

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
University of Phoenix
May 2011**

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at University of Phoenix. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution**

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Educational Leadership		X	
2) Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	X		
3) Resources	X		
4) Faculty and Instructional Personnel		X	
5) Admission	X		
6) Advice and Assistance	X		
7) Field Experience and Clinical Practice	X		
8) District Employed Supervisors		X	
9) Assessment of Candidate Competence	X		

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple/Single Subject, with Internship	19	18	1	0
CTEL	10	10	0	0

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: University of Phoenix

Dates of Visit: May 15 – May 18, 2011

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; and review of additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The entire team reviewed the nine Common Standards to determine whether the standards were met, met with concerns or not met. The team found that six of the nine Common Standards are **Met** and three of the nine Common Standards are **Met with Concerns**: Standard 1: Leadership, Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel, and Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors.

Program Standards

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for each of the programs. Following these discussions of each program reviewed, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns or not met. All program standards were found to be **Met** in all programs listed below with the exception of Multiple Subject and Single Subject Standard 16: Learning, Applying, and Reflecting on the Teaching Performance Expectations being **Met with Concerns**:

- Multiple Subject, with Internship
- Single Subject, with Internship
- CTEL Certificate
- Preliminary Administrative Services (new program, not reviewed)

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documentation, evidence provided at the site, additional information provided by program administration and faculty, and interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, administrators, employers and other stakeholders. Due to the finding that all Common Standards were Met with the exception of three standards identified as Met with Concerns and all Program Standards are Met with the exception of two standards Met with Concerns. The team unanimously recommends an accreditation decision of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

Stipulations

- That the institution document the research base for the education unit vision, conceptual framework, and instruction which the leadership and faculty can articulate.
- That the unit provide evidence of recruitment of diverse faculty who are reflective of a diverse society.
- That the unit develop and document a system for providing district employed supervisors training evenly and consistently.
- That the unit articulate in program documents responsibility for oversight of supervision of candidate competence with regard to subject matter content and pedagogy by qualified individuals.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject, with Internship

Single Subject

Single Subject
Single Subject, with Internship

Advanced/Services

Preliminary Administrative Services

California Teachers of English Learners

Staff recommends that:

- the institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- University of Phoenix be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- the institution respond in writing to the stipulations within one year of the COA's decision.

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:

Carolyn Bishop
CalStateTEACH

Common Standards Cluster:

Mel Hunt
Saint Mary's College of California

Donna Shea
California State University, San Bernardino

Programs Cluster:

Cathy Buell
San Jose State University (retired)

Daniel Elliott
Azusa Pacific University

June Hetzel
Biola University

Staff to the Visit

Helen Hawley, Consultant
Rebecca Parker, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog
Common Standards Narrative
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Program Assessment Feedback
Program Information Booklet
Program Summaries

Biennial Report Feedback
Field Experience Notebook
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae
Advisory Board Minutes
Education Committee Minutes
University Website

Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards Cluster	Program Sampling Cluster	TOTAL
Candidates	21	67	88
Completers	23	34	57
Employers	13	5	18
Institutional Administrators	18	19	37
Program Coordinators	6	5	11
Faculty	33	40	73
TPA Coordinator	7	3	10
University Assessment Coordinators	2		2
Advisors	22	19	41
Field Supervisors – Program	23	43	66
Field Supervisors - District	15	10	25
Credential Analyst	12	1	13
Advisory Board Members	21	16	37
VP Finance	3		3
IT Director	2		2
Librarian	1		1
Totals	222	262	484

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

The mission of University of Phoenix is to provide access to higher education opportunities that enable students to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve their professional goals, improve the productivity of their organizations, and provide leadership and service to their communities. The College of Education is guided by its own mission and vision that directs its work with teacher candidates and professional educators as outlined in its conceptual framework. The University of Phoenix graduate-level Masters of Arts in Education (MAED)/Teacher Education (MS/SS) programs were granted approval under SB 2042 in 2003. The University is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission and the College of Education is pre-accredited by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). The College of Education is also seeking accreditation with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

The College of Education’s Conceptual Framework serves as the foundation for program design and development. The Framework provides the vision for all education programs and focuses on pedagogical content knowledge, educational access and diversity, and professional and reflective practice. The Conceptual Framework also provides focus on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions demonstrated by proficient and effective educational leaders. These concepts are incorporated into the college’s teaching and learning model, standards-based coursework, field

experiences and clinical practice, and performance assessments. The college's programs are designed to provide candidates with an important theoretical knowledge base integrated with student learning. The College is committed to preparing graduates who can think critically, communicate effectively, advocate for student learning and their own professional development, collaborate with colleagues and families, reflect on their own practice, and serve as leaders in the education profession and in the community.

