

Board of Examiners Report for Transformation Initiative Pilot Visit

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

Institution:

Team Recommendations:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Standard Met	Standard Not Met
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Standard Met	Standard Met
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Standard Met	Standard Met
4. Diversity	Standard Not Met	Standard Not Met
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Standard Met	Standard Met
6. Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Met	Standard Met

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Missouri State University (MSU), a public, comprehensive metropolitan institution, was founded in 1905 as the Fourth District Normal School. In the 106 years since its inception, as several degree programs were added and the university's academic portfolio expanded, the institution went through four name changes. In 2005, the institution became a statewide university, Missouri State University. MSU's public affairs mission contains three components: ethical leadership, cultural competence, and community engagement.

MSU is comprised of six academic colleges – Arts and Letters, Business Administration, Education, Health and Human Services, Humanities and Public Affairs, and Natural and Applied Sciences – the William H. Darr School of Agriculture, and the Graduate College. The institution is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Today Missouri State offers more than 150 undergraduate programs and 45 graduate degree programs, including two professional doctoral programs. The College of Education (COE) participates in a cooperative doctoral program in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis that is housed at the University of Missouri, Columbia. MSU prepares the largest number of teachers for the State of Missouri.

The MSU main campus is located in Springfield, the third largest city in the state with a population of approximately 150,000. The 22,866 students who attend MSU are largely from Missouri with small numbers of students from 48 other states. About 1,300 international students represent 70 countries. The university also offers courses and/or programs at three other locations: a branch campus in West Plains, an agricultural research campus in Mountain Grove, and a branch campus in Dalian, China.

The professional education unit (PEU) at MSU is led by the deputy provost and comprised of the professional education faculty. Their authority is exercised through the Professional Education

Committee (PEC), the representative body to the Faculty Senate that governs the professional education curriculum and defines policies and procedures for professional education programs. The PEC is made up of faculty from all six colleges, local school teachers and administrators, and undergraduate and graduate candidates. A faculty member is elected to chair the PEC. As head of the unit, the deputy provost serves in an advisory capacity to the PEC and serves on the committee as an ex-officio member. The director of Secondary Education is another ex-officio member.

All of MSU's undergraduate and graduate programs leading to certification will be recommended for approval as having met state standards to the State Board of Education by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) team; areas for improvement will be cited for the majority of programs. Several program faculty elected to not submit their programs for review by Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) as they had in the past. Therefore, the only programs maintaining national recognition are the following: early childhood, elementary education, foreign language, mathematics, and reading. The physical education program is recognized with probation.

Several significant changes have occurred since the last NCATE visit:

- The university became a statewide institution and changed its name to Missouri State University.
- Recent administrative appointments include the interim president and interim provost.
- The head of the unit is no longer the dean of the COE; the deputy provost serves as the head of the unit.
- Academic departments in the COE were restructured.
- A new online management system, Student Tracking Electronic Portfolio System, was adopted.
- Some teacher education programs have incorporated the Teacher Work Sample.
- MSU and three other institutions formed the Teacher Education Alliance to address the needs of Title I schools in Springfield Public Schools.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

The NCATE visit was a continuing visit in which initial and advanced level programs were reviewed. Missouri State University is located in an NCATE partnership state where national accreditation is voluntary. The partnership agreement provides for a concurrent visit by an NCATE Board of Examiners (BOE) team and a state team appointed by DESE. The two teams work simultaneously; however, the review of each team has a different focus. The NCATE team used NCATE standards to review the unit, while the DESE team used the Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP) to review the unit's programs that lead to certification. There is a state consultant who advises both teams on state requirements, nomenclature, and special circumstances.

The visiting NCATE team at MSU included five BOE members, and the DESE team numbered five members. One observer from the National Education Association (NEA) was a non-voting member of the NCATE team and present throughout the visit. The director of Educator Preparation at the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education served as the state consultant to both teams. Throughout the visit, the chair of the NCATE team and the state consultant regularly met with the COE dean to clarify information, request additional evidence, and discuss the status of the visit. Members from the two teams participated together in the Sunday afternoon overview provided by the institution, a Sunday evening meeting, some of the school visits, most of the scheduled interviews, and a Monday evening meeting. However, the BOE and DESE teams also worked independently because their reviews differed. There were three deviations from the state protocol. There was no state team chair, nor was there a representative of the Department of Higher Education present. The state report is no longer attached to the BOE Report as a Report Addendum.

I.3 Programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning. Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

Five unit programs are offered at the West Plains branch campus, which is located 110 miles southeast of Springfield. They include: BSED in Elementary Education, MSED in Elementary Education, MSED in Educational Administration, EDS in Educational Administration, and MSED in Counseling. Additionally, there are candidates who take their coursework for four of these programs at Crowder College in Neosho. Nevada serves as a satellite of Crowder College where candidates in these same four programs take their coursework. Due to the streamlined accreditation process and the distance between Springfield and these off-campus sites, the team did not visit West Plains, Neosho, or Nevada.

BOE team members interviewed faculty and administrators responsible for programs and services at West Plains. Some interviews occurred face-to-face on the Springfield campus, others were conducted via Skype. Student teachers at West Plains were also interviewed via Skype. Candidates at Neosho and Nevada participated in a two-way video interview.

Recent graduates of the unit's one online program (Special Education VI – Teachers of Visually Impaired Students) were interviewed on campus.

I.4 Unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit. (Character Limit: 3,000)

There were no unusual circumstances that affected the visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

Reflective practice (Dewey, 1933; Schon, 1984) integrated with inquiry and ethics is the lens through which best practice in education is viewed. This "Reflective Practitioner" theme is aligned with the mission statements of both the university and the unit. MSU is Missouri's only public institution with a mission in public affairs, whose purpose is "to develop educated persons." The unit's mission is "to develop the specialized competencies and skills to facilitate, promote, and enhance, with compassion and fairness, the learning and development of all persons."

Members of the unit believe that professional educators are reflective decision makers and inquirers who maintain that all students can learn. This calls for educators to investigate and determine clear ways of characterizing problems and opportunities in order to develop careful, well informed possibilities for action. Evaluating the consequences of action and potential action through the consideration of fairness, equity, and justice (Dewey, 1922, 1933; Elliott, 1991; Freire, 2000; Gardner, 1996; Schon, 1984) completes the decision making process.

The recently revised conceptual framework states:

We believe that professional educators must acquire the knowledge needed to make full informed decisions (Brophy & Good, 1986; National Commission on Teaching, 2003; Shulman, 1986, 1987; Sirotnik & Clark, 1988). They must acquire a balanced foundation of subject matter, professional knowledge, and pedagogical skills allowing them to transform what they know into potent skills for inspiring professional practices, which actively engage all students in the learning process (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Day, 1999; National Commission on Teaching, 2003; Olson & Wyett, 2000; Stipek, 1986). Recognizing that teaching is fundamentally a moral enterprise encompassing both art and science, professional educators must be able to facilitate learning and development through the expression of appropriate dispositions that are learner-centered, ethical, socially and culturally respectful, fair, and promising (Eisner, 2001; Elliott, 1991; Hansen, 2001; Liston & Zeichner, 1987; Moje & Speyer, 2008; Noddings, 2005; Rubin, 1985; Somekh, 1995).

The conceptual framework articulates competencies that reflect the guidelines and expectations of state and national organizations. At the initial level, it is aligned with the Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs that are based on the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium. At the advanced level, the conceptual framework is aligned with the professional standards specific to various disciplines such as those outlined by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council.

The 10 competencies detailed in the conceptual framework include: foundations, subject matter, learning and development, reflective and inquiry skills, technology, professional skills, assessment skills, dispositions, diversity, and collaboration and leadership.

The unit's conceptual framework was originally developed in 1998 and has been reviewed and revised on several occasions over the years. Most recently, the Conceptual Framework Committee focused on statements in the framework regarding inclusiveness and equity while retaining the central theme of "Reflective Practitioner." These amendments were approved by the PEC on April 6, 2011.

The conceptual framework specifically identifies the six dispositions that are systematically assessed throughout MSU's initial teacher preparation programs. Professional educators are:

- Insightful about the challenges and requirements of a democratic society and knowledgeable about, and sensitive to, issues such as equality and human diversity.
- Highly empathic and show positive regard for the potential of all students for academic and personal growth.
- Ethical, caring, and willing to provide assistance to develop each student's individual potential for educational successes.
- Passionate about teaching, intellectually curious, genuinely concerned about the progress and fair treatment of students, and dedicated to inclusive excellence in their own professional development.
- Responsible for creating and maintaining equitable, respectful, tolerant, collaborative, and healthy environments for diverse learners in whatever context they practice.
- Able to engage in self-appraisal and use feedback from students, supervisors, mentors, and peers to improve their practice.

Only three of the 11 advanced programs (two Educational Administration and Reading) provided dispositions data to the team.

