Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	3.2.9 Petition Dates.png
3.3.2 Assessment of Content Knowledge	Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion	3.3.2 Assessment of Content Knowledge

Items per page: 1 19 of 19 < >

a. Component R3.1 Recruitment

State Demographics

According to the 2020 Census, Montana is classified as rural state with a population of 1,112,826 million, which represents 7.4 residents per square mile and is home to seven American Indian reservations with Native Americans being the largest minority in the state. Information on the MSUB student population indicates that the student body is predominantly white (88.7%), American Indian and Alaska Native (6.5%), Black (0.6%), and Hispanic (4.5%).

MSUB Demographics

MSUB total enrollment in Fall of 2023 was 4,092 students. The COE has the smallest number of undergraduate students and the largest number of graduate students on campus. Students are from across Montana, there are also students from out-of-state and there is also a presence of international students on campus as well. (**#3.1.1 MSUB Student Demographics**).

State Needs

The Office of Public Instruction (OPI) provides information on the needs in Montana. According to the most recent news release in January 2023 from the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the top three critical teacher shortage areas in the state in 2022-2023 are: Elementary (492 needed); Special Education (259 needed); and Mathematics (188 needed). (**#3.1.2 Critical Quality Educator Shortage Report**) .

Montana also supports schools having difficulty hiring a special education teacher because of the lack of applicants. In 1987, Montana’s OPI Special Education Endorsement Project began to address this need with MSUB taking a leadership role in this project. School districts having difficulty hiring a special education teacher can apply to the project for a licensed teacher to fill

a special education position. The licensed teacher hired by the school district is given three years to complete their special education endorsement while they teach in the special education position.

Diversity

The #2.2.1 ETP Vision reflects the commitment to prepare future educators to teach the diverse student population. MSUB welcomes and recognizes students from diverse backgrounds. There are several efforts made across campus to recruit diverse populations. For example, the Native American Achievement Center employs a new student specialist who travels to the seven tribal nations in Montana who assists transfer students. Also, ETP faculty travel to community and tribal colleges to assist with advising from a two-year setting to MSUB. There are also articulation agreements with tribal colleges, as discussed in Standard 2.

Each semester an international food fair is held, reflecting different groups on campus and there are various student organizations specific to these students. The campus houses a Native American Achievement Center (NAAC) to welcome and support Native American students. An annual Pow Wow is held on the campus for students and community members. Other student organizations to support minority students on campus, include a Diversity Center, a Hispanic Club, Intertribal Indian Club, Black Student Union and OUT, an organization for the LGBTQ+ population. There is also SafeZone training offered on campus, which further educates faculty and staff on understanding the LGBTQ+ population. On campus, there is also a center that celebrates Hispanic culture, called LaPlaza.

The ETP is developing international opportunities for students, including opportunities in Belize and Italy. Contacts have recently been established with schools in New Zealand and, to date, several students have finished Student Teaching there. The Office for International Studies has been awarded multi-year funding to develop faculty expertise in international studies, it is anticipated that the COE faculty will increase education-specific international opportunities for students.

Diversity among faculty in the Department of Educational Theory and Practice (ETP) in the COE as follows. Gender of faculty are reported as female (22) and male (4). Faculty members who identify as white (21), American Indian/Alaska Native (1), Asian (2) and unknown (2). Faculty positions in the department are all tenure-track positions: tenured faculty (5) and non-tenured faculty (7).

Undergraduate Student Recruitment

On-campus Recruitment Efforts : The Office of Admissions offer tours to prospective students and their families. Campus tours are offered throughout the year and department faculty meet the students in the building, show them classrooms, discuss the programs and answer questions. Brochures about specific programs have been developed and distributed to the advising center on campus. Additionally, preview nights allow high school students and their families an opportunity to learn more about the programs in the college and the various opportunities that MSUB offers students.

The COE is making further efforts in recruiting as well. In Spring 2023, 19 high school students attended the COE Preview Night with fourteen guests. Of those that attended, twelve students

enrolled in MSUB for the Fall 2023 semester. Ten of those enrolled in a College of Education program in Fall 2023 and all those students were from Montana with eight of the students from the Billings area.

Off-campus Recruitment Efforts : All inquiries from prospective students interested in the COE programs are forwarded to the Department Chair. The Chair enters the students into a shared recruitment document, where prospective students are delegated to individual faculty for follow up. The document is also used to track the details of faculty responses.

Faculty attend professional conferences in Montana in both education and special education to distribute materials about the programs in the department. The *Montana Federation of Public Employee Conference* is held each year and is the main conference for teachers in the state. The *Montana Council for Exceptional Children Conference* is also held yearly in Montana. Faculty attend both conferences to present and to recruit. Potential students are often from families of teachers attending the conferences. Reading faculty have also had recruitment tables at the *Montana State Literacy Conference*.

Faculty in special education have travelled to the MSU Bozeman campus to recruit students for the special education program. Students at the Bozeman campus can take either special education courses as a concentration or as an endorsement at MSUB.

Articulation agreements with several two-year and tribal colleges are also a part of the recruitment plan (see CAEP Standard 2.1) and faculty have traveled to Chief Dull Knife College to assist with advising students.

Faculty are visible in the schools as they collaborate with teachers to enable teacher candidates to teach lessons as part of methods courses. Through this work, they promote MSUB to children in those classrooms. Faculty also work with the Montana Space Grant Consortium to highlight undergraduate opportunities from NASA.

Local media have promoted the work of the COE with newspaper stories to promote summer reading, the Reading Master's program, and the Reading Clinic. The COE Deans and literacy faculty have also participated in the local news station (Q2)'s *Give A Child A Book Campaign*. Kurt Toenjes, Interim Dean, appeared on the morning news show in September 2022 to discuss literacy initiatives at MSUB, and in September 2023, the Dean and two reading faculty members appeared in a Q2 sponsored commercial, promoting reading to the local community. A media campaign was developed to enhance the recruitment of students with interviews filmed to promote the education programs. These advertisements were posted on the MSUB YouTube channel.

Undergraduate Retention

In addition to recruitment, MSUB currently has a strong commitment to increasing student retention and graduation rates. The 2022-2027 Retention and Graduation Plan has established actions and best-practices for improving retention and graduation rates for all student populations and has also established 5-year and annual target rates. Upon admission to the university, undergraduate students and transfer students are assigned a professional advisor in the university advising center. A plan of study is developed for the students. Students are

advised by professional advising during their freshman and sophomore years. Once students are ready to apply to the Educator Preparation Program, they are assigned a faculty advisor in the ETP.

The ETP sends out a notification to all students transferring from the professional advising center to the department that an initial group advising session will be held for these students. The purpose is to provide these students an overview of their path from admission to completion and to assist them with the application to the Teacher Preparation Program. Further details about this meeting can be found in R3.2. In their first year, faculty are given few advisees while they learn the university and department procedures. In the ETP, faculty advising loads can range between a total of 30-60 undergraduate and graduate advisees. ETP advisors continue each student's plan of study in their first semester and meet individually with their advisees as needed. Appointments may be conducted face to face or online.

To assist in supporting students with resources outside of the department, all faculty syllabi are expected to include a list of campus resources for students, including Disability Support Services, the Native American Achievement Center, Student Health Services, and Academic Support Services. The university also introduced the use of *EAB Navigate* which facilitates communication between faculty and students. Through this system faculty can also provide academic alerts to Student Services when a student is failing to submit assignments or not participating in their face to face or online courses. Student Services staff will then follow up with the students to assist them in getting back on track. This system is available to both undergraduate and graduate students to ensure that the university retention efforts are implemented across all programs and levels.

Graduate Student Recruitment

Individuals interested in the program may contact the Graduate Studies office or the ETP, prior to applying. Prospective graduate students are given information about the program, the admission process and information on relevant web pages. The Graduate Studies webpage includes information on the documents needed to apply. Applicants are required to submit all transcripts and fingerprints for a federal background check and a notarized self-disclosure. The Graduate Studies website also includes links to information related to funding graduate study, including costs, scholarships, financial aid, and payment plans.

Graduate student retention . Graduate and post baccalaureate students are assigned a program core faculty specific to their discipline. Faculty advisors review their transcripts for the core courses they need and complete a course alignment with the previous courses they have completed and then develop a plan of study. The plan of study is developed in the first semester and the students meet individually with their advisor as needed.

As with undergraduate students, MSUB faculty include the same references to services on campus (see above) and utilize *EAB Navigate* to address issues with students.

FFRa. Narrative Analysis - Component R3.1 - Recruitment

The EPP reports a total enrollment of 4,092 students. The COEE has the smallest number of undergraduate students and largest number of graduate students on campus. Recruitment efforts from the office of Admissions includes tours for prospective students and families. The COE also provides opportunities for faculty to meet with students, show them classrooms, and discuss programs. Brochures have been developed and distributed to advising center on campus. Similarly, the preview nights allow high school students and families to learn more about programs throughout the university and college. The COE hosted a preview night where 19 high school students attended. Of those that attended twelve students enrolled and 10 enrolled in the College of Education program.

The college also has articulated toon agreements with several two-year and tribal colleges. An example is provided in faculty traveling to Chief Dull Knife College to assist with advising students. Local media have also promoted the work of the COE with newspaper stories related to multiple programs offered through the college.

The EPP reports that they have worked in supporting schools for difficult hiring areas (notably Special Education). School districts may have certified teachers apply for special education positions where the licensed teacher will have three years to complete the special education endorsement. It appears that MSUB developed this program in order to meet the need.

Within the documentation, the provider does not identify goals towards admitting high-quality initial program graduates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations. There are many isolated activities related to recruitment, but there does not appear to be a strategic plan for addressing recruitment efforts for sustainable programs through the college. Similarly, it is unclear based on the SSR evidence, how the students admitted to the university represent the diverse student body of Montana.

SSR Addendum a. Component R3.1 Recruitment

R.3.1 (A) - What are the EPP's goals towards admitting candidates to initial programs from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations?

The EPP has created a 5-Year Recruitment Plan that specifically addresses strategies for recruiting candidates from a broad range of background and diverse populations. See **Evidence #3.1.4 5-Year Recruitment Plan.**

In Year 1, the EPP will be focusing on building High School Partnerships. One specific area that the EPP has already focused recruitment efforts in is meeting with high school peer tutors to encourage them to be teachers. These peer tutors often work with diverse populations because they relate to their backgrounds which motivates them to make a difference in their peers' lives (e.g., culturally/linguistically diverse; neurodiverse). In Year 2, efforts will be intentionally focused on recruiting in rural areas. The EPP has also already begun this work with a few initiatives: a) a faculty member is building relationships with Native American community members in Pryor,

MT. The EPP is specifically working toward creating a pathway for paraeducators from such communities to obtain their bachelors' degrees and teaching licenses. b) The EPP has created articulation agreements with community colleges that serve a high percent of Native American students, such as Fort Peck Community College and Chief Dull Knife College. See **Evidence # 2.1.2 Articulation Agreements**. In Year 3, the EPP will make diversity-focused recruitment a primary aim by hosting recruitment fairs and webinars in communities with diverse populations. In summary, the EPP has been and will continue to focus efforts on recruiting students into the initial licensure programs who have diverse backgrounds and are from diverse populations.

R.3.1 (B) - What data can be shared related to the candidates admitted related to diversity of the groups towards meeting EPP goals?

The EPP has disaggregated the demographics of candidates upon program entrance according to gender and race between Spring 2023 and Fall 2024. Demographics are divided into White and Non-White due to the low number of candidates in each category. Analyses of this data across the six semesters is as follows: 27% identify as male; 73% identify as female; 92% identify as White; 8% identify as Non-White. See **Evidence #3.1.5 Program Diversity Upon Entrance**. This data indicates the EPP has lower percentages of candidates who identify as males and as Non-White. The Montana 2022 Census data that indicates 84% of Montanans identify as White Alone, leaving 16% identifying as Non-White. The EPP has created a target of a minimum of 8% increase in candidates who identify as Non-White within the next five years in order to coincide with Montana demographics.

R.3.1 (C) - What is the systematic and strategic recruitment plan designed to meet the goals of the EPP's recruitment goals?

See **Evidence # 3.1.4 5-Year Recruitment Plan**. The EPP has included the following metrics of achievement within the 5-Year Recruitment Plan: 20% increase from underrepresented groups in Year 3 and establishing at least three partnerships with community colleges, including Tribal colleges.

SRRa. Narrative Analysis - Component R3.1 - Recruitment

The EPP provided a five year plan for recruitment in the addendum (3.1.4 EPP 5-Year Recruitment Plan) with targets for percent growth. It does not include starting points in the plan, although additional data about demographics and enrollments were included. The plan starts in AY 2024-25. Plans alone are no longer sufficient and there is an expectation of reporting on progress of plans submitted at the 2017 visit. During the site visit the EPP shared of events of recruiting by attending recruitment events with the university as a whole. Details are still underdevelopment.

b. Component R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

Admission to the Program

Undergraduate students transition from a professional advisor to a faculty advisor in the ETP when they are ready to apply to the Educator Education Program (EPP), usually in their sophomore year; graduate students meet with an ETP advisor upon admission to Graduate Studies.

Students are informed of their faculty advisor and they are provided details about the application process. Additionally, students are provided an overview of the MACK licensure requirements. Students work on their application with faculty guidance. To be able to complete an application, a student needs to have completed 45 credits, with an overall GPA minimum of 2.65 (Graduate, 3.00), content core GPA minimum of 2.65, and have completed a Criminal Background Report. Completed applications are reviewed by the faculty advisor and the Director of Field Experience and Licensure (DFEL). Students become a teacher candidate once admitted to the program. When their application is approved, the Department Chair notifies each teacher candidate by letter. (**#3.2.1 Tracking Student Progress**).

The students' progress is tracked again prior to the Junior Field experience. Prior to Junior Field, students are required to complete an application which includes a requirement that students are enrolled in two methods courses, and must not have any grades lower than a C. (**#3.2.2 Junior Field Application**)

Students in Junior Field, Graduate Practicum, and Student Teaching are measured using key assessments by the University Supervisor and the Cooperating Teacher. Data was gathered from Fall 2020 to Spring 2023, and this is reported in Standard 1.

The ETP used a longitudinal approach to look at student progression across key transition points in the program. The ETP chose sixteen students from a variety of programs for further analysis. Faculty looked at each of the students' progressions on the TWS during a data dip on April 16, 2024. Data dips are used in the COE to examine data as a faculty and staff. During these meetings, faculty and staff are given questions for analysis of the data and then discuss the findings. Noted from this data dip that most of the scores improved from Junior Field to Student Teaching, but some stayed the same or decreased even. This points to the need for better inter-rater reliability. (**#3.2.3 TWS Longitudinal Chart**). The ETP plans to use a similar approach for data analysis of the Observation Form and Dispositions Tool in a Fall 2024 Assessment Retreat.

The EPP also looked at cohort data for the three cycles: Fall 22, Spring 23 and Fall 23 for the key assessments and the results are included here: (**#3.2.4: Dispositions Scores #3.2.5 TWS Scores**, and **#3.3.6 Observation Scores**).

Plans of improvement

Students in Junior Field/Graduate Practicum or Student Teaching that are not making appropriate progress, are put on a plan of improvement after discussion with the Cooperating Teacher, the University Supervisor and their faculty advisor. First, the Cooperating Teacher or University Supervisor notifies the student of an issue and then documents the issue. Issues generally deal with issues either about professionalism (attendance, dress, professional interactions) or ability to plan and execute lessons. A Plan of Improvement is then developed and later, a progress plan is implemented to ensure that improvements are being made. The

Plan of Improvement also includes a space for deciding on next steps. If the student is making inadequate progress, they may be removed from Student Teaching or given a new placement (**#2.2.3 Student Teaching Guidebook**).

Completion and Cohort GPA

Cohort GPA transition point occurs on completion of the program at the point at which program completers transition to a career in education. The mean GPA of double majors and elementary majors is 3.0 and above on graduation. (**#3.2.7 MACK Scores**).

College of Education

Students in the ETP can submit a petition, should they need to obtain an exception (course substitution, request to waive Student Teaching, formal complaint, etc.). The petition process is typically discussed during student advising meetings in which issues are made aware to the advisor. The petition is reviewed by the College of Education Petitions Committee within the ETP. The committee includes faculty, external members, including an administrator from the community, and the DFEL. (**#3.2.8 Petitions Form**). Dates of the committee meetings are published on the website and students may attend the meeting either in person or virtually. (**#3.2.9 Petition Dates**). At the meeting the committee reviews the student's petition and may ask additional questions of the student if they attend. The committee then makes a recommendation to the Dean. Once the Dean makes a decision, a letter is sent to the student on the outcome. Student petitions are stored in the student's file, kept in a locked file room. The department plans to make this information more accessible to students by developing a guide specifically for students in the department.

University

Student Services provides a handbook on expectations, rights and responsibilities and a complaints procedure. This encompasses nonacademic issues and is posted on the university website. (**#3.2.10 Student Handbook**).

Student complaints about academic issues follow procedures outlined in a handbook posted on the Provost's website. The student must address the issue with the instructor. If the issue is not resolved, then the student takes the issue to the Department Chair. If the issue is not resolved, the student takes the issue to the Dean. If the issue is still not resolved, the student takes the issue to the Provost. (**#3.2.11 Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures**). These are kept within the student's file as well.

FFRb. Narrative Analysis - Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

The EPP has established clear and established procedures for each transition point including academic and non-academic factors. It is less clear about key assessment requirement criteria as students progress through admissions, Junior Field, and Student Teaching. This begins at admissions to the program as students transition from a professional advisor to a

faculty advisor during their sophomore year. Students are informed of their faculty advisor and provided details about the application process. In addition, students are provided with an overview related to MACK licensure requirements.

The EPP states, "Students in Junior Field/Graduate Practicum or Student Teaching that are not making appropriate progress, are put on a plan of improvement after discussion with the Cooperating Teacher, the University Supervisor and their faculty advisor. First, the Cooperating Teacher or University Supervisor notifies the student of an issue and then documents the issue. Issues generally deal with issues either about professionalism (attendance, dress, professional interactions) or ability to plan and execute lessons. A Plan of Improvement is then developed and later, a progress plan is implemented to ensure that improvements are being made. The Plan of Improvement also includes a space for deciding on next steps. If the student is making inadequate progress, they may be removed from Student Teaching or given a new placement (#2.2.3 Student Teaching Guidebook)." When responding to complaint's/appeals.

