

Recommendation to Remove Stipulations for University of Phoenix June 2012

Overview of this Report

This report presents the progress made by the University of Phoenix to address the stipulations placed upon the institution as a result of COA action at the June 23-24, 2011 COA meeting.

Staff Recommendation

After review of the documentation submitted by the University of Phoenix (UOP) and subsequent phone calls, emails, and meetings staff have concluded that UOP has successfully addressed the stipulations identified in the May 2011 accreditation site visit. Staff recommends removal of all stipulations for the University of Phoenix.

Background

The University of Phoenix CTC accreditation visit was held May 15 – May 18, 2011. The team determined that five Common Standards were Met and three Common Standards were **Met with Concerns**: Standard 1: Leadership, Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel, and Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors. All program standards were Met with the exception of Multiple Subject and Single Subject Standard 16: Learning, Applying, and Reflecting on the Teaching Performance Expectations which was **Met with Concerns**: The report of the team was presented to the COA on June 23-24, 2011. COA acted to determine an accreditation status of **Accreditation with Stipulations**. The following stipulations were adopted by COA for the University of Phoenix.

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.

Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership

***Stipulation #1:** That the institution document the research base for the education unit vision, conceptual framework, and instruction which the leadership and faculty can articulate.*

Institutional Response

The University of Phoenix developed its conceptual framework, which was approved by NCATE in 2010, around the concepts of knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

<https://www.taskstream.com/ts/wick3/COADocuments.html>

Although the framework was created in 2010 which included information about the University of Phoenix's research base, it was not well socialized across programs and on each campus. The University of Phoenix took action after the site visit to ensure that the framework was integrated into all areas. Below is a summary list of evidence documenting how the University of Phoenix addressed this stipulation by socializing the conceptual framework:

- incorporated the framework into the University's teaching and learning model, standards-based course work, field experiences and clinical practice, and performance assessments
- used the framework and shared vision to guide all programs
- promoted understanding of the frameworks by integration into curriculum through the "I Am the One" campaign which included faculty training, individual campus socialization, and Advisory Board awareness
- immersed students in the Conceptual Framework (CF) as they are asked to identify the CF elements in their own K-12 teachers and to identify what it might look like in the classroom
- linked the themes of the Conceptual Framework to the weekly objective then to an activity within all courses
- helped candidates realize how they too, as prospective teachers, can be the ONE educator who impacts student learning by developing the themes within the framework and examining practices to achieve these goals
- created a conceptual framework video shown to all orientation classes for both students and faculty. This is consistently available at eCampus and www.phoenix.edu
- included aspects of the conceptual framework in the Student Handbook incorporating links from every course across all campuses via eCampus

Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

***Stipulation:** That the unit provide evidence of recruitment of diverse faculty who are reflective of a diverse society.*

Institutional Response

Below is a summary list of evidence documenting how University of Phoenix addressed this stipulation:

- examined the current hiring practices for diversity. Immediately following the site visit University of Phoenix developed new hiring plans that were completed in October 2011.

All campuses were required to use the updated plan in their yearly Faculty Recruitment Plan starting in November 2011

- reexamined the Campus Faculty Recruitment Plan and made changes to ensure that every campus was making deliberate efforts to recruit diverse faculty in their immediate areas
- changed the language in the recruitment plans to support equal employment opportunity
- implemented a new plan in January 2011 that required each campus to provide details about the steps the local campus was taking to locate potential faculty. The implemented plan required inclusion of efforts to generate leads from a variety of professional, educational, ethnic and gender backgrounds

Below are recruitment comparisons after implementing the Campus Recruitment Plan.

Gender and Ethnicity	F2009- S2011	May 2011-present	Percent increase
Male	128	14	11
Female	184	16	9
Asian	3	2	67
Black/African American	24	5	21
Hispanic	14	5	36
Caucasian	177	19	11
Unknown	73	1	1

Marketing advertisement include specific focus partners such as the following mass media: (print, electronic, magazines, websites, etc) Ihispano, Black Planet, Asian Avenue, Glee, SupplierDiversity.com, VIBE.com, RecuitMilitary, IMDiversity. Faculty recruiting advertisements are also placed with several diversity partners (online job boards which cater to diverse populations).