The unit's governance attempts to facilitate the realization of the conceptual framework and provide a system for ensuring coherence among curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, and assessment across a candidate's program. For example, in the initial Elementary Education program, candidates' progression from general education studies through academic content courses, professional education courses, field experiences, and student teaching necessitates the integration of all program components. The assessment system is designed to include regular review of program courses and

requirements by a variety of constituencies to ensure that there continues to be coherence among curriculum, instruction, field experiences, and assessment. Several advanced programs, however, do not have sufficient data on candidates' skills and/or dispositions.

III. The Transformation Initiative

III.1 Summary of the Transformation Initiative

Two universities joined Missouri State University (MSU) and the Springfield Public Schools (SPS) to form the Teacher Education Alliance (TEA) and submit a transformation initiative proposal to NCATE in March 2010. The proposal included the following four goals:

1. To support quality teaching and learning within the partner schools of the Teacher Education Alliance.
2. To address the needs of high-poverty (Title 1) schools that partner with TEA professional preparation programs.
3. To contribute to the research base for effective teacher education, teaching, and student learning.
4. To link prior research findings and ongoing TEA research to school practices and to the TEA professional preparation programs.

Three NCATE-accredited institutions - Drury University, Evangel University, and Missouri State University - were initial members of the Teacher Education Alliance in 2009. By the time of the proposal submission, Baptist Bible College, which is not currently accredited by NCATE, became the fourth institution of higher education (IHE) partner in the alliance. The five partners signed a Memorandum of Agreement in March 2010 and continue to meet regularly to design, refine, implement, and evaluate the work of the alliance. They are sharing in the research design and effort with MSU taking the lead because it is larger and has greater resources. They are developing shared databases for placements of TEA candidates and recently participated together in a retreat to develop a handbook for the project.

The initiative began in spring 2009 with selected MSU student teachers assigned to Williams Elementary, Bowerman Elementary, Robberson Elementary, and Reed Middle Schools. Student teachers generally conducted their practicum in the assigned school during the fall semester, followed by student teaching in the spring semester. In addition, they tutored students before, during, and after school and began to participate in professional development activities with their cooperating teachers in SPS-sponsored activities.

Beginning in spring 2009, Evangel placed TEA student teachers in Weller Elementary, and Baptist Bible College placed TEA student teachers in Watkins Elementary.

Elementary teacher candidates at Drury University began their TEA experience in spring 2010 at McGregor Elementary, working with students during and after school to improve math skills. Methods of Teaching Reading candidates worked at Boyd Elementary during the morning reading block as well as after school to help improve reading skills. Drury's TEA candidates are also placed in Pipkin Middle School and Central High School.

III.2 Status of TI Implementation

In a presentation on the transformation initiative at the beginning of the onsite visit, the leaders of the

initiative shared the following refined set of goals for the project:

1. Identify those teacher education candidates that have a passion for working with children of poverty.
2. Improve the preparedness of these teacher education candidates to be effective in high poverty schools.
3. Positively impact student learning in these schools.

In 2011, the TI project expanded into two additional Title I elementary schools, bringing the total number of schools to 11. For the first time, student teachers in these schools were from different universities. In interviews with the student teachers in one of these schools, it was clear that the student teachers collaborated with and supported each other at the school, sharing ideas and university requirements. In addition, they met regularly for professional development activities with the TEA candidates assigned to other Title I schools. The TEA is now exploring the assignment of candidates to math and English classes at the high school level.

Joint professional development activities for student teachers in the TEA project were initiated collaboratively by the four IHEs. Two major informal research studies focused on improving field experiences for practicum candidates and student teachers. Results of the focus groups indicated a need for more preparation in differentiated instruction, classroom management, and the effects of poverty on children. End-of-semester evaluations completed by student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors have been placed in the Student Tracking Electronic Portfolio System (STEPS). A draft joint application form for candidates desiring to be in the TEA project was developed. A dedicated university supervisor has been assigned to the cohort of candidates at each TEA school. Work has begun to identify the skills and dispositions candidates need in order to be successful teachers in Title I schools.

The SPS superintendent, principals in TEA schools, cooperating teachers, student teachers, and graduates from the TEA experience were very enthusiastic about the year-long assignments of candidates in Title I schools. Most of the completers of the program have been hired to teach in Title I schools or are currently substituting in them. Although the results cannot be directly contributed to the TEA, the first two schools with which the TEA began its work met academic yearly progress (AYP) in communications arts and mathematics for the first time last year.

Future foci of the project include: (1) selection criteria of preservice candidates for the practicum and student teaching jointly developed by the partnering IHEs and Springfield schools; (2) student success (impact on learning) in the classroom; (3) support for novice teachers enhanced with additional professional development activities; and (4) study of the success of novice teachers in the first three years of teaching, particularly in Title I schools.

III. 3 Statement about TI Findings

The major research question being explored for this initiative is: What are the conditions and accompanying assessments that must be in place in order for the TEA to demonstrate that a positive transformation of the partner institutions and schools has occurred as a result of the collaboration? A second research question relates to the partnership of four IHEs with a local school district to collaborate in the design and delivery of field experiences and clinical practice in Title I schools. The question being tested is: What evidence is there that the design and workings of a specific teacher education program, as part of the TEA, have contributed to a positive transformation of its teacher education program and one or more partner schools?

In 2011, interviews of candidates (practicum and student teachers) with principals for the TEA project are being piloted in two new TEA Title I elementary schools, Delaware and Holland. Some of the

questions have been based on the needs of the buildings as well as input from representatives of the TEA Board and university supervisors.

The TEA Board conducted a retreat on policies, procedures, and regulations where members jointly determined how to define a quality teacher (knowledge, skills, and dispositions). Pilot findings include a prevalence of high mobility rates in the pilot schools, adjustment issues related to social behaviors required of student teachers, and additional skills needed in classroom management and differentiating instruction to meet the needs of a diverse student population.

A study of graduates who student taught in TEA schools has been initiated to determine their teaching effectiveness during the first three years of their career. Particular emphasis will be given to those hired by a Title I school.

A document agreed upon by all stakeholders has been submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval. It was purposely written in a generic manner regarding human subjects in order to allow the researchers to accommodate an extremely large number of variables. Qualitative data (open-ended survey items) have been collected from TEA candidates and TEA cooperating teachers for AY 2010-11 and will be collected for AY 2011-12. Quantitative data collection is in the beginning stages. Once those data have been analyzed, the next step will be measuring differences in teaching behaviors (TEA and non-TEA) as revealed by the Engagement instrument used by SPS and continued analysis of Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) scores. The pilot is scheduled for review with new possibilities being explored. A review of criteria for cooperating teachers and university supervisors is planned as well as a review of candidate selection criteria. It is anticipated that a 10-year longitudinal study will be required to evaluate all initiative goals and begin to answer the question, "Are we getting better?"

III.4 Recommendations on Further Implementation of the TI

The BOE team makes the following recommendations for consideration by the unit as it moves to the next steps of implementation of the transformation initiative:

1. Expand the involvement of faculty, staff, and other IHEs to assist in research efforts.
2. Pursue additional funding streams to sustain TEA activities.
3. Expand promotion of TEA to increase candidate recruitment, especially early in the programs.
4. Retain a consultant to aid in research design and implementation.
5. Expand the data collection to include students and their families.
6. Explore the question, "Is a 30-hour practicum of sufficient length for a meaningful experience in the semester before student teaching?"
7. Research and document the dynamics of four IHEs collaborating on the delivery of field experiences and clinical practice.

III.5 Next Steps for Reporting to NCATE

Based on the timeline developed by the institution, NCATE will expect annual updates. These updates should include supporting evidence to document the changes the institution is making, as well as answers to the research questions as they continue to develop.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

1.1a Areas for concern

1.1a(1) At the time of the offsite review the BOE was unable to access information regarding whether the 11 advanced programs meet Standard 1.

The unit's responses to the offsite review were provided in the NCATE AIMS system and were reviewed by the BOE prior to the onsite visit. During the onsite visit the BOE conducted interviews with faculty, administrators, staff, employers, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, graduates, and candidates and made additional requests to the unit for more information and data relating to the 11 advanced programs. In addition, the BOE met with the DESE program review team on three occasions to discuss its review of the advanced programs.

The unit provided adequate data and information that indicated the Educational Administration: Principal and Educational Administration: Superintendent/Principal K-12 met Standard 1. The documentation provided by the unit at the time of the onsite visit indicates that the Educational Administration programs for Principal (both elementary and secondary levels) and Superintendent assess content knowledge and content specific pedagogical skills with a variety of assessments (e.g., course assignments, field and clinical evaluations, the School Leaders Licensure Assessment, and surveys of graduates and employers).

Educational Administration candidates clearly have a solid understanding of the content within their specific certification area. They also understand the relationship between content and how to use that knowledge to create a school and district environment that supports student learning. MSU maintains a pass rate on the state assessments for licensure well above the required 80 percent required by NCATE.

With the Reading program maintaining national recognition and the additional information provided during the onsite visit, the BOE team is able to document that only three of the 11 advanced programs meet Standard 1.

