

# 2021 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10033	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	1030
<b>Institution:</b>	Montana State University-Billings		
<b>Unit:</b>	College of Education		

## Section 1. EPP Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

<https://www.msubillings.edu/coe/degrees.htm>

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup>

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)<sup>2</sup>

**Total number of program completers** 126

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

<sup>2</sup> For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2019-2020 academic year?**

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

---

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

---

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

---

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

---

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

---

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4   A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3   A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4   A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

**Link:** <https://www.msubillings.edu/coe/accreditation.htm>

**Description of data accessible via link:** This link provides accreditation reports and annual Title II and CAEP reports. There are links to eight annual reporting measures as well as data collection timeline at the bottom of this page.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

*What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?*

*Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?*

*Are benchmarks available for comparison?*

*Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

We have designated an area on our web page (the link is posted above) to publish updates related to the reporting measures. Montana Educator preparation providers have been working together in a Continuous Improvement Collaborative (CIC) to develop a statewide protocol for a three-year data collection to support continuous improvement. As a part of the CIC, we have already administered the completer and employer survey. The third component of the CIC protocol is conducting Case Study. We used employer and completer survey findings to craft questions for the completer case study. We have already completed the case study research and currently analyzing the data. Please see the timeline created by the State related to the Continuous Improvement Collaborative. This timeline can be found on the above webpage.

We collaborated with the Montana Council of Deans to evaluate the MT State criteria related to advanced standards. The College of Education (COE) also worked on aligning advanced programs with SPA/STATE/CAEP standards and revise key assessments. By analyzing completer and employer survey data, we also found that our secondary education programs lacked diversity, classroom management, and assessment competencies. The Elementary and Secondary Program committee coordinated with the secondary programs to change the professional core for secondary programs. As a result of this, the professional core for secondary programs now includes the two credit Strategies for Managing Diverse Learners (EDU 343) course. The committee was

also able to officially change the professional core for secondary to EDU 381, the 3-credit curriculum course instead of EDU 380, a 2 credit course. EDU 381 has some assessment integrated into the course as part of the curriculum planning process and teaching cycle.

In addition, the math and science teaching majors also added the assessment course (EDU 383) to their majors. English program agreed to change the English methods course from a two-credit to a three-credit class so that assessment could be more fully integrated into that course. The English department is also strongly encouraging English majors to select the reading minor as their teaching minor. The reading minor has several courses that emphasize assessment as part of the intervention process.

## Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

*The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.*

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

*The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.*

**6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.**

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs  
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

During the 2019-2020 academic year, the College had two data retreats. In spring 2020, faculty analyzed data from the Evidence of Professional Growth rubric. For Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education programs, we saw an improvement of performance from junior field/grad practicum to student teaching. Discussions were held in terms of the validity and reliability of the Evidence of Professional Growth rubric.

The College of Education voted to adopt the Danielson-based framework to observe and assess candidates' planning, teaching, and reflection. We formed the Assessment Taskforce in spring 2020 to investigate the implementation of new assessment instruments (moving from the Evidence of Professional Growth instrument to a Teacher Work Sample.) This work was initiated in the spring 2020 semester.

The development of the new tools consisted of several rounds of faculty feedback. In fall 2020, the new instruments were presented to the College of Education faculty as well as P-12 partners for feedback, and the College voted to adopt the new tools. We also investigated the validity of the EPP-created assessments through the Lawshe content validity protocol. Plans are in place to create training modules for these new tools and introduce them to our junior field/grad practicum candidates and a selected list of student teachers in fall 2021 (the tools were piloted with a small group of graduate practicum students in Spring 2021.) In Spring








2020, the faculty also voted to adopt a new dispositions assessment tool; this tool was introduced to the Montana Council of Deans of Education group by another EPP in Montana. In Summer 2020, the College of Education collaborated with this EPP in Montana and created a training module for the dispositions tool. We are planning on working on the interrater reliability of these tools starting fall 2021.

In spring 2020, the faculty also analyzed praxis scores as a part of the content assessment of our candidates. Discussions were in place to encourage praxis prep for content majors as well as collaboration with the programs that offer content courses in other Colleges.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **ELEMEvidence\_of\_Professional\_Growth\_Data\_Analysis\_Faculty\_Answers.pdf**
-  **ELEMJFGP\_vs\_ST\_ReportEPG.pdf**
-  **EPGSPEDFinal.pdf**
-  **SECONDARYEvidence\_of\_Professional\_Growth\_Data\_Analysis\_Faculty\_Answers.pdf**
-  **SecondaryJFGP\_vs\_ST\_ReportEPG.pdf**
-  **SPEDEvidence\_of\_Professional\_Growth\_Data\_Analysis\_Faculty\_Questions.pdf**
-  **First\_Data\_Retreat\_1172020Presentation.pdf**
-  **Second\_Data\_Retreat\_3102020Presentation.pdf**
-  **1302020ETP\_Meeting\_Minutes.pdf**
-  **2112020ETP\_Meeting\_Minutes.pdf**

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

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

---

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

**Preparer's authorization.** By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2021 EPP Annual Report.

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

### Report Preparer's Information

Name: Robert Nava

Position: Dean

Phone: 406-657-2286

E-mail: roberto.nava@msubillings.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

### Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site reviews.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

### Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site review report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

**Acknowledge**