The NCATE BOE team that conducted the onsite visit at Missouri State University elects to submit a response to the rejoinder prepared by the unit at MSU. The team was composed of five experienced BOE members and one experienced NEA observer. Three of the five BOE members had served over the past years as team chairs.

Standard 1

The NCATE BOE Team fulfilled its charge to write an accurate onsite report that reflected what was presented by the unit as evidence (IR, IR Addendum, electronic exhibit room, information requested by onsite team) and what was heard in interviews at the time of the site visit. Dr. Deb Eldridge, NCATE Senior Vice President, reminded BOE members on page 10 of the Fall 2011 Update that “Units cannot introduce new evidence in a rejoinder…” It appears this is what the unit at Missouri State University has done by inserting the communication from Dr. Karla Eslinger, Assistant Commissioner at the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, in its rejoinder. In fact, the statement in the rejoinder that introduces Dr. Eslinger’s communication says, “There were several programs that were cited because of providing insufficient evidence. This was corrected immediately after the onsite visit and the institution received the following letter as evidence:”

“The unit did not provide a plan on how to improve the response rate on its survey of graduates of advanced programs.” This statement remains true. The survey was conducted in 2011, the first survey of this type since 2007. Additionally, the use of focus groups is not a proxy for a complete survey of program completers.

“The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates in all of its advanced programs develop and demonstrate the professional dispositions identified by the unit.” This statement remains true. In the IR Addendum, the unit assumes the dispositions of the advanced candidates are assessed as “…part of their ongoing formative and summative evaluations conducted by the school district.” The rejoinder fails to address the rationale given for the AFI and, therefore, offers no evidence that indicates this AFI should be altered.

“The unit does not ensure that candidates in all of its advanced programs are able to create positive environments for student learning…” This statement remains true. Language from syllabi alone does not constitute sufficient evidence of how the unit documents the ability of advanced candidates to create positive learning environments for \textbf{student learning}. The rejoinder fails to address the rationale given for the AFI and, therefore, offers no evidence that indicates this AFI should be altered.
Standard 3

“Field experiences are not required in all advanced programs.” This statement remains true. Using an advanced candidate’s classroom or school as a field experience is acceptable if the candidate is observed or evaluated on the criteria attached to the experience. There was no indication that these candidates were being observed or evaluated, nor was there any indication as to the purpose of the field experience. To meet the acceptable level of the standard, the field experiences/clinical practice requirements must be purposeful, relevant, and systematic across like programs. MSU did not provide evidence to support its meeting this standard element at the acceptable level. The team needed to see documentation and candidate performance data.

Standard 4

“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)” This statement remains true. The AFI, in being a continuing AFI, was addressed in the unit’s 2010 Annual Report by referencing the elementary program for the most part. The team’s AFI gives credit for those changes. It should be noted that a statement was made in Standard 3 about the unit not having evidence that showed tracking of candidates with diverse learners for most programs and most definitely advanced programs. Purposefully, the team made the decision to keep the AFI in Standard 4 rather than write an AFI for Standard 3. Additionally, visit interviews did not provide evidence that all candidates, other than those cited in the AFI, had documented experiences with diverse learners. No system of tracking was mentioned or shown to the team.

Although the unit asserts that courses require field experiences with diverse learners, the team did not see documentation in aggregated form or otherwise verifying those diverse experiences. Interviewees, including candidates and faculty, did not emphasize those experiences or point the team to the tracking of those experiences. Also, the state team heard the NCATE team’s recommendations in at least two joint meetings. No state team member indicated that this AFI was incorrect, and none cited information from a state report that showed a systematic pattern of experiences with diverse learners.

Standard 6

“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 the other units of the institution. (Initial)” This statement remains true. The PEU expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service are determined by each department and the Faculty Handbook. Each department in the College of Education has its own Faculty and Evaluation Policies and Procedures Handbook that defines and outlines the expectations, policies, and procedures for evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service. Handbooks for departments outside of the College of Education were not available to the team. Verification of faculty workloads for departments in the College of Education was found
in the COE Faculty Workload and Production exhibits. Verification of faculty workloads for departments outside of the COE was not available to the team. Also, the state team heard the NCATE team’s recommendations in at least two joint meetings. No state team member indicated that this AFI was incorrect.

“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)” This statement remains true. The team did, in fact, read the definition of the Program Review Committee cited by the unit in its rejoinder. Nonetheless, during interviews, the team learned from some BSED faculty that they did not look at outcomes when they conducted an internal review of the BSED programs. As mentioned in the rationale statement for this AFI, the faculty reported that they focused on format. Additionally, faculty in some advanced programs reported they 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)” This statement remains true. With a truncated site visit, the NCATE team did not have time to travel to Crowder College or Nevada to visit these off-campus facilities. The written description cited in the unit’s rejoinder suggests that the facilities are adequate; however, during interviews, candidates who completed coursework at these two sites reported they did not have regular access to computer labs and could not log into university resources on a regular basis.