Programs at each campus are overseen and managed by a staff of Campus College Chairs, lead faculty, program administrators, candidate advisors, and credential analysts. Practitioner faculty, full- and part-time are recruited, hired, trained, and provide ongoing professional development at each campus to ensure effective instruction and best practice. Ongoing communication between campus staff and the College of Education in Central Administration is conducted via monthly teleconferences, attendance at Commission meetings and trainings, and telephone/email updates. The programs are offered throughout the state at five campus locations and via online modality.

Education Unit

The College of Education at University of Phoenix is guided by a vision and mission that directs its work with candidates and professional educators. Programs encompass the initial preparation of professional educators, as well as professional development and endorsement courses and programs. The College of Education is a leader in preparing effective educators, ensuring the learning and development of P-12 students, and meeting school needs by:

- Offering a comprehensive set of programs that recognize and address the developmental process of teaching and learning in a diverse society
- Employing practitioner faculty members who are recognized as experts in the educational community
- Using integrated technologies to impact learning
- Emphasizing assessment and self-assessment of teaching and learning on a continuing basis
- Sharing its model and best practices with colleagues

The University of Phoenix program includes a developmentally designed sequence of coursework and field experiences that is designed to prepare candidates to teach all K-12 students. Coursework and field experiences are linked throughout the program to provide candidates the opportunity to study and apply the state adopted K-12 academic standards, use state-adopted instructional materials, practice a variety of assessment techniques to monitor student learning, and provide appropriate instruction to diverse learners.

Early coursework in the program provides candidates with knowledge on the foundations of education and the role of schools, which they then can carry into their field experiences through observations and participation in the K-12 classroom. Throughout the program, candidates develop knowledge and skills related to pedagogical competence as defined by the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The TPEs are embedded in all of the coursework and aligned to course topics and objectives.

University of Phoenix is a forward-focused institution that recognizes the current and future needs of those entering the teaching profession. Comprehensive instruction on the utilization of

differentiated learning opportunities is built into College of Education programs as a means to close a notable achievement gap among those designated as English Learners. A change is taking place with a focus turned toward diversity in linguistic history and socio-cultural experience as it best supports students as learners.

The College of Education has one Dean, three Associate Deans, and four Regional Assistant Deans who provide leadership and direction for all education programs on a full-time basis. There is also an educational staff consisting of project directors and education program managers who monitor state regulations and work with faculty to develop curricula for all programs in the College of Education.

Each campus employs a Campus College Chair (CCC) who monitors the education programs at the campus level including daily operations, district relationships, student services, program delivery, and local faculty oversight. This individual supervises faculty and interacts with students on a daily basis. The Campus College Chair is a full-time faculty member who teaches in the College of Education, and reports directly to the Director of Academic Affairs at his or her respective campus but also has an indirect reporting relationship to the Dean. The Campus College Chair at each campus is responsible for maintaining the academic quality and rigor of the education programs. The Campus College Chair (CCC) is also responsible for establishing the Advisory Committee for the education programs and serves as the chair for various other education-related committees, including the campus retention committee which monitors student progress in the education programs.

In addition, the Campus College Chair supervises credential analysts and education program managers who maintain records and monitor candidate progress in the program to ensure that candidates meet all requirements before being recommended for a credential. The program has been designed to incorporate state and University requirements for successful program completion and recommendation for a credential.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of program completers (2009-10)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (10-11)	Agency Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject, with Internship	226	500	CTC
Single Subject, with Internship	196	443	CTC
California Teachers of English Learners	1827	415	CTC
Administrative Services: Preliminary*	0	0	CTC

* There are currently no Administrative Services: Preliminary candidates enrolled in the program.

The Visit

The visit began on Sunday, May 15, 2011 at noon and was completed in the afternoon on Wednesday, May 18, 2011. The team members convened at the hotel on Sunday for a team meeting. The team was transported to the campus to meet with the University Deans, program coordinators, advisory board members and adjunct faculty. The Deans provided an overview of the institution and its programs and the team attended a reception. Following the reception, the team began to interview constituents. A team meeting was held on Sunday evening, and data collection continued through Tuesday, with the team members conferring with one another frequently throughout the visit. The team lead met with the Provost on Tuesday. On Tuesday morning, a Mid-Visit report was presented to the Dean. On Tuesday evening, consensus was reached on all standard findings and on an accreditation recommendation. The Exit Report was held on campus at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, May 18, 2011.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Standard Met with Concerns

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Findings

The institution's curriculum is related to California's adopted student academic content standards and curriculum frameworks. The unit has a conceptual framework on which it bases its instruction. However, the unit administration and faculty could not provide a research-based vision to support the conceptual framework. The unit did not articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation. The campuses have clear direction for programs, courses, teaching, and candidate performance and experiences. However, since the institution did not articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation, this aspect of Standard 1 is not addressed.

Assessment and program improvement based on data are required at the unit level. Scholarship, while not a priority, is valued at a minimal level as evidenced by documents and interview responses. Service is valued by the unit and supported by the vision as is evidenced by the service of the faculty in the community and institution. Collaboration is evidenced by committee work of the faculty and accountability is built into the faculty assessments and internal data driven decision-making.

