

**School Administrators' Satisfaction with Montana Western Graduates:  
2014 & 2015 Summary Report  
The University of Montana Western Department of Education**

The state of Montana recently developed a three-year rotation for assessing the following indicators of the success of Montana's graduates, after they have obtained teaching jobs.

- School Administrators' satisfaction with the graduates
- Graduates' satisfaction with how well prepared they were for the teaching profession
- Impact of graduates on P-12 learning and development

The new three-year rotation was implemented in spring 2018, using survey instruments developed in collaboration between the Montana Office of Public Instruction and the nine teacher education programs within Montana. The new instruments will be used, beginning spring 2018.

The University of Montana Western previously used survey questions listed below, to obtain the reactions of school administrators, regarding the preparation of Montana Western graduates to teach P-12 students.

The tables below summarize the responses from the School Administrators who hired Montana Western graduates. These are the results from the 2014 and 2015 surveys. In the 2014 survey, Montana Western graduates had been teaching in the administrators' schools for one year. But the 2015 survey targeted Montana Western graduates who had completed their programs between 2011-2014.

These results indicate that School Administrators are highly satisfied with the preparation of Montana Western graduates, with very few individuals receiving low scores on the survey.

Here are a few comments from School Administrators that completed the 2015 surveys:

- "I've always been pleased with teachers I hire who've earned their teaching degrees at Western!"
- "The University has an exceptional teaching staff and does a great job preparing students for the profession."
- "The Montana Western graduate is an exceptional teacher with only one year of experience. She has a true passion to help all students; she is also an exceptional employee."
- "The Montana Western graduate is a fantastic young teacher! She has grown professionally and I expect she will only continue."

**School Administrator Survey Responses, based on Montana Western graduates  
who teach in their schools:  
Surveys for 2014 & 2015**

**Note:** These tables indicate which criteria are linked to InTASC and CAEP Standards. InTASC Standards are the national standards for teachers. CAEP standards are the national standard for colleges of education. The University of Montana Western is accredited by CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation).

<b>Survey Criteria</b>	Display accurate knowledge of important concepts and their interrelationships (InTASC 5c; CAEP 1.1, 1.3)	Use a range of effective content-specific pedagogical strategies. (InTASC 7b; CAEP 1.1, 1.2)	Accurately incorporate content related to Montana American Indians. (InTASC 11; CAEP 1.1)	Design instruction, based on learners' cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical development. (InTASC 1b, InTASC 7c; CAEP 1.1, 1.2)
<b>Fall 2014 (N=25)</b>				
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	0	4% (1)	0
Disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	8% (2)	16% (4)	12% (3)
Agree % (No.)	44% (11)	52% (13)	56% (14)	56% (14)
Strongly agree % (No.)	52% (13)	40% (10)	8% (2)	32% (8)
<b>Summer 2015 (N=24)</b>				
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	4% (1)	0	0
Disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	12.5% (3)	21% (5)	8% (2)
Agree % (No.)	54% (13)	58% (14)	46% (11)	42% (10)
Strongly agree % (No.)	38% (9)	25% (6)	33% (8)	50% (12)

Yellow highlights = diversity indicators; Green highlights = dispositions indicators

**Reflections on results**

**Strengths**

- Displaying accurate knowledge of concepts (92-96% of graduates)
- Using a range of content-specific pedagogy (83-92% of graduates)
- Designing instruction based on student development (88-92% of graduates)

**Slight Weaknesses**

- Incorporating knowledge of American Indians in curriculum (64-79% of graduates)

**Other notes**

- While the vast majority of graduates performed well on three of the above indicators, a few individuals were scored poorly by their employers. One English teacher, three elementary education teachers, one music teacher, one science teacher, one art teacher, and one special education teacher received a significant number of low scores across the entire survey. The faculty feels that is too many individuals receiving low scores. The faculty discussed program improvements that they hope will reduce the number of weak scores in any category to below 8%.
- The faculty noted that we need to ensure that we refresh our contacts at Montana State University, to continue to be invited to bring our students to Indian Education for All Events that they sponsor in Bozeman. We have taken groups of our students to these events in recent semesters. We need to continue to seek resources to invite experts to the campus, to provide professional development to all UMW faculty, not just the education faculty.

