

2019 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

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

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

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

Total number of program completers 114

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
- Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:
- 3.6 Change in regional accreditation status
- 3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

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

Description of data accessible via link: This link provides accreditation reports and annual Title II and CAEP reports. Employer and Completer survey data are in this report. The COE is working with the University webmaster on direct links to the survey results.

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

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

2

Link: <https://www.collegefactual.com/colleges/montana-state-university-billings/>

Description of data accessible via link: This national website provides a thorough profile of MSU Billings. MSU Billings Career Services is not currently surveying completers to determine their employment. As the COE moves forward, the the recently hired COE Assessment/Accreditation/Data Coordinator can send surveys to determine completer employment at both initial and advanced levels.

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

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

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

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?
 Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?
 Are benchmarks available for comparison?
 Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

The Title II and CAEP annual report data demonstrate that education programs have stagnant or decreasing enrollments. MSUB Academic Affairs division is currently working on program alignment. The College of Education faculty and Dean recently met with the Provost and Vice Provost to discuss COE program alignment reviews, programs to maintain, invigorate, or delete. The meeting

resulted in the COE being charged with developing benchmarked plans with timelines for each program area. The plans will be submitted to the Provost by April 9th, reviewed by the Program Alignment Committee and returned with suggested necessary changes.

The Annual CAEP report student data are equivalent. However, the COE has commenced on a strategic planning process that has begun with futures visioning. The COE has a young faculty--one first year, six two-year to five-year, and five tenured Associate/Full) Professors. The college is currently searching four positions. The remaining six faculty are not in tenure track positions, but have experience in the college. This bifurcation of experience has made it apparent that the college must review its core values, and expected completer outcomes.

Ultimately, the Program Alignment and Visioning work will impact curricular modifications and overall outcome assessments. The college remains committed to both InTASC Standards and the Danielson Framework. Both form the underlying foundation of program and curricular reviews.

The COE has begun reviewing Advanced Programs. The goal is to align each with SPA standards and revise key assessments to assure program outcome performance. This work was begun AY 18/19. It will be reported on in the AY 20 CAEP Annual Report.

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?

Data Reviewed: MSUB EPP programs reviewed data displayed as heat maps for key assessments in initial programs following the August 2017 and 2018 Retreats.

The MSUB EPP also reviewed results of the Employer and Completer Surveys (included below), as well as a survey sent fall semester to cooperating teachers.

Strengths and Weaknesses: Key assessment data indicated that all elementary education majors required more instruction in how to teach reading. Surveys indicated that completers were well prepared overall but needed additional preparation in the following

areas: (1) class assessment data analysis and use in planning future lessons, (2) response to inappropriate behavior and overall classroom management, (3) incorporating Montana's Indian Education for All (MIEA), and (4) differentiating instruction for each/all learner/s.

Use of Data for Program Improvement: As a result, the Reading Program added a special education course focused on teaching students with learning disabilities to the Reading Major. The Elementary Education program assured that all Elementary Education Majors (as opposed to Reading Majors only) enroll in the reading clinic. This class pairs university student clinicians with p-12 learners for assessment, diagnosis, and remediation. The clinic includes conferences between clinicians and parents of the p-12 learners.

Key assessment review, surveys results, and the fact that since the MSUB EPP 2017 joint national/state accreditation review, the college has one first year faculty member and six two to five year faculty (One third of the faculty were not part of the college for the accreditation preparation.), have led the college to initiate futures visioning. The faculty have begun at the beginning with attention to the areas for growth in candidates, disbanded CAEP committees, and formed four Issues Committees with an Accreditation Steering Committee. Committees will work toward program improvement in the areas for growth and the Steering Committee will assure that CAEP Standards are being met through the Issues Committees work.




Test Innovations, resulting changes, ongoing changes based on data: The MSUB COE is not at a point to test the innovations. That will occur through future survey cycles and annual key assessment data review. Impact on p-12 learners will be judged through the AY upcoming state determined case study process.

Advanced Programs are revising key assessments based on SPA standards. Data are not yet available.

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

- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- x.1 Diversity

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **Fall_2018_Completer_Survey_Results.xlsx**
-  **MEPP_Employer_Survey_Initial_Rpt.pdf**
-  **CIC_Timeline_to_Fall_2018.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

The Montana Continuous Improvement Collaborative (CIC) is a subcommittee of the Montana Council of Deans of Education. Composed of faculty, administration, and staff representing the eight Educator Preparation Providers in the state, the CIC is unique in its state-wide focus on CAEP Standard 4 Completer Impact. The CIC has proposed a three year cycle for administrating Employer and Completer Surveys followed by individual institutional case studies using a state-approved protocol. The CIC developed and piloted the surveys. Both have been formally administrated for the first time. The third piece, the Case Study protocol will be developed and implemented in AY 19-20, the third year of the three year state-wide cycle. The surveys and case studies to date have been focused on initial programs. The state Continuous Improvement Collaborative has just initiated focus on advanced programs.

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2019 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Mary Susan E. Fishbaugh

Position: Dean

Phone: 406 657 2286

E-mail: mfishbaugh@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 visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount 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 visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

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

Acknowledge