The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization and governance of the program. The faculty provides input for program improvement and curriculum development.

Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The leadership makes program improvement decisions based on internal data including candidate and faculty input.

TaskStream is used as a tool for monitoring credential recommendations to ensure candidates have met all requirements. The credential analysts are responsible for this process at each campus. Evidence was provided documenting the monitoring of the credentialing process conducted on a regular basis by the Campus Chairs.

Rationale

The unit administration and faculty could not provide a research-based vision to support the conceptual framework for educator preparation.

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Findings

The University has contracted with TaskStream, an electronic portfolio software company, to provide accounts to its students. Using TaskStream's electronic portfolio system allows the University to collect a wide variety of benchmark assessments from a specific program. The unit's assessment system is aligned directly to the University of Phoenix Conceptual Framework and to state standards. Assessments included in the TaskStream system are selected to represent a range of opportunities for candidates to demonstrate attainment of all program proficiencies.

The electronic portfolio also has been adapted to collect and monitor each candidate's submission of required program progression requirements and completion documents. As a result, TaskStream provides assessment data on items, such as the CalTPA assessments, clinical evaluations and the University of Phoenix standards-based benchmark assignments that can be used for program improvement.

Faculty, campus staff (Academic Counselor), and College of Education staff (Campus College Chair, Program Manager, and Credential Analyst) reported in interviews that they can monitor individual candidate progress on the system. The staff compile and analyze data on a short-term basis to determine if individual candidates need assistance and, on a long-term basis, to provide data to allow the University evaluation system to make decisions about program improvement.

In addition to the data collected by TaskStream, the University gathers data from a number of additional survey instruments that are completed at the end of courses to faculty and candidates. There are also regular Academic Quality Reviews at campus sites to monitor adherence to state standards. More information comes from alumni surveys and from advisory boards which are located for each program at each campus. The team did note that the institution's practice of using active practitioners as instructors and program administrators tended to lead to advisory board members who also had or still had active/dual roles with the University. The alumni survey is currently administered every five years, a schedule which does not provide timely data for programs that are one year in length. Thus, the value of this data is limited for use in program improvement.

The collected data is analyzed at a number of levels for program improvement. The Faculty Council, made up of experienced program faculty, has as part of its charge the analysis of assessment data that the Council uses to recommend program improvements. Area Content Chairs at each campus oversee Content Area Meetings during which candidate assessment data is reviewed and the findings are submitted to the unit as part of the continuous improvement process. At each campus the Campus College Chairs also use the data when working with campus faculty on program improvement.

Examples of recent changes based on data analysis include the revision of student teaching evaluations to ensure alignment to program standards and greater rigor, development of more robust candidate assessments and standardized evaluation rubrics, revision of content area methods and reading courses, and addition of structured field experience evaluations.

Standard 3: Resources

Standard Met

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

The team found that the institution has the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. The team reviewed documents that demonstrate an adequate budget is allocated to sustain both technical and personnel resources. The findings from interviews with faculty and staff indicated resources are provided to meet the needs of the enrollment at the regional campuses.

The team found resources are allocated for effective operation of the program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision, clinical experiences, and assessment management. Documents reviewed by the team represented an organizational structure in which faculty responds to academic concerns. All other advisement is handled by the regional campus or learning center staff, including individuals such as credential analysts, campus chairs, program managers, and academic counselors. Interviews with administrators and candidates reported a credential analyst is available at each campus to advise candidates about the program and the credential process. Interviews with candidates report faculty and staff are responsive and readily available. Counselors are well trained and technical support is available and responsive. The team reviewed documents that support the findings of interviews.

The team found sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. Interviews with candidates indicated on-line resources meet their needs. A presentation by the institution’s information technology staff provided an overview of the proprietary on-line learning system (OLS) demonstrating a functional, easy to navigate, comprehensive learning system for candidates and educators. The presentation included a tour of textbooks, Web links, e-resources, grades/grade book, assignments, professional development opportunities, courses, and faculty workshops. The tour of the OLS included an overview of technology used in K-12. Tutorials are available including tutorials for open source and Web 2.0.

The team found the on-line library to be comprehensive with relevant resources and materials. During interviews candidates indicated support staff that is knowledgeable and helpful is readily available to assist with resources. The institution indicated the OLS features are available to faculty and staff.

Interviews with administrators confirmed that a process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs, which increase as enrollment increases.

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

The team determined that qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses and to provide professional development in each credential and certificate program. Interviews with administrators described the process for assessing content knowledge and clinical experiences prior to assigning courses to faculty. The team reviewed the artifacts used to implement the process and follow-up on teacher effectiveness.