Common Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors

Stipulation: That the unit develop and document a system for providing district employed supervisors training evenly and consistently.

Institutional Response

Below is a summary list of evidence documenting the manner in which the University of Phoenix addressed this stipulation to ensure that District Employed Supervisors (cooperative teachers) are *consistently and systematically* trained:

- faculty supervisors are all required to attend training that prepares them to meet with the cooperating teacher prior to placement of the candidate in the teacher's classroom
- required attendance for cooperating teachers at a face-to-face training facilitated by the faculty supervisor prior to beginning the student teaching process. Cooperating teacher, faculty supervisor, and the candidate must sign off on the training document. Principals are invited to attend but not required. A stipend is paid to the cooperating teacher and the faculty supervisors' pay is not generated until the checklist has been completed and signed to ensure 100% participation.
- developed a standardized state-wide Orientation/Training PowerPoint tool for use with the cooperating teacher to ensure consistency in training

- added Standard Operating Procedures to the Student Teacher Checklist
- created and implemented a new Cooperating Teacher Survey to help evaluate the needs of District-Employed Supervisors and identify the effectiveness of the orientation/training
- made all training materials available in an external TaskStream web folio for ease of access <https://www.taskstream.com/ts/wick3/CaliforniaCooperatingTeacher.html>

The Appendix includes two separate groups of responders with the areas for improvement highlighted in yellow. Incorporation of the **survey measurement began in January 2012 and the second group in April 2012.**

Program Standard 16: Learning, Applying, and Reflecting on the Teaching Performance Expectation

Stipulation: 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.

Institutional Response

Below is a summary list of evidence documenting the manner in which the University of Phoenix addressed this stipulation:

- documented faculty supervisor qualifications to candidate field placement according to content experience and licensure
- continued practice includes the formal evaluation of candidates by District-Employed Supervisors (cooperating teacher) during the placement. Cooperating Teachers use journaling and one-on-one reflective coaching for this formative evaluation process.
- cooperating teacher provides guidance on pedagogy and content and works to develop the candidate's content knowledge through the placement
- continued practice includes evaluations of secondary students. They receive a formal content knowledge evaluation completed by the cooperating teacher at the end of the 15 week placement.
- documented support and ensured appropriate alignment of student teacher and faculty supervisor with the creation and implementation in fall 2011 of the enhanced Faculty Supervisor Placement Tracker
- reviewed the placement tracker---by the Regional Assistant Dean each semester and discussed in the Regional Assistant Dean's meeting as needed

Rationale for Staff Recommendation

Based on the evidence reviewed, staff believes that the University of Phoenix has addressed the stipulations by identifying and implementing necessary changes, adding documentation, and including checkpoints to ensure that the appropriate processes will continue. Staff would like to recommend removal of all Stipulations.

Appendix A – District Employed Survey Response Questions

District-Employed Survey Response Questions

This survey was sent out twice(one semester) after initial training with a 55% response.

	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	Total District-Employees Responses	Total District-Employees
				(n)	(n)
I found the Cooperating Teacher training effective.	79/99	18/12	2/6	37/55	168
I understand how to use TaskStream to evaluate my student teacher.	81/86	14/3	4/12		
I understand the roles and responsibilities of a Cooperating Teacher at the University of Phoenix.	96/100	2/0	2/0		
I understand the use of the student teaching evaluation form and grading criteria used to evaluate the assigned student teacher.	90/100	5/0	5/0		
I understand the required paperwork and timelines for my student teacher	89/88	7/6	5/6		

The chart above includes two separate groups of responders with the areas for improvement highlighted in yellow. Incorporation of the survey measurement began in January 2012 and the second group in April 2012.