Employer Survey Criteria	Clearly communicate standards-based objectives that represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline. (InTASC 7a; CAEP 1.1; 1.4)	Understand the Common Core Standards for Math & ELA (InTASC 7a; CAEP 1.1; 1.4)	Incorporate the Common Core standards in instruction. (InTASC 7a; CAEP 1.1; 1.4)	Consistently use both formative and summative assessment. (InTASC 6c; CAEP 1.1; 1.2)	Modify assessments, as needed, for individuals and sub-groups (InTASC 6d; CAEP 1.1; 1.2)	Provides scaffolding to support student engagement, self-direction, and ownership of learning. (InTASC 3c; CAEP 1.1)
<b>Fall 2014 (N=25)</b>						
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disagree % (No.)	20% (5)	32% (8)	16% (4)	4% (1)	4% (1)	4% (1)
Agree % (No.)	52% (13)	52% (13)	52% (13)	68% (17)	56% (14)	60% (15)
Strongly agree % (No.)	28% (7)	4% (1)	28% (7)	24% (6)	40% (10)	32% (8)
<b>Summer 2015 (N=24)</b>						
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	4% (1)	0	0	0	0
Disagree % (No.)	8% (2)	4% (1)	17% (4)	8% (2)	4% (1)	17% (4)
Agree % (No.)	63% (15)	71% (17)	71% (17)	58% (14)	42% (10)	38% (9)
Strongly agree % (No.)	29% (7)	21% (5)	12.5% (3)	33% (8)	54% (13)	46% (11)

Yellow highlights = diversity indicators; Green highlights = dispositions indicators

### Reflections on results

#### Strengths

- Communicating standards-based objectives (80-92% of graduates)
- Use of assessments (90%+ of graduates)
- Scaffolding instruction (84-92% of graduates)

#### Weaknesses

- Understanding and using Common Core Standards was scored low in 2014, but fairly high in 2015 (83-92%). The faculty will continue to examine ways to ensure consistency of instruction in regards the Common Core and national standards.
- 11-20% of graduates do not clearly communicate standards-based objectives.

#### Other notes

- An adjunct who is a recently retired school teacher commented that she has never heard the term “scaffolding” used in K-12 schools in Montana, and she commented that some school administrators completing the survey may not fully understand its meaning.
- The graduates evaluated in this survey completed their degrees about the time that the Common Core Standards were first implemented in Montana schools, and UMW had just begun providing instruction in this area. The survey for Summer 2015 evaluated graduates from 2011-2014. These individuals seem to have received better instruction in the Common Core from UMW. One faculty commented that we do not know how many Montana school administrators understand

the Common Core Standards. The Montana legislature has been reluctant to fund professional development for teachers related to the Common Core standards.

Employer Survey Criteria	Express a passion and enthusiasm for teaching and learning that fosters student engagement. (InTASC 3c; CAEP 1.1)	Create well-structured lessons, with appropriate pacing. (InTASC 8; CAEP 1.1)	Differentiate lessons for sub-groups of students <u>and</u> for individuals (InTASC 2a, InTASC 6d; CAEP 1.1; 1.2)	Create accommodations for students that remove barriers to learning. (InTASC 2a, InTASC 6d; CAEP 1.1, 1.2)	Engage in friendly interactions with K-12 students and school personnel, demonstrating genuine caring and respect. (InTASC 3b, InTASC 10b; CAEP 1.1)	Support high expectations for learning and student effort, both through verbal prompts and effective use of specific praise. (InTASC 2e; CAEP 1.1)
Fall 2014 (N=25)						
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	0	0	0	0	4% (1)
Disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	12% (3)	12% (3)	8% (2)	4% (1)	0
Agree % (No.)	40% (10)	48% (12)	60% (15)	56% (14)	40% (10)	48% (12)
Strongly agree % (No.)	52% (13)	40% (10)	24% (6)	36% (9)	52% (13)	44% (11)
Summer 2015 (N=24)						
Strongly disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	4% (1)	0	0	0	4% (1)
Disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	0	17% (4)	8% (2)	0	0
Agree % (No.)	29% (7)	67% (16)	46% (11)	50% (12)	38% (9)	58% (14)
Strongly agree % (No.)	63% (15)	29% (7)	38% (9)	42% (10)	63% (15)	38% (9)

Yellow highlights = diversity indicators; Green highlights = dispositions indicators

### Reflections on results

#### Strengths

- Passion and enthusiasm (92% of graduates)
- Differentiation (84% of graduates) – this area had been identified as a weakness in the past
- Accommodations (92% of graduates) - this area had been identified as a weakness in the past
- Well-structured lessons (88-96% of graduates)
- Respectful (92-100% of graduates)
- High expectations for learning (92-96% of graduates)

#### Weaknesses

- While candidates generally exhibited strengths in differentiation and accommodations, and this has improved significantly compared in recent years, the faculty would like to see further improvement.