The team reviewed faculty vitae of instructional personnel and faculty that support current knowledge in the content they teach. Faculty profiles were available in the online learning system (OLS) for the team and candidates to view. During interviews candidates reported faculty are also practitioners who related “real life” examples and presented both theory and methods in the context of public schooling and model best professional practices in teaching and learning. Interviews with candidates and cooperating teachers indicated that faculty model best practices with assignments, strategies, lesson plans, and accountability systems were standards-based with practical application relevant to curriculum that drives public schools. Interviews with candidates, student teachers, completers, and cooperating teachers described standards-based pedagogy. A common theme among candidate interviews was the relevance of instruction to real world application.

The team reviewed faculty vitae and diversity model documentation that did not reflect diversity across all campuses. The institution did not provide evidence that faculty recruitment included specific efforts to increase the diversity of the teaching staff.

During a curriculum review the team found objectives to address ethnic, cultural, gender, special needs, and language diversity across the curriculum relative to teaching and learning.

Interviews with faculty and cooperating teachers described a collaborative relationship to facilitate student teachers that facilitates a broad understanding of professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation for faculty and candidates. Documents reviewed support interview findings that reported faculty supervisors meet and collaborate with candidates and cooperating teachers.

During a presentation of the on-line learning system (OLS) by the institution, the team viewed a selection of courses and workshops available for on-line faculty development. During interviews, associate faculty, lead instructors, and chairs described weekly content meetings and

opportunities for professional development. The team reviewed minutes representative of weekly faculty meetings and general faculty meetings.

The team reviewed performance evaluation tools for course instructors and field supervisors. During interviews administrators described intervention procedures. Interviews with candidates supported documentation and administrative descriptions. The team reviewed on-line handbooks in the OLS that provided procedures and responsibilities for the review and evaluation of faculty competencies.

Rationale

The team reviewed faculty vitae and diversity model documentation that did not reflect diversity across all campuses. The institution did not provide evidence that faculty recruitment included specific efforts to increase the diversity of the teaching staff.

Standard 5: Admission

Standard Met

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

University of Phoenix implements several screening processes for candidates of the Teacher Education Program to ensure that only the most qualified candidates enter, remain, and complete the program. Multiple measures are used in the admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The program design allows access through online modalities and flexible schedules for diverse populations and those who have work commitments to enroll and stay enrolled in the program.

To participate in a credential program the candidate must first be admitted to the University. Following that decision, the candidate must be approved to enter the pre-student teaching phase of the credential program. At this point, the candidate verifies 240 hours of previous work or volunteer experience with children within the past five years. This form assists in the screening process of students seeking a career working with children. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness. The candidate also begins the Basic Skills and subject matter process, which helps to evaluate the candidate's academic preparation for the program. Applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements relevant to this stage of the process.

Early in the first phase of the program the candidate participates in a Personal Assessment Interview. This assessment includes questions and responses that focus on effective instruction and classroom management for all learners. It is conducted early in the program to assist faculty in providing necessary guidance and/or remediation for candidates who may not be focused on K-12 student learning. The unit determines that admitted candidates have effective communication skills. Also, early in the program, the Self-Evaluation Dispositions Checklist is completed by the student. This assessment provides a baseline of the candidate's attitudes toward

teaching and K-12 student learning. Candidates may use the results of the self-assessment to develop a professional growth plan or to seek out additional resources and information on the teaching profession.

Given the flexibility available for students with other commitments (work, family), the University considers candidates for the Teacher Education Program only those students who have completed the requirements for student teaching. The count of current candidates in the report reflects only those students who have been admitted into Student Teaching which occurs during the final 15 weeks of the program. At this stage the candidate must have successfully passed the CalTPA Tasks 1 and 2, have fulfilled the basic skills requirement and have become subject matter competent in the area of the student teaching assignment.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Standard Met

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Student advisement and program planning is handled by a team made up of the Campus College Chair, Credential Analyst, enrollment advisor, academic advisor, education program manager, financial aid advisor, and other student services personnel. The use of the TaskStream system provides this team with the real time information on the status of each candidate, thus enabling proactive intervention. Each candidate's program begins with at least one required orientation course that establishes the baseline for advising.

Candidate interviews confirmed that each candidate is assigned a personal Academic Counselor to assist him/her throughout the program. Academic Counselors work with the education program manager and credential analyst to determine candidate eligibility for both program. Admission at the University occurs in two locally defined levels. Once admitted into the University, candidates must meet the requirements of Level I, including passing the CBEST within completion of 12 credits into their program, and Level II must be completed prior to student teaching. The Internship program requires candidates to pass the CBEST and CSET prior to placement and assumption of intern teaching. Candidates reported that advisement staff routinely reminds them of significant upcoming dates or prerequisites. Online candidates are given the opportunity to set individual face-to-face appointments at the center nearest to them to discuss their personal advisement needs with appropriate center staff.