Data presented by the EPP demonstrates the average score students receive on each of the identified assessments. It is not clear the number of candidates represented in this data, nor whether the data is disaggregated across relevant demographics. Thus, it is less clear how the EPP ensures that there are no loopholes to work around the system. While the EPP reports a cohort GPA of above 3.0 for the Elementary cohort, there is no presence of data for other programs or data to review as part of the evidences provided.

SSR Addendum b. Component R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

R.3.2 (A) - What are the assessment criteria for Junior Field and Student Teaching related to the transition points?

The EPP assesses each candidate at the Junior Field/Graduate Practicum and Student Teaching with the three key assessments: Teaching Observation Evaluation, Teacher Work Sample, and the Dispositions Evaluation. In Junior Field/Graduate Practicum, candidates are expected to perform at the "Developing" level or higher on all three key assessments. If a candidate performs at the "Needs Improvement"/"Unacceptable" levels, they are given formative feedback and support for growth. The same key assessments are administered during Student Teaching; candidates are expected to perform at the "Developing" level or higher; those performing at the "Needs Improvement"/"Unacceptable" levels are provided an opportunity to improve. Improvement is expected before finishing the course.

R.3.2 (B) - What aggregate data can be shared related to admissions on the student demographics?

See **Evidence #3.1.5 Program Diversity Upon Entrance.**

R.3.3 (C) - What aggregate data can be shared related to assessment criteria by program during each of the transition points?

See **Evidence #1.1.4 Assessment_Observation Data; #1.1.15 Assessment_Teacher Work Sample; and #1.1.16 Assessment_Disposition Data.**

R.3.2 (D) - The EPP shared that Elementary Cohort consistently meet the cohort GPA of above 3.0. What about other programs? Can data be shared about other programs? If below the 3.0 Cohort for other programs, what plans does the EPP have to address candidate GPA at the identified transition point?

According to the data across programs Spring 2023 through Fall 2024, all but one GPA data point was above 3.0: Summer 2024 Graduate Elementary program had a mean of 2.820. However, the n was only 3, making this data point an outlier and unreliable due to the small sample size. See **Evidence #3.2.12 Additional GPA Data**.

SRRb. Narrative Analysis - Component R3.2 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

Initial concerns from the self student report focused on disaggregated demographic data at transition points. In the addendum, the EPP provided disaggregated mean and standard deviation GPA data by race and gender at admissions, junior field and student teaching (transition points) by elementary, special education and secondary programs, addressing the initial concern. The EPP depends on the Disposition, TWS and Observation tool as key assessments for meeting the standards, as discussed in Standard 1. They are also assessments at two transition points, where data were also provided in the addendum 1.1.14 Key Assessment_Observation Data, 1.1.15 Key Assessment_Teacher Work Sample Data, and 1.1.16 Key Assessment_Dispositions Data. Candidates progression is monitored in Tavera, which was demonstrated at the site visit. Candidates must meet admission criteria mid sophomore year, apply for Junior Field and the Student Teaching. The progression is monitored in Tavera. Interviews confirmed that pre-admission, each candidate has a university professional advisor, and upon admission is assigned an education faculty advisor who monitors their progression by semester.

c. Component R3.3 Competency at Completion

Montana Assessment of Content Knowledge (MACK)

MSUB teacher candidates must meet the minimum content knowledge requirements described below to be recommended for licensure/endorsement. This multiple-measure assessment for licensure began in 2006 because of dialogue and consensus between the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) and Montana Educator Preparation Programs. It is a three-pronged assessment based on scores on the Assessment of Content Knowledge Coursework GPA, the Assessment of Content Knowledge Demonstrated During Student Teaching/ Clinical Practice and a PRAXIS score.

Teacher candidates must earn at least 7 points on the Montana Assessment of Content Knowledge prior to recommendation for licensure/endorsement. The possible range for the Content Knowledge Score (CKS) is 0-10. Teacher candidates earning fewer than 7 points or who score zero on any of the three rubric components shall not be recommended for

licensure/endorsement. For candidates receiving a score of 1* on rubric components 1, 2, or 3, the program will conduct a further individualized review of the candidate's content knowledge and teaching skills, based on established policy, to ensure that the candidate merits recommendation for licensure/endorsement.

1. Assessment of Content Knowledge. Coursework GPA The range for awarding points is 0-4 and will be calculated as follows: GPA Points 3.50 4.00 4 3.00 3.49 3 2.65 2.99 2 2.00 2.64 1* Below 2.00 0 2.

2. Assessment of Content Knowledge. Demonstrated During Student Teaching/ Clinical Practice. The range for awarding points is 0-3 and will be calculated as follows: Descriptor Points Knowledge is Advanced 3 Knowledge is Proficient 2 Knowledge is Basic 1* Knowledge is Insufficient 0 Note: The assessment is completed by a Cooperating Teacher, college or University Supervisor, or faculty member.

3. Assessment of Content Knowledge on appropriate Praxis Subject Assessments. Students take the Praxis corresponding to their program. The information on which Praxis to take is listed on the handout, which is posted on the website. The range for awarding points is 0-3 and will be calculated as follows: Score Range Points Meets/Exceeds MT score 3 At least 90 % of MT score 2 At least 80 % of MT score 1* Below 80 % of MT score 0. (**#3.3.1 Praxis Subject Assessment Test Information**).

The **#3.2.5 MACK Scores** indicate candidates usually score between 8.78 and 9.09 on this assessment.

Candidates are evaluated by their Cooperating Teacher (CT) on their content knowledge using the **#3.3.2 Assessment of Content Knowledge Form**. They are evaluated on their unit and lesson plan development and teaching in the classroom. The unit/lesson plans and observation forms require the evaluation of pedagogical skills and technology integration.

Student Teaching Measure of Undergraduate Impact on Student Learning

The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is the culminating assignment in Student Teaching. The candidate is expected to develop a unit of three -five lessons. For each lesson, the candidate must evaluate student performance, provide evidence with data, and expand on their assessment in a reflective narrative.

Demographics Analysis

Currently, the ETP can track candidate progress through using the university's Institutional Research (IR) Data. The evidence,, **#3.1.1 MSUB Student Demographics**, shows the university's degrees granted and the evidence, **#3.3.3 Enrollment and Completer Data, College of Education** shows the College of Education's degrees awarded. Both show graduation rates broken down by various demographics, such as race. The ETP is working with IR to ensure that, moving forward, key assessment data stored in Tereva will allow for analysis by demographic, and the ETP hopes to present this evidence at the site visit.

Career & Employment Services

This university level office sends out an annual survey to all graduates of education programs, although not all the graduates respond. The data from the undergraduate Elementary, Secondary and Special Education programs are displayed in Tables 11a to 11i. The data are also available on the MSUB Career and Employment Services webpage. (**#3.3.4 Grad Data Flyer**).

FFRc. Narrative Analysis - Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion

The EPP suggests that MSUB teacher candidates must meet the minimum content knowledge requirements to be recommended for licensure or endorsement. They suggest a three-pronged assessment based on the scores on the Assessment of Content Knowledge Coursework GPA, the Assessment of Content Knowledge Demonstrated During Student Teaching/Clinical Practice and a Praxis Score. The EPP also suggests that candidates must earn at least 7 points on the Montana Assessment of Content Knowledge prior to recommendation out of a range of 1-10. This score is derived from a combination of the three assessments previously identified. Finally, the EPP uses the Teacher Work Sample as the culminating assignment in Student Teaching. The requires candidates to develop a unit of three-five lessons. For each lesson, the candidate must evaluate student performance, provide evidence with data, and expand on their assessment in a reflective narrative. It is less clear what the criteria for the TWS are at completion in order to be considered a successful program completer.

SSR Addendum c. Component R3.3 Competency at Completion

R.3.3 (A) - Can the EPP provide disaggregated data by program (with appropriate N's) to verify candidate quality at completion to teach diverse P-12 students for each assessment?

See **Evidence #1.1.4 Assessment_Observation Data; #1.1.15 Assessment_Teacher Work Sample; and #1.1.16 Assessment_Disposition Data.**

R.3.3 (B) - Can the EPP provide a mapping from the assessments to the expected level of proficiency at completion across (A) content Knowledge, (b) pedagogical knowledge, (c) pedagogical skills, (d) critical dispositions, (e), professional responsibilities, and (f) ability to integrate technology effectively.

See **Evidence #1.1.4 Assessment_Observation Data; #1.1.15 Assessment_Teacher Work Sample; and #1.1.16 Assessment_Disposition Data.**

R.3.3 (C) - Can the EPP provide disaggregation dated across programs (with appropriate N's) to verify candidates effective teaching, including positive impacts on diverse P-12 students learning and development?

See **Evidence #1.1.4 Assessment_Observation Data; #1.1.15 Assessment_Teacher Work Sample; and #1.1.16 Assessment_Disposition Data.**

SRRc. Narrative Analysis - Component R3.3 - Competency at Completion

The MACK is a consortium of EPP created tool to measure candidates' content knowledge using content knowledge from practice, praxis, and GPA as a measure. The EPP provided the forms for content knowledge from practice measures at the site visit (2023 Assessment of content knowledge...), but these are episodes of content in the field and really only capture if the content at that time is accurate and not the scope of the discipline. GPA is used, but it does not seem to just be the discipline specific GPA. PRAXIS provides discipline specific knowledge, but a low score on praxis can be masked by the other two scores, making measuring content knowledge in a definitive way difficult to ascertain. This measure is not required by the state, but is the accepted measure by the consortium of EPPs in the state. However, the EPP provided minimal data on the candidates' impact on student learning. The TWS includes assessment of student learning, but the rubric only measures how well the candidate aligned the assessment with instructional outcomes and provides objective evidence of individual student progress and reflects on it, rather than capturing the student learning.

Standard RA3 Candidate Quality and Selectivity (Advanced Level Programs)

**Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence:
Standard RA3 Candidate Quality and Selectivity (Advanced Level Programs)**

SSR Evidence - Standard RA3

a. Component RA3.1 Recruitment

The School Counseling program is dedicated to attracting high-quality candidates from a wide range of backgrounds and diverse populations, aligning with the College of Education's mission to reflect and cater to the diverse needs of communities at the community, state, national, regional, and local levels. This commitment is particularly geared towards addressing the challenges faced by hard-to-staff schools and bridging the gap in the shortage of school counselors. Designed to mirror the demographic diversity of America's P-12 students, the program emphasizes the preparation of counselors capable of effectively serving a broad

spectrum of student needs.

Leveraging its online format, the School Counseling program serves candidates not only within Montana but across the nation, providing them with the opportunity to engage with P-12 students from various demographic backgrounds based on their geographic location. Using Tevera software for data management, the program collects and intends to analyze demographic data related to its candidates and the students they work with during their internships. Initiated in Fall 2023, this data collection and subsequent analysis will adhere to the specified RA four data cycle, offering insights into the program's reach and effectiveness.

The state provides candidates nearing the completion of their degree the option to obtain a provisional license. This innovative approach enables candidates to undertake their elementary and secondary internships within school districts while receiving a professional salary, offering financial support, and ensuring that school's benefit from the emerging talents of school counseling professionals.

Through these comprehensive strategies, the School Counseling program highlights a robust approach to recruiting, preparing, and supporting future school counselors. By addressing the varied needs of P-12 students and responding proactively to the educational system's demands, the program plays a crucial role in advancing the field of school counseling and enhancing the educational experience of school communities across Montana and beyond.

The School Counseling programs implements a multifaceted approach to recruit candidates, blending traditional outreach with modern digital strategies to attract a diverse and qualified pool of future professionals. Virtual information sessions, webinars, and participation in online educational expos offer accessible ways for interested individuals to learn about the programs, application processes, and financial aid opportunities.

Collaborations with undergraduate institutions and educational organizations further broaden their reach, informing students and professionals about the career opportunities in school counseling and the pathways to entering the field. Such partnerships serve as powerful tools for program promotion, with alumni sharing their experiences and recommending the program to potential candidates.

Engaging online content, including podcasts, and infographics, alongside resources that ease the application process, help to highlight the role and importance of school counselors. Finally, optimizing program websites for search engines ensures higher visibility for these programs, making it easier for prospective students to discover them. Through testimonials, detailed program information, and success metrics, these websites offer a comprehensive view of what candidates can expect, thereby facilitating an informed decision-making process.

By employing these diverse strategies, the School Counseling program effectively reaches a broad audience, assembling cohorts of future counselors poised to contribute positively to educational settings across the country.

FFRa. Narrative Analysis - Component RA3.1 - Recruitment

The narrative includes a description of strategies used to recruit candidates to the school counseling program, including website optimization, podcasts, and collaboration with undergraduate institutions. However, no goals are cited nor progress monitoring of these goals. Enrollment for two academic years is provided in evidence 3.4.4 SCOU Enrollment Rates. Again, no goals are set nor reviewed in the evidence. Data does not indicate how many applicants are admitted and then enrolled.

SSR Addendum a. Component RA3.1 Recruitment

RA 3.1 Provide evidence of goal setting for recruitment. Provide evidence of progress monitoring on those goals. Provide evidence of the success or shortcomings of the strategies employed. How do you know your recruiting strategies are effective?

Refer to **Evidence #3.1.4 EPP Five-Year Recruitment Plan** The Advanced School Counseling Program has exceeded capacity for the past five years, and candidates have been placed on waitlists. Additionally, the state of Montana has a school counseling shortage, as evidenced in **Evidence #3.1.2A SCOU Montana Counseling Shortage Documentation**. The Advanced School Counseling Program monitors candidate progress at multiple points throughout the program as evidenced by **Evidence #1.1.1A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Charts, Evidence #1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle Documentation, Evidence #1.1.12A SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation, Evidence #1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA Checkpoint Progress Documentation**.

SRRa. Narrative Analysis - Component RA3.1 - Recruitment

The EPP has enjoyed "at capacity" enrollment in their School Counseling Program recently. They have developed a written Five-Year Recruitment Plan and it was provided in the addendum data indicating an organized approach to recruitment including measurable target outcomes and timeline for achievement. The interviews with EPP faculty and leadership confirmed new efforts to recruit for the advanced program are in place. The EPP is in year 1 of this recruitment plan. Because they are just starting the plan, they do not have data that represents changes in enrollment or diversity. A specific goal has been set within the plan for year 1 to increase program inquiries by 20%. However, no program inquiry data is provided as a baseline, and admissions data is absent. Evidence is provided indicating a need in the local and state market for school counselors. It is unclear how often this data is reviewed. The recruitment strategies shared have potential to help meet the recruitment goals of the EPP in the coming years.

b. Component RA3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

The School Counseling program sets forth admission criteria that align with the standards of CAEP, incorporating both the program's academic achievement requirements and the state's minimum criteria, alongside those of the graduate school. This comprehensive approach ensures the selection of candidates who are not only academically prepared but also committed to upholding the high standards of the counseling profession. To maintain this quality from admission to completion, the program systematically gathers and analyzes candidate data, ensuring continuous alignment with CAEP accreditation standards.

Admission Requirements for candidates include:

Undergraduate Academic Achievement: Candidates must present an undergraduate GPA of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. For applicants falling below this threshold, provisional admission may be offered under the condition that they complete the GRE within their first semester of study. Expected scores for the GRE include a combined total of 290 for the verbal and quantitative sections and a minimum of 3.5 for the analytical writing section. However, applicants possessing a master's degree from an accredited institution are exempt from this GRE requirement.

Professional Documentation : A current resume or Curriculum Vitae (CV) is required, offering a comprehensive overview of the applicant's academic and professional experiences.

Statement of Purpose : Applicants must submit a concise narrative (maximum one page), articulating their professional aspirations and motivations for pursuing the degree. This personal statement should offer insight into the applicant's career goals and their commitment to the field of school counseling.

Letters of Recommendation: Four letters of recommendation are required, with an even split between academic and professional references. These recommendations should provide a well-rounded perspective on the applicant's capabilities and potential. It is important to note that recommendations from personal acquaintances, such as family members, are not considered valid.

Official Transcripts: Submission of official transcripts from all post-secondary institutions attended is mandatory, providing a detailed record of the applicant's academic history.

Criminal Background Report (CBR): An essential requirement for admission is the submission of a CBR to the College of Education Director of Field Experiences and Licensure, ensuring the candidate's suitability for working within educational settings.

Complete Application : Candidates must submit a full application to the Office of Graduate Studies, ensuring that all components of the application process are meticulously compiled and presented. Complete applications are then reviewed by the ETP Department Chair and School Counseling faculty for admission determination.

Graduation requirements include the successful completion of the Master of Education in School Counseling degree and passing the Graduate Endorsement PRAXIS exam in school counseling (#1.1.8APraxis 5422 School Counseling), ensuring that graduates meet both academic and professional standards required for effective practice in the field. Throughout the program,

students' GPA is monitored to ensure academic success. If a student's GPA drops below 3.0 at any point in the program, they are placed on academic probation for one semester. If the student fails to raise their GPA above 3.0 during the probationary semester, they are unenrolled from the program. To return, the student must go through a petition process and may or may not be allowed to reenroll in the program. Additionally, if a student receives below a grade of "C" in any coursework, they are required to retake the course.

Through these comprehensive admissions and graduation requirements, the School Counseling program at MSUB demonstrates its commitment to attracting and cultivating high-caliber candidates capable of contributing significantly to the school counseling profession. This rigorous process ensures that graduates are well-prepared to meet the diverse needs of students and effectively address the challenges within educational settings.

FFRb. Narrative Analysis - Component RA3.2 - Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

According to the narrative "To maintain this quality from admission to completion, the program systematically gathers and analyzes candidate data, ensuring continuous alignment with CAEP accreditation standards." Data is not provided. According to the provider, the students are required to keep a 3.0. Data is not provided that shows GPA is being tracked. Praxis data is provided in evidence 1.1.6A 5 Years of Praxis Data to indicate preparation at completion. However, data is not disaggregated by program or other demographics.

SSR Addendum b. Component RA3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

RA3.2 Please provide evidence of GPA or other tracking data that is reviewed. Please provide disaggregated Praxis data. Please provide any other data that is reviewed at admission.

Disaggregate that data.