1.1a(2) At the time of the offsite review it was unclear how the unit assesses the professional dispositions of initial teacher preparation (ITP) and advanced teacher preparation (ATP) candidates.

Preservice teacher candidates are provided information regarding the unit's expectations for dispositions in EDC 150. Additionally, the unit's Transition Points for initial programs document indicates that at admission all initial teacher preparation (ITP) candidates receive the Disposition Handout and a dispositions contract that they sign. At each of the four transition points prior to program completion, ITP candidates sign a disposition contract as part of successfully moving through the program. The unit has completed an alignment of the dispositions and the Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEPS) and uses the alignment in its analysis of the performance of student teachers. In addition, student teachers also use the unit's disposition checklist to complete a self-evaluation during

their student teaching experience.

The unit was able to provide documentation regarding the assessment of professional dispositions for only three of the 11 advanced programs. The Reading program and the Educational Administration programs for Principals and Superintendents provided ample evidence of both identifying and assessing the candidates' dispositions.

1.1b Evidence to be validated during the Onsite Visit

1.1b(1) Status of state program approval. What are the findings of the state team's review during the onsite visit?

The Missouri DESE team conducted program reviews at the same time the NCATE onsite visit was conducted. The DESE team is recommending that all programs have met state standards; areas for improvement have been cited for the majority of programs.

1.1b(2) Pass rate on all required Praxis II assessments for the following programs:

(a) All middle school subject areas, (b) Agriculture, (c) Speech and Theatre, (d) Technology, (e) Family and Consumer Science, (f) Art, (g) Music Instrumental, (h) Music Vocal, (i) Special Education Visually Impaired, (j) Special Education Mild Moderate, and (k) Special Education SEACT.

A review of pass rates on Praxis II assessments indicates that the unit maintains a summary pass rate on all required content tests well above the NCATE required 80 percent pass rate.

1.1b(3) Response rates for the employer survey, graduate survey, and DESE survey of new teachers. What are the response rates? What is the unit doing to improve the rates?

Data from the 2007-09 program completer follow-up employer survey indicate that nearly half (49%) of the respondents were Satisfied and 40 percent were Highly Satisfied that teachers prepared at MSU demonstrated "...abilities to implement the skills, techniques, and strategies associated with student learning."

The COE dean reported that the 2009-10 follow-up surveys of initial program completers resulted in very low response rates. In an effort to gather the needed information on its graduates, the unit conducted a series of well designed focus groups with program graduates and administrators who supervised the graduates. Twelve focus groups that ranged in size from one to 12 participants were conducted between July and August 2011. A total of 26 graduates and 25 supervisors participated in the groups (n = 51). The groups revealed both strengths and challenges in the following areas: preparation, assessment, diversity, curriculum, technology, and communication. Additionally, the discussions raised some secondary issues that the report indicates merits further exploration. These secondary issues include: (1) the need for expanding and enhancing field experiences, (2) increased participation by university faculty in schools and agencies, (3) mentoring, (4) familiarity of graduates with current practice, (5) specific program challenges, and (6) systematic follow-up.

The 2007-09 survey of graduates from the 11 advanced programs had an extremely low response rate with only eight respondents. The unit did not provide a plan on how to improve the response rate on its survey of graduates of advanced programs. Neither did the unit provide any evidence of a survey of employers of graduates from its advanced programs.

1.1b(4) Evaluations of student teachers by cooperating teachers and university supervisors. What assessment instruments are used? What has the unit learned from these assessments? STEPS and reports

from STEPS were not available to the offsite team.

During the onsite visit, the unit provided ample documentation of its evaluations of student teachers by both the cooperating teacher (CT) and the university supervisor (US). The student teacher is scored by both the CT and US on a three-point scoring system that includes High Level, Satisfactory, and Needs Improvement. The unit provided the data by the CT and the US as well as a table that combined the scores from both. Overall, student teachers maintained a 98.8 percent pass rate on the evaluation, with no observable variance between the scores provided by the CT and those provided by the US.

The unit has developed reports on the final evaluations of student teachers and placed these reports in STEPS. During the onsite visit, the BOE team was able to access the reports. These data are available to faculty and the clinical placement office and appear to be informing the TEA project as well as the ITP programs across the unit.

1.1b(5) Clarification of the cooperative doctoral program with the University of Missouri program. What candidate assessment data are available? What do the data show about candidates and the program?

The cooperative doctoral program with the University of Missouri is not within the purview of the NCATE review. This program is completely under the authority and responsibility of the University of Missouri at Columbia.

1.1b(6) Status of the renewal of national recognition for the following programs: (a) Biology (NSTA), (b) Chemistry (NSTA), (c) Special education: mild to moderate cross categorical (CEC), (d) English/ Language Arts (NCTE), (e) Instructional Media Technology (AECT), (f) Principal (ELCC), (g) Reading specialist (IRA), (h) School library media specialist (ALA), and (i) Superintendent (ELCC).

The unit indicated that the only programs maintaining national recognition are the following: Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Foreign Language, Mathematics, Physical Education (probation), and Reading. The program faculty decided not to submit the other programs for SPA review.

1.1b(7) Assessment of professional dispositions for initial and advanced candidates. What assessments address professional dispositions? How are candidates performing on the disposition assessments?

During the onsite visit, the unit provided extensive documentation regarding the development of policy for the assessment of dispositions for preservice teachers. The documentation included a Dispositions Development Plan that was adopted by the Dispositions Sub-Committee of the B.S. in Education Oversight Committee on March 7, 2008 and by the Professional Education Committee on March 12, 2008. The adopted plan addresses only preservice teachers with no reference in the plan to candidates in advanced programs. See the response to 1.1a(2) above for additional information.

With regard to the professional dispositions of advanced candidates, the unit provided the following statement in its IR Addendum:

ATP programs follow Transition Points that assume dispositions are met as long as the advanced candidate continues to be successful in their education position or program. Practicing professionals receive disposition evaluations as part of their ongoing formative and summative evaluations conducted by the school district. ATP Certification or licensure programs (i.e. Counseling, Ed Administration) use clinical evaluations that include disposition indicators. Disposition reviews are conducted systematically for each advanced candidate at transition points or earlier. If areas of concern are noted, the disposition review process can be activated.

The onsite BOE team was able to locate data and information regarding the Educational Administration

programs for Principals and Superintendents. In addition, the Reading program maintains national recognition and the BOE team was able to review relevant data regarding candidates in the Reading program. There were, however, no data or information on the identification or assessment of professional dispositions for candidates in the other advanced programs.

1.1b(8) Assessment of advanced candidates in the following areas: pedagogy and student learning; content; and school, family, and community contexts.

The unit was able to provide data and information regarding the skills and knowledge of candidates in the Educational Administration programs for Principals and Superintendents and for those in the nationally recognized Reading program. There were, however, no data or information on the skills and knowledge of candidates in the other advanced programs.

1.2 Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

None

1.3 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

Not applicable to this standard

1.4 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.4.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	

1.4.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	

1.4.3 New Areas for Improvement

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates in all of its advanced programs develop and demonstrate the professional dispositions identified by the unit. (Advanced)	Only three of the unit's 11 advanced programs provided documentation regarding the identification, development, or assessment of candidates' professional dispositions. The two Educational Administration programs and the Reading program provided evidence.
The unit does not ensure that candidates in all of its advanced programs are able to create positive environments for student learning and understand and build upon the developmental levels of P-12 students with whom they work; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work. (Advanced)	Only three of the unit's 11 advanced programs provided documentation of candidates' ability to create positive learning environments for student learning. The two Educational Administration programs and the Reading program provided evidence.

1.5 Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Not Met

1.6 Corrections to the Institutional Report Addendum

None

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

2.1a Areas for concern

2.1a(1) It is not clear that the unit disaggregates candidate assessment data when candidates are enrolled in off-campus and distance learning programs.

One initial program, Elementary Education, is offered in its entirety at two off-campus locations – Neosho (Crowder College) and West Plains (MSU branch campus). Two advanced programs, Educational Administration MSED – Principal and Educational Administration Specialist – Superintendent, are offered in their entirety at West Plains. Additionally, cohort on-site programs have been offered in Joplin, Waynesville, and Springfield School District. Candidate assessment data have been disaggregated for these sites.

The Special Education VI program (Teachers of Visually Impaired Students) is offered predominantly online as an alternative certification program. All data collected for this program represent the distance education program as no courses are offered on campus.

2.1a(2) It is not apparent that the unit has taken effective steps to eliminate bias in assessments. Nor is it evident that the unit is working to establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and unit operations at either the initial or advanced level.

The unit takes steps at both the unit and program levels to eliminate sources of bias in performance assessments and also works at both levels to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures. Program faculty review the curriculum to ensure that candidates have opportunities to learn, practice, and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions reflected in course syllabi. The state DESE program review process requires each program to construct a curriculum/standards matrix. Faculty members review the alignment of standards with the conceptual framework outcomes. They review assessments and scoring guides to eliminate vague instructions; poorly worded questions; and vocabulary that is cultural, ethnic, or gender biased.