The system also allows administrators to monitor candidate performance on course assignments during the time course is offered. In addition, faculty reported that the timeliness and appropriateness of faculty grading and formative and summative feedback are also monitored by University of Phoenix administrators while the course is being taught.

The credential analyst at each campus is responsible for student advisement concerning comprehensive information about specific program credential requirements, especially those not included in University of Phoenix coursework. The credential analysts also track and interpret

new information from the Commission publications and communications and share this information with students, faculty and administrators.

The education program manager is responsible for placing students in their field experience and student teaching assignment. Education program managers advise students in their student teaching placement, including remediation during student teaching and providing information on CalTPA requirements, and act as a liaison between faculty supervisors, student teachers, and cooperating teachers. Prior to student teaching, all students receive a student teaching orientation conducted by the education program manager or other appointed staff member. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements.

The unit provides support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Candidates who do not meet expectations are counseled out of the program based on a well-defined process of evaluation and possible remediation. Candidates reported that the use of the cooperative learning teams focused attention on candidates who were not able to work in such a setting. Remediation occurred first within the learning group based upon guidelines provided by University of Phoenix when the group was formed. If that effort failed the instructor would also provide additional remediation to the candidate. But candidates reported that each cohort lost individuals who were unwilling to maintain the effort needed to match the rigor of the program. As part of the TPA process the number of remediation attempts for Tasks 3 and 4 is limited to two. At least two candidates reported that they were repeating student teaching due to deficiencies in their performance in their first attempt.

University of Phoenix ensures that all staff members who communicate with and assist students are trained to answer the questions and concerns regarding the program. Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development. The University's designated enrollment, academic, and financial aid advisors are trained on a continuous basis by the Center of Employee Development, the Campus College Chair, Credential Analyst, Teaching Performance Assessment Coordinator, and Program Directors/Managers. Updates on new policies/regulations affecting the program are sent via e-mail and distributed at the University's monthly director's meetings.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

Standard Met

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

The team reviewed documents that support a well-designed and regularly evaluated sequence of field-based and clinical experiences for candidates that allow them to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively relevant to

state-adopted academic standards. Candidates interviewed felt coursework is directly related to field experience. The institution uses the CalTPA to evidence performance competency.

Candidates indicated that student teaching provided them the opportunity for hands-on practice of strategies and methods sometimes using lesson plans, techniques, and classroom management strategies from their coursework. During interviews, cooperating teachers indicated they collaborated with seminar teachers to discuss candidate improvement during the placement.

The team reviewed documents detailing the policies for the selection of school sites and cooperating teachers that meet the standards and the program requirements. The institution ensures all placements occur at K-12 sites that are university approved based on specific criteria. Cooperating teachers and candidate interviews reported formal and informal collaboration with faculty supervisors in person, by telephone, and via e-mail indicating faculty supervisors are responsive to candidate needs. Faculty supervisors collaborate with cooperating teachers to determine when and how Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) are met, and they receive input from cooperating teachers in consideration of determining a final grade.

Candidate, field supervisor and cooperating teacher interviews verified that field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning. Candidates interviewed indicated they had exposure to diversity during their field experience and clinical practice. Candidates interviewed described a variety of on-site demographics that document exposure to diverse student populations and school climates.

Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisor

Standard Met with Concerns

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

Findings from interviews and document reviews indicated that district-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. The process for selecting Cooperating Teachers (CTs) is based on a system of evaluation. The institution requires that Cooperating Teachers have a minimum of three years experience in the classroom and be recognized in their district as being a mentor teacher. Cooperating Teachers receive a stipend and the amount of the stipend is determined in conjunction with the district.

The institution's policy for new Cooperating Teachers (CTs) requires the faculty supervisor to meet with the CT and the candidate early in the placement to review procedure for evaluation of the candidate. Interviews with cooperating teachers from across the six campuses revealed that CTs were usually provided with a handbook to guide their training and coaching of the student teachers assigned to them. Most Cooperating Teachers reported that although they received a handbook to guide them, they did not have anything they considered as "training."

Rationale

Interviews with university supervisors indicated that they consistently provided orientation for their Cooperating Teachers which sometimes included invitations to regional campuses for training. However, findings from interviews with CTs indicated that most CTs were only provided a one-on-one orientation meeting sometime during their work with the institution's candidates. Since the regional campus training is not provided to all CTs the team concludes that implementation of CT training is uneven and non-systematic.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Standard Met

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.

The standardized curriculum including benchmarks and objectives, and the academic and teacher evaluations provide evidence that candidates are prepared to serve as professional school personnel and can demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards.

TaskStream provides the structure for an assessment system that is used by faculty to communicate with candidates about their ongoing success in meeting the commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards. The system allows both candidates and faculty access to evaluations as soon as each is completed.