The Advanced School Counseling Program monitors candidate progress at multiple points throughout the program as evidenced by **Evidence #1.1.1A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Charts, Evidence #1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle Documentation, Evidence #1.1.12A SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation, Evidence #1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA Checkpoint Progress Documentation.**

Please refer to **Evidence #1.1.10A SCOU Praxis 5421 and 5422 Documentation** and **Evidence #3.1.1A SCOU Candidate GPA at Program Application Documentation.**

SRRb. Narrative Analysis - Component RA3.2 - Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

The EPP maintains rigorous standards for admission to the School Counseling Program. Admission requirements include GPA of at least 3.0, professional documentation, statement of purpose, letters of recommendation, among others. GPA is measured at 6 times throughout the program from admission to completion. GPA data is disaggregated and a summary of findings is presented in evidence.

c. Component RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

The School Counseling program at MSUB establishes comprehensive criteria for program progression, employing disaggregated data to meticulously track candidates' advancement from admission to completion. This program is dedicated to ensuring that all progression milestones and transition points are clearly communicated to candidates, alongside providing detailed planning and documentation for candidate support. This approach is particularly responsive to needs identified through disaggregated data, including race, ethnicity, and other categories relevant to the School Counseling mission, thereby facilitating candidates' successful achievement of program milestones.

Candidates in the program are rigorously assessed at multiple stages: upon entry, mid-program, during their elementary and secondary internships, and at program completion, to ensure they exhibit the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions essential for impactful school counseling. Access to evaluation materials is seamlessly integrated into the program's infrastructure, available within course syllabi, the online course platform (D2L), and the MSUB Tevera software. This comprehensive access supports candidates in meeting the School Counseling program outcomes, including the attainment of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as outlined in the **#1.1.3A SCOU Guidebook** and throughout course requirements.

To meet CAEP's standards for student progress, candidates must demonstrate competency or proficiency in the relevant knowledge and skills by program completion. Essential to this achievement is the requirement to pass the Professional School Counseling Praxis Exam with a score of 159 or above during the Capstone course, and to maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0. Furthermore, candidates are required to complete a specified number of clinical hours, tracked, and reviewed through the Tevera software, ensuring comprehensive practical experience in both elementary and secondary school settings.

The School Counseling program also emphasizes the importance of self-assessment, with candidates creating a self-evaluation at the start of the program and at commencement to benchmark their knowledge. These evaluations, along with feedback from University Supervisors and site mentors during internships, are essential components of the candidate's developmental journey, with all evaluations stored in Tevera for lifelong access.

In instances where candidate improvement is necessary, a **#1.1.9A Evaluation Plan of Improvement** form is utilized, providing structured support through faculty, University Supervisors, and academic advisors. This feedback mechanism ensures immediate accessibility of assessment outcomes and personalized feedback for candidates via Tevera software.

Candidate Retention Strategies. Upon admission, candidates are assigned a core faculty advisor based on faculty interest and advisee load, who assists in developing their plan of study. Regular advisement, primarily conducted online via MSUB Webex meetings, ensures candidates are well-supported throughout their program of study.

The syllabi list essential campus resources available to candidates, including Disability Support Services, the Native American Indian Achievement Center, Student Health Services, and Academic Support Services. These resources are part of a broader retention and graduation strategy, which includes the use of *EAB Navigate* for enhancing faculty-student communication and the proactive monitoring of academic engagement. Through Tevera software and other communication channels, the program facilitates academic alerts and personalized feedback, ensuring candidates receive the necessary support to excel in their studies and complete their program successfully.

FFRc. Narrative Analysis - Component RA3.3 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

The narrative speaks to a robust monitoring of candidates, including employing disaggregated data to meticulously track candidates. However, no evidence is provided and no candidate data is provided. Evaluation materials are noted to be easily integrated and available, however no data is provided to support this claim. The SCOU guidebook was not linked to review the knowledge, skills and dispositions being measured. There is mention of an Evaluation Plan of Improvement of support but it is not in evidence. There is also no documentation of complaints or disaggregated data of remediation efforts or progress monitoring.

SSR Addendum c. Component RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

RA 3.3 Please provide evidence of your tracking systems and how you have analyzed student data at each checkpoint. Disaggregate all data. Additionally, please provide performance reviews, remediation efforts, student support, and progress monitoring evidence, documentation of complaints.

The Advanced School Counseling Program monitors candidate progress at multiple points throughout the program, as evidenced by **Evidence #1.1.1A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Charts, Evidence #1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle Documentation, Evidence #1.1.12A SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation, Evidence #1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA Checkpoint Progress Documentation, Evidence #3.3.2A Candidate Plan of Improvement.**

SRRc. Narrative Analysis - Component RA3.3 - Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

The SCOU Advanced School Counseling Framework was included in evidence showing course names and associated assessments. The EPP uses its evaluation rubric with students as a self evaluation upon admission and then again at internship. The EPP's narrative suggest candidates are checked upon entry, mid-program, during internships, and at program completion but data was not provided that clearly demonstrates this student data tracking. Interviews with students confirmed being well cared for and supported but did not articulate knowledge of clear transition points in the program. The EPP did provide evidence of comparison data from Initial self reflection to Internship. A sample evaluation plan of improvement form is provided as evidence and is utilized to provide structured support to struggling candidates. No samples of use were provided. Candidates are assigned advisors and are to assist as needed. Strong relationships are evident between students and professors and this culture supports students. A systematic checkpoint system is lacking. There has been limited analysis of the progress of students.

d. Component RA3.4 Competency at Completion

The School Counseling program at MSUB is committed to ensuring candidates are not only academically competent but also effectively equipped to positively influence diverse P-12 student learning and development. This commitment is actualized through a curriculum that emphasizes the application of content knowledge, data literacy, research-informed decision-making, collaborative skills, and the integration of technology within the school counseling domain. To validate and enhance candidate competencies, the program employs a comprehensive assessment strategy that incorporates multiple measures, with data analyzed and disaggregated based on race, ethnicity, and other pertinent demographics aligning with the programs mission.

Assessment frameworks within the School Counseling program are aligned with CAEP Advanced Standards, as well as the criteria set by the American School Counseling Association (ASCA), the Montana School Counseling Association (MSCA), the Professional Educator Preparation Program Standards (PEPPS), and the Danielson Framework. These assessments and the corresponding course content are strategically designed to reflect the essential knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions candidates are expected to demonstrate throughout the program of study. At the program's conclusion, candidates are required to exhibit proficiency or competence in these areas, crucial for the school counseling profession.

Academic excellence is a cornerstone of candidate success within the program. Candidates must maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA and achieve a score of 159 or above on the Professional School Counseling 5422 Praxis Exam. Additionally, fulfillment of all state licensure requirements is mandatory for candidates applying for graduation. The graduation application process is comprehensive, necessitating a meeting with the candidate's advisor to ensure all program and state licensure prerequisites are satisfactorily met. This process involves sequential approvals from the program's licensure officer, department chair, graduate studies chair, college dean, and the registration office, ensuring a thorough review and validation of each candidate's readiness for graduation and professional practice.

To provide transparency and insight into the program's effectiveness and outcomes, several key indicators are regularly monitored and reported through all program assessment, coursework, and supervisor feedback. These include:

#3.4.1A SCOU Retention Rates. Tracking the persistence of candidates within the program to identify patterns and implement retention strategies. This document includes the number of degrees awarded.

#3.4.2A SCOU 3-year and 6-year Graduation Rates : Monitoring the timeline to graduation to assess program efficiency and candidate support mechanisms.

#3.4.3A SCOU Employment Rates: Evaluating the success of program graduates in securing employment within the field of school counseling, reflecting the program's alignment with market needs.

#1.1.8A 5 Years of SCOU Praxis Scores:Analyzing the achievement levels of candidates on the Praxis exam to gauge preparedness for state licensure and professional practice.

#3.4.4A SCOU Enrollment Rates:

The enrollment rate documents have been reviewed to identify enrollment trends to understand the program's appeal and areas for recruitment enhancement. During this time, the School Counseling Program was at or above capacity given a single professor leading/teaching in the program. An additional faculty member has been added to address this issue and recruitment efforts have resumed at the end of the Spring 2024 semester.

SCOU Tevera Evaluation Rubrics and Completion Scores:Tevera software is used during each data cycle to systematically assess student progress and outcomes, providing a rich dataset for ongoing program evaluation and improvement.

Through this robust assessment and monitoring framework, the School Counseling program at MSUB ensures graduates are well-prepared to meet the challenges of the school counseling profession, equipped with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to make a meaningful impact on P-12 student learning and development across diverse educational settings.

FFRd. Narrative Analysis - Component RA3.4 - Competency at Completion

Assessments are referenced in the narrative to indicate candidates are competent at completion. No assessments or assessment data is provided. Praxis exams are provided as evidence of competence but are not disaggregated. Although it is stated to provide transparency that several key indicators are regularly monitored and reported through assessment, coursework, and supervisor feedback, data is not provided. Retention data is not relevant here. 3 and 6 year graduation rates are referenced but not provided. Enrollment rates are also not relevant here.

SSR Addendum d. Component RA3.4 Competency at Completion

RA3.4 Please provide 3 cycles of disaggregated data and subsequent analyses of the assessment results. Please provide examples of the assessments demonstrating competence. Provide disaggregated Praxis data.

Please refer to **Evidence #1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle Documentation, Evidence #1.1.12A SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation, Evidence #1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA Checkpoint Progress Documentation and Evidence #1.1.10A SCOU Praxis 5421 and 5422 Documentation.**

SRRd. Narrative Analysis - Component RA3.4 - Competency at Completion

The EPP presents evidence of using the following data sets to verify candidate quality at completion

- " Praxis
- " GPA
- " Evaluation Rubric 3 cycles not disaggregated
- " Mean Score Data Cycle Table

Three cycles of most data is included. Some of the data is disaggregated and some analysis is provided for each data set. In the summary analysis, references are made to differences in scores among demographic groups. Triangulation of data is not demonstrated. Evidence was not provided that demonstrates meeting the criteria for CAEP Evaluation of EPP-Created Assessments.

Standard R4: Program Impact (Initial-licensure Level Programs)

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence:
Standard R4: Program Impact (Initial-licensure Level Programs)

SSR Evidence - Standard R4

a. Component R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

The Montana Education Preparation Providers (MEPP) **#4.1.1 Statewide Protocol for Continuous Improvement** is a regular cycle of data collection and dissemination designed to support the EPP Initial and Advanced programs' continuous program improvement and meet

the Chapter 58 Rules (See **#1.2.1 Chapter 58 Screenshot**) by analyzing employer satisfaction and completer perception of program impact, performance, and relevance. Employer and Completer surveys are deployed on a data collection cycle, which also includes case studies, implemented at least once during a three-year window for initial programs.

The statewide protocol for Continuous Improvement Coalition (CIC) was developed and is managed by a subcommittee of the Montana Council of Deans (MCDE). This is noteworthy because the protocol has undergone periodic review and revisions and there are two (2) distinct iterations of the protocol. The original plan is shown in **#4.1.2 Initial MEPP CIC Protocol** and in **#4.1.1 Statewide MEPP CIC Protocol**.

Because Montana does not collect state-level data of teacher performance, a case study protocol is used to assess how initial completers effectively contribute to P-12 student-learning growth. It also is used to assess how completers apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions learned from their MSUB program into their own classrooms. The first case study was developed in Fall 2020 by the Assessment, Accreditation, and Data Coordinator to better understand completer effectiveness. This position was vacated in Fall 2021 and has been moved to the Office of Assessment and Accreditation to support all programs. The faculty were supported through the transition by the university Office of Assessment and Accreditation, among several other offices.

During the Fall 2020 developmental phase for the first case study, research questions were developed from the 2018 Employer and 2019 Completer survey data, with faculty input. The Initial MEPP CIC Protocol was used to design this case study. The MSUB EPP faculty and staff analyzed feedback from both employer and completer surveys, identifying two areas of improvement: *classroom management* and *culturally relevant pedagogical* practices, including Indian Education for All (IEFA), a mandatory state requirement. The data underscore the pivotal role of these elements in shaping the effectiveness and impact of educators within diverse educational settings and was the basis for the research questions developed the case study.

In the following Spring of 2021, the case study data collection began, collecting data from 15 program completers representative of several licensure areas. First, completers provided responses to a questionnaire developed by the EPP. The completers then submitted a recording of a teaching demonstration. This approach aimed to capture a holistic understanding of completer effectiveness, encompassing both theory and practice. The attached document, **#4.1.3 MEPP Case Study Guide**, describes the research process for the case study, including methodologies, findings, and conclusions. The **#4.1.4 Completer Case Study 2021** includes five sections demonstrating completers' performance, impact on student learning, and development. It also includes completer perceptions of program relevance. The key research questions focused on completer perception of program relevance and performance and impact of completers on student learning and development.

Findings from the initial case study were thematically grouped. First, completers felt underprepared to manage the incorporation of culturally responsive pedagogy, including Indian Education for All (IEFA). Teachers who are adept in culturally relevant pedagogical practices not only foster inclusive learning environments but also cultivate a sense of belonging and affirmation among diverse student populations. By embracing IEFA and integrating culturally sensitive approaches into their curricula, educators can transcend cultural barriers, thereby

fostering deeper engagement, understanding, and empathy within the classroom. The decision to address these aspects of completer effectiveness within the case study reflects the EPP's commitment to addressing challenges.

The EPP embarked on a series of strategic initiatives aimed at directly addressing perceived areas of dissatisfaction identified through rigorous data analysis and stakeholder feedback. Among these endeavors was a collaborative effort with content area departments, in which the EPP advocated for the integration of specialized coursework tailored to fortify the competencies of secondary education majors in classroom management and assessment. The EPP worked with content liaisons to implement bolstered content in the areas of assessment, culturally relevant experiences, and classroom management.

Based partially on the case study results and other data, the EPP implemented a comprehensive redesign of the Student Teaching assessment paradigm to better meet student needs, transitioning from the Evidence of Professional Growth (EPG) tool to a more robust Teacher Work Sample (**#1.1.7 TWS Tool**) framework. Unlike its predecessor, the TWS examines teacher candidates' proficiency across a spectrum of essential domains. The TWS framework also emphasizes facets such as classroom management, differentiation strategies, and the integration of culturally responsive pedagogies. During this time, the tool used to evaluate teaching during formal field experience observations was also redesigned to be fully aligned with the Danielson Framework for Effective Teaching and InTASC standards. Finally, the EPP adopted a new Dispositions Tool that was considerably more robust than the previous tool being used.

The EPP's strategic initiatives, such as advocating for specialized coursework in critical domains and transitioning to a robust Teacher Work Sample (TWS) framework, observation of teaching, and disposition tool for field experiences, including Student Teaching and Junior Field/Graduate Practicum assessments, reflect a commitment to continuous improvement by addressing perceived areas of dissatisfaction and enhancing the overall quality of teacher preparation.

FFRa. Narrative Analysis - Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness

The EPP provides evidence #4.1.1 Statewide Protocol for Continuous Improvement which outlines a protocol for case study to measure p-12 student-learning growth and assess how completers apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The EPP followed this protocol and provided a completer case study in evidence #4.1.4 Completer Case Study 2021. The EPP provided evidence of programmatic changes based on their analysis of the case study. The EPP did not provide three cycles of data with subsequent analyses of results. Rationale for selection of impact measures used was included.

SSR Addendum a. Component R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

R4.1 Can you provide additional evidence beyond the one case study provided to demonstrate

three cycles of data?

The EPP is a member of the Montana Continuous Improvement Collaborative (CIC). The CIC works together to establish collective protocols across Montana for Standard 4. The common tools are the employer and completer surveys. Due to the small size of the state, it is common for schools to receive requests for employer surveys from various EPPs. For this reason, Montana uses a consistent procedure across all EPPs, with completer and employer surveys deployed through the Office of Public Instruction (OPI). Attached in the materials is the protocol for deploying the completer and employer survey. (See **Evidence #4.1.1: Statewide Protocol for Continuous Improvement**). The EPP believes that it has completed three cycles of data, based on the protocol established by the CIC which have been approved through other EPPs. In 2018-2019, Employer Surveys were deployed across all EPPs and state-wide data was gathered. Upon CAEP feedback, the protocol was then changed. In 2019-2020, a completer survey was deployed, which covered years 2014-2015, 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. This was completed in August 2018. In 2020-2021, a case study was deployed, which involved completers from 2017-2020. In 2021-2022, an employer survey was sent out, which yielded incomplete data. It was resent in 2022-2023. In addition, a completer survey was deployed in Spring 2022, covering 2016-2017, 2017-2018, and 2018-2019. For the 2022-2023 school year, an Employer survey was sent in August 2022, a make-up from 2020-2021, covering 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. In 2023-2024, the Employer survey was completed, covering 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. Currently, the EPP is preparing to send out the completer survey to completers of 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 in Spring 2025 and is also in the process of beginning a new case study. The IRB is completed and participant recruitment is underway. A change in protocol occurred in the middle of the review period, based on feedback from other EPPs and is located in **Evidence #4.1.5: MDCE CIC Regeneration Plan**. This caused a delay in the deployment of a new case study. The IRB for the new case study is uploaded as **Evidence #4.1.6: Case Study IRB 2025 and Evidence #4.1.7 IRB Approval**. Although there has been only two completer surveys, these surveys cover more than one year.