Employer Survey Criteria	Establish effective routines, transitions, and procedures that result in little loss of instructional time. (InTASC 3d; CAEP 1.1)	Make effective use of a wide range of available resources, including technologies (InTASC 7b, 8d; CAEP 1.1, 1.5)	Monitor student behavior in a subtle and preventive manner, using both verbal and non-verbal cues, proximity, and re-direction. (InTASC 3d; CAEP 1.1)	Respond to misbehavior in ways that are sensitive to individual student needs and respectful of students' dignity. (InTASC 10c; CAEP 1.1)	Immediately respond to issues that might compromise the safety of students. (InTASC 3d; CAEP 1.1)	Apply principles of Response to Intervention & Montana Behavioral Institute to your school setting (InTASC 3; CAEP 1.1; 1.2)	Clearly explain content, using correct, age-appropriate, spoken & written language, & accurate academic vocabulary (InTASC 5b, 9b; CAEP 1.1)	Demonstrate effective presentation skills* (InTASC 5b; CAEP 1.1)
<b>Fall 2014 (N=25)</b>								
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disagree % (No.)	16% (4)	4% (1)	16% (4)	4% (1)	0	20% (5)	8% (2)	4% (1)
Agree % (No.)	52% (13)	60% (15)	44% (11)	64% (16)	56% (14)	64% (16)	56% (14)	48% (12)
Strongly agree % (No.)	32% (8)	36% (9)	40% (10)	32% (8)	44% (11)	16% (4)	36% (9)	36% (9)
<b>Summer 2015 (N=24)</b>								
Strongly disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	0	0	0	4% (1)	0	0	0
Disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	4% (1)	8% (2)	8% (2)	0	8% (2)	4% (1)	8% (2)
Agree % (No.)	58% (14)	50% (12)	54% (13)	42% (10)	17% (4)	75% (18)	58% (14)	54% (13)
Strongly agree % (No.)	33% (8)	46% (11)	38% (9)	50% (12)	79% (19)	17% (4)	38% (9)	38% (9)

\* Three school administrators did not select this item in 2014.

Yellow highlights = diversity indicators

Green highlights = dispositions indicators

Blue highlights = technology indicators

### Reflections on results

#### Strengths

- Safety (96-100% of graduates)
- Presentation skills (92-96% of graduates)
- Responding to student misbehavior (92-96% of graduates)
- Establishing effective routines (84-91% of graduates)
- Use of resources, including technologies (96% of graduates)
- Use of academic vocabulary (92-96% of graduates)

#### Slight Weakness

- Applying principles of RTI and MBI (20% of graduates not successful in 2014 survey, but 92% successful in 2015 survey)

- In 2014, 16% of graduates were scored low on two classroom management items (routines, re-direction), from a variety of programs (Art, Elementary Education, English, Physical Ed & Health). Scores were higher in 2015, with only 8% scoring low.

**Other notes**

- The CEEDAR grant provided financial support for UMW faculty to attend the annual RTI and MBI conference in Bozeman, to obtain professional development. MBI is the statewide school behavior management system.
- Montana Western graduates’ classroom management skills have improved quite a bit, compared to data from five years ago, but faculty would like to see more improvement.
- The faculty noted that not all Montana schools have adopted MBI or RTI models (recently, the state combined these two efforts, to create what is now called Multi-Tiered Systems of Support). Faculty suggested we add a question to the survey, to have the administrator identify whether or not RTI, MBI, or MTSS are implemented in the school. The faculty also noted that Montana secondary schools do not pay much attention to RTI.

Employer Survey Criteria	While may use some questions at the level of knowledge & comprehension, he/she poses some questions designed to promote higher-level thinking (InTASC 5; CAEP 1.1)	Create a genuine* discussion among students, providing adequate time for students to respond and stepping aside when doing so is appropriate. (InTASC 4a; CAEP 1.1)	Provide multiple* examples and representations of concepts or skills. (InTASC 4b; CAEP 1.1)	Persevere in* seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning, by drawing on a broad repertoire of strategies. (InTASC 2e; CAEP 1.1; 1.2)
<b>Fall 2014 (N=25)</b>				
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	0	0	0
Disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	8% (2)	8% (2)	12% (3)
Agree % (No.)	56% (14)	48% (12)	28% (7)	44% (11)
Strongly agree % (No.)	32% (8)	32% (8)	52% (13)	32% (8)
<b>Summer 2015 (N=24)</b>				
Strongly disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	0	0	0
Disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	8% (2)	4% (1)	4% (1)
Agree % (No.)	71% (17)	63% (15)	67% (16)	50% (12)
Strongly agree % (No.)	21% (5)	29% (7)	29% (7)	46% (11)

\* Three school administrators did not select these items in 2014.

Yellow highlights = diversity indicators; Green highlights = dispositions indicators

**Reflections on results**

**Strengths**

- Asking higher level questions (88-92% of graduates)
- Creating a genuine discussion (80-92% of graduates)
- Providing multiple examples of concepts (80-96% of graduates)

**Weaknesses**

- Perseverance: 12% of graduates were scored low in 2014, and three administrators did not score this item at all. However, in 2015, 96% scored high. The faculty noted the desire to ensure that all candidates develop skills in perseverance.