Formative evaluation of candidate competence in the K-12 setting begins with the analysis of the early field experience placements. There are also benchmark assignments in each course that are key components in the formative assessment of each candidate's competence in regard to the state standards. Formative evaluation continues into the initial phase of student teaching. In the Multiple Subject program there are two placements over the 15 week student teaching period while in Single Subject there is a single placement. In this phase, both the faculty supervisor and the cooperating teacher complete a mid-term evaluation of the candidate's performance in the classroom. Additional data is provided by the completion of CalTPA Task 3 during this phase of the placement. Because all this activity is conducted on TaskStream, the candidate is fully aware of the results.

The summative assessment of candidate effectiveness begins with the candidate's completion of CalTPA Task 4 during the last half of the placement phase. Task 4 is designed to measure the candidate's competence in relation to the TPE.

The summative assessment of candidate competence in relation to the standards occurs in two parts. Faculty and candidates reported that the Final Student Teaching Evaluation is conducted by the field supervisor based upon classroom observations. This assessment forms half of the final evaluation. The instructor of the student teaching course also makes a summative evaluation of the candidate's competence based upon work done during the course. The instructor and the

field supervisor consult together to reach a final decision on program standard competence that is reflected in the final course grade.

Before any candidate is recommended for the credential, the Credential Analyst determines that all other requirements for the credential are also met.

TaskStream is also used by the CTEL program to verify that completers of that program have met all of the Commission's requirements.

Multiple Subject, with Internship Single Subject, with Internship

Program Design

Interviews with employers, students, faculty, administrators, and staff, as well as assessment documentation of candidates on program documents, indicate that the Multiple and Single Subject programs at University of Phoenix have a well-sequenced program of coursework and fieldwork experiences with a strong administrative leadership structure that prepares teacher candidates for successfully assuming the professional role of classroom teacher.

Program documents, administrative interviews, student interviews, university supervisor interviews, and formative and summative assessments confirm the design and development of the multiple and single subject programs are focused on pedagogical content knowledge, educational access and diversity, and professional and reflective practice. Course syllabi and assessments, as well as the visitor orientation provided by the Dean of Education, confirm the TPE-embedded curriculum, emphasizing the domains of planning and preparation, the learning environment, instruction, and professional practice.

As supporting evidence for the consistency of candidate preparation throughout the five regional centers, as well as in the highly-subscribed online program, faculty, staff, and administrative interviews, along with the Dean's visitor orientation, indicate that the core requirements for the curriculum, such as core standards, course syllabi, and core readings are developed by an administrative team with some academic freedom given to each regional site and professor, so long as the core curriculum remains consistent. Faculty, administrative, and staff interviews indicated that if summative assessment data indicate challenges in student competencies, discussion takes place with the regional Campus College Chair, program manager, lead faculty, and other faculty in order to determine if curricular changes need to be implemented in order to assist candidates in successfully acquiring the target competencies of the University of Phoenix's teacher education program. Additionally, personal interviews of faculty, administration, and staff indicate that programmatic concerns are also discussed at the Advisory Councils.

Interviews with administration, staff, and faculty confirmed that the program design includes a cycle of candidate assessment and program modifications to improve practice. An example of program modification in the last year, as described through interviews with faculty, staff, and administration, includes the revamping of the Self-Evaluation Dispositions Rubric and Personal Assessment Interview which facilitated more candidate reflection and candidate provision of evidence in their self-assessment of dispositions. This change was a result of administrative and faculty analysis of program data.

Personal and/or telephone interviews with employers, staff, administrators, and Advisory Council members, as well as reading the agenda and minutes of Advisory Councils in the electronic document room, confirm that each site has its own Advisory Council, which includes key stakeholders from the community who also provide program improvement feedback and meet at least two times per year.

Interviews with academic counselors, candidates, and alumni indicated that the program is designed to provide intentional student support throughout the program, including the following team of advisors for each teacher candidate: enrollment advisor, finance counselor, academic

counselor, and credential analyst. While staff provides intentional support for progressive requirements, faculty provide academic advising related to coursework and curriculum as indicated by university supervisor, student, and alumni interviews. Candidate and/or alumni telephone or in-person interviews from all sites indicated that they were contacted by phone or email weekly or twice per month by their advisors to ensure that they were receiving the appropriate support for their progressive program requirements. According to documents and administrative, faculty, staff, student, and alumni interviews, credential analysts track credential requirements with a checklist throughout the program, providing candidate support in the completion of their credential requirements.

Evidence, including documents and/or interviews with administration, faculty, and staff, indicate appropriate leadership is taking place within the credential programs at the regional sites, clarity and frequency of communication between the credential program and the institution, appropriate connective relationship between theory and practice within the coursework and field experiences, and a cycle of program modifications based upon the analysis of program data and input from key stakeholders.

Course of Study

Courses in the Multiple and Single Subject Credential tracks (including internship) at the University of Phoenix for California cover the content areas required by state content standards and the CTC program standards for professional preparation. Review of the syllabi and other program literature verified the sequence of courses as logically aligned in scope and sequence to prepare teachers for California schools. Interviews with program lead faculty, administrators, candidates, program completers, and employers verified that candidates complete preparation at Phoenix with full understanding of content for the grade levels and subjects for which they become certified. Interviews with employers revealed at least six cases where program completers had gone on to become ‘teacher of the year’ or received other significant recognition by their employing agencies. In interviews, student teachers and program completers are conversant about instructional models, strategies, and rationale for the instructional decisions that effective teachers must make daily.

Student teachers and candidates interviewed described field experiences that were very relevant to their coursework. In eight cases, candidates described being able to go to their professors’ K-12 classroom and observe the types of instructional techniques they had been recently taught, because most instructors are daily employed in K-12 settings. Courses about classroom management inspired candidates to make specific observations about class management activities in their 100 field observation hours. Observation forms relevant to content in specific courses were required from candidates during field observation hours. These influenced candidates’ performance assessment in these specifically-aligned courses. Cooperating teachers interviewed described how well prepared candidates were in their student teaching terms and how much new theory and pedagogical knowledge candidates brought to their classrooms from their course learning, thereby creating a genuine collaboration.

Candidates in coursework, student teachers, and program completers from all six campuses described heavy emphases in learning about special needs learners and instructional strategies most relevant for all special needs learners including English language learners. Candidates were expressive of various instructional differentiation strategies they use. Employers interviewed commented how program completers were effective in serving special needs learners.

Student teachers and program completers interviewed described their field observation assignments as being very helpful in becoming aware of the diverse types of schools and populations. While most student teachers are assigned through a district entity, and/or the building principal, the unit is able to assert its expectations for excellence and expertise in cooperating teachers through arrangements made by the Program Managers from each campus with the various local districts.

Interviews with cooperating teachers from across the six campuses revealed that they were provided a handbook to guide their training and coaching of the student teachers assigned to them. Most cooperating teachers reported that, though they received a student-teaching handbook to guide them, they did not have anything they considered as ‘training.’ Several reported they did not need training, that the handbook was sufficient. However, interviews with university supervisors from two campuses indicated that they consistently provided orientation for their CTs (cooperating teachers) which included invitations to regional campuses for training and the one-on-one orientations that university supervisors provided for the CTs. Therefore, the team concludes that implementation of CT training is implemented in an uneven manner across the regional programs.

Student teachers reported visits by their university supervisors approximately once each two weeks. Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors confirmed that type of visitation pattern. The majority of student teachers and program completers interviewed reported very positive and helpful mentoring relationships exist between them and their university supervisors, some even extending past graduation and on into their teaching careers. However, interviews with University Supervisors and candidates, as well as university documents, indicate that the university routinely assigns faculty supervisors without regard to the faculty member’s subject matter and grade level expertise as it relates to the student teacher’s assignment. It must be noted that the final Student Teacher Evaluation requires the University Supervisor to assess the candidate in the area of content knowledge and content-specific pedagogical practice. The team found consistent evidence in interviews with administration, supervisors, and candidates that university supervisors may be assigned to evaluate candidates outside the field supervisors’ pedagogical content knowledge, yet they are required to evaluate the candidate’s pedagogical content knowledge.

Candidate Competence

Interviews with administration, faculty, and staff, along with electronic documentation (e.g., Biennial Report), indicate candidate competence through: 1) passage of the CalTPA, Tasks 1-4; 2) the final student teacher evaluations, which infuse the TPEs and a five-point rubric; 3) the Self-Evaluation Disposition Checklist; 4) RICA for MS candidates; and 5) course grades (a minimum of 3.0). Candidates interviewed in the Assessment Class at the Gardena site, who were early in the program or in their last class prior to student teaching, indicated that candidate competence was also indicated by passage of the CBEST and CSET exams.

University Supervisors described candidate competencies, including: classroom management, content knowledge, lesson planning and delivery, reflective practice, teacher dispositions, acceptance of all learners, and demonstration of “proficient” or “advanced” in all of the domains as described on the Student Teacher Evaluation. In interviews with the CalTPA administrator

and staff for the entire state, candidate competence was determined by the summative data of the CalTPA. When interviewing candidates and staff, reference was regularly made to the final checklist of materials that the Credential Analysts track which include all of the state requirements for subject matter competency, such as the CBEST and RICA, as well as methods mastery, which includes passage of the CalTPA. Faculty ensure passage of key assignments within the coursework via the coursework grades.

Interviews with candidates and alumni repeatedly confirmed ongoing formative feedback by their professors regarding teaching practice within coursework, and particularly during student teaching. Additionally, interviews with candidates and alumni also confirm appropriate assistance in working towards competency with summative assessments, such as the CalTPA, including remediation opportunity if needed, as cited in the CalTPA director's interview.