SRRa. Narrative Analysis - Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness

A case study dated Spring 2021 was submitted as evidence of completer effectiveness. This study included a survey of completer satisfaction, an analysis of video teaching using the Danielson Framework for some participants and a narrative describing how some completers impacted student learning through MAP scores and interventions. The data analysis portion of the case study states the following in regards to the video observations "Using a basic interpretive approach (Merriam, 2002), the following are the themes emerged from the data", however no themes are listed. Progress has been made by the EPP to begin a new case study under the work of the Montana Continuous Improvement Collaborative (CIC). The IRB is complete and has been approved as of January, 2025 to begin data collection.

b. Component R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers

The Employer survey is administered every two years, as per the CIC protocol. For this

accreditation cycle, data from employers was first collected in Spring 2019. The next collection cycle was poised to be in Spring 2021, but there was a low response rate due to the COVID-19 pandemic. A make-up survey was deployed in Spring 2023. In Spring 2024, an employer survey is in the deployment process (which is back on a regular cycle.) (See **#4.1.1 Statewide Protocol for Continuous Improvement.**)

Survey results for the employer survey are reported for employers of completers of each individual EPP (Spring 2019), as per the Montana Council of Deans of Education (MCDE). The following are the results from the 2019 data collection cycle. Areas of concern included: *responding productively to negative behavior; analyzing assessment data to improve effectiveness of instruction; reflect on how instructional choices affect students; and actively incorporate the 7 Essential Understandings of IEFA.* (**#4.2.1 2019 CIC Employer Satisfaction Survey Results**)

The same employer survey was deployed in the second cycle of data collection. These results can be compared to the previous results to indicate areas of growth or decline. Survey results for this instrument are reported for employers of completers of each EPP (Spring 2023). (**#4.2.2 2023 CIC Employer Satisfaction Survey Data.**)

The results of the employer survey overall indicate high satisfaction rates with the program. Two items: *plan instruction based on knowledge of students in their community context* and *apply knowledge of the legal responsibilities of teachers* scored the lowest satisfaction of the employers. The highest scores on the 2023 survey were for the following survey statements, *purposefully use instructional technology* ; *encourage critical thinking for problem solving* ; *implement instruction aligned with Montana State Content Standards* ; and *use a variety of instructional strategies* . These areas of excellence indicate students are using a variety of instructional strategies, including technology applications that are aligned with Montana standards and require students to think critically. As compared to the previous survey results, all these indicate an increase in satisfaction in these areas.

Areas that were scored with the least satisfaction in the previous (2019) survey were: *respond productively to negative behavior* ; *analyze assessment data to improve the effectiveness of instruction* ; *reflect on how instructional choices affect students* , and *accurately incorporate the 7 Essential Understandings of Indian Education for All.* These scores have all increased from the first cycle to the second cycle, therefore demonstrating improvement in the EPP for preparing teachers in the classroom. The table below outlines the growth in each area. (**#4.2.3 Growth Areas as Indicated by Employer Survey.**)

There were two areas within the first survey, marked as "needing improvement" that declined even further in the second survey. The first area was *plan instruction based on knowledge of students in their community context* , receiving an 84% satisfaction rating. The EPP is committed to reviewing courses and assignments that incorporate culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP). Further, given the rural context of Montana, adding assignments which challenge students to think about alternative contexts is recommended. Another area to address is with the question *apply knowledge of legal responsibilities of teachers* which received the same score of 84% satisfaction. This indicates a candidate needs in having adequate knowledge of the law as it applies to teaching. The newly established TWS works toward this improvement with 1.3: *Preparation through Knowledge of Students (1b)* . To address this area, the new TWS

incorporates legal responsibilities, such as IEP and 504 accommodations into coursework and assignments. In addition, the curriculum mapping process through the Proficiency Based Education (PBE) Grant is addressing potential gaps in content. This is described in more depth in Standard 5.

Overall, employers displayed a high satisfaction rate with completers, showing growth among several areas during this data collection cycle.

FFRb. Narrative Analysis - Component R4.2 - Satisfaction of Employers

EPP employer survey results are provided for 2023 in evidence titled #4.2.2 2023 CIC Employer Satisfaction Survey Data). 2019 employer survey results are referenced as #4.2.1 2019 CIC Employer Satisfaction Survey Results but this data link does not show 2019 results. A comparison document is included in evidence #4.2.3 Growth Areas as Indicated by Employer Survey. However, the title indicates years 2018 and 2023. Overall, the EPP perceives general satisfaction in completers' preparation from employers. The EPP identifies opportunities for growth from survey results, and growth is noted between the two surveys in four categories. Evidence is provided in the narrative indicating EPP analyses of data. No disaggregated data is provided nor analyzed by program or other characteristic.

SSR Addendum b. Component R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers

Please clarify the timeline of employer surveys. The MEPP timeline and the results reported are different. The EPP provided 2019 (although not attached) and 2023 data but the data collection cycle indicates 2022, 2024. Also, please include the spring 2024 employer survey results. Please provide 2019 survey results as the provided link did not have employer survey results. (#4.2.1 2019 CIC Employer Satisfaction Survey Results.) How is it demonstrated that the employer surveys have met the criteria for evaluation of EPP created surveys? Can you provide disaggregated data by program or other?

In 2018-2019, the employer surveys were deployed across all EPPs and state-wide data was gathered. Upon CAEP feedback, the protocol was then changed. In 2021-2022, the employer survey was launched, which yielded incomplete data. This survey was redone in 2022-2023, covering 2020-2021, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021. In 2023-2024, the Employer survey was sent out, surveying employers from 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. The following evidence has been uploaded: **Evidence #4.2.4: 2021-2022 Employer Survey Results; #4.2.5: 2023-2024 Employer Survey Results** and **#4.2.6 Updated Employer Survey Results Comparison Chart**.

SRRb. Narrative Analysis - Component R4.2 - Satisfaction of Employers

Three cycles of employer survey results were provided in evidence. Additionally, "Updated

Employer Survey Results Comparison Chart" was presented. Percentages of satisfaction with each survey item are listed. No n value is provided on comparison chart 4.2.6 nor a breakdown of which programs these employers represent. Two items were identified by the EPP in the narrative as areas needing improvement, item 5 and item 10. However, the comparison chart indicates an increase in satisfaction rate. The EPP states that this information is used for improvement and shared with advisory board. This could not be confirmed through interviews with advisory board. Analysis of data is insufficient to compellingly demonstrate the EPP's case and what they have learned from the evidence. Evidence that the survey meets the CAEP Criteria for EPP-created surveys was not provided.

c. Component R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

The data from the 2021-22 completer survey (**#4.3.1: 2021-2022 Completer Perception of Preparation Survey**) indicated that completers felt the EPP was effective or very effective in the following areas: *demonstrating accurate content knowledge* ; *implementing instruction aligned with Montana state content standards* ; *using a variety of instructional strategies* ; *reflecting on how instructional choice affect students* ; *applying knowledge of the legal responsibilities of teachers*; and *engaging with colleagues in a professional manner*. These results are consistent with the previous cycles of completer data.

The completers who took part in the survey instrument felt EPP provided relevant preparation for their jobs with 72% responding Effective or Very Effective. The data also indicated completers felt competent in utilizing Montana Common Core State Standards (MCSS) in their curriculum. These concepts are introduced, reiterated, and practiced throughout coursework in the EPP including applying the MCSS through their Junior Field Experiences and in Student Teaching. These proficiencies are also demonstrated through the TWS unit and lesson plan requirements. Completers recognized their placement within the legal frameworks afforded to the educator, including their respective duties and responsibilities as an educator apropos of the law in its relation to education. Legal concepts are introduced and assessed in various courses, notably in the EDU 406 Philosophical, Legal, and Ethical Issues in Education and EDF 515 Social and Philosophical Issues in Education courses and in special education courses, including EDSP 204, Introduction to Exceptional Learners and SPED 540 Education of Exceptional Learners. The introduction and inclusion of other features of the law aligns with a strong knowledge of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and 504s which are taught in special education courses in the program and are also referenced in other required courses. The data demonstrates the completer's ability to recognize their place within the professional landscape of education, i.e., collaborating with other professionals and colleagues. Such principles are demonstrated, in writing, within the candidates' TWS during Junior Field/Graduate Practicum Experiences and Student Teaching. Results from the 2019-20 survey administration and the results from the most recent survey administration show an improvement in this area.

The completer survey data indicates notable improvements from the 2019-2020 cycle to the most recent cycle (2021-2022) as shown in the #4.3.2 Growth Areas as Indicated by Completer Survey data. Areas of improvement included the following categories: *purposefully use instructional technology* (54% to 74% between data cycles); *engage with colleagues in a*

professional manne r (70% to 83% growth between cycles) and *accurately incorporate the 7 Essential Understanding of Indian Education for All* (58% to 76% growth between cycles).

The areas EPP completers felt somewhat or not effective were methodological approaches to differentiate instruction effectively for *English Learners (ELs)*; *respond productively to negative behavior*; and though disparate in the data spread (48%) with the data compiled from the 2021-2022 survey *plan instruction based on knowledge of students in their community context*. Past completer survey data indicated similar sentiments, particularly with differentiating instruction effectively for English Learners (ELs). These key areas are also assessed by the TWS projects, which allows instructors formative data to make continuous improvements at a micro-level. The results will be monitored through the completer surveys as well. The EPP has been addressing these gaps through integrating EL and place-based instruction modules in social studies and language arts courses.

References

Flower, A., McKenna, J., & Haring, C. (2017). Behavior and classroom management: Are teacher preparation programs really preparing our teachers? *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 61(2), 163-169.

<https://doi/10.1080/1045988X.2016.1231109>.

Scheuremann, B, & Hall, J. (2016). *Positive behavioral supports for the classroom*. Pearson.

Straus, L. (2022). Case Study--University of Montana Western Education Division: CAEP Standards R4.1 Completer Effectiveness, R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers, R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers, Retrieved XX/YY/2023 from: <https://www.umwestern.edu/wp-content/uploads/Case-Study-CAEP-2021-UMW-guidance-and-management.pdf>.

Indian Education for All. (2 April 2024). Montana State University.

FFRc. Narrative Analysis - Component R4.3 - Satisfaction of Completers

The EPP provides evidence that completers perceive their preparation was sufficient for the job through results of a completer perception of preparation survey. Data is provided for two cycles #4.3.1: 2021-2022 Completer Perception of Preparation Survey) and 4.2.1 CIC 2019 Employer Satisfaction Survey although titled employer is actually Completer Perception survey results. No comparison document indicating areas of growth is included in evidence, although the title is shown as 4.2.3 Growth Areas As Indicated on Completer Survey - this leads to employer survey results. The narrative indicates analyses of the completer survey comparing one year to another. Areas of excellence and opportunities for growth are noted. Disaggregated data is not provided, nor analyzed. Only two cycles of data are mentioned.

SSR Addendum c. Component R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

R4.3 Please provide comparison chart of completer survey data from 19-20 and 21-22. Please provide a third cycle of data. Please include disaggregated data and analyses. Please provide evidence that survey meets CAEP criteria.

The **Evidence #4.3.3 MEPP CIC Crosswalk** demonstrates that the completer (and employer) survey is aligned with InTASC standards.

Completer surveys were deployed via the CIC process in 2018, which covered years 2014-2015, 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. This was completed in August 2018. In addition, a completer survey was deployed in Spring 2022, covering 2016-2017, 2017-2018, and 2018-2019. A completer survey will be deployed in Spring 2025. The data cycle includes three years of completers for each survey, thus meeting the CAEP criteria. The EPP does disaggregate data by the following: year completed the program, program level completion, endorsement area, Montana data only, related field, and if the student is currently teaching in Montana. As the EPP has very small n's for some of these categories, confidentiality is a concern when sharing these numbers publicly. However, this data will be available at the site visit if needed. The 2019-2020 data is now uploaded as **Evidence #4.3.4: Fall 18 Completer Survey**. Finally, the **Evidence #4.3.5 Completer Comparison Chart** demonstrates a comparison between the Fall 2018 data and the Spring 2022 data.

SRRc. Narrative Analysis - Component R4.3 - Satisfaction of Completers

Completer survey results were provided in evidence aligned with the Montana State Program Impact timeline. Two cycles were included which each includes multiple years of completers being surveyed. However, the survey was only done twice. Some charts did not indicate an n value and data is not disaggregated by program. Data Dips are used to analyze data with faculty. The EPP states that this information is used for improvement and shared with advisory board. This could not be confirmed through interviews with advisory board. In interviews with EPP leadership, it was stated that the data can be disaggregated but no written documentation was provided. Evidence that the survey meets CAEP criteria for evaluation of EPP-Created Surveys was not provided. Analysis of data is insufficient to demonstrate completer satisfaction.

Standard RA4. Program Impact (Advanced Level Programs)

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence:
Standard RA4. Program Impact (Advanced Level Programs)

SSR Evidence - Standard RA4

Evidence Title	Caep Component	File
4.1.1 Statewide Protocol for Continuous Improvement	Component R4.1 - Completer Effectiveness, Component RA4.1 - Satisfaction of Employers	4.1.1 Statewide Protocol for Continuous I

Items per page: 10 | 1 of 1

a. Component RA4.1 Satisfaction of Employers

The School Counseling program at MSUB is committed to evaluating and enhancing the quality of its preparation program through systematic feedback from completers and their employers. This evaluation focuses on the relevance and effectiveness of the training provided, ensuring that program graduates are well-equipped to meet the demands of their profession. To support continuous improvement, a statewide protocol, developed under the auspices of the Montana Educator Preparation Programs (MEPP) Continuous Improvement Collaborative (CIC), facilitates a regular cycle of data collection (**#4.1.1 Statewide MEPP CIC Protocol.**) This cycle is specifically designed to gather insights into employer satisfaction and completers' perceptions regarding the impact, performance, and relevance of their training. The protocol schedules the distribution of employer and completer surveys on a biennial basis, establishing a structured approach to collect critical feedback.

During the 2021 and 2022 academic years, the CIC team undertook the development of the Advanced School Counseling Program Employer/Completer Pilot Survey. Launched in the spring of 2022, this survey aimed to capture valuable feedback from both employers and program completers. The insights gained from this survey were meticulously analyzed by the program's faculty, who then addressed identified gaps in program performance by adjusting course content accordingly. This data will be reported in the Fall 2024 Addendum in order to report a full cycle of data.

This initiative aligns with a broader statewide effort coordinated through the MEPP CIC. This collaborative endeavor sought to meet the requirements of CAEP Standard 4 (now succeeded by CAEP Standard R4), emphasizing the importance of continuous program improvement based on stakeholder feedback. The Montana Council of Deans of Education (MCDE), in collaboration with the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI), approved this protocol in 2019, marking it as a proprietary assessment recognized and validated by both MCDE and OPI. This designation signifies the design, validation, and administration of the protocol are managed at the state level, offering a unique and credible source of evidence for program assessment.

In 2016, the MEPP CIC reached out to CAEP to confirm the appropriateness of the assessment process. CAEP's response, through a memo titled "When States Provide Limited Data: Using Standard 4 to Drive Program Improvement," affirmed the protocol as a suitable proprietary assessment for addressing CAEP Standard 4. This memo, now part of the MCDE records, underscores the legitimacy and effectiveness of this approach to program evaluation. The comprehensive protocol comprises: (a) a statewide survey of completers, assessing their

satisfaction with the preparation they received; (b) a statewide survey of employers, evaluating their satisfaction with the readiness and performance of the program's completers; and (c) a case study derived from survey data, aimed at exploring emergent questions and further examining the data collected (for initial programs only).

This structured feedback mechanism plays a pivotal role in the School Counseling program's ongoing efforts to refine its curriculum and support services, ensuring that graduates are fully prepared to contribute positively to the school counseling field.

Data Collection Cycle

The MEPP employs regular cycle of data collection designed to support MEPP Initial and Advanced programs' continuous program improvement, and to meet ARM 10.58.314 and 10.58.608 through analyses of employer satisfaction and completer perception of program impact, performance, and relevance (**See #4.1.1 Statewide MEPP CIC Protocol**). The rotation cycle will deploy the Employer and Completer surveys every other year for the School Counseling program.

The School Counseling program at MSUB has consistently demonstrated a high level of employer satisfaction with the preparation of its graduates for their professional responsibilities. This achievement is evidenced by the survey results from Spring 2023. These surveys align with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards for effective statewide assessment practices. Over the past three data cycles, feedback from employers has offered valuable insights into various aspects of graduate performance and competency.

The scope of these surveys is comprehensive, covering several critical areas of graduate capability in the school counseling field:

Knowledge and Skills: The surveys evaluate graduates' understanding and application of school counseling principles, especially their contribution to P-12 student learning and development.

Data Literacy and Research Application: Graduates' proficiency in employing data literacy, along with qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method research methodologies, is assessed to determine their effectiveness in fostering supportive, diverse, equitable, and inclusive educational communities.

Leadership and Collaboration: The surveys examine the ability of graduates to lead or participate effectively in collaborative endeavors within the school counseling arena.

Technology Use: Graduates' aptitude for appropriately integrating technology into their counseling practice is also evaluated.

Adherence to Standards: Additionally, the surveys gauge graduates' compliance with essential legal, policy, and ethical standards critical to the school counseling profession.

Content Knowledge and Pedagogy: Finally, employers provide feedback on graduates' content knowledge, their understanding of legal frameworks, and their application of pedagogical methodologies relevant to classroom settings.

This detailed feedback from employers paints a clear picture of the School Counseling program's success in preparing candidates to meet the diverse and complex demands of the school counseling profession. The consistently positive feedback across various competency areas underscores the program's commitment to producing skilled, knowledgeable, and well-prepared professionals. These professionals are not only aligned with the rigorous standards set by CAEP but are also highly valued and respected by the employers for their contributions to the educational and developmental needs of P-12 students.

The survey results from Spring 2024, along with data from the past three cycles, have been compiled and analyzed according to the statewide protocol established by the MCDE MEPP CIC. This structured approach to gathering and evaluating employer feedback ensures that the School Counseling program at MSUB continues to refine and enhance its curriculum and support services, thereby maintaining its standing as a leader in the field of school counseling education.

FFRa. Narrative Analysis - Component RA4.1 - Satisfaction of Employers

The EPP states in the narrative that in the spring of 2022, a survey was implemented, and meticulously analyzed by the program's faculty, who then addressed identified gaps. However, no data is included although it is stated that it will be reported in Fall 2024. The narrative also indicates that "This achievement is evidenced by the survey results from Spring 2023". However, no data has been provided. Three cycles of data is referenced, but not provided.

SSR Addendum a. Component RA4.1 Satisfaction of Employers

RA4.1 Please provide three cycles of data, the employer survey, comparison between cycles, and evidence of analysis. Also please provide disaggregated data and analyses.

The Advanced School Counseling Program was required to update all of the standards, evaluations, and surveys for the program in 2022, therefore, the data is limited to that period of time. During that time, the state updated their survey protocol and content. Additionally, they completed a Lawshe Panel and ran a pilot of the survey to determine effectiveness. The Advanced School Counseling Program has included data on the survey form, the pilot that was conducted in the spring of 2023, and the results of the Employer Survey that was conducted in the Spring of 2024. Please refer to the following evidence: **Evidence #4.1.1A SCOU Employer/Completer Survey Form**, **Evidence #4.1.2A SCOU Spring 2023 Employer/Completer Pilot Survey Results**, and **Evidence #2.1.4A SCOU Spring 2024 Employer Survey Results**.