University supervisors are mentored in the use and application of the practicum and student teaching evaluation forms. Also, each initial candidate is evaluated independently by the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. The comprehensive examinations, theses, and other end-of-program projects are assessed by multiple raters. Among the numerous practices found in the unit to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency, and elimination of bias in its assessment procedures are the following: use of scoring guides, rubrics, and criteria checklists; multiple evaluators of common assessments; training on scoring; review of data to determine if there are differential performances for demographic subgroups; review of key assessments by DESE-approved external examinations; alternative field placements; and inclusion of disability accommodations and a nondiscrimination statement in syllabi.

2.1a(3) Not all programs have clearly defined transition points.

As of academic year 2010-11, all programs have clearly defined transition points. They are available for review on the Teacher Certification website. At quick glance a reviewer sees the requirements at each transition point, the date on which each transition point was met, as well as the dates on which the Teacher Education Contract and Dispositions Checklist were signed. While all initial programs have the same transition points, most advanced programs have the same transition points. Some variations exist at the advanced level due to the distinctiveness of each program.

2.1a(4) It is not clear that decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments at admission into programs, appropriate transition points, and program completion.

At the time of the Offsite Review, some programs were in the process of completing their program review reports. Under New Exhibits, assessment charts for all programs indicated that multiple assessments are used at admission into programs, appropriate transition points, and program completion, thereby providing the unit with data for making decisions. Faculty confirmed during interviews that multiple assessments are used throughout each program.

2.1a(5) It is not clear that faculty have access to candidate assessment data and/or data systems.

At MSU there are multiple data systems available to faculty and staff for reviewing candidate and program assessment data. Institutional Research provides support for data collection, and a research analyst has been assigned 50 percent to the unit to provide historical and current data to assist faculty and program coordinators on candidate and program assessments. Institutional Research responds to program faculty requests and facilitates having "cubes" developed for Argos. Also, personnel are available to assist with STEPS and other assessment reporting.

My Missouri State is the portal that provides faculty and staff access to many data resources including Faculty Services, Faculty Dashboard, and Faculty Grade Assignment. Several initial, advanced, and alternative programs use ePortfolio to collect artifacts and clinical logs. All faculty, both full-time and part-time, have access to the ePortfolio to evaluate candidate progress through checkpoints and/or transition points.

STEPS is an online management system into which candidates in initial, advanced, and alternative programs upload and submit assignments for faculty to evaluate. Candidates can then see their evaluations, and programs are able to both view and create reports to analyze data. STEPS also accommodates candidate action plans that can be monitored for progress toward achieving program goals based on data. SharePoint is yet another management system used by the unit for sharing and maintaining program data. In addition to shared resources, each program has its own protected space to warehouse data and information for program analysis and review. Documents can be uploaded and edited, and programs can find information such as CBASE (College Basic Academic Subjects Examination) scores, Praxis results, and admission data.

Banner is the university-wide database to which deans, department heads, program coordinators, and faculty have access. Transition point records are built from information housed in Banner. "Cubes" are created to facilitate reports such as Students with GPA < 2.5, COE Student Enrollment, and Students Admitted into COE by Date. The transition point monitoring system is embedded in Banner to facilitate accurate individual student progress.

Bear Intelligence is the university resource center for university data and reports. It is available to all

faculty. Samples of reports found in this center include Course Enrollment, Student Enrollment, Faculty/Advisor, End of Semester Grades, and Student Persistence and Success. Bear Intelligence houses the University Fact Book which gives a comprehensive overview of every aspect of the university system. Another university database is Digital Measures where faculty maintain information generally reflected in faculty vitae. The university, its colleges, departments, and programs have the capacity to develop reports about faculty activities in areas such as research and service. Finally, the COE utilizes SurveyMonkey to create graduate and employer follow-up surveys. This resource is also available to all departments, programs, and faculty.

2.1a(6) The unit does not appear to have a remediation system when a candidate does not meet requirements at a transition point.

The unit supports a remediation process to ensure candidates have multiple opportunities to be successful and complete the program. This is evidenced in the Persistence to Graduation Rate which shows an overall mean completion rate exceeding 80 percent for students admitted to an educator preparation program, which far exceeds the graduation rate for the entire university (43% - 54% during the past 10 years). At each transition point in initial, advanced, and alternative programs, if candidates have not earned the required minimum GPA, they work with their advisor and program coordinator to create a remediation plan, which may involve retaking courses. These candidates also need to submit a formal request to the department head/secondary education director/program coordinator to move forward in the program. Professional dispositions are assessed at each transition point. Candidates demonstrating inappropriate dispositions meet with the Disposition Development Team to develop and implement an intervention plan. These candidates may request to move forward in the program while on the plan.

2.1b Evidence to be validated during the Onsite Visit

2.1b(1) Operation of the unit assessment system. How does the unit assessment system work? Who is involved in data collection? How do the web-based portfolio, STEPS, BANNER, and other information technologies work together? How are data compiled, aggregated, disaggregated and analyzed? What summary reports are generated? What assessment data are available on program candidates? How are data shared with faculty? What information technology is used for data collection and analysis at the advanced level?

The assessment system was presented at the orientation session provided by the unit on the first day of the onsite visit. See the response to 2.1a(5) above for additional information.

2.1b(2) The role of the Conceptual Framework Committee. What is the role of this committee? Is the committee involved in evaluating the revised assessment system? In using the data?

Charged by the Professional Education Committee (PEC), the Conceptual Framework Committee is expected to periodically review the language and beliefs outlined in the conceptual framework for a need to change or revise it. Also, this committee is charged with reviewing and revising the assessment system, if needed, and driving data collection to be used for program improvement. The system should reflect current practice with respect to the use of MSU's Electronic Portfolio System, graduate follow-up studies, impact of candidates on the learning and achievement of P-12 students, and other common assessment systems currently required among SPAs.

2.1b(3) Involvement of school partners in the evaluation and refinement of the unit's assessment system. Who is involved? How are they involved? What data are shared with P-12 partners?

School partners serve on the PEC, the committee that hears reports from the Conceptual Framework Committee. Because the latter committee is responsible for revising the assessment system, school partners participate in the discussions about revisions. Several advisory boards include P-12 representatives; they have the opportunity to review candidate performance data presented at board meetings.

2.1b(4) Samples of unit assessments and scoring rubrics. How are they aligned with the conceptual framework?

Matrices indicate the alignment of standards, program assessments, and scoring rubrics. Unit assessments are absent.

2.1b(5) The unit's records of formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution. Where are they housed?

The dean of the College of Education indicated that records of formal candidate complaints emanating from educator preparation programs offered by the COE are housed in his office. Deans in the other five colleges that house teacher education programs receive formal complaints from candidates enrolled in their respective programs.

2.1b(6) Changes that have occurred as a result of data analysis. What are the changes? What data led to the changes?

A diversity course (EDC 345) was added to the initial program while diversity strands were incorporated into a variety of courses. Candidates have been placed in schools identified as having diverse student bodies (free and reduced lunch, Title I schools). Initial candidates are required to earn a passing score on the appropriate Praxis II exam prior to student teaching.

2.1b(7) Process of testing the consistency, accuracy, fairness, and bias of assessments. How is the unit ensuring that assessments at both the initial and advanced levels are meeting these criteria?

See the response to 2.1a(2) above for information.

2.1b(8) Clarification of the use of electronic portfolio. What programs are using the electronic portfolio? How are the data compiled and used?

Although the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education no longer requires electronic portfolios, several initial, advanced, and alternative programs at MSU continue to use ePortfolio to collect artifacts and clinical logs. Faculty access the electronic portfolio to evaluate candidate progress through checkpoints.

2.2 Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

Substantive changes leading to improvements in the assessment system have occurred since the last visit. Although a web-based portfolio system was in place in 2003, it was not as comprehensive as it currently is. Features have been added over the years to include the collection of data on the requirement for all candidates at both the initial and advanced levels to have a diverse field/clinical experience. Another new component of the assessment system is the requirement for all initial candidates to earn a passing score on the appropriate Praxis II exam prior to student teaching.

Two committees have become central to the assessment system: the Conceptual Framework Committee and the Program Review and Accreditation Committee. Charged by the Professional Education Committee (PEC), the Conceptual Framework Committee is expected to periodically review the language and beliefs outlined in the conceptual framework for a need to change or revise it. Also, this committee is charged with reviewing and revising the assessment system, if needed, and driving data collection to be used for program improvement. The system should reflect current practice with respect to the use of MSU's Electronic Portfolio System, graduate follow-up studies, impact of candidates on the learning and achievement of P-12 students, and other common assessment systems currently required among SPAs.

Similarly, the Program Review and Accreditation Committee was charged by the PEC to develop a process for monitoring the progress of all PEU programs in the collection of data needed for the successful completion of an external review tied to SPAs. Also, the committee was charged to ensure that the additional documentation required by DESE as part of the MoSTEP review process is reflected in the work completed by unit programs. For example, a state requirement is the development of MoSTEP matrices.