Interviews with the administrators, students, and alumni indicate that candidates receive information about the University of Phoenix teacher preparation assessment system from their introductory course at the beginning of the program, along with systematic guidance on progressive requirements via their advisory team. Interviews with faculty and staff indicate that candidates receive feedback on their individual performance on their CalTPA summative assessments via correspondence from the centralized TPA Director and staff in Sacramento. Feedback on the summative assessment for student teaching is discussed through one-on-one meetings.

University of Phoenix' assessment system provides an opportunity for professors, university teachers, and master teachers to mentor candidates to the point of proficiency. For example, the Student Teacher Mid-Evaluation is the same form as the Final Student Teacher Evaluation Form. When candidates are not proficient on some elements of the four domains, their University Supervisors and Master teachers can continue to work with candidates until the point of proficiency. However, administrative, faculty, and university supervisor interviews also confirmed that there is a process (i.e., Alert Form) for identifying candidates who are at-risk for being successful in the profession. In extreme cases, after due process, the candidates are dismissed from the program.

Findings on Standards

After interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, and employers, unit administrators, and other key stakeholders, and after reviewing supporting documentation, the team determined all program standards to be **Met** with the exception of Standard 16 for both multiple and single subjects which is **Met with Concerns**. Program Standard 16 requires qualified supervisors to formatively assess each candidate's content knowledge and pedagogical performance in relation to the TPEs. The team found consistent evidence in interviews with administration, supervisors, and candidates that university supervisors may be assigned to evaluate candidates outside the field supervisors' pedagogical content knowledge, yet they are required to evaluate the candidate's pedagogical content knowledge. Hence, mismatches between the Supervisor qualifications and the student teacher's subject matter or grade level placement are occurring. Although candidates, supervisors and CTs confirmed that CTs advise candidates specifically with regard to subject matter pedagogy, the team found no articulation in program documents to confirm these responsibilities.

California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)

Program Design

The program is aligned with the CTET Standards and consists of four courses. The course content includes language structure and use, first and second language use and their relationship to academic achievement, assessment, and foundations for literacy and content instruction. Additionally, culture and cultural diversity and culturally inclusive instruction are infused throughout the coursework.

The program document reports that there are CTET programs at each campus overseen and managed by Campus College Chairs, program administrators, candidate advisors, and credential analysts. Interviews with faculty demonstrated that practitioner faculty are recruited, hired, trained, and provided ongoing professional development at each campus to ensure effective instruction and best practice. Ongoing communication among the College of Education, Central Administration, and the faculty members occurs in monthly teleconferences, training sessions and other orientation meetings.

Through review of documents provided, and interviews with candidates and faculty the team found the CTET program at the University of Phoenix has been enrolling candidates since 2008. The biennial report indicates that the program serves 24 candidates and 17 program completers in Central Valley, 103 candidates and 123 program completers in Northern California, no candidates but 34 program completers in Sacramento, 46 candidates with 45 program completers in San Diego, 97 candidates with 93 program completers in Southern California, and 2,131 online candidates with 1,688 online program completers.

Course of Study

The program introduces candidates to MTE/502 Orientation to the California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Program, ELD/502 Foundations of Instruction for English Learners, ELD/504 Assessment of English Learners, ELD/506 Understanding Language Acquisition & Cognition, and ELD/535 Teaching Reading and Writing to English Learners. Courses include benchmark assignments with related scoring rubrics that are entered in the TaskStream data collection system and rated according to a rubric. Additionally each course includes tasks designed for candidates to engage in field observations, analysis and reflection and submission and evaluation.

The team found documented evidence of annual collection and analysis of candidate performance data including summaries of candidate comments about program quality issues. The unit quickly introduced adjustments in plans for the program that were designed to address those identified concerns from data analysis and candidate survey comments. Interviews with candidates included comments about responsiveness by faculty members when candidate concerns were raised over relevance and accuracy of course activities. Candidates and faculty alike remarked about the noted authorities for English Learner instruction that are read and analyzed in the program courses.

Candidate Competence

The University of Phoenix CTEL candidates are required to complete four benchmark assignments, one in each of the four classes that make up the curriculum. As evidenced by the matrix provided, the assignment components are aligned with the CTEL standards. Expectations include using assessments that are appropriate for English Learners, strategies and activities that reflect consideration for learning styles and needs of English Learners, objectives that are aligned with standards, content supporting biliteracy development, and strategies that address principles of language learning and teaching. The CTEL candidates interviewed recognized the value of the program content, indicated that the strategies were valuable in their classrooms, and stated that they gained a better understanding of assessing and meeting the needs of their students.

All assignments include a field experience application. Each assignment is scored using a 4-point rubric; each score point is carefully described specific to the assignment expectations. Earning an overall rating of 3 is required for each benchmark. Data collected showed that scores on benchmark assignments have improved as the program has matured. The candidates are informed about the assignments and the assessment via descriptions in syllabi found in Task Stream.

Findings on Standards

After interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, and employers, unit administrators, and other key stakeholders, and after reviewing supporting documentation, the team determined all program standards to be **Met**.