Criteria	*Makes minor adjustments to lessons and does so smoothly, if impromptu measures are needed. (InTASC 8; CAEP 1.1, 1.2)	*Make an accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes. (InTASC 6b, 10a; CAEP 1.1, 1.2)	*Seeks out opportunities for continued professional development. (InTASC 10d; CAEP 1.1, 1.2)	*Engage with colleagues and supervisors in supportive, professional conversation about practice. (InTASC 10d; CAEP 1.1; 1.2)	*Volunteers to participate in school events or in school or district projects. (InTASC 10)
<b>Fall 2014 (N=25)</b>					
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	0	0	0	0
Disagree % (No.)	4% (1)	12% (3)	8% (2)	4% (1)	8% (2)
Agree % (No.)	48% (12)	48% (12)	48% (12)	40% (10)	40% (10)
Strongly agree % (No.)	40% (10)	32% (8)	32% (8)	44% (11)	44% (11)
<b>Summer 2015 (N=24)</b>					
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	0	0	0	8% (2)
Disagree % (No.)	8% (2)	4% (1)	8% (2)	0	4% (1)
Agree % (No.)	63% (15)	54% (13)	50% (12)	50% (12)	29% (7)
Strongly agree % (No.)	29% (7)	42% (10)	42% (10)	50% (12)	58% (14)

\*Two to three school administrators did not select these items in 2014.

Green highlights = dispositions indicators

### Reflections on results

#### Strengths

- Most of these indicators showed improvement in the 2015 survey, which included graduates from 2011-2014.
- Making minor adjustments to lessons, as needed (88-92% of graduates)
- Making an accurate assessment of the lessons' effectiveness (80-96% of graduates)
- Seeking out continued professional development (80-92% of graduates)
- Engaging with colleagues in professional conversation (84-100% of graduates)
- Volunteering at the school (84-87% of graduates)

#### Weaknesses

- Deficiencies in several of these criteria were exhibited by one individual from each of the following programs: Art, English, Music, Science and Elementary Education

#### Other notes

- On each of these questions two or three administrators did not choose the item, in the 2014 survey. This may simply mean they did not have an opportunity to observe the behavior, or it may mean they did not feel the teacher demonstrated the behavior.

Criteria	*Maintain a well-organized system of tracking student progress. (InTASC 6; CAEP 1.1)	*Convey information about student progress to families in a professional manner. (InTASC 10b; CAEP 1.1)	*Understand the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant law and policy. (InTASC 9d; CAEP 1.1; 3.6)	*Display high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. (InTASC 9d; CAEP 1.1; 3.6)	*Comply fully with school and district regulations. (InTASC 9d; CAEP 1.1, 3.6)
<b>Fall 2014 (N=25)</b>					
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	0	0	0	0
Disagree % (No.)	12% (3)	0	8% (2)	0	8% (2)
Agree % (No.)	44% (11)	56% (14)	40% (10)	48% (12)	24% (6)
Strongly agree % (No.)	36% (9)	36% (9)	44% (11)	44% (11)	60% (15)
<b>Summer 2015 (N=24)</b>					
Strongly disagree % (No.)	0	0	12.5% (3)	8% (2)	8% (2)
Disagree % (No.)	17% (4)	4% (1)	4% (1)	8% (2)	12.5% (3)
Agree % (No.)	38% (9)	33% (8)	29% (7)	21% (5)	17% (4)
Strongly agree % (No.)	46% (11)	58% (14)	54% (13)	63% (15)	63% (15)

\*Two to three school administrators did not select these items in 2014.

Yellow highlights = diversity indicators; Green highlights = dispositions indicators

### Reflections on results

#### Strengths

- Conveying progress to families in a professional manner (91-92% of graduates)
- Understanding codes of ethics (83-84% of graduates)
- Integrity (84-92% of graduates)
- Tracking student progress (80-84% of graduates)
- Compliance with school district policies (80-84% of graduates)

#### Weakness

- 12-17% of graduates do not maintain a well-organized system of tracking progress
- Two individuals in 2014 were scored low on understanding codes of ethics, and four in 2015.
- Two individuals were scored low on compliance with school district policies in 2014, and five in 2015.

On each of these questions, in the 2014 survey, two or three administrators did not choose the item. This may simply mean they did not have an opportunity to observe the behavior, or it may mean they did not feel the teacher demonstrated the behavior.

#### Other notes

- Even though few graduates were scored low on understanding ethics and on complying with school policies, the faculty were concerned by these data. The faculty have an exemplary system in place, to identify unacceptable behaviors and provide remediation. The data reminded faculty of how important it is to use that system consistently, to identify these individuals, when



inappropriate behaviors are detected. Montana Western faculty have seen some excellent results from remediation efforts.

- While Montana Western graduates performed very well overall on the survey, the survey highlighted concerns with a few individuals. Some clear areas for improvement are described above, but in a number of areas, the number of individuals who exhibited problems is so small that no clear path for program improvement is evident.