Work on the design of the assessment system continued in order to measure candidate growth over time while in the teacher education program and beyond. Ultimately, the purpose of the assessment system is to measure the influence on student learning in the classroom. A three-tiered benchmark approach, a developmental framework, guided the creation of assessments and scoring guides. Through the three tiers an initial candidate's ability to plan, implement, analyze, and revise an instructional lesson is formatively assessed. In the first tier candidates develop a lesson plan based on best practice in ELE 302 or SEC 302. The second tier occurs during the candidates' methods course with limited exposure in the classroom to implement the plan. The third tier, student teaching, is when candidates are evaluated on their ability to influence student learning by the implementation of a unit/lesson plan based on the students' existing knowledge, assessment of the students' progress, and analysis of the data and revisions of instruction. The summative student teaching form was revised in September 2006 to include a narrative section for the supervisor to describe the candidate's ability to influence student learning and a rating section based on NCATE descriptors. The methodology includes a scoring guide with common benchmarks at each tier. Also, at each tier the level of evaluating the candidate's knowledge, skills, and overall performance becomes more sophisticated.

The assessment plan was revised in 2006-07 and approved by the PEC in November 2007. Programs with SPAs have implemented the collection of data according to the structure provided in the SPA report. Programs without SPAs were encouraged to adopt the same or similar structure to assess, collect, and review program data.

The assessment plan was again reviewed during 2007-08. The unit called upon a consultant to help establish the need for changes in the unit's programs. Thus, major emphases for 2008-09 included writing SPA reports, focusing on assessments, fine-tuning rubrics, collecting data, and moving to a new management system that was developed at California State University, Chico – STEPS. The STEPS system was considered in part to provide additional support that could not be handled by the newly implemented BANNER system. Assessment system revisions continued with the incorporation of transition points as well as revising or developing six to eight program assessments for each program by the end of 2010-11.

Some teacher education programs in the unit have incorporated the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) as a program requirement. Programs have been encouraged to review and analyze the results of the six to eight assessments and make recommendations for program improvement at least annually, including utilization of advisory committees for programs. Still, a majority of the programs continue to have a

checkpoint system involving the ePortfolio and not the TWS. Some programs, however, have a blended approach of both as they transition to the TWS.

The STEPS management system has been able to disaggregate data. It continues to add programs across the years. By 2014 most of the programs will be on the system. In the meantime, programs not in the system maintain their information on office computers. The BANNER system continues to be expanded to meet the COE's needs with a pilot of the transition points studied and placed in the system for the undergraduate programs to track each student. With additional expansion of the system in future years, all programs' transition points will be tracked for candidates.

2.3 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

Not applicable to this standard

2.4 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.4.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	

2.4.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	

2.4.3 New Areas for Improvement

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not have an assessment system in place to assess unit operations and candidate performance at the unit level. (Initial and Advanced)	Candidate performance is assessed at the program level; however, candidate performance on common assessments is not aggregated at the unit level. Aggregated unit operations data were not available.

2.5 Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

2.6 Corrections to the Institutional Report Addendum

None

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

3.1a Areas for concern

No areas for concern were cited in the Offsite Report.

3.1b Evidence to be validated during the Onsite Visit

3.1b(1) Clarification on the inclusion of Section 302 into all secondary programs. What are these requirements?

SEC 302 - General Methods of Instruction in Middle and Secondary Schools contains a 30-hour field experience required at Greenwood Lab School or other middle or secondary schools. The first portfolio check is completed in the course. Candidates are required to pass CBASE to progress to remaining program coursework. The unit is making a transition from SEC 300 and 301 to SEC 302.

3.1b(2) Implementation dates for the TEA Transformation Initiative proposals. Why are the same dates used throughout the proposal? How will the TI expand to other schools and impact more candidates? How will the TI work inform other programs?

The Implementation Plan submitted with the proposal contained typographic errors. The research plan indicates that data from each year will be analyzed the following academic year. Data will include: (1) student attendance measured by percentage of attendance for participating schools, (2) student behavior measured by number of incidents reported, and (3) student achievement measured by MAP (Missouri Assessment Program). Beginning of Year (BOY), Middle of Year (MOY), and End of Year (EOY) data will be analyzed to measure growth.

See Section III of this report, The Transformation Initiative, for additional information.

3.1b(3) Structures for master's and doctoral program fieldwork. What are the requirements for field experiences, practica, and internships at the advanced levels?

No field experiences are required in the MSED Secondary, Early Childhood, Elementary Education (non-certification), and Technology programs for licensed teachers. All candidates are current practitioners. The MSED in Reading program brings P-12 students to campus to interact with candidates. Tutoring is also required of candidates in the Literacy Institute. The experience is supervised by the faculty member teaching the course, and candidates are debriefed immediately after the tutoring sessions. The Educational Technology program has an optional field experience.

Programs for other school professionals do require fieldwork. The Library Media Specialist certification program requires a 40-hour service learning experience and a practicum. Graduate certificates in Orientation and Mobility, and Autism Spectrum Disorders require clinical experiences as well as course-embedded practica. Candidates in the Counseling program complete field experiences at the secondary and elementary levels, a 30-hour shadowing experience, and an internship in a school and community agency (96-hour lab) where candidates act as assistant counselors. Fieldwork is supervised by the faculty member teaching the course and a licensed counselor. The Special Education Alternative Certification Training program requires a minimum of two practica (Learning and Behavioral Disorders and Developmental Disabilities and Other Health Impairments) and a clinical experience. Additional field experiences are embedded in coursework. No evidence was found concerning candidate performance in field experiences and clinical practice for these programs.

The Educational Administration (EAD) - Principal candidates complete field study and internships in a local school and related agencies, supervised by the faculty member teaching the course and the building

administrator. The internship is a continuous field experience that includes a minimum of 240 hours working in clinical experiences at school sites. The skill field-based experience includes the following: 20 hours at each school area where the candidate is not currently working, 20 hours working with special needs children, establishing school goals that will positively affect the school where the candidate works, identifying and working with community agencies, working with colleagues on simulations, working one-on-one with special needs children, and many other activities embedded within the EAD curriculum. Candidates are required to develop plans of action including the problem, the goal, objectives, expected outcomes, and artifacts that will be collected. Candidates validate their work by keeping journals, logs, and reflections. The internship is a partnership with clinical supervisors, university professors, and the candidates.

The skill field-based portfolio assessment for the principal preparation program includes the courses taught in educational administration during the first three semesters of the candidate's program. The assessment incorporates all ELCC (Educational Leadership Constituents Council) Standards. This is based on the educational administration course strands and is also tied to state standards (MoSTEP). The data analysis indicates an "N" range from 25 to 106. The analysis is reflective of the standards. The mean score is 2.5 on a 3-point scale, with a low of 2.3 and a high of 2.6. The percentage of candidates earning "1" ranged from four percent to six percent. The candidates who scored "2" ranged from 30 percent to 52 percent. The candidates who scored "3" ranged from 43 percent to 66 percent. The mean score of 2.5 reflects that the bulk of candidates are functioning in the 2-3 range. There is evidence during the early part of the program that up to six percent of the candidates identify in the "1" range. Individual growth plans are developed by the candidates and department members to ensure that a minimum criterion is met. According to the EAD program report, results indicate there has been no general trend in the last nine years.

The EAD Educational Specialist candidates complete field study and internships in a local school and related agencies, supervised by the faculty member teaching the course and the district administrator. The internship is a continuous field experience that includes a minimum of 240 hours working at a district site. The skill field-based experience includes the following: 20 hours at each school area where the candidate is not currently working, 20 hours working with special needs children, establishing school goals that will positively affect the school where the candidate works, identifying and working with community agencies, working with colleagues on simulations, working one-on-one with special needs children, and many other activities embedded within the EAD curriculum. Candidates are required to develop plans of action including the problem, the goal, objectives, expected outcomes, and artifacts that will be collected. Candidates validate their work by keeping journals, logs, and reflections. The internship is a partnership with clinical supervisors, university professors, and the candidates.

The skill field-based portfolio assessment for the Educational Specialist program includes the educational administration courses taught throughout the candidate's entire program. The assessment incorporates all ELCC Standards. This is based on the educational administration course strands and is also tied to the MoSTEP Standards. The data analysis indicates an "N" range from eight to 26. The analysis is reflective of the standards. The mean score is 2.9, with a low of 2.8 and a high of 3.0. There were no candidates scoring "1." The candidates who scored "2" ranged from zero percent to 15 percent. The candidates who scored "3" ranged from 85 percent to 100 percent. The mean score of 2.9 reflects that the bulk of candidates are functioning in the 2-3 range. According to the EAD program report, results indicate there has been no general trend in the last nine years.

3.1b(4) Mechanisms to ensure diversity placements for all candidates in advanced programs. What tracking system is used by the unit? Do all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice with students from diverse groups?

Field experiences and clinical practice at the advanced level are the purview of program coordinators and faculty. No evidence was found documenting the tracking of diverse field placements.