SRRa. Narrative Analysis - Component RA4.1 - Satisfaction of Employers

Pilot survey results that combined employers and completer results were submitted in evidence. Through their participation with the Continuous Improvement collaborative (CIC), the EPP has a survey that is used for employers and completers per a schedule. The survey is aligned to the ASCA standards as well as CAEP on a 4 point Likert scale. A survey was sent to employers in 2024 (the second after the pilot) but it only yielded 3 responses. Effort was made to analyze the results, but low n is limiting. It was stated by the EPP that this data is shared with the advisory board and I will try to confirm in interviews. Two cycles of data provided. Surveys were updated in 2022, limiting them to these two cycles. The survey is set to be repeated in Spring of 2025.

b. Component RA4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

MSUB School Counseling program completer data demonstrates that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and their preparation was effective.

The Fall 2024: The survey instrument is designed to request feedback on the experiences of the completers during their time in the program, focusing on a comprehensive array of aspects integral to the domain of school counseling.

The survey includes questions related to the advanced degree knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions deemed essential for fostering learning and developmental opportunities for K-12 students. It addresses a curriculum that encompasses thorough application of data literacy, research utilization, and a robust understanding of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method research methodologies. The curriculum aims to equip candidates with the capacity to conduct data analysis and use evidence-based approaches to cultivate supportive, diverse, equitable, and inclusive school communities, all of which are included in the survey.

The survey asks the candidates about their proficiency in leading or contributing to collaborative efforts within the school counseling field, demonstrating the effective use of technology in their practice, and adhering to appropriate school counseling dispositions. It also evaluates their understanding and application of professional school counseling laws, policies, and ethical guidelines. The curriculum is built on solid content knowledge, legal frameworks, and the ability to apply differentiated and pedagogical methodologies in classroom settings.

The survey report includes an analysis of results from the Spring 2024 data collection cycle, providing a comprehensive overview of the trends and insights gathered (forthcoming in the Fall 2024 Addendum). This approach enables stakeholders to monitor progress and identify areas for continuous improvement in preparing school counselors who are well-equipped to meet the challenges of the modern educational landscape.

FFRb. Narrative Analysis - Component RA4.2 - Satisfaction of Completers

The narrative provided by the EPP indicates a survey exists to measure the satisfaction of completers. The EPP references types of questions and states that the results have been analyzed. However, no data is provided.

SSR Addendum b. Component RA4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

RA 4.2 Please provide three cycles of data, the employer survey, comparison between cycles, and evidence of analysis. Also please provide disaggregated data and analyses.

The Advanced School Counseling Program was required to update all of the standards, evaluations, and surveys for the program in 2022. Therefore, the data is limited to that period of time. During that time, the state updated its survey protocol and content. Additionally, they did a Lawshe Panel and ran a pilot of the survey to determine effectiveness. The Advanced School Counseling Program has included data on the survey form and the pilot that was conducted in the spring of 2023. The Completer Survey will be conducted during the spring of 2025. Please refer to the following evidence: **Evidence #4.1.1A SCOU Employer/Completer Survey Form, Evidence #4.1.2A SCOU Spring 2023 Employer/Completer Pilot Survey Results.**

SRRb. Narrative Analysis - Component RA4.2 - Satisfaction of Completers

Pilot survey results that combined employers and completer results were submitted in evidence. This was from Spring 2023. Through their participation with the Continuous Improvement collaborative (CIC), the EPP has a survey that is used for employers and completers per a schedule. They did a Lawshe panel to determine effectiveness. The next completer survey is to be repeated in Spring of 2025. The survey is aligned to the ASCA standards as well as CAEP on a 4 point Likert scale. Only the pilot data is available Key strengths and areas for growth were noted based on the pilot results (n=13). Limited evidence of completer satisfaction from survey results. Very positive satisfaction of completers was noted in the completer interview.

Standard R5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity (Initial-licensure Level Programs)

**Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence :
Standard R5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity (Initial-licensure Level Programs)**

SSR Evidence - Standard R5

a. Component R5.1 Quality Assurance System

The first component of the ETP's Quality Assurance System (QAS) (**#5.1.1 QAS**) is data collection. The ETP uses eight data sources within the QAS. The key assessments: a Teacher Work Sample (TWS), an Observation Tool for field experiences, and a Dispositions Tool are all collected for evaluation during key points in each semester. Dispositions evaluations are administered during each field experience: sophomore practicum, Junior Field experience/Graduate Practicum and Student Teaching. The TWS and Observation are completed during Junior Field and Student Teaching. However, the ETP is moving toward collecting disposition data in each course, twice a semester. This more frequent process will ensure that the ETP can address dispositions issues that arise during courses. The **#5.1.2 Data Collection Cycles Evidence** outline the processes in more detail.

As addressed in Standard 4, the Montana Education Preparation Providers (MEPPs) formed the Continuous Improvement Collaborative (CIC). The CIC coordinates a state level effort to collect feedback from employers and completers through a survey to each group. A case study is also conducted every three years for initial programs. Following the CIC protocol, the surveys are distributed electronically to MSUB completers and those who employ the completers. In addition, MACK data and Praxis data are collected at the close of the program. The Montana Comprehensive Assessment System (MACK) is a state-wide assessment tool which measures content knowledge. (**#1.1.2 MACK Worksheet**). This is a three-pronged assessment system used for licensure which includes GPA, Praxis Scores, and a Content Assessment completed by the Cooperating Teacher (CT) during Student Teaching.

Currently, data are collected through either Qualtrics or Tevera. At the beginning of the accreditation cycle in 2017, the ETP used a paper/pencil collection system, gathered by University Supervisors. This data was then entered by hand into a spreadsheet. The COVID-19 pandemic necessitated a shift to an electronic system. The ETP then moved to using a fillable pdf to collect the individual data and started to enter the data manually into Qualtrics. The Qualtrics system was chosen because the tool was already purchased by the university's Information Technology (IT) department. Data entry was completed by the ETP's Assessment, Accreditation and Data Coordinator during the first part of the cycle. Since then, trained graduate students have been entering the data into Qualtrics. The process of manually entering the data is cumbersome and less efficient than other options. After the School Counseling program piloted Tevera, which is a more comprehensive system in which assessments are completed directly in the system, the ETP decided to explore adopting this software for data collection. It is currently being piloted by the remaining programs in the ETP. The Qualtrics and Tevera systems are being used by faculty to track the key assessments: the TWS, the Dispositions tool, and the Observation tool. Historically, the Director of Field Experiences and Licensure (DFEL) housed Praxis and MACK scores using a spreadsheet. Currently, the DFEL is working with the university Information Technology Office to embed these scores within Tevera. The employer and completer survey data are stored within a Box folder that all faculty can access. Analysis of the data becomes more efficient with the use of these tools, as it presents the data in aggregate and provides some level of reporting.

Data is reported and used in a variety of ways. Data is shared with faculty through assessment retreats and data dips. Assessment retreats which have typically taken place annually, have the advantage of allowing a deeper dive into the data, whereas data dips, which typically take

place during faculty meetings, are shorter, focused analyses and have the advantage of occurring more regularly. During data dips, faculty approach several questions regarding one type of data. Then, small groups analyze data and then report back to the whole group. The purpose is to utilize the data to make changes as needed. Assessment retreats will ensure that data are reviewed consistently, on a timeline, and they will allow for the deeper analysis often needed to make programmatic changes. The ETP faculty use both assessment retreats and data dips as the primary means of reporting, analyzing, and discussing the data collected. Data is also reported to the University Assessment and Accreditation Office through an annual assessment report. This report details the student learning assessment data for the program student learning outcomes and whether these outcomes are being met. The report also includes any necessary curricular or pedagogical changes that resulted from the analysis. Additionally, all MSUB academic programs undergo Academic Program Review (APR) every seven years. This process is intended to be an in-depth review of programmatic self-reflection, as well as providing the opportunity for an external reviewer to examine and offer feedback for potential improvements. These two institutional processes and expectations help ensure a cycle of continuous quality improvement is implemented for each academic program at MSUB. The faculty look forward to continuing these rich discussions that comes from reviewing student learning data and further strengthening the quality assurance system. Data examinations have both focused on CIC data and internal data, including the TWS, Observation Form, and Dispositions Tool data.

Advisory committees are another important group for sharing and reporting data. Within the COE, advisory committees are comprised of faculty, university administrators, and external stakeholders, including teachers, K-12 administrators, and school counselors. During this review cycle, changes in leadership resulted in some shifts in the way advisory committees met as they met regularly until Dean Nava resigned. These meetings were paused under interim dean leadership (which coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic). With new leadership, and with the addition of the Proficiency Based Education (PBE) Grant, the ETP Advisory Committee has been reinstated to specifically review and discuss data. (**#5.1.3 Advisory Board Minutes**). Further details regarding the advisory committee can be found in R5.3.

The ETP utilizes key assessment data and other data to make programmatic changes. Several modifications have occurred because of faculty data analyses and discussions. During the 2018-2019 school year, faculty engaged in reviewing employer and completer surveys as part of the state assessment protocol. During this review cycle, faculty recognized the following areas needed improvement: data-based decision making; better classroom management skills; Indian Education for All; and differentiation of instruction. As a result of this data, the following changes were made: The reading major and reading minor added a learning disabilities course as a requirement. (Note: The reading major has since been discontinued because of a budget realignment process and low enrollment.) Also, all undergraduate elementary education majors now enroll in the course, EDU 438 Literacy Assessment, Diagnosis, Instruction. This is an on-campus course in which students use data-driven assessments to drive instruction.

From the collected employer and completer survey data, faculty observed areas of weakness, specific to secondary majors in the following categories: diversity, classroom management, and assessment competency. The elementary and secondary faculty coordinated with stakeholders in the secondary content areas to add the course EDU 343 Managing Diverse Learners (classroom management) as a requirement. In addition, the course EDU 380 Introduction to

Curriculum, a previously two-credit course, was removed and a three-credit course, EDU 381 Curriculum Theory and Practice was added. The three-credit course also includes some assessment. Math and science majors also added the assessment course, EDU 383 Assessment in Education, to their major and the English department changed their methods course from 2 to 3 credits to allow for more discussion about assessment. The ETP just completed collecting the three cycles of data from key assessments and have engaged in one data dip to date. The ETP plans on looking at this data again during the Fall 2024 Assessment Retreat to more closely examine if programmatic changes need to occur based on this data.

FFRa. Narrative Analysis - Component R5.1 - Quality Assurance System

The EPP reports the use of eight data sources within the QAS. This includes three key assessments including the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), an observation tool for field experiences, and dispositions tool collected for evaluation during key point each term. Evidence 5.1.2 Data Collection Cycle indication methods of data collection for (1) Employer Survey, (2) Completer Survey, (3) Case Study, (4) TWS: Longitudinal and Program Level, (5) Observation, and (6) Dispositions. It is unclear how the six methods of data collection represent eight data sources within the QAS.

It appears that the Montana Education Preparation Providers (MEPPs) formed a Continuous Improvement Collaborative (CIC) to coordinate state level efforts to collect employer and completers surveys. A case study is also conducted by the EPP every three years for initial programs. The EPP also identifies the Montana Comprehensive Assessment System or MACK. This is a three-pronged sliding scale for which students are able to perform to a specified standard in order to be recommended for licensure. The EPP reports multiple formats and tools that are or were used to collect data. It appears that the EPP is making a systematic effort to move all data collection to the Tevera platform. Data is then shared with internal stakeholders via a Box.com folder.

Data are shared internal with faculty during assessment retreats and data dips. Assessment retreats take place annually and allow faculty a deep dive into data whereas data dips typically take place during faculty meetings, focused on analyses. Data is also reported to the University Assessment and Accreditation Office through an annual assessment report. These internal university processes appear to assist the EPP to ensure a cycle of continuous quality improvement for each academic program.

Advisory committees are comprised of faculty, university administrators, and external stakeholders. While there was a pause in the advisory committee due to administrative changes, a grant has initiated the reinstatement to review and discuss data. This meeting appeared to occur on 4/18/2024. It is unclear if this was the only meeting that has been held with an advisory committee in over four calendar years.

Finally, the EPP reported several programmatic changes as a result of the data reviewed from 2018-19. It is unclear if further meetings and continuous improvement opportunities have arisen since. That time as the EPP did not share data, assessment instruments, or

meetings minutes where the changes took place.

b. Component R5.2 Data Quality

In Fall 2019, when COE Dean and the Assessment, Accreditation and Data Coordinator assumed responsibilities for CAEP, a gap analysis was conducted with the existing assessment instruments and CAEP's Evaluation Framework for EPP-created assessments. This gap analysis was helpful to determine the level of validity and reliability of the existing instruments and it was identified that the tools lacked both. The Assessment, Accreditation and Data Coordinator and the Dean presented these findings to the faculty during a college-wide meeting. The CAEP timeline was also presented to inform an appropriate timeline for revising the tools. The faculty brainstormed ideas to revise the assessment instruments (**#5.2.1 ETP Meeting Minutes 1.30.20**), which would meet three primary foci: content assessment, pedagogical assessment, and a dispositions tool.

The key method of reliability was established through inter-rater reliability. According to the CAEP consolidated handbook, reliability is defined as "the degree to which the result of a measurement, assessment calculation, or specification can be depended on over repeated applications. A metric is said to have a high reliability when it produces consistent results under consistent conditions. Inter-rater reliability is a measure of consistency used to assess the degree to which different judges (or raters) agree in their evaluation (or scoring) decisions of the same phenomenon." This definition is useful because human observers will not necessarily interpret concepts, performances or scoring categories the same way. If various raters do not agree, the effects can be detrimental and suggest either that the scale is defective or that the raters need to be re-trained. Inter-rater reliability is high when reviewers demonstrate that they consistently reach the same or very similar decisions. A formal training and calibration procedure is usually needed to achieve this result, and the calibration involves calculating reliability coefficient. To ensure reliability of key assessments, faculty and field supervisors engaged in inter-reliability exercises, which are further outlined below.

1. Content Knowledge .

Content Knowledge is measured through the MACK tool, which is a state-wide assessment that the COE has continued to use to measure content knowledge. There are three prongs to this tool which include: content knowledge GPA, Assessment of Content Knowledge during Student Teaching, and Assessment of Content Knowledge using the Praxis examination. This has been a long-established protocol at MSUB and the state of Montana.

2. Pedagogy.

The tools used to measure pedagogical knowledge were created by a team of faculty and the assessment coordinator and included the **Teacher Work Sample (TWS)** and the **Observation Assessment**. Both the TWS and Observation tools are Danielson-based frameworks, a framework in which many of the faculty were already trained. A taskforce was then created for observing and assessing students. Throughout the development process, faculty were given several opportunities to provide feedback to about the tool (**See #5.2.2 Faculty Feedback Responses**)

To ensure validity, the Lawshe Method (Lawshe, 1975) was implemented, which sought feedback from both faculty members and external stakeholders. To establish content validity, each of the questions on the TWS and Observation tools were rated using the following categories: essential; useful but not essential; or not useful. Lawshe argues that content validity can be established when there is a 50% agreement. As evidenced, in all but two questions (Question 4_16 and Question 6_5), content validity was established for the TWS and Observation Tool (# **5.2.3 TWS-Lawshe Content Validity-Faculty-Partners-Combined**),

During the Fall 2021 Assessment Retreat, faculty and University Supervisors were trained on using the TWS. During this retreat, the group also participated in an activity to establish inter-rater reliability for the TWS. The approach to the training was a jigsaw approach in which smaller groups met, and then came together for a larger group discussion. For most questions (aside from 1.4.7), inter-reliability was established. The attached evidence, **#5.2.4 Inter-rater Reliability in Faculty TWS Training** and **#5.2.5 Inter-rater Activity** shows this process.

Inter-rater reliability was established for the Observation Tool by viewing videos. In this representative evidence, **#5.2.6 Observation Video Rating**, faculty rated a teacher on each element within the Danielson-based observation tool. After the completion of the Lawshe validation process, the tools were then piloted in the EDCI 519 Graduate Practicum course. During Fall 2021, the tools were fully implemented within all Graduate Practicum and Junior Field courses. A full implementation of all tools (TWS, Observation tool, and Dispositions) with all candidates occurred by Spring 2022.

3. Dispositions.

The third prong of the assessment system is the dispositions tool. In Spring 2020, during the Montana Council of Deans (MCDE) meeting in Helena, the University of Montana-Western introduced a dispositions tool to the council of Deans. During this meeting, the tool was shared with the group and content validity was tested using the Lawshe Content validity method.

The MSUB COE Dean and the Assessment, Accreditation and Data Coordinator introduced the tool to the faculty at MSUB for review. The faculty voted to adopt the tool in Spring 2020. In Summer 2020, the Assessment, Accreditation and Data Coordinator collaborated with the Director of Teacher Education at the University of Montana Western to develop a training module for the tool.

During the Fall 2020 semester, faculty reviewed the tool in more detail and discussed it during the ETP meetings. There were two ETP level discussions held regarding the tool. Faculty also completed the dispositions training module in Fall 2020. In Spring 2021, the tool was presented to the advisory committee. Content validity was conducted using Lawshe validity protocol (see "Dispositions Lawshe Content Validity" and "Dispositions-Lawshe".) Below are the results from the content validity protocol. Panel size=5, Ncritical=5, Proportion Agreeing Essential=1. All constructs/indicators reached the appropriate Content Validity Rating, and no changes to the tool were required. (#5.2.7 Rater Agreement Dispositions Module).

FFRb. Narrative Analysis - Component R5.2 - Data Quality

The EPP reports in the Fall 2019, a gap analysis was conducted with existing assessment instruments and CAEP's Evaluation Framework for EPP-created assessments. The analysis determined that the instruments at that point in time lacked both validity and reliability. Therefore, the EPP has worked to establish inter-rater reliability through engaging faculty and field supervisors in inter-reliability exercises that included: (1) Content Knowledge, (2) Pedagogy, (3) Dispositions.

