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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Contact person</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 EPP characteristics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Program listings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
http://coehs.umt.edu/about/accred/CAEP%20Annual%20Reporting%20Measures/default.php

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 licensure¹ : 133

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 : 53

Total number of program completers : 186

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual
² For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes
Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2019-2020 academic year?

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

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

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

The University of Montana now offers a bachelor of arts degree in early childhood education leading to P-3 licensure. This program was not reviewed at our last NCATE visit. It was reviewed and approved by the Montana Board of Public Education and holds state approval at this time.

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    | 5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)     |
| (Component 4.1)                               |                                                     |
| 2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness       | 6. Ability of completers to meet licensing          |
| (Component 4.2)                               | (certification) and any additional state            |
|                                               | requirements; Title II (initial & advanced         |
|                                               | levels)                                            |
| 3. Satisfaction of employers and employment   | 7. Ability of completers to be hired in             |
| milestones (Component 4.3 | A.4.1)                                              | education positions for which they have prepared    |
|                                               | (initial & advanced levels)                         |
| 4. Satisfaction of completers                 | 8. Student loan default rates and other              |
| (Component 4.4 | A.4.2)                                              | 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link:</th>
<th>Description of data accessible via link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://coehs.umt.edu/about/accred/CAEP%20Annual%20Reporting%20Measures/default.php">http://coehs.umt.edu/about/accred/CAEP%20Annual%20Reporting%20Measures/default.php</a></td>
<td>Employer survey, Completer survey, Case Study information, Praxis information, graduation/completer information, CAEP annual reports, Title II annual reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Annual Reporting Measure</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial-Licensure Programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced-Level Programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

Per state protocol, all EPPs in Montana use a three-year cycle for Standard Four data collection; employer survey (year one), completer survey (year two) and the case study (year three); hence one report covers a three-year period. However, due to COVID, the case study won’t be completed until July 2021 AND the employer survey will also be completed in spring 2021; next autumn the next completer survey will be distributed.

In 2018, completers noted that differentiating instruction for English Language Learners was an area of concern. To respond, we started to pilot a field experience for our students who were dealing directly with English Language Learners in the community. This initiative was later expanded to all our elementary and early childhood licensure students. The most recent employer and completer surveys suggest our students could use more guidance analyzing assessment data to improve instruction. We use a key assessment, Applied Research and Reflective Practice, as part of student teaching and we are drilling down on the results of that assessment to more accurately gauge our response to this concern. Moreover, the completer and employer surveys are guiding our focus areas of the case study.
Our Praxis pass-rate for program completers is of particular note. For the 19-20 testing year, 95% of our elementary program completers met or exceeded Montana's score on the Praxis test for licensure on the first attempt with an average of 14 points higher than the MT score and a median of 15 points higher than the MT score. For all required licensure tests (all content areas) in 19-20, 94% of UM completers met or exceeded the Montana score on the first attempt. This illustrates the strength of our content area preparation for our candidates.

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.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. Candidates have limited opportunities to work with diverse P-12 students. (ITP) (ADV)

In addition to our work with English Language Learners (Sec 4.2), we also partner with Arlee Public Schools located on the Flathead Reservation to provide field experiences for our students. This continues to be an area of concern as we actively pursue other avenues to address this issue. Our college is currently developing a recruitment plan with a particular focus on diversity as well.

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?

This past year we presented summary data to the Department of Teaching and Learning as well as the Professional Education Council consisting of the Level I capstone project (Autumn 2019 and Autumn 2020), the applied research and reflective practice project (Autumn 2019 through Autumn 2020), as well student teaching data using the Danielson framework (Autumn 2016 through Autumn 2020). While our students generally demonstrate strong performance on all three assessments, approximately 10% to 14%
of our students do not perform as well as we would like. We are beginning to look more closely at these students to identify characteristics and commonalities so that our faculty might provide additional supports as students progress through the program.

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

| 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool |
| 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability |
| 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress |
| 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 |
| 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation |

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

CAEP_Data_Presentation.pdf

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

☐ Yes  ☐ No

6.3 Optional Comments

---

**Section 7: Transition**

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPPâ€™s evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress made on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPPâ€™s assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

☐ No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be prepared by your CAEP site review in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

Not applicable
7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

☐ Yes  ☐ No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Kristine Steinberg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>Licensure and Assessment Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>4062432121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kristine.steinberg@mso.umt.edu">kristine.steinberg@mso.umt.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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