3.1b(5) Qualifications for advanced candidates mentors/supervisors. What are the expected qualifications? How does the unit ensure that the mentors/supervisors meet the qualifications?

Field experiences and internships/clinical practice are supervised by the faculty member teaching the course and the building or district administrator as appropriate for the program. Expectations and qualifications are congruent with initial programs. The site administrator is required to have completed a minimum of three years experience at the building or district level.

3.1b(6) TEA candidate data for the three critical periods: beginning of practicum, between the practicum and student teaching, and completion of student teaching. What data exist? How are the data being used?

Research on the Teacher Education Alliance (TEA) is ongoing. Quantitative data collection is in the early stages. MSU has offered to hire a person for Springfield Public School (SPS) to mine data from the SPS database.

3.1b(7) Data that support the quality of the traditional, Teaching Academy, and TEA candidate competencies. What comparative data are being collected? What is the unit learning from these data? How are the data being used to improve programs?

Qualitative data have been collected and a preliminary analysis has been done as evidenced by the two reports resulting from TEA candidate focus group interviews. To date, no comparative data have been collected. This activity is part of the research design's future projects.

3.2 Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

In 2004, new field experiences involving Hispanic populations, Title I schools (for high level of diversity), and the Good Samaritan Boys Ranch (for socioeconomic, race/ethnicity, exceptionalities diversity) were added to programs. The Teaching Academy (2008), one of the unit's three student teaching models that features one 16-week placement, expanded to nine schools. Up to 10 student teachers were placed in one building. Weekly seminars and organized program assessment supported the placements.

Also in 2008, discussions began with Springfield School District, Baptist Bible College, Drury University, and Evangel University to form a partnership to offer candidates opportunities to fulfill their field experiences in settings with students from diverse populations. As a result, the Teacher Education Alliance (TEA) pilot began in spring 2009 in selected Title I schools. See Section III of this report, The Transformation Initiative, for additional information.

3.3 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

See Section III of this report, The Transformation Initiative, for information.

3.4 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.4.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

AFI	AFI Rationale

No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	
---	--

3.4.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	

3.4.3 New Areas for Improvement

AFI	AFI Rationale
Field experiences are not required in all advanced programs. (Advanced)	The MSED programs in Secondary Education, Early Childhood, Elementary Education (non-certification), and Technology Education do not require field experiences.

3.5 Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report Addendum

None

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

4.1a Areas for concern

It was noted in the Offsite Report that previous AFIs would need to be reviewed during the onsite visit to determine whether they had been corrected.

4.1b Evidence to be validated during the Onsite Visit

4.1b(1) Candidates' knowledge about diversity and multicultural issues. How are candidates learning about diversity? What does a review of syllabi indicate? What assessment data demonstrate candidates' ability to connect lessons, instructions, or services to students' experiences and cultures? How is the development of proficiencies assessed? What is the unit learning from the assessment data?

The unit failed to provide data indicating candidates' knowledge about diversity and multicultural issues. A new course, EDC 345 - Introduction to Multicultural Education and Diversity, will be required of

initial level candidates in Elementary and Early Childhood Education beginning in spring 2012. According to faculty interviews, Secondary programs and other programs at the initial level infuse content about diversity throughout the curricula. The Counseling program includes a required course in multicultural education, COU 714 - Diversity and Multicultural Issues in Counseling. RDG 560/660 - Diversity Issues in Literacy and Content Area Classes is required for all MSED Reading candidates. Other advanced level programs did not identify similar courses.

4.1b(2) Samples of teacher work samples. What data indicate that candidates can incorporate multiple perspectives in the subject matter being taught or services being provided?

The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is not required by all programs. However, those Teacher Work Samples that were completed and available showed that candidates analyze pretest data for learners and plan to accommodate individual differences.

4.1b(3) Data that indicate candidates can work effectively with English language learners. How are candidates learning about English language learners and developing their ability to help ELLs learn?

The unit failed to present data to show that candidates at the initial or advanced level work effectively with linguistically diverse learners.

4.1b(4) Diversity requirements for secondary candidates. Do all candidates take Sec 302? How does the unit ensure that secondary candidates are developing proficiencies related to diversity?

There is a lack of aggregated data indicating candidates' knowledge about diversity and multicultural issues including those in Secondary Education. A review of syllabi in Secondary Education courses shows that issues of diversity are addressed in some courses. The unit does not attempt to assess dispositions related to diversity of candidates in advanced teacher education programs not leading to certification according to written exhibits submitted during the onsite visit and faculty interviews.

4.1b(5) Data about whether candidates in all programs are interacting with diverse faculty, especially when candidates are participating in distance learning programs. How diverse are cooperating teachers and internship supervisors with whom candidates interact? What good faith efforts has the unit undertaken to increase or maintain faculty diversity in the PEU?

Interviews with faculty and candidates indicated that a majority of candidates in initial and advanced level programs do not have an opportunity to interact with diverse faculty. At the initial level, Elementary and Early Childhood candidates now, through EDC 345, have at least one course with a faculty member from an underrepresented group, but candidates in other programs are not assured the opportunity to work with faculty from diverse groups.

The institution has initiated efforts to recruit diverse faculty in the unit. A new position titled vice president for Diversity and Inclusion was filled by an African American male approximately six weeks preceding the onsite visit. The Office for Institutional Equity and Compliance updated hiring guidelines, and funds were secured to recruit diverse faculty. In 2008, a Hispanic female was hired to fill the College of Education Endowed Professorship of Hispanic Assimilation. From 2003 through 2008, five full-time faculty members from underrepresented groups were hired by the College of Education. Table 8 in the exhibits shows 10 faculty members from underrepresented groups. Nevertheless, interviews and exhibit reviews do not indicate that the majority of candidates interact with faculty from at least two ethnic/racial groups.

4.1b(6) Faculty's knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse

student populations, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. What experiences have faculty had with students from diverse groups?

Information on faculty experiences in working with students from diverse groups was not provided.

4.1b(7) Disaggregated data on the diversity of the faculty on the main campus and in the off-campus programs. Are the faculty at off-campus sites included in the data presented? How diverse are the faculty at off-campus sites?

No disaggregated data on faculty diversity in off-campus sites were available.

4.1b(8) Support for candidates from diverse groups. How do candidates from diverse groups perceive their voices are valued and they are supported by the unit and its faculty?

Of the large number of candidates interviewed by the visiting team, only three were non-White. In an interview with persons in the university division for diversity, a statement was made that a survey of university students revealed that candidates of color in education did not feel supported by the unit and institution.

4.1b(9) Diversity of candidates. What are candidates' perceptions of their opportunities to interact with peers from diverse groups? What are the comparative data of candidate diversity with the diversity of the geographic region served by the university?

The composition of initial level candidates in teacher education is reported to be 89.6 percent White compared to the total undergraduate student count showing 92 percent White, approximating 2000 U.S. Census Data for Springfield, Missouri, the location of the institution. At the time of the last visit in fall 2004, the initial level candidate group was 93.3 percent White. Interviews indicate that the surrounding area population has become somewhat more diverse since 2000. The composition of advanced level candidates in Table 8 shows Whites make up 90.8 percent of the total in fall 2011, down from 94.2 percent in fall 2004. These data show that diversity of candidates has improved slightly at the initial and advanced levels, yet several candidates at both levels reported during the onsite visit that they had few or no classes with peers of color.

4.1b(10) Diversity of P-12 students in the schools in which candidates do their field work and student teaching. How diverse are the students by ethnic, racial, ELL, special education, and other diverse groups? What evidence does the unit have to show that candidates are actually learning how to teach effectively all children? How does the unit ensure that candidates are having field experiences with students from diverse groups?

The unit did not provide data to show that all initial level and advanced level candidates work with or have an opportunity to work with P-12 students from diverse groups. Not all programs utilize the Office of Field Experiences, and several programs including some Secondary Education programs, Educational Administration, and Counseling attempt to place and monitor their own candidates regarding field and clinical experiences. While those programs may be successful in providing experiences in diverse settings for their candidates, the data were not available to ensure that all candidates have experiences with diverse learners. In addition, advanced teacher education programs that do not result in additional certification do not require practica and do not attempt to document or monitor experiences with diverse learners. Initial level candidates in Elementary and Early Childhood Education and in the MAT program must work in diverse settings, and field and clinical experiences are monitored by the Office of Field Experiences to include diverse settings.

4.2 Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

See 4.3 below for information.

4.3 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

The Transformation Initiative (TI) involves initial level candidates in the Elementary and Early Childhood programs who spend 30 hours in the semester before student teaching in a school designated as a high poverty school, meaning that a significant portion of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch. The candidates also complete the student teaching semester in the same school, often with the same cooperating teacher. The TI provides candidates with increased experiences with students from diverse groups, particularly those of poverty, and increased opportunities to demonstrate diversity proficiencies.