For Content Knowledge the EPP uses a proprietary assessment identified as the MACK tool. This includes a three pronged approach to assessing an individual's content knowledge. However, it is unclear if this assessment is scored locally or by an external body. Thus, reliability would need to be present if the MACK was scored internally regarding the first and second prongs of this assessment.

For Pedagogy, the EPP reported the use of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) and the Observation Assessment based on the Danielson framework. Furthermore the EPP reported that many faculty were already trained in this framework. During Fall 2021 Assessment Retreat, faculty and University Supervisory were trained on using the TWS. During that retreat, the group also participated in an activity to establish inter-rater reliability. This is reported in evidences 5.2.4 Inter Rater Reliability in Faculty TWS Training and 5.2.5 Inter-rater activity that outlines the process. The EPP also conducted the Lawshe content validity for both the TWS and Observation Tool as evidenced in 5.2.3 TWS Lawshe Content Validity. The Observation was also provided with Inter-rater reliability however, it is unclear if this was determined to be valid under any investigation.

The last assessment was the dispositions assessment. The Montana Council of Deans meeting was held in Spring 2020. During the meeting the dispositions tool was shared with the group and content validity was assessed as well using the Lawshe method. In Summer 2020 a training module was developed for the tool in collaboration with other EPPs. Faculty received training in Fall 2020. In examining the assessments, the alignment is clear for the Observation tool and TWS, however is not present for the dispositions assessment. The EPP has done a lot of work to ensure valid and reliable assessments except in the circumstances previously mentioned in the narrative. Data has not yet been disaggregated across all programs, thus far to determine if the data is representative of candidates and completers of the programs. Means are provided for some assessments across three cycles except those identified in CAEP Standard R.1.

SRRb. Narrative Analysis - Component R5.2 - Data Quality

R.5.2 The EPP has comprehensive assessments that address the areas outlined in R.1.1-R.1.4. Documentation was provided indicating alignment with CAEP standards. It is unclear whether data can be triangulated across multiple data points. Data have not yet been disaggregated across all programs to determine if they accurately represent candidates and

completers. Mean scores are available for some assessments over three cycles, except those covered under CAEP Standard R.1.1-R.1.4. A plan or procedures regarding the design, collection, analysis, and interpretation of data to ensure validity and reliability were not identified.

c. Component R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

The ETP faculty value both internal and external stakeholders and embrace the principle of shared decision-making throughout the assessment and accreditation processes. During the accreditation process, faculty have been integral in the development of tools, establishing reliability and seeking feedback from community partners (see 5.2). Beginning in 2017, a Visioning Committee was established in the COE to address potential changes. When Dean Robert Nava was hired in 2019, the Visioning Committee was replaced with a Dean's Council, consisting of faculty members, the Dean, the Assessment Coordinator, and the Field Experience Coordinator. Bi-weekly meetings were held which consisted of CAEP updates. From 2020-2022, a faculty workgroup worked closely with the Assessment and Accreditation Coordinator to develop new tools that met CAEP standards for reliability and validity. Faculty championed the new tools by developing trainings and then establishing reliability and validity procedures with support from the COE Dean and the University Assessment and Accreditation Office.

Faculty committees for each CAEP standard were recently established (**#5.3.1 Committee List**) These committees meet bi-monthly to ensure progress. Two faculty members assumed the leadership roles of assessment co-coordinators. For this role, the faculty members have overseen the accreditation process with assistance from the university Assessment and Accreditation office and the college and university administration. This increased role in accreditation has improved faculty buy in and has strengthened the ETP's programs because faculty are well-versed in CAEP language and CAEP standards.

Another important faculty initiative was the Proficiency Based Education (PBE) grant. For this process, a group of faculty reviewed syllabi within the general education and special education teaching majors. The group coded syllabi to determine how each course scaffolded student learning of specific proficiencies found in the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). The faculty at large were included in the process through sharing how they met proficiencies in their various courses (TWS Crosswalk). From the work in the PBE, an ETP Advisory Committee was re-established. To date, the committee has reviewed key assessment data as the PBE process, as well as results from the curriculum mapping process.

From an administrative level, the COE has had a variety of support, particularly during significant changes in leadership at the Dean level. Long-time Dean Mary Susan Fishbaugh retired in 2019, and the role was filled by Dr. Robert Nava. However, Dr. Nava left the position in 2021, and the role was filled by two interim deans. During this time, the university Assessment and Accreditation Office, University Registrar and Department Chairs assumed much of the leadership in CAEP efforts, alongside faculty leaders.

The Montana Council of Deans of Education (MCDE) plays a significant role with the continuous

improvement process. The goal of the MCDE is "to foster communication and collaboration among leaders of educator preparation programs and state partners for the purpose of continuously strengthening P20 education in Montana." (#2.1.7 MCDE Screenshot) One of the primary roles of the MCDE is to provide CAEP and state accreditation support to one another. MCDE meets quarterly at various locations across the state. In addition, the CIC (Continuous Improvement Coalition) is a subset of MCDE which meets regularly to develop and implement state-wide assessment tools, used for CAEP Standard 4.

Community partners also play a key role in the continuous improvement cycle. Community stakeholders were included in the development of tools and establishing reliability and validity. The Advisory Committee, which has gone through various iterations with changing leadership, has remained an integral part of how the EPP receives feedback. Through the PBE Grant, the ETP Advisory Committee reviews curricular alignments to tools and evaluates data obtained through the tools, particularly the TWS. Moving forward, the ETP anticipates the Advisory Board can serve in a variety of roles, including reviewing curriculum and looking at data from key assessments and the CIC data. (#5.1.3 Advisory Board Minutes).

The Office of Field Placement and Licensure has also established many partnerships with surrounding community colleges and local school districts. The ETP maintains many 2+2 Agreements and MOUs with several community and tribal colleges and P-12 partners, as evidenced in the #2.1.2 CAEP MOUS and discussed more in Standard 2.

FFRc. Narrative Analysis - Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement

Based on the evidence and self-study report, the EPP presented a wealth of evidence that suggested faculty and EPP administrators' involvement in the program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes. There is substantially less evidence that external partners including alumni, practitioners, school and community partners, and employers are subsequently included in meeting related to those same program elements. There was a single Advisory Board meeting that included two external P-12 partners from one school system, but no additional evidence to suggest their involvement. Similarly, additional evidences were not include for R5.3 which included a committee list that was absent.

SSR Addendum c. Component R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

R.5.3 (A) - Can the EPP provide additional evidences of external stakeholder involvement?

The EPP can provide additional evidences of external stakeholder involvement. **Evidence #5.3.1 Committee List** demonstrates that faculty are involved in standards committees for CAEP. Each faculty member takes an active role in contributing to the process. **Evidence #5.1.4 Lawshe Panel List**, which demonstrates participation from external stakeholders in the development of key assessment tools. **Evidence #5.1.5 Advisory Committee Invitation** is the letter inviting additional stakeholders to a data dip in March 2025. **Evidence #5.1.6 Additional Meeting Minutes** demonstrate stakeholder involvement through advisory boards, including through the

PBE grant. **Evidence #5.1.7 Superintendent’s Committee Minutes** and **Evidence #5.1.8 Petitions Committee** show stakeholders involvement. Also, **Evidence #5.3.2 Stakeholder Contribution Chart** is a compiled list of all of the community input and involvement of the EPP throughout the cycle.

To summarize, external stakeholders participate in a variety of ways. Through advisory committees, stakeholders played a key role in key assessment development and implementation. They also assisted in curriculum mapping through the PBE process. The EPP also consult the advisory committee in the data dip process. In addition to Advisory Committees, the dean and field experience personnel regularly attend regional Superintendent’s meetings in which they receive feedback on programs. A petitions committee that includes outside community members makes decisions when students need to deter from policies and procedures. For example, a student may file a petition to take two classes during student teaching. More informal participation from stakeholders is also vital. The EPP participates in many partnerships with area schools and community organizations, and feedback is regularly sought out. For example, students from a reading methods course do a unit plan at a local elementary school. Students in Human Growth and Development work with local community partners, such as the Boys and Girls Club. Members from these groups offer feedback on a regular basis. A more complete listing is on the **#5.3.2 Stakeholder Contribution Chart**, and the EPP can provide more explanation during the site visit as well.

SRRC. Narrative Analysis - Component R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement

R.5.3 The EPP presented documentation indicating efforts to engage stakeholders in relevant processes. However, observations from onsite interviews revealed ambiguity regarding the extent to which data were actively shared with stakeholders or whether recommendations from both internal and external stakeholders were simply acknowledged rather than systematically incorporated. Much of the evidence provided in support of stakeholder engagement was anecdotal in nature, lacking substantial documentation or clear examples demonstrating meaningful participation in key decision-making activities. Furthermore, the EPP did not sufficiently distinguish the specific roles and contributions of stakeholders within the processes of continuous improvement, program design, or program evaluation. There was limited clarity as to how stakeholders influenced changes or enhancements to the program, and how their feedback was systematically gathered, analyzed, and integrated into practice. While the EPP referenced a Stakeholder Involvement Chart as supporting evidence, it was not evident how this chart translated into practical, ongoing engagement or measurable impact on the development and evaluation of the program.

d. Component R5.4 Continuous Improvement

This assessment cycle has proven challenging yet also enlightening. Navigating a global

pandemic, changed leadership, and changed expectations within the field of education have impacted this most recent cycle. The ETP faculty view these challenges as an opportunity for re-imagining systems through innovation.

A significant component of the continuous improvement process is the implementation of a new data collection system. Through this self-study process and through the challenges brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic, the EPP has realized the importance of a quality data collection system to ensure the data is useable and in meeting the expectations set forth by CAEP. Accessing data on a regular basis through using Tevera will make this process much easier, as currently data input is effortful. This will also help the faculty better understand the support needed in specific curriculum areas, providing powerful data to pinpoint specific areas for growth.

The key assessments have afforded the ETP many new opportunities. The capacity to examine data points at a more granular level has led to increased engagement in the continuous improvement process. In the most recent data dip, faculty were able to examine each component of CAEP Standard 1. The key assessment data, as analyzed in a data dip on April 16, 2024, indicated students are performing well, scoring sufficient and proficient in most areas, as shown throughout Standard 1. (**#5.4.1 Data Dip Document**).

The PBE grant also provided an avenue for increased structure within the curriculum. By mapping the curriculum to the tools, the ETP increased its capacity for meeting student needs throughout the entire program. The PBE embraces a model of teaching called the TWS Pedagogical Continuum (**#5.4.2 Final Report PBE**). In this model, curriculum is arranged in a three-tiered system: Learn It, Practice It, and Apply It. By better mapping the curriculum and engaging with a continuous improvement practice involving stakeholders, students will be equipped to meet the demands of application of curriculum in their field experiences, as measured by the key assessments.

Another area for continuous improvement is a broader training of the tools, including Cooperating Teachers, to ensure increased inter-rater reliability. Training took place in 2021 but needs to be offered each semester. Now that the COE has a new full-time field experience coordinator, and leadership is more stable within the college, this process will begin in Fall 2024, with the data being reported by the site visit in April 2025.

Finally, the ETP is striving for more consistent offering of assessment retreats and data dips. With the designation of faculty co-leaders and the assistance of the university assessment and accreditation staff, the plan is to establish an off-campus assessment retreat each semester, as well as frequent data dips during department meetings.

Reference

Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28(4), 563-575.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x>

FFRd. Narrative Analysis - Component R5.4 - Continuous Improvement

The EPP reported, "This assessment cycle has proven challenging yet also enlightening. Navigating a global pandemic, changed leadership, and changed expectations within the field of education have impacted this most recent cycle. The ETP faculty view these challenges as an opportunity for re-imagining systems through innovation." The EPP did have a significant change to a new data collection system, Tevera. While the receipt of the PBE grant did provide an opportunity for increased structure within the curriculum. As for any specific curricular improvements, those are unclear as provided within the documentation.

The EPP does hope to achieve more consistent assessment retreats and data dips to engage in the continuous improvement process.

SSR Addendum d. Component R5.4 Continuous Improvement

R.5.4 (A) - Can the EPP provide actions taken as a result of a specific data source?

Based on the first round of completer and employer surveys, the EPP went under an extensive review of curriculum. As a result, visioning committees were formed. Following this, the Elementary/Secondary Committee made a recommendation to add several courses to the required Elementary Core. This decision came from a variety of entities, including the EPP's involvement with CEEDAR. As a result, five courses were added to most programs. (See **Evidence #5.4.3: Curriculum Change Rationale**). Additionally, as mentioned in 5.1, changes were made to the EDU 433 course, as well as the EDU 343 course so that both courses now include trauma-informed practices.

5.1.4 (B) - Can the EPP provide recommendations from various internal and external stakeholders related to program design, evaluation, and the continuous improvement process?

The EPP has involved stakeholders in a variety of capacities. First, the Lawshe panel involved in the development of key assessments. Second, regular attendance at Superintendent's meetings provides feedback on programs. Third, the petitions committee participates in key decisions for students. The **Evidence #5.3.2 Stakeholder Contribution Chart** highlights the many ways stakeholders partake in the EPP as does the **Evidence #5.3.1: Committee List**.

5.3 (C) Can the EPP highlight data review and decisions within any meeting minutes for programs?

Meeting minutes are now provided in the **Evidence #5.1.6 Additional Meeting Minutes**, and **Evidence #5.4.3 Curriculum Change Rationale**.

5.4 (D) - Can the EPP provide any documentation of what occurs during data dip and assessment retreats? Minutes, agendas, etc.

Meeting minutes are now provided in the **Evidence #5.1.6 Additional Meeting Minutes**, and **Evidence #5.4.3 Curriculum Change Rationale**.

SRRd. Narrative Analysis - Component R5.4 - Continuous Improvement

R.5.4 The evaluation of the EPP's support for the continuous improvement of its programs was hindered by challenges in differentiating data at the programmatic level. This lack of clear distinction made it difficult to ascertain the extent to which the EPP actively and effectively fosters ongoing enhancement across its varied offerings. The EPP did provide documentation such as the Curriculum Change Rationale to illustrate adjustments that have been enacted within existing coursework, signaling an awareness of the need for curricular evolution. In addition, meeting minutes from "data dips" and records of proposed improvements were submitted as evidence of an emerging process for review and adjustment.

Nevertheless, the documentation presented by the EPP was inconsistent and did not convincingly demonstrate that assessment of institutional performance occurs with regularity or in a methodical, systematic fashion. There remains insufficient evidence that the EPP has established and maintains a robust, continuous cycle of evaluation and improvement spanning all programs. In order to meet the standards of continuous improvement, the EPP should focus on developing mechanisms that ensure the systematic collection, analysis, and application of data to drive program enhancements. Furthermore, a more transparent and consistent approach to documenting and communicating these processes would support a clearer understanding of the EPP's commitment to regular, evidence-based improvement and accountability.

Standard RA5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity (Advanced Level Programs)

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section II. CAEP Standards and Evidence:

Standard RA5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity (Advanced Level Programs)

SSR Evidence - Standard RA5

a. Component RA5.1 Quality Assurance System

The School Counseling program at MSUB has established and continuously refines a dynamic Quality Assurance System (QAS) that underscores the program's commitment to operational effectiveness and sustainable improvement processes. This comprehensive system tracks the flow of data from entry through analysis and utilization in decision-making, linking the outcomes of these decisions back into program enhancement efforts.

Central to the program's approach to quality assurance, the QAS is supported by a foundation of reliable assessments, skilled personnel, streamlined policies, and the integration of Tevera

software. This system is pivotal in fostering a candidate-centered educational environment, facilitating collaborations with state and local agencies, external stakeholders, and partners in P-12 education. At critical junctures of the program upon entry, at mid-term assessments, and upon completion the program rigorously collects and analyzes data on candidate performance and feedback. Utilizing the capabilities of Tevera software, this information is systematically examined by the faculty, University Supervisors, and the Director of Field Experiences and Licensure, ensuring comprehensive and expert analysis.

The QAS leverages Tevera's advanced features for data aggregation and disaggregation to refine strategies for admission, advisement, and retention, and to illuminate both individual and collective areas for program enhancement. Current initiatives aim to expand the data analysis efforts to include more detailed considerations, such as race/ethnicity and geographic location, further enriching the understanding and response to diverse candidate needs.

A key component of the assessment strategy is the collection of feedback from employers and program completers, utilizing tools like Qualtrics. This feedback plays a crucial role in assessing the effectiveness of the program and the preparedness of the graduates, informing continuous improvement efforts and strategic program adjustments. Faculty members actively use Tevera not only to document candidate performance but also to provide timely support, particularly in areas identified for improvement.

The Quality Assurance System also supports critical program activities, including annual assessment reporting and comprehensive program reviews. It facilitates reflective and constructive discussions at various organizational levels, engaging faculty with specialized expertise in regular training to ensure consistent evaluation standards across the board. Our faculty frequently review candidate performance data to identify areas for improvement, with quarterly data analysis meetings serving as a forum for data-driven dialogue and the development of action plans for ongoing program enhancement. These plans are periodically revisited and updated, highlighting the flexible and proactive nature of the QAS.

The **#5.1.1A Quality Assurance System of the School Counseling Program** at MSUB is a clear demonstration of our unwavering commitment to evidence-based decision-making and collective pursuit of excellence in preparing candidates for the complexities of the school counseling profession.

Entry Data Collection, Mid-term Assessments, and Completion Evaluation : These stages represent the critical junctures at which data on candidate performance and feedback is collected, marking the program's dedication to monitoring candidate progression and outcomes.

Tevera Software Data Analysis: Utilizing Tevera software, the collected data is systematically analyzed, supporting the program's ability to make informed decisions based on comprehensive and expert analysis.

Feedback Collection (Employers, Completers): This stage is crucial for gathering insights into the program's effectiveness and the preparedness of its graduates, using tools like Qualtrics to collect feedback from key stakeholders. The flowchart illustrates how each component of the QAS is interconnected, creating a feedback loop that links outcomes back to program enhancement efforts. The flowchart also incorporates both the involvement of key stakeholders

and the frequency at which each stage of the Quality Assurance System (QAS) occurs in the Advanced School Counseling Program at MSU Billings: Entry Data Collection, Mid-term Assessments, and Completion Evaluation all occur every semester, reflecting the program's commitment to ongoing evaluation and feedback throughout the academic year.

Strategic Adjustments & Support : Based on the analysis and feedback, the program makes strategic adjustments and provides targeted support, especially in areas identified for improvement.

Ongoing Enhancement Plans & Reviews: This final stage reflects the program's commitment to continuous enhancement, with plans and reviews that are periodically revisited and updated to ensure the QAS remains dynamic and responsive to emerging needs.

Tevera Software Data Analysis also takes place every semester, ensuring that data collected at various stages is analyzed systematically and timely to inform decision-making.

Feedback Collection from Employers and Completers happens annually, allowing the program to gather and integrate broader perspectives on its effectiveness and the preparedness of its graduates over a longer term.

Strategic Adjustments & Support , informed by the analysis and feedback collected throughout the year, are implemented annually. This stage encapsulates the program's dedication to making informed, strategic changes that enhance its quality and responsiveness to stakeholder needs.

This comprehensive representation emphasizes the cyclical and iterative nature of the QAS, highlighting the program's dynamic approach to continuous improvement and stakeholder engagement. (See Also: **#5.1.2 Advisory Panel PowerPoint** and **#5.1.3 SCOU Data Dip** .)

FFRa. Narrative Analysis - Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System

The EPP reports that the School Counseling program continually refines the QAS. However, the Evidence RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System failed to attach for the School Counseling program. The EPP reports that data is entered into the Tevera system at Entry, Mid-Term, and Completion. It's unclear if these data points represent every single term or at program entry, midway through the program and at program completion. Similarly, the program reports analyzing data within the Tevera data analysis tools.

Feedback is also collected from Employers and program completers related to the program's effectiveness and the preparedness of its graduates for the roles they were trained to perform. Qualtrics survey software is used for this data collection. A Powerpoint for the program advisory meeting was provided however, it is unclear when this meeting occurred and who was in attendance. Similarly, the only data presented in the overview includes a headcount, completion count, graduation rate, average praxis results, and average GPA at some point in the program. Thus, it is unclear what assessment constitute the school

counseling programs quality assurance system.

SSR Addendum a. Component RA5.1 Quality Assurance System

RA.5.1 (A) - Can the EPP provide the intended document for the School Counseling Quality Assurance System? RA.5.1 (B) - Can the EPP provide the measures for the QAS and the rationale for selecting those measures? RA.5.1 (C) - Can the EPP share the data from school counseling used in decision-making and across all key assessments identified by the program? RA.5.1 (D) - Can the EPP align data from the QAS and any programmatic change or adjustment in the program?

The Advanced School Counseling Program has a Framework and Benchmark Alignment System established to monitor student progress from program admission to program completion, as evidenced by **Evidence # 1.1.1A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Charts**. Additionally, the Program meets with an Advisory Panel to present the program data and to identify and discuss potential areas of growth. Further data is collected through an Employer/Completer Survey Cycle through the Office of Public Instruction as evidenced in **Evidence # 2.1.4A SCOU Spring 2024 Employer Survey Results**. In addition, please refer to **Evidence # 1.1.10A SCOU Praxis 5421 and 5422 Documentation, Evidence # 1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation of Rubric, and Evidence # 5.4.1A SCOU Data Analysis Program Summary**.

SRRa. Narrative Analysis - Component RA5.1 - Quality Assurance System

RA.5.1 The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) has presented evidence indicating the existence of a functioning Quality Assurance System (QAS) that is intended to support both quality control and ongoing improvement across its programs. While documentation demonstrates that the system is operational and capable of generating relevant data, there remains ambiguity regarding the extent to which all components of the system are fully integrated and aligned. Notably, certain processes and procedures appear to operate in isolation rather than as cohesive elements of a comprehensive system.

Furthermore, the manner in which data are reported lacks consistency and clarity, which complicates the interpretation and subsequent application of these data for informed decision-making. It is not evident from the provided materials how data are systematically analyzed, monitored, or leveraged to inform continuous improvement efforts. Although the EPP has documented an instance in which data-informed decision-making occurred during a particular meeting, there is an absence of broader assessment evidence to illustrate this process as a routine or embedded practice.

Additionally, there is a lack of specificity regarding data sources and limited documentation linking programmatic improvements directly to the data collected. The QAS itself does not appear to include an explicit mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness or impact of continuous improvement initiatives. As a result, while initial steps towards establishing a quality assurance framework are apparent, further development is required to ensure that quality assurance and improvement are systematic, transparent, and cohesive across all

programs. This includes establishing clear protocols for data collection, analysis, monitoring, and reporting, as well as demonstrating the tangible impact of these processes on program enhancement and overall institutional effectiveness.

b. Component RA5.2 Data Quality

MSUB School Counseling program's quality assurance system from RA 5.1 relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures to ensure interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

The Quality Assurance System (QAS) is an integral component, primarily serving the school counseling faculty in effectively monitoring and evaluating various program areas. Annually reviewed through a series of assessment activities, the QAS excels in tracking student progress over multiple semesters, employing diverse measurement instruments, and utilizing consistent data collection methods. This systematic approach enables the generation of real-time performance reports at both individual and specialization levels. While the Quality Assurance System (QAS) exhibits several strengths, currently a challenge that is being proactively addressed is the limitation of disaggregated data, especially in terms of demographic variables like race and ethnicity. The current system is unable to disaggregate at a micro-level, looking at individual components on each assessment; it is only able to look more globally at factors such as program completion. Active measures are being taken to augment this aspect of the Tevera software system, with a dedicated focus on improving the ability to provide detailed, demographic-specific insight. The QAS's data quality is upheld through several standards. Relevance is ensured by selecting appropriate measures that align with program goals and focus on key program competencies, reflected in assessments, clinical hours in both practicum and internships. These tools collectively demonstrate candidates' ability to apply their professional knowledge in real-world settings. Faculty engage in inter-rater reliability training.

Representativeness within the QAS is achieved by collecting data at various program stages, guided by comprehensive data collection software (Tevera). This ensures consistent and appropriate data gathering by all faculty members. The resultant cumulative data provides a holistic view of both individual progress and overall program performance. Actionability is a key feature of the data, leading to informed decision-making and tangible changes within the School Counseling program. This is evident in the advisory panel meetings where data from the previous year will be analyzed to formulate improvement plans. Transparency and clarity are fundamental to the assessment processes. Candidates are thoroughly informed about the purpose and nature of each assessment through discipline-specific guidebooks and course syllabi. The School Counseling program created assessments, aligned with CAEP, ASCA, MSCA, PEPPS, and Danielson Framework standards. Faculty, supervisors, and site mentors are well-trained in collecting diverse data types at various program stages, ensuring reliable and actionable evaluations. This multi-faceted approach guarantees that students receive comprehensive feedback, reinforcing their performance and the overall quality of assessment within the School Counseling program (# **5.1.2A SCOU Advisory Panel Power Point**).

The School Counseling program's commitment to representativeness, actionability, and

transparency in its Quality Assurance System (QAS) is ideal. By leveraging comprehensive data collection through Tevera and adhering to high standards set by CAEP, ASCA, MSCA, PEPPS, and the Danielson Framework, the program ensures that every aspect of student assessment is both rigorous and relevant. The systematic approach to collecting and analyzing data, combined with the engagement of faculty, supervisors, and site mentors in a cycle of continuous improvement, exemplifies best practices in educational assessment. These processes not only facilitate a deep understanding of individual progress but also foster a culture of excellence and accountability across the program. Through informed decision-making and targeted improvement plans, the program demonstrates a steadfast dedication to enhancing the educational experience and outcomes for its candidates, thereby setting a benchmark for quality and effectiveness in school counseling education.

FFRb. Narrative Analysis - Component RA5.2 - Data Quality

The provider suggests that the program's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures. While the EPP provided a very well-informed narrative, it is unclear how the program within the EPP addresses several key concepts related to RA5.2 including relevance, verifiability, cumulative, and actionable. Based on the evidences submitted, the team cannot determine at this time (other than Praxis), what assessments are part of the QAS and the linkages between those measures and intended outcomes from RA.1.1 and the standards identified by the EPP. This is consistent with the measures and/or results of the assessments as the data were not provided by the EPP in the evidences submitted. Of course, if the data was presented, it would be representative as the only advanced certification program at the EPP. Finally, the cumulativeness and actionability of the measures are unclear provided the information presented.

SSR Addendum b. Component RA5.2 Data Quality

RA.5.2 (A) - Can the EPP provide a clear link between what is being measured and what the EPP intends to measure including alignment with relevant standards and CAEP indicators from RA1.1? RA.5.2 (B) - Can the EPP provide evidence of the assessments used throughout the program? RA.5.2 (C) - Can the EPP provide evidence that the assessments are valid and reliability (other than Praxis)? RA.5.2 (D) - Can the EPP provide additional data from the assessments identified in the previous question disaggregated by graduating class across three cycles? RA.5.2 (E) - Can the EPP provide evidence that linkages assessment evidence and programmatic changes/innovations?

The Advanced School Counseling Program has a Framework and Benchmark Alignment System established to monitor student progress from program admission to program completion, as evidenced by **Evidence #1.1.1A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Charts**. Further data is collected through an Employer/Completer Survey Cycle through the Office of Public Instruction as evidenced in **Evidence #2.1.4A SCOU Spring 2024 Employer**

Survey Results In addition, please refer to **Evidence #1.1.10A SCOU Praxis 5421 and 5422 Documentation, Evidence #1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation of Rubric, Evidence #1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle Documentation, Evidence #1.1.12A SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation, Evidence #1.1.13A SCOU Candidate GPA Checkpoint Progress Documentation, and Evidence #1.1.8A Lawshe Panel CVR Table.**

SRRb. Narrative Analysis - Component RA5.2 - Data Quality

RA.5.2 The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) has submitted a range of supplementary evidence indicating reliance on measures that are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable. As the institution's sole provider of advanced certification, the EPP has demonstrated a concentrated commitment to the development, implementation, and assessment of its school counseling program.

Specifically, the EPP has supplied additional documentation, including the Praxis examination results, the corresponding Evaluation Rubric, and the Cohort Evaluation Growth Document. These materials collectively illustrate a deliberate effort toward ensuring the integrity, accuracy, and comprehensiveness of the data utilized in program evaluation. The inclusion of multiple types of evidence reflects a systematic approach to data triangulation, which in turn supports the ongoing validation and refinement of programmatic outcomes. Through these actions, the EPP appears dedicated to fostering a data-driven culture that not only monitors growth and performance but also identifies areas for targeted improvement. The rigorous application of evaluation instruments and the thoughtful aggregation of cohort-level data further strengthen the credibility of the EPP's quality assurance system. However, continued efforts in documenting and clearly articulating the processes by which these measures are selected, analyzed, and acted upon will be critical for reinforcing the system's transparency, accountability, and capacity for sustained improvement.

c. Component RA5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

MSUB School Counseling program includes relevant internal (administrators, faculty, staff, candidates) and external (alumni, practitioners, school and community partners, employers) stakeholders in the program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes. Its internal and external stakeholders significantly influence the School Counseling program, each playing a vital role in shaping the graduate preparation process outlined in the Quality Assurance System. Internally, this group includes faculty, University Supervisors, advisors, the Dean of the College of Education and Graduate Studies (**#1.1.7A SCOU Lawshe Feedback: #5.1.2A SCOU Advisory Board Power Point** and the SCOU Strategic Adjustment and Support Feedback, forthcoming in Fall 2024 Addendum).

Internal stakeholders function as the primary point of engagement yet working alongside external entities like the Office of Public Instruction, the CIC, an advisory panel, employers, and individuals who have completed the programs is vital for generating new ideas and expanding viewpoints. This vibrant exchange frequently includes conversations with the Dean of the ETP,

encouraging constructive debates and collaborative decision-making, essential for sustaining robust connections with P-12 and community partners. Receiving a wide range of input is crucial for addressing the evolving requirements of the graduate candidates.

The effectiveness of the School Counseling program relies heavily on strong, cooperative ties with partners and affiliated schools, with a focus on ongoing enhancement. The advisory panel provides an external perspective that is key to widening viewpoints and considering new program possibilities. The cooperative ties with partners, affiliated schools, and program completers are critical, especially since many of the graduate candidates are professionals already in the workforce, who understand the importance of these connections and collaborations.

FFRc. Narrative Analysis - Component RA5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement

The EPP School Counseling program indicates that they include relevant internal and external stakeholders in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement. Evidence submitted includes the 5.1.2 SCOU Advisory board panel that was also referenced in CAEP component RA.5.1 based on a single meeting. Similarly, the EPP submitted 1.1.8A that represents a Lawshe Panel to determine an overall content validity ratio. It is unclear what this panel was to assess and what members were present as well as their identified roles. Thus, it is not clear what involvement the EPP has made to include relevant partners in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes. Similarly, it is not clear what process is used to involve stakeholders in data driven decision making or how partners (internal and external) participate in the continuous improvement process.

SSR Addendum c. Component RA5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

RA.5.3 (A) - Can the EPP submit additional meeting minutes, agenda, with attendees and designated roles from meetings with internal and external partners related to program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes? RA.5.3 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation of the process the EPP uses to involve stakeholders in data driven decision making? RA.5.3(C) - Can the EPP provide documentation of how clinical partners are included in the continuous improvement process?

The Advanced School Counseling Program held a "Data Dip" on Feb. 20th of 2024 to share the program data that had been collected and analyzed to receive feedback from the EPP faculty as evidenced in **Evidence #5.1.3A SCOU Data Dip**. Further data is collected through an Employer/Completer Survey Cycle through the Office of Public Instruction as evidenced in **Evidence #2.1.4A SCOU Spring 2024 Employer Survey Results**. The Advance School Counseling Program meets with an advisory panel on an annual basis as Evidenced in **Evidence #2.2.1A SCOU Advisory Panel Documentation** and will be meeting again during May of 2025. The Advisory Panel was re-established following the updated program standards, evaluation tools, and program outcomes.

SRRC. Narrative Analysis - Component RA5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement

RA.5.3 The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) has submitted supplementary documentation specifically, reference 2.2.1A SCOU Advisory Panel Documentation which indicates the establishment of a dedicated advisory panel for its sole advanced preparation program. According to the EPP's report, this advisory panel convenes on an annual basis, providing a structured forum for the discussion of programmatic developments and evaluation of ongoing initiatives. The advisory panel has played a notable role in the redevelopment of key assessments and has contributed recommendations intended to foster program improvement.

Furthermore, the EPP notes the ongoing administration of employer surveys as an integral component of its continuous improvement processes. These surveys are designed to solicit targeted feedback from employers regarding program effectiveness and candidate preparedness, with results intended to inform the refinement of curricula and instructional practices. By incorporating employer perspectives alongside those of advisory panel members, the EPP demonstrates a commitment to engaging multiple stakeholder groups in the evaluation and enhancement of its program offerings.

d. Component RA5.4 Continuous Improvement

The School Counseling program at MSUB evaluates its performance against established goals and benchmarks, ensuring a continuous monitoring of outcomes over time and documenting the impact of any changes or innovations on program effectiveness. The faculty are committed to the progress of candidates from admission to program completion, emphasizing continuous improvement. This commitment is reflected in the diverse assessment strategies as detailed in the narrative for the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Responding to recent updates in CAEP and the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) standards, the faculty have actively adapted the curriculum and practices to align with these revised standards. Some areas have presented challenges, necessitating additional efforts to ensure full compliance and seamless integration into the program. A significant step in this adaptation process has been the adoption of the Tevera software system, which has markedly enhanced the ability to manage student learning outcomes, streamline the site placement process, and effectively track student progress.

This technological advancement has significantly improved the capacity for generating detailed reports and disaggregating data, enabling the faculty to conduct in-depth analyses across various demographic factors such as race, rural background, and the identification of first-generation students within specific assessment contexts. This enhancement reflects the dedication to achieving excellence and fostering continuous improvement in the field of school counseling.

The faculty's mastery of the Tevera system marks a major progression, allowing for better alignment with educational goals. Moreover, the Office of Assessment and Accreditation as well as Provost's office utilizes portions of the reports in the Academic Program Review, which is

shared with the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education and Montana Board of Regents and incorporated into state-level reports, highlighting the importance of continuous program improvement and the commitment to meeting and surpassing national standards.

The structure within the School Counseling program supports the systematic collection of data across various aspects, employing tools such as Qualtrics Surveys and Tevera software for this purpose. Managed by the dedicated faculty, this process involves members from various disciplines in the crucial tasks of data analysis, interpretation, and application. This collaborative approach is aimed at enhancing the program and addressing the unique challenges it faces. Central to the strategy are Action Plans, which outline the future goals and the means to achieve them. These plans provide a clear framework for the faculty to adjust or refine the approach based on robust empirical evidence, promoting a culture of informed decision-making, and fostering innovations that drive meaningful improvements across the program. (**#2.2.1A Employer Survey**; Completer Survey data forthcoming in Fall 2024 Addendum.)

FFRd. Narrative Analysis - Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement

The EPP School counseling program indicates that they assess performance related to the goals and standards from the national organization. Based on the evidence submitted, there was no evidence to verify this claim made by the EPP. In review of all evidences, the CAEP review team cannot find where the program has documented modifications and tracking of the results over time. Similarly, there is no evidence of data used to make regular and systematic data driven changes that were grounded in (1) data analysis and interpretations from the QAS or (2) changes were linked to its goals and relevant standards.

SSR Addendum d. Component RA5.4 Continuous Improvement

RA.5.4 (A) - Can the EPP identify goals and relevant standards for the EPP and how those are aligned to the assessments used in the school counseling program? RA.5.4 (B) - Can the EPP provide documentation of performance (candidates/graduates) over three cycles? RA.5.4 (C) - Can the EPP provide documentation of modifications over-time and how those changes are linked to meetings and/or data collected from candidates/graduates? RA.5.4 (D) - Can the EPP provide data analyses from data collected over time from candidates/graduates of the program? RA.5.4 (E) - Can the EPP provide examples of changes in courses, clinical experiences, other candidate experiences that represent the continuous improvement efforts?

The Advanced School Counseling identifies goals and relevant standards through the use of a framework and benchmark alignment charts as evidenced in **Evidence #1.1.1A SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Charts**. In addition candidates are monitored for progress using an evaluation rubric that alignes with program outcomes and standards as evidenced in **Evidence #1.1.4A SCOU Evaluation Rubric**. Data was collect, analyzed, and continuous improvement goals were developed based on the desegregated data as evidenced in **Evidence #1.1.11A SCOU Candidate Mean Score Data Cycle Documentation, Evidence**

#1.1.12A SCOU Cohort Evaluation Growth Documentation, and Evidence #5.4.1A SCOU Data Analysis Program Summary, and Evidence #1.1.10A SCOU Praxis 5421 and 5422 Documentation.

SRRd. Narrative Analysis - Component RA5.4 - Continuous Improvement

RA.5.4 The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) submitted additional documentation for the advanced school counseling program, including the SCOU Framework and Benchmark Alignment Charts. While these materials indicate some alignment with standards and benchmarks, there remains a lack of clarity regarding the mechanisms by which data collected from these sources are systematically utilized to inform and drive continuous improvement initiatives.

Upon review, it appears that significant programmatic enhancements have often resulted primarily from anecdotal evidence and informal discussions with both internal and external stakeholders, rather than from a consistently applied, data-driven evaluation process. The absence of clearly articulated procedures for the collection, analysis, and application of programmatic data hinders the EPP's ability to demonstrate a robust and methodical approach to ongoing program refinement.

Current Recommendations (AFI/Stipulations)

**Self Study Report (SSR) : Section III. Areas for Improvement (AFIs)/Stipulations :
Current Recommendations (AFI/Stipulations)**

All Recommended AFI/Stipulations

The below shows all AFI/stipulations with the "New (Preliminary Recommendation)" Status from this review.

All AFI/Stipulations



Preliminary AFIs/Stipulations Removed

The below lists the AFIs/Stipulations that have the "Removed During Site Review Process" status. This means the AFI/stipulation was a part of the Formative Feedback Report, but then removed after the site review.

Removed AFI/Stipulations

Component ↑	Type	Status	Rationale
R1.1 The Learner and Learning	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	The EPP did not provide evidence of disaggregated data across licensure areas on the reported Key Assessments with a subsequent analysis of the data. Evidence was also missing in the 1.1.1 InTASC Alignment Chart. The Key Assessment were examined for alignment, but the Dispositions assessment did not appear to be tagged to any specific InTASC standard or category.
R1.3 Instructional Practice	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	Disaggregation of data was missing as well as an analysis of candidates performance as it relates to Instructional Practice. Alignment across all key assessments was also missing.
R1.4 Professional Responsibility	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	The EPP did not provide evidence of disaggregated data across licensure areas on the reported Key Assessments with a subsequent analysis of the data. Evidence was also missing in the 1.1.1 InTASC Alignment Chart. The Key Assessment were examined for alignment, but the Dispositions assessment did not appear to be tagged to any specific InTASC standard or category.
R2.3 Clinical Experiences	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	While the EPP provides documentation in the implementation of clinical experiences including depth, breadth, coherence, and duration, it is unclear how technology applications are addressed that prepare candidates for their position or how they ensure all candidates receive diverse

placements.

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	While the EPP provided assessments, the data shared was unclear related to aggregate data for admissions related to student demographics and assessment criteria at each transition point. Finally, The EPP indicated that Elementary Cohort met the 3.0 GPA average, but failed to address other programs offered.
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	There was a single Advisory Board meeting that included two external P-12 partners from one school system, but no additional evidence to suggest their involvement. Similarly, additional evidences were not include for 5.3 which included a committee list that was absent.
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	The EPP did not include some evidences #1.1.1A SCOU Data Framework & #1.1.2A SCOU Program Standards Benchmark Chart that would have been essential in understanding how the EPP knows candidates are aware of the specialized content for their field and can apply that content. Similarly, disaggregated data was not presented on the EPP's assessments. Limited data was presented in Praxis II, but there was not disaggregation or analysis that includes the components of the Praxis assessment taken by candidates.
RA3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	Narrative suggests meeting the standard but not data is provided to support that claim. Praxis data is not disaggregated.

RA3.4 Competency at Completion	Stipulation	Removed During Site Review Process	Although discussed in the narrative, the EPP provided no evidence of candidate competency at completion. No data was presented except Praxis.
RA5.2 Data Quality	Stipulation	Removed During Site Review Process	The EPP provided no evidence to substantiate claims within the narrative of the Self Study Report.
RA5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	Stipulation	Removed During Site Review Process	There was very limited documentation provided that could be used to verify claims in the narrative of the self-study report that the EPP engages both internal and external stakeholders in the program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes.

Items per page: 1 11 of 11 < >

Previous AFI(s)

Self Study Report (SSR) : Section III. Areas for Improvement (AFIs)/Stipulations: Previous AFI(s)

Previous AFI(s)

AFIs from the EPP’s last review. These have been addressed by the EPP during the completion of the Annual Accreditation Report each year.

Component ↑	Type	Status	Rationale

R1.2 Content	AFI	Open	Though some data were provided for R1.2 [Praxis II scores and MACK scores], the EPP inconsistently demonstrated, through verifiable and reliable means, that candidates were able to apply their knowledge of content upon program completion. Analysis of completion data for continuous improvement and candidate monitoring was not presented.
R2.2 Clinical Educators	AFI	Open	While the EPP provided documentation on the selection and support of clinical educators (IHE and P-12), there was minimal evidence of co-selection component, evaluation and training of clinical educators.
R3.1 Recruitment	AFI	Open	While the EPP provided evidence towards partially meeting the component by providing a draft of a plan, the EPP did not address progress on the recruitment goals.
R3.3 Competency at Completion	AFI	Open	The EPP described the process (continuum) of assessment that contributed to the competency at completion, but did not share disaggregated data by program (with appropriate N s) to verify candidate quality including impact on P-12 student learning or how those assessment criteria addressed the components of proficiency at completion indicated in Question R.3.3 (B), particularly for content knowledge sufficiently to meet the state standards.
R4.1 Completer Effectiveness	AFI	Open	There was only one cycle of data provided in evidence for this component. Additionally, the EPP presented an incomplete analysis and demonstration of completer impact on P-12

student learning and development.

R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers	AFI	Open	Although three cycles of data were provided in evidence, there was minimal analysis, and no disaggregation by program. No demonstration that the survey met the criteria for evaluation of EPP created surveys was provided. Data was unverifiable. The EPP made an insufficient case for employer satisfaction.
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers	AFI	Open	There were only two cycles of data provided. Although each data set represents multiple years, it was only one cycle each. Minimal analysis, no disaggregation of data by program, and no demonstration that the survey met the criteria for evaluation of EPP-created surveys was provided.
R5.1 Quality Assurance System	AFI	Open	While the EPP provided some evidence of meeting this CAEP component, the EPP did not provide assessment evidence, data, programmatic improvement aligned to data, or a clear understanding of the data sources. Similarly, the EPP did not present a Quality Assurance System that evaluated the impact of the continuous improvement changes.
R5.2 Data Quality	AFI	Open	Data were not disaggregated across all programs to determine if the data were representative of candidates and completers of the programs. Data were provided for some assessments across three cycles except those identified in Standard R1.
R5.4 Continuous Improvement	AFI	Open	The EPP provided inconsistent evidence that it regularly, systematically,

and continuously assessed its performance.

<p>RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions</p>	<p>AFI</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p>The EPP provided limited evidence and data that the Advanced CAEP competencies were considered or discussed with candidates or assessed. In numerous instances, questionable alignment between the CAEP RA1.1 competencies and rubric indicators indicated a misalignment or potentially a lack of understanding of the CAEP RA1.1 competencies. Three competencies were not identified as areas of foci and data collection, analysis, and candidate monitoring/progress were not provided, discussed, or analyzed for growth or continuous improvement.</p>
<p>RA2.2 Clinical Experiences</p>	<p>AFI</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p>There was limited evidence provided to suggest the EPP designed varied and developmentally appropriate clinical experiences culminating in the demonstration of their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research that were characterized by the documentation from RA1.1.</p>
<p>RA3.1 Recruitment</p>	<p>AFI</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p>The provider presented a five-year plan for recruitment but did not provide baseline admissions data or evidence to reach goals.</p>
<p>RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression</p>	<p>AFI</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p>Some components of progress monitoring of candidate progression were in place, but not a clear system of support. Limited data were provided but not analyzed. Limited evidence was provided to indicate how and when interventions with problems in the</p>

progression of individual candidates were handled systematically. Communication of transition points was not clearly demonstrated.

RA4.1 Satisfaction of Employers	AFI	Open	The EPP made an inconsistent case for the use of data and subsequent analysis of the assessment results including what conclusions and interpretations were made as it related to the satisfaction of employers (provided two cycles of data).
RA4.2 Satisfaction of Completers	AFI	Open	The EPP made an inconsistent case for the use of data and subsequent analysis of the assessment results including what conclusions and interpretations were made as it related to the satisfaction of completers (provided one cycle of data).
RA5.1 Quality Assurance System	AFI	Open	While the EPP provided some evidence of meeting this CAEP component, the EPP did not provide assessment evidence, data, programmatic improvement aligned to data, or a clear understanding of the data sources. Similarly, the EPP did not present a Quality Assurance System that evaluated the impact of the continuous improvement changes.
RA5.4 Continuous Improvement	AFI	Open	The EPP provided inconsistent evidence that it regularly, systematically, and continuously assessed its performance.

Items per page:

10

1 18 of 18



Third Party Comments

Self Study Report (SSR) : Third Party Comments : Third Party Comments

Link to Call for Third Party Comment

Please provide a link to the call for third party comment the EPP posted on its website. This is due no later than 16 weeks prior to the start of the virtual site review.

https://www.msubillings

Proof of Call for Third Party Comment

Please upload a document with a screenshot of the EPP's call for third party comments either on the EPP website or distributed in another format.

Choose Files

No File Selected

Name	size	Action	Uploaded Date
College of Education Accreditation _ MSU Billings.pdf	0.5 MB	View Download	02/10/2025

Third Party Comments

CAEP will upload any third party comments received no later than six weeks prior to the EPP's virtual site review.

Choose Files

No Files Selected

Response to Third Party Comments

The EPP may optionally respond to the third party comments uploaded here in the text box below.

Insert text here ...

Rejoinder

Self Study Report (SSR) : Rejoinder : Rejoinder

Recommended AFIs/Stipulations

Component ↑	Type	Status	Rationale	Epp Agree/DisagiLead Agree/Disagree
R1.2 Content	AFI	Open	Though some data were provided for R1.2 [Praxis II scores and MACK scores], the EPP inconsistently demonstrated, through verifiable and reliable means, that candidates were able to apply their knowledge of content upon program completion. Analysis of completion data for continuous improvement and candidate monitoring was not presented.	Agree
R2.2 Clinical Educators	AFI	Open	While the EPP provided documentation on the selection and support of clinical educators (IHE and P-12), there was minimal evidence of co-selection component, evaluation and training of clinical educators.	Agree
R3.1 Recruitment	AFI	Open	While the EPP provided evidence towards partially meeting the component by providing a draft of a plan, the EPP did not address progress on the recruitment goals.	Agree

R3.3 Competency at Completion	AFI	Open	<p>The EPP described the process (continuum) of assessment that contributed to the competency at completion, but did not share disaggregated data by program (with appropriate N s) to verify candidate quality including impact on P-12 student learning or how those assessment criteria addressed the components of proficiency at completion indicated in Question R.3.3 (B), particularly for content knowledge sufficiently to meet the state standards.</p>	Agree
R4.1 Completer Effectiveness	AFI	Open	<p>There was only one cycle of data provided in evidence for this component. Additionally, the EPP presented an incomplete analysis and demonstration of completer impact on P-12 student learning and development.</p>	Agree
R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers	AFI	Open	<p>Although three cycles of data were provided in evidence, there was minimal analysis, and no disaggregation by program. No demonstration that the survey met the criteria for evaluation of EPP created surveys was</p>	

provided. Data was unverifiable.
 The EPP made an insufficient case for employer satisfaction. Agree

R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

AFI

Open

There were only two cycles of data provided. Although each data set represents multiple years, it was only one cycle each. Minimal analysis, no disaggregation of data by program, and no demonstration that the survey met the criteria for evaluation of EPP-created surveys was provided. Agree

R5.1 Quality Assurance System

AFI

Open

While the EPP provided some evidence of meeting this CAEP component, the EPP did not provide assessment evidence, data, programmatic improvement aligned to data, or a clear understanding of the data sources. Similarly, the EPP did not present a Quality Assurance System that evaluated the impact of the continuous improvement changes. Agree

R5.2 Data Quality

AFI

Open

Data were not disaggregated across all programs to determine if the data were representative of candidates and completers of the

			programs. Data were provided for some assessments across three cycles except those identified in Standard R1.	Agree	
R5.4 Continuous Improvement	AFI	Open	The EPP provided inconsistent evidence that it regularly, systematically, and continuously assessed its performance.	Agree	
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	AFI	Open	The EPP provided limited evidence and data that the Advanced CAEP competencies were considered or discussed with candidates or assessed. In numerous instances, questionable alignment between the CAEP RA1.1 competencies and rubric indicators indicated a misalignment or potentially a lack of understanding of the CAEP RA1.1 competencies. Three competencies were not identified as areas of foci and data collection, analysis, and candidate monitoring/progress were not provided, discussed, or analyzed for growth or continuous improvement.	Disagree	Agree with EPP

RA2.2 Clinical Experiences	AFI	Open	<p>There was limited evidence provided to suggest the EPP designed varied and developmentally appropriate clinical experiences culminating in the demonstration of their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research that were characterized by the documentation from RA1.1.</p>	Agree
RA3.1 Recruitment	AFI	Open	<p>The provider presented a five-year plan for recruitment but did not provide baseline admissions data or evidence to reach goals.</p>	Agree
RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	AFI	Open	<p>Some components of progress monitoring of candidate progression were in place, but not a clear system of support. Limited data were provided but not analyzed. Limited evidence was provided to indicate how and when interventions with problems in the progression of individual candidates were handled systematically. Communication of transition points was not clearly demonstrated.</p>	Agree

RA4.1 Satisfaction of Employers	AFI	Open	<p>The EPP made an inconsistent case for the use of data and subsequent analysis of the assessment results including what conclusions and interpretations were made as it related to the satisfaction of employers (provided two cycles of data).</p>
RA4.2 Satisfaction of Completers	AFI	Open	<p>The EPP made an inconsistent case for the use of data and subsequent analysis of the assessment results including what conclusions and interpretations were made as it related to the satisfaction of completers (provided one cycle of data).</p>
RA5.1 Quality Assurance System	AFI	Open	<p>While the EPP provided some evidence of meeting this CAEP component, the EPP did not provide assessment evidence, data, programmatic improvement aligned to data, or a clear understanding of the data sources. Similarly, the EPP did not present a Quality Assurance System that evaluated the impact of the continuous improvement</p>

changes.		Agree	
RA5.4 Continuous Improvement	AFI	Open	The EPP provided inconsistent evidence that it regularly, systematically, and continuously assessed its performance. Agree

Items per page: 1 18 of 18 < >

Preliminary AFIs/Stipulations Removed During Site Review Process

Below is a list of the AFI/Stipulations that were recommended during the Formative Feedback Report but were removed as a result of the SSR Addendum and site review.

Component ↑	Type	Status	Rationale
R1.1 The Learner and Learning	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	The EPP did not provide evidence of disaggregated data across licensure areas on the reported Key Assessments with a subsequent analysis of the data. Evidence was also missing in the 1.1.1 InTASC Alignment Chart. The Key Assessment were examined for alignment, but the Dispositions assessment did not appear to be tagged to any specific InTASC standard or category.
R1.3 Instructional Practice	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	Disaggregation of data was missing as well as an analysis of candidates performance as it relates to Instructional Practice. Alignment across all key assessments was also missing.
R1.4 Professional			

Responsibility	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	<p>The EPP did not provide evidence of disaggregated data across licensure areas on the reported Key Assessments with a subsequent analysis of the data. Evidence was also missing in the 1.1.1 InTASC Alignment Chart. The Key Assessment were examined for alignment, but the Dispositions assessment did not appear to be tagged to any specific InTASC standard or category.</p>
R2.3 Clinical Experiences	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	<p>While the EPP provides documentation in the implementation of clinical experiences including depth, breadth, coherence, and duration, it is unclear how technology applications are addressed that prepare candidates for their position or how they ensure all candidates receive diverse placements.</p>
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	<p>While the EPP provided assessments, the data shared was unclear related to aggregate data for admissions related to student demographics and assessment criteria at each transition point. Finally, The EPP indicated that Elementary Cohort met the 3.0 GPA average, but failed to address other programs offered.</p>
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	AFI	Removed During Site Review Process	<p>There was a single Advisory Board meeting that included two external P-12 partners from one school system, but no additional evidence to suggest their involvement. Similarly, additional evidences were not include for 5.3 which included a committee list that was absent.</p>

<p>RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities</p>	<p>AFI</p>	<p>Removed During Site Review Process</p>	<p>The EPP did not include some evidences #1.1.1A SCOU Data Framework & #1.1.2A SCOU Program Standards Benchmark Chart that would have been essential in understanding how the EPP knows candidates are aware of the specialized content for their field and can apply that content. Similarly, disaggregated data was not presented on the EPP's assessments. Limited data was presented in Praxis II, but there was not disaggregation or analysis that includes the components of the Praxis assessment taken by candidates.</p>
<p>RA3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully</p>	<p>AFI</p>	<p>Removed During Site Review Process</p>	<p>Narrative suggests meeting the standard but not data is provided to support that claim. Praxis data is not disaggregated.</p>
<p>RA3.4 Competency at Completion</p>	<p>Stipulation</p>	<p>Removed During Site Review Process</p>	<p>Although discussed in the narrative, the EPP provided no evidence of candidate competency at completion. No data was presented except Praxis.</p>
<p>RA5.2 Data Quality</p>	<p>Stipulation</p>	<p>Removed During Site Review Process</p>	<p>The EPP provided no evidence to substantiate claims within the narrative of the Self Study Report.</p>
<p>RA5.3 Stakeholder Involvement</p>	<p>Stipulation</p>	<p>Removed During Site Review Process</p>	<p>There was very limited documentation provided that could be used to verify claims in the narrative of the self-study report that the EPP engages both internal and external stakeholders in the program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes.</p>

Items per page:

10

1 11 of 11