4.4 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.4.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	

4.4.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

AFI	AFI Rationale
Candidates have limited opportunities to work with diverse peers. (Initial and Advanced)	Insufficient evidence was available to show that candidates have opportunities to work with diverse peers.
The unit does not ensure that all candidates work with diverse faculty. (Initial and Advanced)	No evidence was presented that demonstrated all candidates work with diverse faculty.
The unit does not ensure that all candidates other than initial level candidates in elementary, early childhood education, and MAT programs have field experiences or clinical practice in diverse settings. (Initial and Advanced)	Data were not presented to show that all candidates other than those initial level candidates in Elementary, Early Childhood, and MAT programs have field experiences and clinical practice in settings with diverse P-12 learners.

4.4.3 New Areas for Improvement

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not evaluate candidate proficiencies related to diversity. (Initial and Advanced)	Insufficient aggregated and disaggregated data were available to show that candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity are assessed at the initial and advanced levels for all programs.

4.5 Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Met
Advanced Preparation	Not Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report Addendum

None

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

5.1a Areas for concern

No areas for concern were cited in the Offsite Report.

5.1b Evidence to be validated during the Onsite Visit

5.1b(1) Clarification of the number and composition of faculty in the PEU. How many tenured faculty are in the PEU? What is the diversity of the tenured/tenure track faculty in the PEU? How many full-time and part-time faculty are in the PEU? How many faculty are adjunct? What are the differences among instructor, adjunct faculty, adjunct professor, professional staff, staff, and faculty (some terms are not defined in Faculty Handbook)? Who are the clinical faculty? How many of them are there?

The PEU provided three exhibits that identify the unit's faculty. They differed in the number of PEU faculty reported: Table 1 indicated 287, Table 8 indicated 171, and Table 11 indicated 231. The PEU also provided various terms to identify faculty; some terms were not identified in the Faculty Handbook. A review of Table 11 indicates that the majority of PEU faculty members hold earned doctorate degrees, with others having at least a master's degree, expertise in their area, or retired from their expert field. Table 11 also indicates that the majority of faculty members are tenured or on the tenure track. Additionally, it provides evidence on rank and employment status of PEU faculty. Table 8 shows that the diversity of faculty in the PEU is relatively consistent with that of the university. The data are disaggregated by faculty teaching in the initial programs, advanced programs, and both initial and advanced programs. Based on the onsite information requested to clarify the number of faculty in the PEU, Table 8 was provided as evidence of the actual number of faculty. The difference among the numbers found on the three exhibits cited above was not clarified.

5.1b(2) Expectations of faculty. What are the expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service at all ranks?

The PEU expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service are determined by each department. The Faculty Handbook; Reading, Foundations, and Technology Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures; Child Education and Family Studies Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures; and Counseling, Educational Leadership, and Special Education Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures define and outline the expectations, policies, and procedures for evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service for faculty within the unit and in each department. These exhibits provide guidelines for successful verification of productivity relative to teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion at each of the rank levels as well as tenure. Also, these exhibits indicate that annual progress and feedback are provided through the annual faculty reports with the potential for compensation. Although evidence of faculty expectations was provided for faculty within the College of Education, no evidence regarding faculty expectations in the Secondary Education programs within the other academic colleges was provided.

The exhibit on Evaluation of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators includes a draft policy of guidelines for

unit administrators to follow when addressing employee conduct that is in violation of "appropriate standards." This policy offers general guidelines to address allegations of "minor unprofessional faculty conduct and the imposition of minor sanctions." The policy allows for one of the three-tiered disciplinary actions: (1) Formal Warning, (2) Letter of Reprimand, and (3) Required Formal Apology.

The exhibit Greenwood Laboratory School Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures details expectations of faculty at Greenwood Laboratory School for teaching, scholarship, and service. There are various weighed options for the three areas for the purpose of evaluation, promotion, and tenure. These options allow faculty members to focus the greatest weight in another area as long as their main emphasis is on teaching. The policies, procedures, and processes are similar in structure to those in the departments within the College of Education. During the onsite visit interview with the director of the Greenwood Laboratory School, evidence was provided that indicated teachers at the school have the option to be evaluated based on the Greenwood Laboratory School Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures or the university's faculty evaluation policies and procedures. The director reported that the number of faculty members selecting the university's faculty evaluation policies and procedures over the years has declined.

Onsite interviews with student teachers revealed that cooperating teachers are evaluated by the candidates during student teaching. Some candidates interviewed were not aware of the evaluation process because they had not yet been asked to complete that evaluation. Other candidates demonstrated knowledge and awareness of the evaluation process of cooperating teachers.

5.1b(3) Faculty vitae. What are the faculty's qualifications to teach the courses assigned?

Table 11 – Faculty Qualification Summary and faculty vitae offers evidence of faculty credentials. The table specifies each faculty member's highest degree, academic area of degree, rank, tenure status, scholarship, and P-12 experience. The table also shows academic and administrative assignments. The vitae verify the educational and experiential qualifications of the faculty. Therefore, evidence provided by the unit verified and supported the qualifications of the faculty to teach the courses assigned. Interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers, and faculty members also indicated that faculty members demonstrate qualifications required to teach the assigned courses.

5.1b(4) Faculty workload. What are the workload policies? What are the actual faculty workloads?

The College of Education Policies and Procedures Handbook specifies that the unit follows the university's policies concerning faculty workload as described in the Faculty Handbook. Ranked faculty members (tenured and untenured) are assigned nine hours of teaching each semester and three hours of research provided they present an established research agenda. Service is an expectation in their workload. Faculty members without a research agenda are assigned 12 hours of teaching each semester. These faculty members are expected to have some documented scholarly activity and service. Reassigned time is possible for designated activities such as grants and program coordination. Evidence verified that faculty workloads are within the parameters of the Faculty Handbook.

Verification of faculty workloads for the Departments of Childhood Education and Family Studies; Counseling, Leadership, and Special Education; and Reading, Foundations, and Technology was found in the COE Faculty Workload and Production exhibits. The table indicates faculty workload and reassignment load for faculty within those departments. Evidence of faculty workloads was provided for the faculty within the College of Education but not for faculty in the Secondary Education programs housed within the other academic colleges.

5.1b(5) Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation. How are the faculty evaluation data

used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service? How are faculty members performing on this evaluation? How are annual report data used? What support does the unit provide faculty members to ensure their success? How are faculty members performing on faculty evaluation? What changes based on the evaluations have resulted?

The PEU evaluation policies and procedures are consistent and aligned with the university evaluation policies and procedures as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The unit policies reflect the mission, professional values, long-range vision/plan, common standards, and fundamental priorities of the College of Education. The Evaluation of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators; Reading, Foundations, and Technology Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures; Child Education and Family Studies Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures; Counseling, Educational Leadership, and Special Education Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures; and Greenwood Laboratory School Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures outline the expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for faculty within the unit and in each department represented in the College of Education. These exhibits outline the procedure for developing and implementing the departmental evaluation policies and procedures, as well as provide examples of artifacts that would serve as evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service. The exhibits also outline the unit's understanding of the evaluation process as a performance-based evaluation designed to empower, enhance, and support continuous professional growth of its faculty. The faculty member's evaluation is directly connected to unit, college, and university rewards and professional recognition systems.

The Evaluation of Faculty, Staff, and Administration exhibits indicate that each department or the unit will explicitly define remediation for performance that is judged to be below minimum expectations for two consecutive years. The evaluation policy also provides for formal warnings, letters of reprimands, and formal apologies within the evaluation remediation process. "It is expected that all Academic Leaders take the appropriate steps immediately to address any faculty concern in a professional manner after consideration of all available information" and that the system does not violate the university policies on discrimination and harassment. Evidence of faculty evaluation policies and procedures was provided for faculty within the College of Education, but was not available for Secondary Education programs within the other academic colleges. No evidence was found on how the evaluation results are used by the PEU.

5.1b(6) Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results. What opportunities for professional development are provided by the PEU? How many faculty members participate in professional development activities? How does the unit assess the needs of faculty?

The Professional Development of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators exhibit outlines the expectations, policies, procedures, and practices for professional development. Interviews of candidates, supervising teachers, cooperating teachers, and faculty verified that professional development opportunities are provided by the PEU. Faculty members participated in professional development activities at the college, university, school district, local, state, regional, and national levels as indicated by faculty vitae, Table 11, and onsite interviews. Candidates also participated in professional development at the school, school district, and university levels. Some candidates indicated that professional development opportunities were also available and provided through professional organizations and conferences. Supervising teachers are provided professional development by their respective school districts and the PEU.

5.1b(7) Clarification of the unit's definition of service. Does service include supervision? Is participation in collaborations with school districts, agencies, and other higher education institutions viewed as service?

The Evaluation of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators; Reading, Foundations, and Technology Faculty

Evaluation Policies and Procedures; Child Education and Family Studies Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures; Counseling, Educational Leadership, and Special Education Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures; and Greenwood Laboratory School Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures define service. Evidence of service was provided for faculty in the College of Education but not for faculty in the Secondary Education programs housed within the other academic colleges

5.2 Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

None

5.3 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

Not applicable to this standard

5.4 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.4.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	

5.4.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	

5.4.3 New Areas for Improvement

AFI	AFI Rationale

5.5 Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

5.6 Corrections to the Institutional Report Addendum

None

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

6.1a Areas for concern

6.1a(1) It is not clear that the unit effectively manages or coordinates all programs so that its candidates are prepared to meet standards.

All governance policies followed at the Springfield campus are applied at the West Plains branch campus. As such, the Child and Family Development bachelor's program on the Springfield campus is directly responsible for the Child and Family Development bachelor's program at West Plains. Just this fall elementary education faculty implemented a pilot program with a rural education emphasis for three cohorts at West Plains. Assessment data gathered over the next two years will be used to make a decision regarding the future of the pilot. During interviews, the team learned that faculty are selected and supervised by the departments offering programs at West Plains in the same way faculty are selected and supervised on the Springfield campus. Some MSU faculty travel to West Plains to teach classes at the branch campus.

During interviews, the team learned that faculty in some programs had not shared data and discussed program outcomes. When faculty in the BSED programs conducted an internal program review, they focused on the report format rather than program outcomes. It is not clear that the current governance structure provides for the effective monitoring of the implementation of the various program assessment plans or the regular reporting of candidate performance relative to each program's defined outcomes.

6.1a(2) It is not clear that the unit ensures that all candidates have access to student services such as advising.

All education candidates have access to advising. The head of the unit explained that as of this fall advisement for postbaccalaureate candidates was moved from the COE Professional Advisement Center to program faculty and the program director. All candidates in advanced programs are advised by program faculty as well. Additionally, at the university level candidates can avail themselves of services provided by the Academic Advisement Center and the Counseling and Testing Center.

6.1a(3) The budget does not appear to be comparable to that of other units on campus with clinical components.

An exhibit entitled Revised – Teacher Education Expenditures vs. Total Institutional Expenditures by College for fiscal year 2011 indicates that the College of Education's per student expenditure was \$4,835 while the College of Health and Human Services' per student expenditure was \$4,661. The nursing and social work programs located in the College of Health and Human Services have clinical components comparable to those in educator preparation programs.

6.1a(4) It is not clear that campus and school facilities adequately support candidates in meeting standards.

Facilities at the Springfield campus and the P-12 schools affiliated with the MSU educator preparation programs support candidates in meeting standards. Exhibits and interviews confirmed that the West Plains facilities, too, adequately support candidates in meeting standards. According to faculty, classrooms are equipped with technology that is superior to the technology found in classrooms on the Springfield campus. Many of the required field experiences are located in West Plains area school districts. Links to West Plains RV-11 Schools and Willow Springs School District were provided to the team. The website for both school districts revealed that MSU teacher candidates are placed in facilities comparable to those in which candidates at the Springfield campus are placed.

Unlike the facilities at West Plains, those at Crowder College do not adequately support candidates in meeting standards. Teacher candidates reported that they do not have regular access to computer labs. Nor are they able to log into university resources on a regular basis. A similar situation exists at Nevada, where Crowder has a satellite campus.

6.1b Evidence to be validated during the Onsite Visit

6.1b(1) The roles of the dean and the head of the unit. How is the separation of the two positions working?

The deputy provost now serves as the head of the unit. It is unknown who will replace the deputy provost when he retires at the end of the fall semester. As head of the unit, he serves in an advisory capacity to the Professional Education Committee (PEC) and serves on the committee as an ex-officio member. The director of BSED programs directly reports to the head of the unit. The PEU budget has been removed from the COE budget. It is managed by the head of the unit.

Neither the dean of the College of Education nor the deans of the other five colleges where teacher education programs reside are members of PEC. All deans serve on the Academic Leadership Council (ALC) chaired by the provost. The deputy provost (head of the unit) also holds membership on the council. ALC agendas do include PEU items.

6.1b(2) The West Plains branch campus. Who coordinates the unit's programs at this site? Who teaches classes there? Who places and supervises student teachers? Do candidates have access to a curriculum resource center?

All governance policies followed at the Springfield campus are applied at the West Plains branch campus. As such, the Child and Family Development bachelor's program on the Springfield campus is directly responsible for the Child and Family Development bachelor's program at West Plains. Similarly, the Educational Student Services Office on the Springfield campus makes placements for student teachers at the West Plains campus. During interviews, the team learned that faculty are selected and supervised by the departments offering programs at West Plains in the same way faculty are selected and supervised on the Springfield campus. Some MSU faculty travel to West Plains to teach classes at the branch campus. Per the dean of the library, there is a small curriculum resource center at West Plains. Candidates at the branch campus are able to access materials from the curriculum resource center on the main campus as well; delivery of materials to West Plains may take two days.

6.1b(3) Strategic plans. How do the most recent PEU, COE, and department strategic plans align and complement each other?

Members of the PEC described the strategic planning process at MSU. Their involvement in planning within their respective departments and colleges ensures that there is alignment of PEU, college, and department strategic plans. Currently, changes are being made at the university level. Once the MSU strategic plan is finalized, the PEU, college, and department strategic plans will be revisited.

6.1b(4) Comparison of education, nursing, and social work budgets. What do the budgets for the previous two to three years show? What are the per student expenditures across the three programs? What are the plans to continue to ensure comparability? How do COE faculty salaries compare to those of faculty in nursing and social work?

An exhibit entitled Revised – Teacher Education Expenditures vs. Total Institutional Expenditures by College for fiscal year 2011 indicates that the College of Education's per student expenditure was \$4,835

while the College of Health and Human Services' per student expenditure was \$4,661. The nursing and social work programs located in the College of Health and Human Services have clinical components comparable to those in educator preparation programs. According to the interim chief financial officer, the budget process is transparent and deans participate in the construction of the budget. For several years there have been no raises in salary except for faculty who have been successfully promoted to the next rank. However, in January 2012, all full-time faculty will receive a raise.

6.1b(5) PEU as a line item in the COE budget. Has this happened? If yes, how does the COE dean administer this line item when the deputy provost serves as the unit head?

The PEU is no longer a line item in the COE budget. The PEU budget now resides in the office of the deputy provost who is serving as the head of the unit. The provost provided a copy of the PEU budget in the amount of \$101,837, which covers the cost of memberships in professional organizations, a stipend for the chair of the PEC, the salary of the director of BSED programs, the salary of the administrative assistant to the BSED director, travel, and supplies.

6.1b(6) Advisement. What model of advisement is used at the postbaccalaureate level and in advanced programs?

The head of the unit explained that as of this fall advisement for postbaccalaureate candidates was moved from the COE Professional Advisement Center to program faculty and the program director. All candidates in advanced programs are advised by program faculty as well. Additionally, at the university level candidates can avail themselves of services provided by the Academic Advisement Center and the Counseling and Testing Center.

6.1b(7) Support staff. Is there a sufficient number of support staff so that programs can prepare candidates to meet standards?

Exhibits and interviews confirmed there is a sufficient number of support staff in the unit so that programs can prepare candidates to meet standards. An administrative assistant now supports the Director of the BSED programs. PEC members explained that faculty have approved a unit assessment coordinator position. They are waiting to learn about the status of the position from the head of the unit.

6.2 Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

The Bear CLAW (Center for Learning and Writing) is now incorporated in Meyer Library, bringing together Tutoring Services, the Writing Center, and Library Services in order to provide an enhanced learning environment for students. There is wireless access throughout the main library.

Considerable technology resources have been allocated to develop and implement the assessment system. The Office of Institutional Research has one individual identified half-time to work directly with the COE with the data collection for NCATE/DESE and other reports.

6.3 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

Not applicable to this standard

6.4 Areas for Improvement

6.4.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

--	--

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	

6.4.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited for the previous visit.	

6.4.3 New Areas for Improvement

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit lacks sufficient evidence that the unit's governance structure allows the unit to manage and coordinate the education programs that are located in other units of the institution. (Initial)	As reported in Standard 5, no evidence was provided on faculty in the Secondary Education programs housed in departments outside the College of Education regarding faculty expectations, evaluation policies and procedures, workloads, and service.
The current governance structure does not provide for the effective monitoring of the implementation of the various program assessment plans or the regular reporting of candidate performance relative to each program's defined outcomes. (Initial and Advanced)	Although faculty conducted an internal review of BSED programs, they did not look at outcomes. They focused on format. Faculty in some advanced programs had not shared data and therefore did not know about program outcomes.
Campus and school facilities are not adequate to enable professional education faculty members to support candidates in meeting standards. (Initial and Advanced)	Candidates taking their program of work at Crowder College and Nevada (a satellite of Crowder College) do not have regular access to computer labs and cannot log into university resources on a regular basis.

6.5 Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

6.6 Corrections to the Institutional Report Addendum

None

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

You may either type the sources of evidence and persons interviewed in the text boxes below or upload files using the prompt at the end of the page.

Documents Reviewed

Persons Interviewed

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

(Optional) State Addendum: