NCATE
The Standard of Excellence in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

First Visit

Continuous Improvement Pathway

UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX - HAWAII

745 Fort Street, Suite 2000
Honolulu, HI 96813
May 11-14, 2014

Confidential

Type of Visit:
First visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
First visit - Advanced Preparation

Institutional Report for a First Visit (Continuous Improvment Pathway)
Updated May 2013

OVERVIEW

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

I.1 Summarize the institution's mission, historical context, and unique characteristics (e.g., land grant, HBCU or religious).

The University of Phoenix (UOPX) was founded in 1976 and is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission which is a member of the North Central Association. The mission of the institution states:

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 mission and purposes of the institution are detailed within the unit's Conceptual Framework (Exhibit 1).

The University has been continuously accredited by HLC since 1978. The University of Phoenix has been placed on Notice by the Higher Learning Commission. Notice is a Commission sanction indicating that an institution is pursuing a course of action that, if continued, could lead it to be out of compliance with one or more Criteria for Accreditation. An institution on Notice remains accredited. At the end of the notice period, the Board of Trustees may remove the sanction, place the institution on Probation if the identified concerns have not been addressed, or take other action. For additional information visit http://www.ncahlc.org.

The University of Phoenix is a for-profit higher education institution granting associate to doctoral degrees. The institution has 112 brick-and-mortar campus locations in 36 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. In addition, the University offers coursework and degree programs via the online modality. This Institutional Report for NCATE's continuous improvement pathway for accreditation is submitted for the unit based in Hawaii. Access to the University Catalog for Hawaii and Online is detailed in Exhibit 2.

The Hawaii Campus was officially established in 1993. The campus has a student resource center, a nursing simulation laboratory, and 14 classrooms. September 2013 marked the campus' 20th anniversary. The total number of degrees awarded has reached over 5,610 and 26 commencement ceremonies have been conducted over the past 20 years.

The Online division of the University of Phoenix is physically located in Phoenix, Arizona. The administration, student services, faculty recruiting, academic affairs and technical support are all based in the central administration offices for the institution. However, the local campus advisors in Hawaii

are trained and prepared to enroll candidates in either the local campus or online modality dependent upon personal preference. Field and clinical experience placement and supervision are managed by local campus personnel and faculty.

The unit began offering initial educator preparation programs via the online modality in 2001. These programs were the Arizona Department of Education approved programs for elementary, secondary, and special education preparation. These programs were available to residents of Hawaii using the state agency interstate agreement. Upon program completion, candidates applied for licensure in Arizona and then applied for licensure in Hawaii via reciprocity. This process has been in place until spring 2013 when the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) approved programs were made available via the online modality. Candidates now complete a HTSB-approved program online and can apply directly to the HTSB for licensure.

4000 character limit

I.2 Summarize the professional education unit at your institution, its mission, and its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators.

The professional education unit is overseen by the President of the University and is comprised of the College of Education. The University President has given authority over the unit to the Dean of the College of Education. The unit is headed by a dean who works in collaboration with associate and assistant deans to provide leadership and direction for all programs on a full-time basis. Associate and assistant deans work collaboratively with unit program managers to monitor state regulations, implement and manage unit and program assessment, and coordinate the development and revision of coursework, assessments, clinical experiences, and other program components. This team also collaborates directly with local campus-based personnel who implement and operate the programs under review.

The local Hawaii campus is led by a Campus Director who has oversight for all functions of the university at that site. A Director of Academic Affairs has direct oversight of the academic functions. There are additional directors overseeing enrollment, finance, and student services that comprise the campus-based leadership team. Reporting to the Director of Academic Affairs is a Campus College Chair for Education overseeing educator preparation programs.

The online division of the Hawaii Campus has a Regional Director of Academic Affairs who is has primary responsibility for Academic Affairs and the unit's programs including oversight of campus functions such as personnel, admission, student services, fiscal activities, and quality. Online Academic Affairs is under the management of the Provost's office and Central Academic Operations. The Director of Academic Affairs has the responsibility and authority for all academic matters specific to online Education programs in Hawaii and supervises the Education Campus College Chair and departmental staff of the online division.

All members of the unit collaborate to ensure a quality student and faculty experience.

2000 character limit

I.3 Summarize programs offered at initial and advanced preparation levels (including off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs), status of state approval, national recognition, and if applicable, findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals.

The unit made significant changes to all initial programs during the SPA and ILPB program review process. As a result, new programs were developed with revised benchmarks and implemented fall 2013. At the time of submission for the SPA program reports and this IR, there will be no student learning data available based on these revised benchmark assessments. However, data analysis will be included for the purposes of the IR from previous iterations of these same benchmark assessments showing candidate attainment of knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

The following programs are available within the unit at the local Hawaii campus and via the online modality. Sample syllabi are included for each program as Exhibit 3a MAED SPE Syllabus Example; Exhibit 3b MAED TED Elem Syllabus Example; Exhibit 3c MAED TED Sec Syllabus Example. Enrollment by program for AY 2012-2013 for the local campus and March 1 thru August 31, 2013 in the online modality is:

The Bachelor of Science, Elementary Teacher Education (BSED) - Recognition with Conditions, ACEI
• Local: 0
• Online: 21

Master of Arts in Education, Elementary Teacher Education (MAED/TED-E) - Recognition with Conditions, ACEI
• Local: 40
• Online: 9

Master of Arts in Education, Secondary Teacher Education (MAED/TED-S) Submitted via ILPB process, September 2013
• Local: 44
• Online: 11

Master of Arts in Education, Special Education (MAED/SPE) – National Recognition - CEC
• Local: 16
• Online: 0

The MAED/TED-E and the MAED/TED-S received approval from TEAC using the Inquiry Brief review process with approval expiring in December 2013. The TEAC Audit Report is included as Exhibit 4.

Initial state approval was granted by the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board in 1997. All of these state-approved programs were made available in the online modality as of March 1, 2013.

2000 character limit

I.4 Summarize the basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards, and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

The institution's Mission 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 unit's mission is to prepare candidates who possess the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and dedication to lifelong learning that will support their practice as P-12 educational professionals.

The University's Learning Goals are designed to prepare successful and effective professionals who will have a positive impact in their workplaces and communities:

• Collaboration
• Communication
• Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
• Information Utilization
• Professional Competence and Values

The unit's vision and purpose is centered on seven themes of professional educational practice:

• Advocating for Learning
• Collaborating with Educational Communities
• Engaging in Reflective Practice
• Integrating Technology
• Leading through Innovative Practices
• Practicing Professional Ethics
• Valuing Diversity

These themes are derived from:

• Adult learning theory
• Constructivist learning theory
• Germinal and current research on effective education programs
• National and state content standards and best practices
• University Learning Goals

Candidate performance is assessed through:

• Standards-based benchmark assignments aligned to national standards
• State and professional licensure examinations
• Dispositions assessments
• Writing and research skills
• Reflection
• Performance in field experiences and clinical practice
• Program admission/completion/graduation requirements

The conceptual framework (Exhibit 1) was developed by faculty across the Education and School Counseling programs. The unit assigned a select group of faculty to conduct the necessary research and begin the preliminary stages of writing the conceptual framework. The deans in the unit served as project managers to ensure that all components were addressed and to create a cohesive document. The conceptual framework was then presented at faculty meetings across the country over the course of one year for further input and feedback. The document submitted to NCATE is the result of several years of researching, writing, editing, and finalizing the unit's conceptual framework.

6000 character limit

I.5 Exhibits

I.5.a	Pages from catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies
I.5.b	Examples of syllabi for professional education courses
I.5.c	Conceptual framework(s)

I.5.d	Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)
I.5.e	Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS

Exhibit 2 University Catalog
Exhibit 3a MAED SPE Syllabus Example
Exhibit 3b MAED TED Elem Syllabus Example
Exhibit 3c MAED TED Sec Syllabus Example
Exhibit 4 TEAC Audit Report
Exhibit 1 Conceptual Framework
Hawaii NCATE IR Exhibit List

See **Attachment** panel below.

II. Unit Standards and Movement Toward Target

Movement Toward Target

Please indicate the standard(s) on which the unit selected to demonstrate movement toward target:

	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	☐	☐
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	☐	☐
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	☐	☐
Standard 4: Diversity	☐	☐
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	☐	☐
Standard 6: Governance and Resources	☑	☐

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 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1.a Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.

Content knowledge of candidates is measured by scores on the Praxis II exam, results from content-specific standards on the Student Teaching Evaluation, a transcript analysis for secondary candidates, and creation of a content-based lesson plan. Details regarding the requirements for each benchmark and rubric are included in the applicable SPA program report. There is limited, if any, data available on the

revised benchmarks so data and analysis of the previous iterations of the benchmarks have been included to support the unit's claims on candidate ability to demonstrate content knowledge. Since AIMS does not support the use of data tables within the IR narrative, Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables contains the data tables to support the narrative of each element in Standard 1 as applicable.

Assessment 1 (CEC, ACEI, ILPB)
Candidates are required to submit passing scores on the Praxis II content knowledge exam prior to student teaching. These exams verify that candidates have the appropriate content knowledge to be eligible for licensure in Hawaii. Included in the SPA program reports are the data reports from the Hawaii Campus. A summary is provided here:

Pass Rates on PRAXIS Content Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation

Academic year 2009-2010: 53/61 test takers passed with an 87% institutional pass rate
• 14 Special Education
• 20 Elementary
• 19 Secondary

Academic Year 2010-2011: 64/71 test takers passed with a 90% institutional pass rate
• 13 Special Education
• 25 Elementary
• 33 Secondary

2011-2012: 41/43 test takers passed with a 95% institutional pass rate
• 13 Special Education
• 18 Elementary
• 12 Secondary

Assessment 2 (CEC, ACEI, ILPB)
The chosen benchmark for Assessment 2 for each program includes:

• CEC: MAED/SPE—Lesson Plan
• ACEI: BSED and MAED/TED-E—Standards-based content knowledge section was added to the Student Teaching Evaluation
• ILPB: MAED/TED-S—Transcript analysis

The CEC approved and recognized the use of the Lesson Plan in the MAED/SPE program to meet this standard. The data presented in the CEC program report refers to the prior iteration of the benchmark. Based on feedback from the CEC, revisions were made to the benchmark and made available to new cohorts as of spring 2013. The unit has not had new cohorts in the MAED/SPE program to date.

Due to the type of revisions that were made, data from the previous benchmark is still a good indicator of candidates' content knowledge in special education. An analysis of data from four academic years shows two years of high proficiency on the benchmark but the last two years show a significant drop in proficiency. The revisions the unit made to the benchmark clarified instructions to the candidate on how to integrate content knowledge instruction into a special education classroom lesson plan. The unit believes that data from the revised benchmark will once again show high proficiency in candidate demonstration of content knowledge. Refer to Table 1 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

The unit revised its Student Teaching Evaluation to include content-specific standards from ACEI to

satisfy program review requirements for the BSED and MAED/TED-E. The previously implemented Student Teaching Evaluation was based on Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching. The first domain, Planning and Preparation, includes a sub-standard for content knowledge. Candidate data from the previous benchmark evaluation shows a very high proficiency in candidate demonstration of content knowledge during the student teaching experience. Refer to Table 2 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

Feedback from ACEI noted that the evaluation did not explicitly evaluate content-specific knowledge. In response to this feedback, the unit revised the evaluation to explicitly contain the ACEI content standards. The revised Student Teaching Evaluation was implemented with new cohorts as of spring 2013. There were 6 total student teachers who were evaluated using the revised benchmark towards the end of the 2012-2013 academic year with 100% of candidates scoring at proficient or higher on their midterm evaluation. Final evaluations results are pending.

The ILPB program report provides information on the transcript analysis process used as an additional measure of content knowledge for candidates in the MAED/TED-S program. The unit also is in process of changing its admissions policy to state that a content major or 30 credits in a content area is required at Level I admissions for the MAED/TED-S program as further evidence of candidate content knowledge.

Assessment 7 (ACEI, ILPB)
The ACEI and ILPB program reports will provide details on the Lesson Plan chosen as Assessment 7 as additional evidence for measuring candidates' content knowledge. The Lesson Plan was significantly revised based on SPA feedback and re-implemented as of spring 2013 for cohorts in the MAED/TED-E and MAED/TED-S programs.

To date only 5 candidates in the MAED/TED-E have completed the revised benchmark and 96% have scored at proficient or higher. Candidate data from the previous benchmark shows that 100% of candidates have scored at proficient or higher in demonstrating content knowledge while lesson planning. Refer to Table 3 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

There are no results to date for the MAED/TED-S program on the revised benchmark. The previous benchmark data shows high levels of proficiency in candidate ability to demonstrate content knowledge on the Lesson Plan. In 2010-2011 there was a significant decline in scores but the N was only two candidates. Upon further review it was revealed that these two candidates needed additional instruction in this area. Refer to Table 4 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

6000 character limit

1.1.b Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the pedagogical content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.

Pedagogical content knowledge of candidates is measured by results on an Integrated Unit, Instructional Unit, Case Study Project, and Classroom Management Plan. Details for each benchmark are included in the applicable SPA program reports. All of these benchmarks were significantly revised and re-implemented with spring 2013 cohorts. The revised benchmarks meet the SPA criteria for evaluating pedagogical content knowledge and the unit looks forward to reviewing candidate data explicitly related to the SPA standards. This new approach will give the unit valuable information to make informed decisions regarding candidate pedagogical knowledge and skills. As noted in 1.1.a, there is limited data

available on the revised benchmarks but data and analysis from the previous iterations of the benchmarks are included here to support the unit's claims. Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables contains the data tables to support the narrative of each element in Standard 1 as applicable.

Assessment 3 (CEC, ACEI, ILPB)
The Integrated Unit was used as evidence for pedagogical content knowledge in MAED/SPE and MAED/TED-E since it focuses on elements of reading, language, and literacy specific to the chosen P-12 student population and content area. The rubric evaluates candidates' ability to plan instruction based on application of standards and knowledge of pedagogy.

Candidate data from the previous benchmark in the MAED/SPE shows that 94% or more of candidates across four academic years consistently score proficient or higher on rubric criteria for the Integrated Unit. Refer to Table 5 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

Candidate data from the previous benchmark in the MAED/TED-E shows 97% or more of candidates across four academic years consistently score proficient or higher on rubric criteria for the Integrated Unit. Refer to Table 6 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

The Instructional Unit was used as evidence for pedagogical content knowledge in the MAED/TED-S. The Instructional Unit focuses on math or science pedagogical content knowledge at the secondary level. The purpose of the benchmark is to evaluate candidate use of content standards and content pedagogy standards when planning instruction. Candidate data from the previous benchmark in the MAED/TED-S shows that 89% to 98% of candidates over four academic years scored proficient or higher on rubric criteria that evaluated candidate ability to plan content instruction. Refer to Table 7 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

Assessment 6 (CEC, ACEI ILPB)
The Case Study Project evaluates candidate ability to select and use appropriate special education methodologies. Various elements of the revised benchmark rubric assess CEC Standard 7: Instructional Planning and will provide the unit with valuable information on candidate pedagogical knowledge when data becomes available. Candidate data from the previous benchmark in the MAED/SPE shows that 95% to 100% of candidates over three academic years scored proficient or higher on the benchmark rubric criteria demonstrating pedagogical content knowledge. Refer to Table 8 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

The Instructional Unit from the MAED/TED-E program was used as an additional benchmark to provide evidence of candidate ability to demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge. Candidate data from the previous benchmark in the MAED/TED-E shows that for three years 93% to 98% of candidates scored proficient or higher on rubric criteria for the Instructional Unit. During academic year 2012-2013, only 76% of candidates scored proficient or higher. The N this academic year was significantly lower than previous years. The unit feels that the revisions made to the Instructional Unit assignment and rubric will alleviate any issues related to obtaining necessary pedagogical content knowledge. Refer to Table 9 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

Secondary Science candidates in the MAED/TED-S program will have their pedagogical content knowledge evaluated using the Instructional Unit as a whole as well as an additional component specific to the NSTA Safety Assessment as required by the ILPB program review process. The NSTA Safety Assessment is a brand new component of the benchmark so previous data is not applicable.

Assessment 8 (ACEI)
The unit selected an additional optional benchmark as evidence of pedagogical content knowledge for

the ACEI program report. The Classroom Management Plan provides evidence of how candidates plan to create supportive and effective learning environments. Various ACEI standards are assessed in the benchmark rubric specific to pedagogical content knowledge. Candidate data from the previous benchmark in the MAED/TED-E shows that 95% to 100% of candidates scored proficient or higher over three academic years on rubric criteria for the Classroom Management Plan. Refer to Table 10 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

6000 character limit

1.1.c Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.

Assessment 4 (CEC, ACEI, ILPB)

The Student Teaching Evaluation was submitted during the SPA program review process to provide evidence of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. The Student Teaching Evaluation was significantly redesigned based on the program review process. The revised evaluation was made available to cohorts starting in spring 2013. The revised Student Teaching Evaluation utilizes the respective SPA standards as the basis for evaluation and is program and content specific.

Included in the applicable program reports are the revised Student Teaching Evaluations and data based on the previous evaluation form showing that a majority of student teaching candidates are performing at or above the proficient level and show progress from the mid-term evaluation to the final evaluation.

Four years of candidate data from the previous Student Teaching Evaluation in the MAED/SPE program shows 83% to 97% of candidates score proficient or higher on the midterm evaluation while 97% to 100% of candidates score proficient or higher on the final evaluation. Refer to Table 11 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

Four years of candidate data from the previous Student Teaching Evaluation in the MAED/TED-E program shows 95% to 97% of candidates score proficient or higher on the midterm evaluation while 98% to 100% of candidates score proficient or higher on the final evaluation. Refer to Table 12 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

Four years of candidate data from the previous Student Teaching Evaluation in the MAED/TED-S program shows 85% to 92% of candidates score proficient or higher on the midterm evaluation while 97% to 100% of candidates score proficient or higher on the final evaluation. Refer to Table 13 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

6000 character limit

1.1.d Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Summary processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of the knowledge, skills, and ability to affect student learning.

Assessment 5 (CEC, ACEI, ILPB)

The Teacher Work Sample was submitted during the SPA program review process to provide evidence of candidates' ability to demonstrate the knowledge and skills to affect student learning. The Teacher Work Sample was also redesigned based on the program review process. The revised assessment was made available in spring 2013. The revised Teacher Work Sample utilizes the respective SPA standards and is now content and program specific.

Teacher candidates are required to complete a Teacher Work Sample during the student teaching experience. It is developed and evaluated in conjunction with the cooperating teacher and university faculty supervisor. The Teacher Work Sample includes seven standards by which candidates are assessed:

• Standard 1 – Contextual Factors
• Standard 2 – Learning Goals and Objectives
• Standard 3 – Assessment Plan
• Standard 4 – Design for Instruction
• Standard 5 – Instructional Decision-Making
• Standard 6 – Analysis of Learning Results
• Standard 7 – Reflection and Self-Evaluation

Student teachers collaborate with their cooperating teachers to develop and implement the Teacher Work Sample in the P-12 classroom. The Teacher Work Sample requires candidates to plan and teach an instructional unit over a span of time. Included in the applicable program reports are the revised Teacher Work Sample benchmarks, rubrics, and accompanying data based on the previous iteration of the benchmark. Data from the previous benchmark iteration shows that a majority of student teachers are performing at or above the proficient level on the Teacher Work Sample.

Candidate data from the previous benchmark in the MAED/SPE program shows that over four academic years 83% to 100% of special education candidates scored proficient or higher across all seven standards. Candidates consistently scored the highest on Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 3, and Standard 5. Overall, special education candidates demonstrated strong proficiency in delivering appropriate content and having a positive impact on student learning. Standard 6 had the lowest proficiency with 80% of candidates scoring proficient or higher during one academic year. The next three academic years showed significant improvement with 93% to 100% of candidates scoring proficient or higher after curriculum modifications focusing analyzing student learning results were added to assignments across the program. Refer to Table 14 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

Candidate data from the previous benchmark in the MAED/TED-E program shows that over four academic years 87% to 100% of elementary candidates scored proficient or higher across all seven standards. Candidates consistently scored the highest on Standard 2, Standard 3, and Standard 5. Overall, elementary candidates demonstrated strong proficiency in delivering appropriate elementary content and having a positive impact on student learning. Standard 1 and Standard 6 had the lowest proficiency levels, though still ranging from 87% to 96%. A stand-alone assessment course has been added to the MAED/TED-E program after analysis of data across benchmarks showed a candidate weakness in the area of assessment. The unit expects to see improvements across the program benchmarks related to analysis of learning results. Refer to Table 15 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

Candidate data from the previous benchmark in the MAED/TED-S program shows that over four academic years 70% to 100% of secondary candidates scored proficient or higher across all seven standards. Candidates consistently scored the highest on Standard 2, Standard 3, Standard 5, and Standard 7. Overall, secondary candidates scored the lowest in comparison to special education and

elementary candidates. The unit believes that the significant benchmark revisions that have occurred across the MAED/TED-Secondary program will have a positive impact on candidate achievement in implementing the Teacher Work Sample. Refer to Table 16 in Exhibit 5: Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

6000 character limit

1.1.e Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on other school professionals' demonstration of the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.

The unit does not offer programs for other school professionals at the Hawaii Campus.

6000 character limit

1.1.f Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on other school professionals' demonstration of abilities to create and maintain positive environments, as appropriate to their professional responsibilities, which support student learning in educational settings.

The unit does not offer programs for other school professionals at the Hawaii Campus.

6000 character limit

1.1.g Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Summarize processes for development and outcomes from key assessments based on candidates' demonstration of professional dispositions expected by the unit.

Candidate dispositions are evaluated during coursework, field experience, and student teaching. Assessment rubrics for student teaching, field experience, and benchmark assessments include dispositional criteria. For example, during student teaching candidates are expected to "demonstrate positive and collaborative relationships," "demonstrate a nurturing and caring attitude toward students," and "demonstrate professional demeanor." Candidates are expected to be "aware of and reflect on their practice" throughout the program while completing benchmark assessments, participating in field experience, and completing student teaching.

Candidates complete a self-assessment of dispositions at the beginning, middle and end of each program. The Dispositions Self Assessment is included as Exhibit 6. Using the Dispositions Self-Assessment, candidates are asked to evaluate the importance of, and their level of experience with, defined dispositions toward effective P-12 teaching and learning. The evaluation rubric is aligned with the Supplemental Standards and remediation process used by faculty and staff explained below. The self-evaluation and subsequent review by faculty will provide information to candidates, faculty, and staff that can be used for candidate advisement, personal and professional development, and remediation as necessary.

The program's design supports the development of these dispositions as candidates participate in coursework, field experience, and clinical practice. An analysis of data was conducted to determine

candidates' levels of experience with dispositions related to P-12 teaching and learning from the beginning of the program to the end of the program. The results indicate candidate growth from the beginning of the program to the end.

For example, data from September 1, 2009 to August 31, 2013 indicate that MAED/Special Education candidates demonstrated substantial growth related to experience with Disposition 3: Being a thoughtful and responsive listener, soliciting and receiving feedback related to program and professional goals in a positive manner and making necessary adjustments (75% (n=20) to 88% (n=9)). Growth in experience also was indicated related to Disposition 4: A commitment to reflection, assessment, and learning as an ongoing process and a belief that all students can learn (65% (n=20) to 78% (n=9)).

For the same time period, MAED/TED-Elementary candidates indicated substantial growth related to experience with Disposition 1 (77% (n=30) to 95% (n=43)). MAED/TED-Secondary candidates also indicated substantial growth (60% (n=20) to 91% (n=35)). Levels of experience related to Disposition 4 also rose for MAED/TED-Elementary candidates (77% (n=30) to 81% (n=43)) and MAED/TED-Secondary candidates (55% (n=20) to 77% (n=35)). The original data used for this analysis is not included in AIMS due to size limitations but can be made available upon request.

In addition, the University has Supplemental Standards (Exhibit 7) and Professional Dispositions Rubric (Exhibit 8) for all educator preparation programs with a referral and remediation process that is used by faculty throughout the program to assist candidates who are not meeting professional and program goals and standards. For the duration of the program, faculty members review program requirements and dispositions to monitor progress. Candidates who receive one or more faculty referrals are advised, remediated, and/or counseled out of the program, as appropriate. The Campus College Chair will serve as the primary point of contact in instances of remediation plans and/or retention hearings.

One faculty referral results in a formal warning letter and a mandatory interview with the candidate's Academic Counselor. At this meeting, any issues or problems that are hindering a candidate's progress are discussed. A collaborative plan to correct deficiencies is developed. Additionally, a candidate is reminded of the importance of adhering to the program standards.

A candidate who receives two or more faculty referrals is notified in writing by the Campus College Chair of the specific issues or concerns. The Campus College Chair will convene a meeting of the Student Retention Committee and, if necessary, conduct a formal hearing. The committee may make one of the following recommendations (based on work by Blake, R. and Oda, L., 2001):

1. Take no action;
2. Institute a formal remediation plan;
3. Recommend withdrawal from the program.

Exhibit 9 Procedures for Referrals contains the step-by-step directions on how student referrals and remediation plans are handled. All documentation related to faculty recommendations and/or advice to a candidate is maintained in individual candidate files at the campus. Access to these documents can be granted during the onsite visit. The referral and remediation process is ongoing throughout the program. Effectiveness of a remediation plan is determined by the candidate's improved performance and successful completion of the program.

6000 character limit

1.1.h Follow Up Studies

Summarize results from follow-up studies of graduates and employers regarding your teacher education graduates' content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, ability to help all students learn, and professional dispositions.

The Office of Learning Assessment (OLA) administers and compiles analyses of results from alumni and employer surveys on behalf of all colleges and schools at the university. These surveys are administered nationally rather than state or campus-specific. The unit is working collaboratively with OLA on a bi-annual cycle to update and administer the Alumni Academic Questionnaire.

Alumni Survey

The alumni survey is a web-based questionnaire aligned with the University of Phoenix mission statement and intended candidate learning outcomes and is called the Alumni Academic Questionnaire. Exhibit 10 contains the Alumni Academic Questionnaire questions and findings. The purpose of the Alumni Academic Questionnaire is to evaluate the quality of the educational experience by ascertaining the degree to which the University of Phoenix and the unit helps candidates attain the objectives stated in the institutional mission. The Alumni Academic Questionnaire is intended to provide institutional and college-level data and information. Though administered nationally, the raw data from the Alumni Academic Questionnaire can be disaggregated for the Hawaii Campus for unit programs. The date range, the number of respondents from Hawaii, and the response rate specific to the College of Education in Hawaii shows the following:

• Program completers from September 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011
• n = 13
• Response rate = 4.9%

The alumni survey was administered in 2011 and had 1,332 respondents nationwide with an 11.5% response rate. To increase the potential for response rates the administration of the Alumni Academic Questionnaire includes an invitation email along with two follow-up reminder emails. In addition, the Campus College Chair sent recent graduates a pre-invitation to the Alumni Academic Questionnaire. Last, the administration of the Alumni Academic Questionnaire was open for four and a half weeks. The two strongest areas of preparedness by program were found to be the following:

MAED/SPE: 1) Provide opportunities for student involvement in learning and 2) understand the developmental characteristics of students and use those characteristics as a guide for planning.

MAED/TED-Elementary: 1) Plan objectives and select supporting activities that are aligned to state academic standards and 2) use materials, resources, and activities that are developmentally appropriate.

MAED/TED-Secondary: 1) Provide opportunities for student involvement in learning and 2) understand the developmental characteristics of students and use those characteristics as a guide for planning.

Employer Survey

The Office of Learning Assessment administered an employer survey in March 2012 on behalf of the College of Education. Unfortunately there was a very small sample size from which to draw conclusions. The employer survey for the College of Education had 35 total respondents nationwide, making it difficult to draw conclusions from the findings. The employer survey was administered from March 1-15, 2012 by Campus College Chairs nationwide providing a survey deployment package containing an email invitation, survey link, and directions to contact schools and districts to solicit their

volunteer participation in this project. The total number of Campus College Chairs who sent emails is not known with certainty; however, OLA staff members were able to confirm with evidence that thirteen Campus College Chairs forwarded the email to their school and district contacts. There were 93 total respondents with a final sample size of 36 respondents. Specific information explaining why some of the surveys received were not included in the analysis is included as Exhibit 11 Employer Survey.

The survey specifically asked employers to rate teacher preparation graduates on their ability to understand and convey accurate subject matter knowledge. Overall, the small number of responses showed a positive result with most graduates demonstrating that they are very well prepared or well prepared in the content area. It is also important to note that in most cases, the University did not provide content area knowledge to initial teacher preparation graduates since all alumni have completed master's level preparation programs to date.

6000 character limit

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

□ Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
□ Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
□ Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

Not applicable

36000 character limit

1.2.b Continuous Improvement

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The unit is always in an active cycle of continuous improvement especially with its programmatic offerings, course content, benchmark assessments and associated rubrics. All programs, courses, benchmarks, and rubrics were thoroughly reviewed and revised as part of the SPA program review process and in preparation for writing the NCATE Institutional Report. The time spent in the review, revision, and implementation phases has not allowed for substantial data to be available in time for the onsite visit. The unit does feel that the review, revision, and implementation of new programs, courses, benchmarks, and rubrics has been an excellent learning experience and will provide the unit with valuable data on candidate learning, unit operations, and program integrity.
As part of the ongoing continuous improvement efforts that the unit engages in, several items have been identified as immediate areas for improvement including:

• Implementation of a campus-based assessment calendar
• Review of different ways to meaningfully analyze and present dispositions data
• Review of options for formal dispositional measurements that are not candidate self-assessments
• Updating and re-distributing the alumni and employer surveys
• Engaging in faculty calibration exercises

As will be discussed in Standard 2, campus-based assessment calendars are mandatory action items for every college. The assessment calendar is used to schedule data collection and analyses on a continuous basis by faculty, campus staff, and the dean's office. The calendar aligns with a corresponding assessment plan detailing what data/information will be collected, how and with whom it will be shared, and how it will be used for programmatic improvement.

Improvement of the dispositions tool and processes involved with measuring candidate dispositions is an ongoing area for improvement. Currently, the unit uses a candidate self-assessment tool three times in the program and the student teaching evaluation to measure dispositions. In addition, dispositions are monitored throughout the program by faculty of record in each course and the Supplemental Standards process can be used to notify administrative faculty of any issues with a candidate's dispositions. The unit is currently reviewing various options for formal faculty evaluation of candidate dispositions. Also, the unit is currently looking in to different ways to review and present existing dispositions data for internal analysis. For this Institutional Report the dispositions data was presented as a sequence of data from beginning, middle, and end of the program rather than presented by a specific time frame such as previous academic year. This presentation of the data proved far more meaningful to the unit than by academic year which only yields a partial story of the dispositions assessment.

The unit is working with the Office of Learning Assessment to develop alumni and employer surveys that provide disaggregated data in a more meaningful way. The updated surveys should reflect the types of questions and provide the required data to inform decisions around program improvement.
As will also be discussed in Standard 2, additional faculty calibration exercises were found to be a weakness and efforts have been made to informally and formally provide faculty training. Data revealed a need for additional faculty training on the proper use of the e-portfolio system, procedures for running student learning data reports, and how to utilize student learning data meaningfully.

5000 character limit

1.3 Exhibits for Standard 1

1.3.a	State program review documents and state findings (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.)
1.3.b	Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years
1.3.c	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against professional and state standards as well as proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Some of this information may be accessible for nationally recognized programs in AIMS. Cross reference as appropriate.)
1.3.d	Aggregate data on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.)
1.3.e	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn
1.3.f	Aggregate data on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.)

1.3.g	Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning
1.3.h	Examples of candidates' work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from programs across the unit
1.3.i	Aggregate data on follow-up studies of graduates
1.3.j	Aggregate data on employer feedback on graduates
1.3.k	Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation programs and the effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, when available

Exhibit 5 Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables
Exhibit 6 Dispositions Self Assessment
Exhibit 7 Supplemental Standards
Exhibit 8 Professional Dispositions Rubric
Exhibit 9 Procedures for Referrals
Exhibit 10 Alumni Academic Questionnaire
Exhibit 11 Employer Survey

See **Attachment** panel below.

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

2.1.a Assessment System

Summarize content, construct, process, and evaluation of the unit assessment system, its key assessments in relation to professional, state, and institutional standards, and its use in monitoring candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

Candidate Performance

The assessment system for monitoring candidate performance is the electronic portfolio from TaskStream. Using TaskStream's portfolio allows the unit to collect data on student learning outcomes from benchmark assessments. Data can be aggregated and disaggregated based on numerous variables in order to monitor candidate performance including by campus, program, cohort, individuals, specific date ranges, or rubric criteria.

Benchmark assessment selection is based on coverage of standards and proficiencies, and the artifact's ability to demonstrate actual application of relevant knowledge and skills. Appendix A in the Conceptual Framework (Exhibit 1) provides a mapping of the benchmarks with the program standards and the University Learning Goals. The benchmark assessments and rubrics are included in each of the SPA Program Reports found on AIMS. Standards-based rubrics are used for evaluation and to provide the candidate with feedback on progress in meeting standards and proficiencies. Assessments were selected to represent a range of opportunities for candidates to demonstrate attainment of all program

proficiencies.

Additionally, the unit monitors candidate performance related to program progression and completion through in an internal database with reporting capabilities. Items such as fingerprint clearance, letters of recommendation, and Praxis results are stored in the database for easy retrieval at any time. Exhibit 12 Program Transition Points details the candidate lifecycle from admissions to progression through program completion with benchmark assessments noted.

Program Quality

The unit's assessment system and specific benchmarks are aligned directly with the conceptual framework and SPA standards. Alignment with the conceptual framework is reflected in the incorporation of framework themes (e.g., Valuing Diversity, Engaging in Reflective Practice) into specific assessments. The assessments reflect professional standards by aligning program outcomes to assessment components of rubric criteria. Using the state content standards embedded in TaskStream, candidates are required to align their lesson plans, units, and P-12 student assessments with the applicable standards. Candidates must meet program proficiencies that are embedded in course content and assessments, expectations for field experience and clinical practice, program progression, and completion requirements.

The Deans Office has responsibility for reviewing aggregated and disaggregated data across all programs nationwide; across a specific program but for all state/campus locations; a specific program for a specific state/campus; and/or all programs for a specific state/campus. Staff members within the Deans Office such as instructional designers, curriculum development managers, and associate/assistant deans review aggregated and disaggregated data on a continuous basis to make informed decisions regarding program quality. Internal program evaluation procedures described later in Standard 2 as well as external processes such as state agency program review and SPA program review provide the mechanisms for assessing program quality.

Unit Operations

Unit review and analysis of data occurs at the state and national programmatic level to guide the work of the unit in making data-based decisions regarding program effectiveness and candidate learning outcomes. The Campus College Chair along with the Lead Faculty/Area Chairs review program-specific candidate learning outcomes data on a quarterly basis in Content Area Meetings with faculty. The Lead Faculty/Area Chairs are assigned to specific program areas based on their own area of expertise and are responsible for programmatic improvement, candidate learning, and faculty development under the guidance of the Campus College Chair. Together they review aggregated and disaggregated data for the programs and will then interact with the Deans Office to make recommendations for program improvement.

The Deans Office assesses unit operations through accreditation and program approval efforts; review of institutional and nationwide student learning outcomes data; alumni/employer survey results; overall faculty trends and effectiveness; participation on institutional academic, operational, and strategic committees and councils; development of programs, curricula, and policies; national admissions data; Title II reporting; program completion data; and monitoring institutional recommendations. The portion of the unit that comprises the Deans Office is actively involved in gathering, reviewing, analyzing, and presenting data and outcomes on a daily basis as a major component of the roles and responsibilities for the staff members of the Deans Office.

The Hawaii Campus and Online staff members review enrollment trends to determine program offerings

and course scheduling on an ongoing basis since candidate demand determines which programs are offered when. Since the programs have two admissions transition points (Level I and Level II admissions), academic counselors and Teacher Education Specialists monitor candidate progress throughout the program. Counseling, advising, and/or remediation is provided on a continuous basis for all candidates by the academic advising staff.

Data regarding admissions, programs, and student services are regularly collected, summarized, analyzed, and utilized to make decisions as part of the normal operating procedures of the institution and the unit. The successful performance of all staff members is dependent upon knowing and understanding this information and pursuing continuous improvement of institutional operations.

8000 characterl limit

2.1.b Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Summarize processes, timelines, and outcomes of data collection, analysis, and evaluation of candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

Candidate Performance

The use of an electronic portfolio and a customized internal database allows the unit to gather, summarize and analyze data related to benchmark assessments and program progression requirements. Candidates must submit evidence of basic skills proficiency, verification of fingerprint clearance, and other documentation as appropriate to their assigned academic counselor to meet requirements for Level 2 admission to the college. Candidates also must provide evidence of eligibility to progress into student teaching (scores from Praxis content knowledge exam and student teaching application). Throughout the program candidates complete benchmark assessments and submit for evaluation. Scores for each assessment criterion and an overall assessment score are calculated using tools provided by TaskStream. Data from the Praxis exam are provided to the college in a secure portal that University personnel access.

Faculty members evaluate each candidate's completed benchmark assignment and discuss the results with each candidate for reflection and improvement.
In addition, during Content Area Meetings, the Lead faculty/Area Chairs will lead quarterly reviews of data to evaluate candidates' performance and progress related to specific program outcomes. These analyses by faculty guide curricular changes, instructional adaptations, and use of new materials. Examples include creation of supporting documents to assist faculty and site-based supervisors in evaluating student teachers, calibration activities, and continued coaching for faculty and supervisors on assessment. Data analysis also has helped faculty members determine areas of focus for teaching such as differentiated instruction. From this analysis, faculty members meet as a group to discuss methods for teaching differentiated instruction and for modeling its use in the classroom with candidates.

Program Quality

Unit staff members summarize and analyze the data, in particular the Dean, Associate/Assistant Deans, and the Campus College Chair. This analysis is in consultation with assigned staff members from the Office of Learning Assessment who guide the process and provide general assistance with statistical analysis and interpretation. Faculty Council members also assist in data analysis and program evaluation projects related to curricula, assessments, policies, and operations. A list of the Faculty Council Tasks for the past three years is included as Exhibit 13 Faculty Council Tasks.

The Campus College Chair and faculty members collaborate to determine strengths and areas for improvement in candidate performance based on data from TaskStream. Based on this analysis, faculty members may decide to make instructional changes, suggest curricular and program revisions to the unit, and/or offer tutoring or other remediation for candidates. In addition to licensure test support for all MAED candidates that resulted from examining records in TaskStream, faculty have examined TaskStream data and determined students needed supplemental assistance with lesson planning goals and objectives, and have offered workshops to students in this area.

Data from TaskStream is exported to an Excel spreadsheet which includes the percentage of candidates achieving a particular score on the assessment by criterion, number of candidates assessed, and overall percentages for all candidates. This format allows for analysis of individual programs offered at the campus as well as analysis across campuses. Trends and areas of strength/weakness at the campus support faculty development and training. Comparison of these trends and areas of strength/weakness across campuses support program and curricular revision, review of assessments and rubrics, and faculty development and training on a national scale.

Unit Operations

As noted in an earlier response, the Deans Office reviews aggregated data on a continuous basis to make informed decisions regarding all aspects of unit operations. There are numerous data points and reports that are generated in Central Administration that are utilized to guide the work of the Deans Office including admissions and progression, Title II reporting, enrollment and retention trends, and graduation rates.

The unit also formed an NCATE Council in academic year 2010-2011 who had the responsibility of reviewing SPA program review feedback as well as feedback from the Faculty Council from the previous academic year. In September of 2010, the unit gathered faculty from campuses nationwide to review and discuss the SPA program report feedback for each of the programs as part of the NCATE accreditation process. The Hawaii Campus did not have an individual representative on the NCATE Council. Using benchmark assessment data and the SPA feedback, the NCATE Council determined next steps for revising program benchmarks, curriculum, and outcomes. Minutes from that meeting are included as Exhibit 14 NCATE Council Meeting Minutes.

8000 character limit

2.1.c Use of Data for Program Improvement

Summarize processes, timelines, activities, and outcomes derived from use of data for program improvement of candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

Candidate Performance

Transition points are monitored by the Campus College Chair, Academic Counselors, and Teacher Education Specialists to ensure that all progression requirements are being met. The faculty members' role includes providing reminders, encouragement, and evaluation of candidate work required at transitional points. Faculty members who teach courses that involve submission of transition point requirements are responsible for ensuring those requirements are submitted for review and evaluated prior to the end of the course.

In addition, there are centralized processes and systems that monitor transition point requirements. The unit requires a two-tiered admissions (Level 1 and Level 2) process whereby candidates must meet specific requirements in order to enter the core courses of initial programs and progress to student

teaching. The institutional scheduling system will not allow candidates to progress in their degree programs without having all requirements met for Level 2 Candidacy. If all candidacy requirements have been met, the system allows scheduling of their next course. If not, the system does not allow the candidate to be scheduled for additional courses until those requirements have been met. Transition points for each program are included as Exhibit 12 Program Transition Points.

Benchmark assessment data is exported from TaskStream and used by various stakeholders to make informed decisions on curricula, programs, and candidate performance. A recent analysis of TaskStream data by Hawaii Campus faculty revealed that candidates had weaknesses on the Praxis I basic skills exam. A team of faculty members created consistent and required assessments for the courses preceding the transition point within the program when candidates must present passing scores on the basic skills exam. An upward trend in Praxis I basic skills exam scores is already being seen.

The Lead Faculty/Area Chairs also use candidate performance data in the Content Area Meetings that they chair with all program faculty members. On a quarterly basis, they will meet to review programmatic, faculty, and candidate issues related to a specific program. These committees share best practices, instructional and assessment strategies, and updates regarding program policies and procedures. Committees also review candidate assessment data and submit critical analysis results to the unit as part of the continuous improvement process. The unit compiles these analyses to guide the work of the Faculty Council and assist unit staff with data-based decisions on programmatic, assessment, and curricular improvements.

Program Quality

The summarizing, analyzing, and sharing of data at the Hawaii Campus and online is done using the mandated Campus Assessment Calendar (Exhibit 15). The Campus Assessment Calendar is used to drive programmatic improvement. The first assessment calendar was implemented in the 2012-2013 academic year. Benchmark assessments, surveys, and relevant data are assessed by the Campus College Chair and the Lead Faculty/Area Chairs on a monthly basis. The results of the data are shared with numerous stakeholders including faculty, staff, candidates, and the newly developed advisory board.

Using the previous six months of assessment-related activities noted on the Campus Assessment Calendar, a Campus Semi-Annual Assessment Report (Exhibit 16) is then created. The Campus Semi-Annual Assessment Report includes an overview of assessment activities, an overall analysis of assessment data aligned to proficiencies and outcomes, and findings and actions based on the data. Members of the Dean's Office then compile the nationwide results of the Campus Semi-Annual Assessment Report into a national College of Education Programmatic Assessment Semi-Annual Report (Exhibit 17).

The Faculty Council analyzes this data, other benchmark assessment data, SPA and state agency program review feedback and provides recommendations for program and unit improvement. The Faculty Council consists of college and campus staff, faculty, and representatives from professional organizations. The very nature of the practitioner faculty used to teach courses at the University allows for input from the field and meaningful involvement in program development and unit improvements. The Faculty Council functions as an external check and balance against student and faculty inputs and outcomes for the unit related to program development and evaluation and unit operations.

The unit utilized their Faculty Council members from three different academic years as well as an NCATE Council that was formed for the purposes of reviewing the SPA feedback and determining next steps for revisions of the program assessments. Exhibit 13 Faculty Council Tasks and Exhibit 14 NCATE Council Meeting Minutes provide additional details. The following tasks included

recommendations from the Faculty Council that were made to programs and the benchmark assignments:

Faculty Council Project #6 (May – June 2010): Critically read the ACEI Program Report and feedback, analyzed benchmark data and other information in the program report, and made specific recommendations for continuous improvement of the BSED-E and MAED/TED-E programs based on the data.

Faculty Council Project #7 (June – July 2010): Critically read the CEC Program Report and feedback, analyzed the benchmark data and other information in the report, and made specific recommendations for continuous improvement of the MAED/Special Education program based on the data.

Faculty Council Project #8 (June – July 2010): Participated in online NCATE standards discussion forums with a Regional Assistant Dean or Associate Dean as a facilitator in each forum.

The NCATE Council was formed to review feedback from the SPAs, candidate learning outcomes data, benchmark assessments and rubrics, and all clinical and field experiences. Over the course of two days, the participants broke into groups and discussed the feedback provided by the external evaluators and determined a plan for revision for each benchmark assessment in each program including BSED/Elementary, MAED/TED-Elementary, MAED/TED-Secondary, and MAED/Special Education. The meeting resulted in detailed plans for full revision of benchmark assignments to meet SPA requirements and standards.

Unit Operations

Using the campus-specific assessment calendars, staff in the Dean's Office prepare a College of Education Programmatic Assessment Semi-Annual Report (Exhibit 17) summarizing all of the campus assessment activities, results, findings, and actions nationwide for the previous six months. Starting in the 2013-2014 fiscal year, the Dean's Office will also prepare an annual programmatic assessment report using data from all campus assessment calendars nationwide to analyze, evaluate, and improve unit operations. Also beginning this fiscal year, the Dean's Office has developed a College of Education Assessment Calendar (Exhibit 18) to review and analyze data related to candidate achievement of program outcomes. The Dean's Office has engaged in this type of programmatic and unit evaluation in past years but outside of the SPA or state agency program review process, it was not a formalized process of its own. The results of these analyses (past and present) are shared with unit and campus staff, and used to determine the need for curricular and programmatic revisions, faculty training, and additional support services for candidates (e.g., test preparation workshops).

The assessment reports are reviewed by the Office of Learning Assessment and contribute to the University of Phoenix Academic Annual Report (Exhibit 19). The Academic Annual Report includes learning outcomes and demographic data of its students and faculty, and topics of academic interest such as academic quality and risk factors for learners.

8000 character limit

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

□ Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
□ Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
□ Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

Not applicable

36000 character limit

2.2.b Continuous Improvement

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

Data is consistently and regularly utilized to make informed decisions regarding curriculum and program revisions as well as unit operations. Examples of these changes and future plans for further enhancements are provided below.

Curriculum Changes

The unit developed and implemented a stand-alone assessment course in all initial preparation programs based on candidate data indicating weakness in the area of student assessment.

The unit revised its Teacher Work Sample to make it program-specific based on candidate data indicating some confusion and low performance on the standard related to classroom context. The standards and rubric criteria remain the same but specific language within each standard provides more directed guidance to candidates.

The Faculty Council critically reviewed and revised the foundations and methods courses in initial preparation programs. The revisions were based upon the analysis of programmatic data as well as feedback from faculty and candidates. The focus of these revisions included: relevancy of content; refining content-area assessments; differentiation of instruction; identification of innovative resources to support curriculum; development of diverse assessments to support respective professional standards; and the enrichment of field experiences.

Program Changes

The unit also created a Technology Resource Library to be accessed online by faculty and candidates. The resource library was created as a response to data showing candidate weakness in the area of technology integration into instruction. This resource library includes demonstrations, user guides, and links to different types of instructional technology. A demonstration of the Technology Resource Library will be provided at the onsite visit.

Additionally, significant changes were made to initial preparation programs based on feedback received in the SPA program report review process. Examples include revising benchmark assessments and rubrics to align more closely with SPA standards. Language in each assessment reflects the SPA standards and age/grade level; in addition, the rubrics were revised to delineate applicable SPA standards as assessment criteria. The Student Teaching Evaluation was revised to include specific tasks and expectations for activities that align directly to applicable SPA standards.

Unit Changes

The unit oversees and manages the collection and analysis of programmatic data and the development of associated reports for internal use as well as external evaluation both at the campus level and nationally in the Dean's Office. The unit also oversees the ongoing development, implementation, and analysis of benchmark assessments and data at the campus and nationwide. In order to manage the breadth and depth of this task, assessment calendars were mandated for campuses and the Dean's Office to help guide continuous improvement efforts. The assessment calendar is used to schedule data collection and analyses on a continuous basis by faculty, campus staff, and the dean's office. The calendar aligns with a corresponding assessment plan detailing what data/information will be collected, how and with whom it will be shared, and how it will be used for programmatic improvement. The assessment calendars have been used to create semi-annual assessments reports for the campus and for the Dean's Office at the national level. The next step is to create annual reports using the data collected from the assessment calendars and semi-annual reports. This work will begin in academic year 2013-2014.

A new role also was created to support the integration of technology across the curriculum and programs as well as to support the unit. The Director of Educational Technology reports to the Dean's Office and is responsible for researching and analyzing new technologies to help support candidate learning as well as improve unit operations. The creation of the Technology Resource Library was the first output of this new role. During academic year 2013-2014 further revisions to the curriculum and to the simulated virtual school district will be undertaken and campus-based classroom technology enhancements will be added.

Data analysis also revealed a need for additional faculty training on the proper use of the e-portfolio system, procedures for running candidate learning data reports, and how to utilize candidate learning data meaningfully. Formal and informal trainings have occurred as a result and will continue to be offered throughout academic year 2013-2014.

5000 character limit

2.3 Exhibits for Standard 2

2.3.a	Description of the unit's assessment system including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points
2.3.b	Admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry to programs
2.3.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of program quality and unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias
2.3.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used for continuous improvement
2.3.e	Policies, procedures and practices for managing candidate complaints
2.3.f	File of candidate complaints and the unit's responses and resolutions (This information should be available during the onsite visit)
2.3.g	Examples of significant changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system

Exhibit 12 Program Transition Points
Exhibit 13 Faculty Council Tasks
Exhibit 14 NCATE Council Meeting Minutes

Exhibit 15 Campus Assessment Calendar
Exhibit 16 Campus Semi-Annual Assessment Report
Exhibit 17 COE Programmatic Assessment Semi-Annual Report
Exhibit 18 COE Assessment Calendar
Exhibit 19 UOPX Academic Annual Report

See **Attachment** panel below.

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 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.1.a Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

Summarize processes and outcomes of collaboration between unit and school partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences, and in sharing of responsibilities, resources, and expertise.

The Hawaii Department of Education serves a dual role and purpose in that it provides the administration and structure as Hawaii's P-12 school district as well as governing all aspects of teacher preparation. The unit has a single affiliation agreement/memorandum of understanding with the Hawaii Department of Education for the placement and supervision of candidates in field and clinical experiences across the islands.

The Hawaii Campus has four Clinical Placement Supervisors who meet with individual school partners to discuss and document questions, concerns, and ideas. The Clinical Placement Supervisors are all retired Hawaii Department of Education personnel. These four individuals conduct the placement process for all Hawaii candidates including online. For all candidates, staff members verify documentation and ensure that the candidate is eligible for the clinical placement. The Clinical Placement Supervisors meet with each school placement site to discuss the program, field experience requirements and expectations, and school characteristics. Feedback from all stakeholders is used to guide local program improvement efforts. In addition, the unit has affiliation agreements in place with local schools to insure contractual agreements for all placement services. The following exhibits provide additional information regarding placement services.

Exhibit 20 Field Experience Approved Site List
Exhibit 21 Affiliation Agreement
Exhibit 22 Field Experience Principal Permission Form
Exhibit 23 Student Teaching Approved Site List

In the past, initial feedback from school partners suggested some areas for improvement related to field and clinical experiences. One suggestion was for the unit to provide specific training for the teachers who mentor and supervise candidates. In response to this feedback, the unit developed and implemented a mandatory university faculty supervisor and cooperating teacher training and checklist that all

participants must complete at the end of the training to document that they reviewed and understood all essential components of the training. The training and evaluation materials are included as:

Exhibit 24 Student Teaching Orientation Training
Exhibit 25 Cooperating Teacher Training Checklist
Exhibit 26 Cooperating Teacher Service Agreement
Exhibit 27 Faculty Supervisor Training Overview

Another suggestion from partner schools was for the unit to strengthen the curriculum to focus more on local Hawaiian issues. In response, the unit faculty formed committees and developed state-specific syllabi that address areas of concern to local schools. A sample of the state-specific syllabi is included as Exhibit 3a, 3b, and 3c.

NCATE's 2010 Blue Ribbon Panel report on clinical preparation and partnerships reported that most states require a student teaching experience ranging from 10-14 weeks. The 2011 report on student teaching conducted by NCTQ established five critical standards for student teaching experiences. The first critical standard states that the student teaching experience should be a full-time commitment of no less than 10 weeks, with no less than 5 weeks at a single school site. The state of Hawaii requires a minimum of 10 weeks for student teaching. Based on concerns expressed by both student teachers and cooperating teachers, the unit established a 65 day/13-week student teaching experience. By moving to a 13-week student teaching experience, the University of Phoenix meets and exceeds the state established requirements for student teaching experiences. Exhibit 28 Student Teaching Handbook provides details on all aspects of the student teaching experience.

Support for candidates is a shared responsibility among university and school-based personnel. Each student teacher is assigned a university faculty supervisor. The university faculty supervisor oversees the clinical experience and acts as a liaison between the site-based personnel and the university. The university faculty supervisor observes, evaluates, and supports the candidate throughout the clinical experience. Exhibit 28 Student Teaching Handbook provides additional information on the roles and responsibilities of the university faculty supervisor.

School-based support for candidates comes from assigned cooperating teachers. These partners supervise and support candidates on a daily basis to support candidates' professional growth. University faculty supervisors and school-based cooperating teachers share responsibilities for evaluating candidates' performance in the field and collaborate on the grades for clinical experiences. Exhibit 28 Student Teaching Handbook provides additional information on the roles and responsibilities of the cooperating teacher.

Partner schools share their curriculum and expertise with university candidates. They provide the day-to-day materials and resources for the candidate to complete the clinical experience. The university also shares resources with the school-based staff. Cooperating teachers and university faculty supervisors are provided access to TaskStream by the unit. Cooperating teachers have access to this system to complete their evaluations of the candidates electronically. They have access to the tools on the site such as the lesson, unit, and rubric builders aligned with state content standards that can be used in their own classrooms. School partners also have access to portfolio and web page tools that allow them to create personal web publications. All materials created through the TaskStream tools can be downloaded and saved to the site-based personnel's computer for easy and permanent access. These resources are provided to school partners free of charge by the unit. The unit also provides stipends for school-based personnel who support our candidates during clinical experiences.

8000 character limit

Summarize the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practices; expectations for mentors and supervisors; and outcomes of candidates in meeting proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards during their field and clinical experiences.

Design

The Dean's Office leads unit efforts to design field and clinical experiences based on best practices and research in the field. The unit employs curriculum managers, regulatory personnel, and subject matter experts to oversee the design of field and clinical experiences. The unit uses national reports such as NCATE's Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation (2010), NCTQ's Student Teaching in the United States (2011) report, as well as national and state standards to guide decisions related to the design of field and clinical experiences. Exhibit 29 Field Experience Record and Exhibit 28 Student Teaching Handbook provide additional details on the unit's clinical experience requirements.

The design of clinical experiences is a continual process and modifications are made as warranted. When modifying the design of field and clinical experiences, the unit utilizes the expertise of the clinical placement supervisors, university faculty supervisors, and input from constituents in the field, including cooperating teachers and principals. The clinical placement supervisors coordinate the placement for elementary, secondary, and special education candidates. These supervisors are retired Hawaii Department of Education teachers and administrators and have each placed University of Phoenix student teacher candidates for over eight years.

The campus administration and faculty also conducts analyses of candidate outcomes during field and clinical experience and have modified clinical experiences accordingly. For example, an analysis of Hawaii student teaching candidates indicated that lesson planning was an area for improvement based on results from the Student Teaching Evaluation. The faculty examined ways to strengthen lesson planning instruction throughout the program to better prepare candidates prior to student teaching. Through an analysis of field experience placements conducted by lead faculty/area chairs, the campus also determined some school complexes on the island of Oahu were not included on the list of approved field experience sites. In response to that finding, the unit refined its field experience site selection process to ensure that approved field experience sites represent all geographic areas of Oahu, thus ensuring candidates have exposure to a variety of P-12 students across the island. Exhibit 20 Field Experience Approved Site List and Exhibit 23 Student Teaching Approved Site List contain all of the clinical placement sites throughout the islands.

Implementation

The clinical placement supervisors oversee clinical practice and placements. These program representatives focus on implementation of the field and clinical experiences to insure the established policies and procedures are implemented with fidelity. They establish and maintain collaborative partnerships with schools, facilitate clinical placements, provide training for school- and university-based personnel, and oversee the evaluation process for clinical experiences. Candidates record site demographics and reflections for each field experience. Faculty members, unit staff, and university faculty supervisors monitor the candidates' records/logs. Exhibit 30 Sample Completed Field Experience Record demonstrates this process.

Evaluation

The unit's curriculum managers oversee the design and alignment of the evaluation instrument.

Evaluations of clinical experience are aligned with the appropriate SPA standards. The benchmark assessments and rubrics are found in the SPA program reports in AIMS. The campus personnel oversee the delivery and completion of the evaluation and conduct analyses on the evaluation data. Evaluation data are used by faculty as context for program improvement efforts.

Expectations for site-based personnel

Expectations for the roles and responsibilities of the cooperating teaching and university faculty supervisor are provided in Exhibit 28 Student Teaching Handbook. The student teacher evaluates both the cooperating teacher and the university faculty supervisor using the forms in Exhibit 31 Cooperating Teacher Evaluation by Student Teacher and Exhibit 32 Faculty Supervisor Evaluation by Student Teacher. The faculty supervisor is evaluated by a Lead Faculty/Area Chair using Exhibit 33 Faculty Supervisor Evaluation. The cooperating teacher is not formally evaluated by unit personnel. The Faculty supervisor collaborating with the cooperating teacher and student teacher can provide feedback directly to the P-12 building principal regarding the cooperating teacher. The student teacher evaluation of the cooperating teacher is also shared with the P-12 building principal.

Outcomes

Data from the Student Teaching Evaluation provides information on candidate outcomes in the student teaching experience. The summary includes the number of candidates scoring at the proficient levels across all clinical evaluation criteria as a measure of successful completion of student teaching. A difference in the N between the midterm and final evaluations is due to the date when the evaluation occurred—in some cases individual candidates received their midterm evaluation in one academic year while their final evaluation occurred in the next academic year. A summary reveals the following:

MAED/SPE

2009-2010 Midterm: N = 9, 91% scored at proficient
2009-2010 Final: N= 9, 98% scored at proficient

2010-2011 Midterm: N = 19, 83% scored at proficient
2010-2011 Final: N= 20, 99% scored at proficient

2011-2012 Midterm: N = 15, 88% scored at proficient
2011-2012 Final: N= 24, 97% scored at proficient

2012-2013 Midterm: N = 11, 97% scored at proficient
2012-2013 Final: N= 12, 100% scored at proficient

MAED/TED-E

2009-2010 Midterm: N = 18, 97% scored at proficient
2009-2010 Final: N= 17, 100% scored at proficient

2010-2011 Midterm: N = 53, 95% scored at proficient
2010-2011 Final: N= 46, 98% scored at proficient

2011-2012 Midterm: N = 40, 96% scored at proficient
2011-2012 Final: N= 37, 99% scored at proficient

2012-2013 Midterm: N = 58, 96% scored at proficient
2012-2013 Final: N= 58, 99% scored at proficient

MAED/TED-S

2009-2010 Midterm: N = 41, 87% scored at proficient
2009-2010 Final: N= 42, 99% scored at proficient

2010-2011 Midterm: N = 36, 85% scored at proficient
2010-2011 Final: N= 35, 97% scored at proficient

2011-2012 Midterm: N = 35, 90% scored at proficient
2011-2012 Final: N= 36, 100% scored at proficient

2012-2013 Midterm: N = 24, 92% scored at proficient
2012-2013 Final: N= 16, 98% scored at proficient

8000 character limit

3.1.c Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Summarize proficiency expectations and processes for development during field experiences and clinical practices; and outcomes based on demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn.

Proficiency Expectations

Candidates are expected to complete 100 hours of field experience in the initial programs. These hours must be completed prior to beginning student teaching. The intention of the field experiences is to expose candidates to a broad range of school and classroom settings. All candidates are required to complete field experiences across the P-12 grade levels and types of schools/classrooms (urban, rural, suburban, ELL, special education, Title I, etc., as well gain exposure to diverse teachers and P-12 students. Candidates are expected to gain proficiencies in a broad range of teaching and learning activities through the field experiences. A Sample Completed Field Experience Record is included as Exhibit 30 to provide a picture of the expected proficiencies.

Candidates complete a 65-day, 13-week student teaching experience in their specified content area (elementary, special education, English, mathematics, etc.). Special Education candidates are required to complete one half of the student teaching experience in an elementary classroom and the other half in a secondary classroom. A content-specific Teacher Work Sample is completed during student teaching. The Teacher Work Sample is aligned to the applicable national content area standards and candidates are instructed to add the applicable Hawaiian content standards to their lessons and units. The evaluation rubric that accompanies the Teacher Work Sample details the expected proficiencies. Also during the student teaching experience, candidates are formally evaluated at least twice by the cooperating teacher and university faculty supervisor using the Student Teaching Evaluation. The expected proficiencies outlined on this form are the content-specific standards. The Teacher Work Sample and the Student Teaching Evaluation are included with the Program Reports on AIMS.

A summary of entrance and exit requirements for clinical experiences in each program can be found in the Student Teaching Handbook (Exhibit 28).

Process for Development of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions for helping all students learn are formally evaluated during field experiences and student teaching. These evaluations are completed by school-based cooperating teachers and university faculty supervisors. Candidates are evaluated on criteria related to helping all students learn such as:

• Analyzes student diversity to guide appropriate instructional activities.
• Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge through effective teaching and assessment.
• Applies assessment results to plan instruction for individuals, groups, and diverse learners.
• Creates and implements lessons, activities, and assessments that are well paced and cognitively appropriate for the student population.
• Identifies and uses appropriate services, technology, and other resources to meet support learning needs of diverse and exceptional learners.

As discussed in Standard 1, candidates also complete three dispositional self-assessments during initial preparation programs. All candidates are subject to knowledge, skills, and dispositional expectations found under the supplemental standards. Every faculty and staff member who interacts or supports these candidates can refer them for remediation related to knowledge, skills, or dispositions if they detect possible violations of the supplemental standards.

Any candidate in the unit's programs who needs remediation or development related to his or her knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions is provided with appropriate support services. These services may include assistance through the following resources provided by the unit:

• Academic Skills Center
• Writing Skills Center
• Student Workshops – Resume Writing, Interviewing Skills
• Field Experience Workshops
• Praxis Exam Preparation Workshops
• Academic advising

In addition, assistance during clinical experiences also includes intensive individualized guidance provided by the candidate's university faculty supervisor, campus personnel, and site-based personnel based on the developmental needs of each candidate. When warranted, an individualized remediation plan is developed to guide the support and development of a struggling candidate. The template for candidate remediation plans for clinical experience is included with the Supplemental Standards.

Outcomes Based on Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Site-based personnel provide feedback on candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions in a variety of ways. One method is through required weekly feedback from the cooperating teacher during the student teaching experience. The cooperating teacher completes a weekly feedback form, wherein the student teacher's progress and areas for improvement are noted. This feedback mechanism provides site-based personnel the opportunity to regularly monitor and evaluate candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the classroom. If deficiencies are noted or concerns about the teacher candidate are expressed, resulting interventions can include counseling, remediation, or in extreme cases, removal from student teaching.

Data is collected from the Student Teaching Evaluation, Teacher Work Sample, and Dispositions Self-

Assessment. This data is used to provide evidence of the candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn. Applicable data tables are included as Exhibit 5 Standard 1 KSD Supporting Data Tables.

8000 character limit

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

Not applicable

36000 character limit

3.2.b Continuous Improvement

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The unit is investigating and/or implementing several areas in which further improvements could be made. To better support site-based personnel, the unit has developed a new process and training for university faculty supervisors who specifically want to focus on supporting clinical candidates on-site rather than or in addition to teaching University-based classes. This new process and training was implemented in summer 2013. Details are included as Exhibit 27 Faculty Supervisor Training Overview.

The Hawaii Campus has also recently instituted mandatory orientation training for all cooperating teachers, in order to ensure that cooperating teachers understand the programmatic goals and conceptual framework of the initial teacher preparation program, their responsibilities in being a cooperating teacher, and the standards of the University. Exhibit 24 Student Teaching Orientation Training contains the relevant materials.

The Hawaii Campus and Online also have activities regarding analysis of candidate data in clinical experiences as part of its assessment calendar discussed in Standard 2 (Exhibit 15 Campus Assessment Calendar). Candidate data from the Student Teaching Evaluations and end-of-course surveys from the student teaching seminar courses associated with clinical experiences will be reviewed and analyzed and an action plan developed and implemented based on analysis of the data. The surveys and evaluations completed by university faculty supervisors will also be reviewed and analyzed for continuous improvement. The assessment calendar is used to schedule data collection and analyses on a continuous

basis by faculty, campus staff, and the dean's office. The calendar aligns with a corresponding assessment plan detailing what data/information will be collected, how and with whom it will be shared, and how it will be used for programmatic improvement.

The unit will sustain efforts to obtain stakeholder feedback whenever possible. Plans to better involve stakeholders in developing and defining teacher candidate outcomes include the creation of a Hawaii Campus Advisory Board, which will consist of local school partners, cooperating teachers, administrators, and other interested community members. This advisory board will be an important link to the local P-12 community as well as the use of post-clinical surveys completed by site-based personnel and candidates. The unit will look to collect, analyze, and use stakeholder feedback in developing and implementing clinical experiences.

The unit will continue to refine candidate and stakeholder materials to ensure information on clinical experiences is current and accurate. The unit will continue having a representative attend state-sponsored meetings and conferences to ensure programs and clinical experiences align with current regulations and requirements.

5000 character limit

3.3 Exhibits for Standard 3

3.3.a	Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding
3.3.b	Aggregate data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery)
3.3.c	Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P–12 school faculty
3.3.d	Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs
3.3.e	Guidelines/ handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical faculty, including support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection
3.3.f	Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and clinical practice for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
3.3.g	Aggregate data on candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice for all programs (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)

Exhibit 20 Field Experience Approved Site List
Exhibit 22 Field Experience Principal Permission Form
Exhibit 23 Student Teaching Approved Site List
Exhibit 25 Cooperating Teacher Training Checklist
Exhibit 26 Cooperating Teacher Service Agreement
Exhibit 27 Faculty Supervisor Training Overview
Exhibit 29 Field Experience Record
Exhibit 31 Cooperating Teacher Evaluation by Student Teacher
Exhibit 32 Faculty Supervisor Evaluation by Student Teacher

Exhibit 33 Faculty Supervisor Evaluation
Exhibit 28 Student Teaching Handbook
Exhibit 24 Student Teaching Orientation Training
Exhibit 30 Sample Completed Field Experience Record
Exhibit 21 Affiliation Agreement

See **Attachment** panel below.

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 Diversity

4.1.a Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Summarize the design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences; descriptions of and processes for development of diversity proficiencies; and the outcomes based on key assessments.

Design Unit programs are designed to develop candidate skills and knowledge to address diversity in the P-12 school environment. The design of the curriculum and experiences is a collaborative effort as discussed in Standard 3. Stakeholders that participate in the design of curriculum and experiences include local P-12 school personnel, university faculty, unit administrators, and subject matter experts. The curriculum and clinical experiences are evaluated continually by unit faculty, faculty council, and unit staff and modifications are made when warranted. The curriculum is designed to teach diversity proficiencies throughout the program and be applied through assignments such as lesson and unit plans and then have candidates be formally evaluated on their application of diversity proficiencies during the student teaching experience. Implementation Candidates' abilities to accommodate diverse learners, either through adapting curriculum, implementing community programs, or making other services and programs available for diverse populations are infused throughout the program curricula. Candidates are required to include accommodations for diverse learners in all lesson plans, classroom management plans, and unit plans throughout their degree programs. In addition, each program has at least one course that focuses specifically on diversity issues. These include classes such as ESL 300: Teaching English Language Learners, MTE 553: Instruction and Assessment of English Language Learners, SPE 514: Survey of Special Populations, and SPE 575: Inclusion Strategies of the Special Educator. A curriculum matrix that details the criterion and candidate outcomes addressing diversity proficiencies is included as Exhibit 34 Curriculum Matrix of Diversity Proficiencies.

Evaluation

Course objectives and clinical experience requirements, aligned with the unit's conceptual framework theme of "valuing diversity," specifically address diversity and identify expected outcomes for working with diverse students, faculty, and community populations. These outcomes include a candidate's ability to create instructional activities that reflect individual learning styles; their ability to create a climate that supports diversity and is appropriate for developmental and cultural norms; their ability to create lessons and activities appropriate for all learners; and their ability to use feedback from students, parents, and colleagues to modify professional practice.

As detailed in response 4.1.d., the unit insures that candidate field and clinical experiences occur in schools that have high levels of diversity. According to demographic data from the US Department of Education:

• 68% of Hawaii public schools are designated as Title I schools.
• 14% of P-12 students are Caucasian.

The demographic makeup of the Hawaiian Island population affords all candidates ample opportunity for exposure to diverse field and clinical settings. The unit stores demographics of placement sites in two different ways. The Clinical Placement Supervisors at the Hawaii Campus use a Drop Box account to document P-12 school demographic information as they place candidates. This account is used for individual purposes and ease when placing candidates. In addition, the unit uses an internal database, Integrated Student Services (IS3), to track school demographics. Currently, reporting is not available in either of these systems. This is an area of concern for the unit and progress is being made to adopt a new database system for tracking all components of field and clinical experiences.

8000 character limit

4.1.b Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Summarize opportunities and experiences for candidates to work with diverse faculty; qualifications and expertise of faculty in supporting candidates in their development of expected proficiencies; and the unit's affirmation of the value and efforts to increase or maintain faculty diversity.

To ensure candidates have opportunities to work with diverse faculty members, the unit limits the number of courses individual faculty members can teach for each cohort of candidates. Ideally, candidates have an individual faculty member as an instructor no more than twice during their academic program. This maximizes the number of opportunities candidates have to work with a diverse pool of faculty. These practices align with the Hawaii campus faculty recruiting goal to ensure that students have a diverse faculty pool from which to learn. A diverse pool of faculty would include faculty from a variety of professional, educational, ethnic and gender backgrounds. Refer to Exhibit 35 for the Hawaii Faculty Development Plan.

All unit faculty members are professional P-12 educators. All faculty members must possess a master's or doctoral degree earned at a regionally accredited institution of higher education. Additionally, prior to being approved to teach any course, faculty members are required to meet the prescribed levels of academic preparation and graduate level coursework in addition to the required amount of relevant professional experience identified for that course. Faculty members must possess both the advanced academic preparation that allows them to provide candidates with a strong foundation in the theory of a

discipline, as well as the significant practical professional experience that enables them to focus on the practical application of theory in the candidates' licensure area. All faculty members must hold the applicable professional license in the area to be taught. This information is required and maintained in the University's database system for faculty management. The qualifications of faculty are further detailed in Standard 5.1.a. The unit uses this information to guide recruiting efforts to achieve the highest level of diversity possible in their faculty pool, given the general population of the area.

The University of Phoenix supports, recognizes, and embraces staff, faculty, and student diversity within the institution. The promotion of inclusiveness is of utmost importance in developing efforts in this area. The University of Phoenix Diversity Mission Statement is equally committed to a diverse workplace represented through its staff, faculty, student body, and programs. It reads as follows:

Apollo Group recognizes and embraces the diversity of its students, staff, and faculty and, in recognition of this diversity, strives to maintain a united environment embodying principles of mutual respect and acceptance for everyone. It is within this environment that Apollo Group and its stakeholders will achieve success.

In order to meet the University's mission regarding diversity, the unit ensures that faculty members represent the diversity of candidates in the programs. When hiring for faculty positions, the campus conducts advertising efforts to reach the widest variety of applicants possible. Some of the vendors have included Monster, CareerBuilder, LinkedIn, Inside Higher Ed, Google, and Direct Employer. Faculty recruiting advertisements are also placed with several diversity partners (online job boards which cater to diverse populations) by adding diversity keywords for generating interest nationally.

To qualify as faculty, individuals must have an earned master's degree or doctorate. According to U.S. Census data, only 9.7% of Hawaii residents have an advanced degree. However, the population of the state is culturally diverse. According to 2012 U.S. Census data only 23% of Hawaii's overall population is defined as 'White' as compared to 63% of the U.S. national population being defined as such. The faculties in the College of Education and at the Hawaii Campus overall are representative of the cultural diversity found in the state. Exhibit 36 Hawaii Campus Diversity Snapshot provides additional details regarding statistics for faculty diversity.

Candidates in the unit programs are exposed to an ethnically diverse faculty within the unit, and this exposure helps to prepare them for the diversity they will encounter in the Hawaii public school system. The unit will continue to hire faculty who are diverse in gender, ethnicity, educational preparation, and current experience working in P-12 schools. The unit seeks faculty members who serve high-needs and ethnically diverse students in the local schools. The unit also enhances candidate exposure to diverse faculty through clinical placements. Candidates are placed at local school sites that have high levels of P-12 student and faculty diversity. This provides candidates with robust opportunities to work with cooperating teachers and mentors that represent diverse groups.

8000 character limit

4.1.c Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Summarize opportunities and experiences for candidates to work with diverse peers; and the unit's affirmation of the value and efforts to increase or maintain candidate diversity.

Diverse Issues in Higher Education has recognized the University of Phoenix overall for having graduated more underrepresented students with master's degrees in business, health care, and education than any other university in the nation (2007). Diversity brings vibrancy to the classroom, creating an environment where multiple perspectives are shared for the benefit of all. As of the 2011-2012 academic

year undergraduate enrollment at University of Phoenix nationally was more ethnically diverse than the national enrollment figures provided by the National Center for Education Statistics. Female students comprise 67% of the undergraduate University of Phoenix enrollment, in comparison to 57% of the national undergraduate students. Graduate student enrollment at University of Phoenix is more ethnically diverse with over 50% minority enrollment as opposed to 36% minority enrollment nationally. University of Phoenix candidates are representative of the general population of the United States and of their local community. Almost half of the University's enrollment consists of students from under-represented racial or ethnic communities which is well beyond the national average.

While the University has much success in serving under-represented populations on a national level, recruiting and retaining diverse candidates continues to be an important goal for the unit. Throughout its history, the University has sought to provide access to higher education for all those who are willing to put in the effort to earn a degree. The University's national student body remains diverse; for example, 18 percent are African American, compared to a national average of 12 percent. Undergraduate enrollment and graduate enrollment at University of Phoenix are both more ethnically diverse than national averages. Exhibit 19 University of Phoenix Academic Annual Report provides details on the University's diversity-related statistics.

According to the most recent census figures, Hawaii is comprised of 23% Caucasian residents, with 49.8% being female. With high numbers of ethnically-diverse residents, the unit attracts a diverse pool of candidates into the programs. Diversity is an integral part of life in Hawaii and, as such, is embedded into all facets of College of Education programs. Exhibit 36 Hawaii Campus Diversity Snapshot provides details specific to candidate diversity.

The faculty and candidate population mirrors the diversity of the state. Therefore, there is no distinct effort at recruiting diverse faculty or candidates. However, the unit has distinct curricular offerings in the programs that encourage the inclusion and integration of Hawaiian Studies content into the elementary, secondary, and special education programs such as inclusion of Hawaiian studies content in lesson plans in the elementary program and secondary unit plans. Specific assignments in the Hawaii programs require evidence of the inclusion of Hawaiian Studies into candidate work.

8000 character limit

4.1.d Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Summarize opportunities and experiences for candidates to work with diverse students in P-12 schools; processes for the development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity; and outcomes based on key assessments during field experiences and clinical practice.

Opportunities to Work with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

The Hawaii Campus makes a concerted effort to provide candidates ample experience working with diverse student populations. According to data from the U.S. Department of Education, 68% of Hawaii's public schools are designated Title I, and only 14% of P-12 students are Caucasian. As a result, the ethnic diversity of the student population in the Hawaii schools offers candidates exposure to and interactions with students from a multitude of academic and cultural backgrounds. Of the 195 schools on Oahu, Hawaii, the University of Phoenix has placed candidates in 170 schools on the island, as part of the field experience or student teaching experience. Such a great variety of placement sites insures that candidates experience diverse students in their P-12 assigned locations.

Development of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions Related to Diversity

Initial preparation candidates participate in field experiences throughout the program as well as the student teaching experience. The minimum of 100 hours of field experience exposes candidates to a variety of settings, including English language learners and special education needs students. Diverse students and settings are a required component of the field and clinical experiences. Candidates must document the type of school (e.g., public, urban, Title I, private, rural, virtual, suburban, or No Child Left Behind Underperforming School), document the school's diversity by listing the predominant demographics and/or specialized student populations served by the school, note the content area and grade level, as well as document the student diversity in the classroom (e.g., special education, English Language Learners, gifted and talented, remedial education, or ethnic and cultural) for each field experience placement. Exhibit 30 Sample Completed Field Experience Record provides details on how exposure to diverse field experiences is documented.

Through coursework and application the program assists beginning teachers in understanding students' cultures and in communicating with families/caregivers about the achievement of students. The knowledge, skills, and dispositions of teacher candidates are evaluated throughout the preparation program. The program standards set clear expectations of what is required of a graduate and can assist the new teacher in modifying their own behaviors and methods.

Evaluations of student teachers from cooperating teachers and university faculty supervisors, as well as final course grades, are the methods by which the unit insures that candidates have developed and practiced knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their student teaching experience. Exhibit 34 Curriculum Matrix of Diversity Proficiencies provides a summary of candidate outcomes from the Student Teaching Evaluation on diversity proficiencies.

There are several mechanisms in place to ensure candidates understand expectations and requirements related to working with diverse student populations and develop the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The unit's Conceptual Framework emphasizes valuing and addressing diversity in P-12 schools. Linked to the Conceptual Framework are candidate proficiencies that emphasize the concepts of equity and diversity as they are applied in teaching and learning practices. The Teacher Work Sample completed during the student teaching experience also requires candidates to select a group characteristic to analyze such as gender, performance level, socio-economic status, language proficiency, or other attribute of diversity and form a sub-group based on that distinguishing characteristic (e.g., male, low performance, free or reduced lunch, ESL, etc.). These proficiencies are used to guide curriculum development and require candidates to reflect upon principles of equity and diversity as they design and deliver instruction and support to P-12 students.

8000 character limit

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have

led to target level performance.
□ Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

Not applicable

36000 character limit

4.2.b Continuous Improvement

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The unit has made positive strides in insuring candidates have opportunities to work with diverse P-12 student populations. As noted in the response, the unit places candidates for clinical experiences in schools that have high levels of diversity; this diversity of student ethnicities and backgrounds is representative of the K-12 student population within Hawaii public schools. The demographic data on P-12 schools will continue to be updated and considered when placing students for clinical experiences. The mechanism by which the unit tracks the demographics of P-12 school sites will also continue to be improved upon. The unit will sustain efforts to place candidates in schools with high levels of diversity. Faculty and candidate recruiting will continue to enhance efforts to hire faculty and recruit candidates from minority groups representative of the ethnicity of Hawaii.

5000 character limit

4.3 Exhibits for Standard 4

4.3.a	Aggregate data on proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools, including impact on student learning
4.3.b	Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.)
4.3.c	Assessment instruments and scoring guides related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
4.3.d	Data table on faculty demographics (see Appendix A for an example)
4.3.e	Data table on candidates demographics (see Appendix B for an example)
4.3.f	Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (see Appendix C for an example)
4.3.g	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty
4.3.h	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates
4.3.i	Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups

Exhibit 34 Curriculum Matrix of Diversity Proficiencies
Exhibit 35 Hawaii Faculty Development Plan
Exhibit 36 Hawaii Campus Diversity Snapshot

See **Attachment** panel below.

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

5.1.a Qualified Faculty

Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty, school-based faculty, and university clinical faculty regarding faculty qualifications.

The University has an unbundled faculty model that separates administrative, advising, and teaching duties and allows faculty members to focus their efforts in areas that align with their strengths by defining two distinct categories of faculty: Core Administrative Faculty and Practitioner Associate Faculty, as outlined in Exhibit 37 Faculty Handbook.

Core Administrative Faculty

Administrative faculty members are full-time, exempt employees assigned to Academic Affairs whose duties include a combination of instruction, curriculum oversight and development, and/or academic and faculty administration. This classification does not include members of the non-academic administration, even those who are members of the faculty, whose primary responsibilities rest in functional areas other than Academic Affairs (e.g. Market Vice Presidents, Campus Directors, or functional area directors). It also does not include other staff members who are faculty members but whose job responsibilities are primarily support or technical in nature, even if they are assigned to the academic function. There are 8 core faculty members at the Hawaii Campus and 5 core faculty members at Online supporting College of Education programs and operations.

The Lead Faculty/Area Chair position is carried out under annual (12-month) term contracts and is considered a core administrative faculty position. Lead Faculty/Area Chairs are exemplary faculty who are in good standing with the unit and teaching a significant number of courses within their content area for an annual term. Although teaching is their primary function, Lead Faculty/Area Chairs are also responsible for the following:

• Faculty Training & Certification
• Faculty Mentoring
• Content Interviews
• Faculty Assessment
• Participation in Content Area Meetings, Campus College Steering Committees, College Academic Program Councils

The College of Education in Hawaii is supported by three Lead Faculty/Area Chairs: Dr. Lorraine Mito, Elementary Education; Joseph Trimarche, Secondary Education; and Sherri Gelbard, Special Education.

Practitioner Associate Faculty

The Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 37) details the unit's general expectations for associate faculty. Faculty must have both the academic preparation necessary to teach discipline-specific theory and the practical experience to render the theory relevant and useful. These expectations are incorporated throughout the

faculty selection process. The faculty selection process begins with an initial application, which includes credential evaluation, interviews, and assessment of instructional aptitude. Once faculty applicants complete the initial phase, they become a faculty candidate and are invited to complete an extensive knowledge, competency, and skills assessment process as part of faculty certification.

The second phase in the faculty selection process addresses facilitation of adult learning, classroom management skills, meeting learning objectives, grading and evaluation, resources available to students and faculty, and policies and procedures. After successful completion of faculty certification, faculty candidates continue in the selection process to the third phase of the faculty selection process by teaching a class under the direction of a faculty mentor. The faculty mentor coaches and assesses the faculty candidate's instructional abilities, and helps the faculty candidate become acclimated to the University's teaching and learning model. Upon successful completion of the mentorship experience the faculty candidate is invited to become a member of the faculty. The University's faculty certification process was recognized by the Arizona Quality Alliance, receiving a Showcase in Excellence Award in 2010.

All professional education faculty members, both core administrative and practitioner associate faculty members, must possess a master's or doctoral degree earned at a regionally accredited institution of higher education. Faculty must possess both the advanced academic preparation that allows them to provide candidates with a strong foundation in the theory of a discipline, as well as the significant practical professional experience that enables them to focus on the practical application of theory in the candidate's licensure area. All professional education faculty members must hold the applicable professional license in the area to be taught.

In addition to the core administrative faculty members, there are 18 associate practitioner faculty at the local campus and 28 associate practitioner faculty teaching via online.

School-Based Faculty

For initial preparation programs, P-12 school-based faculty (Cooperating Teacher) are required to have at least three years of P-12 teaching experience; hold the applicable HTSB professional license; ideally possess a master's degree; and have at least one year of supervisory experience before they are considered by the unit as acceptable supervisors of University candidates. The Campus College Chair and Clinical Experience Program Manager collaborate with the school to ensure that properly qualified personnel are selected as cooperating teachers. Additional details regarding the qualifications and responsibilities of the cooperating teacher can be found in the Student Teaching Handbook in Exhibit 28.

Clinical Faculty

The unit utilizes a university faculty supervisor to oversee individual student teachers through their clinical experiences and to work collaboratively with the cooperating teacher. The university faculty supervisor serves as an ongoing resource for the cooperating teacher in the school and monitors and evaluates the student teacher's progress. This faculty member must have a master or doctoral degree and must have experience in supervision. Additional details regarding the qualifications and responsibilities of the university faculty supervisor can be found in the Student Teaching Handbook in Exhibit 28.

6000 character limit

5.1.b Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding modeling best professional practices in teaching.

The Classroom Management Tool and Classroom Performance Review (CMT and CPR Overview in Exhibit 38) is the primary method of faculty evaluation based on a class observation. Based on the observation, campus academic leadership and the faculty member discuss strengths and areas for improvement relevant to the faculty member's presentation skills, facilitation of individual and group activities, assessment and feedback practices, coverage of course objectives, and class management. Reviews are conducted by lead faculty to provide suggestions that assist faculty in improving their performance as faculty members and to ensure that faculty are meeting all the expectations outlined in this response.

Faculty members receive an evaluation every two years, conducted by a lead faculty that includes observation of the faculty member during class instruction. As a component of this review, faculty members are invited to engage in self-assessment and reflection on their own teaching skills. Additionally, faculty members may engage in self-assessment and sharing of best practices during regularly scheduled faculty meetings. Faculty members are encouraged to engage in self-assessment and self-reflection as a key component of collegial dialogue surrounding the teaching and learning process. This is encouraged within the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 37) and supported by specific performance criteria defined in the CMT and CPR Overview in Exhibit 38. A summary of faculty evaluations are included as Exhibit 39 HI Local Campus Faculty Information and Exhibit 40 HI Online Faculty Information.

Faculty expectations regarding teaching and learning include the following:

• Varying the use of teaching methods and techniques
• Aligning instruction to the course learning objectives
• Integrating practitioner knowledge
• Encouraging critical thinking
• Encouraging students to take an active role in their own learning
• Incorporating a variety of course assessment strategies, tools, and techniques

Faculty are expected to model a variety of instructional strategies and assessments, much like those the teacher candidates are expected to implement in their own classrooms. Faculty model direct instruction, cooperative learning activities, differentiated instruction, simulations, role-playing, whole-group and small-group discussion, and other instructional techniques. Faculty must model interactive instructional methods to encourage meaningful participation. A variety of formal and informal assessment strategies are modeled, including tests, quizzes, papers, and observation. Faculty are encouraged to use rubrics and scoring guides as they provide both quantitative and qualitative feedback to candidates.

Faculty are expected to demonstrate technology and software competencies and incorporate these into their instruction as a stipulation for employment. All course materials are solely available electronically including textbooks, supplemental readings, syllabi, and all communication. Additional resources to support the incorporation and use of technology into instruction include Faculty Development Workshops and training materials and the Technology Resource Library available to faculty and students via the Online Learning System. Also, faculty are expected to model and use the technology tools available through TaskStream including the lesson, unit, and rubric building tools.

One of the tools available in the Online Learning System is a virtual P-12 simulated school district. This resource has been integrated into the curriculum allowing faculty members the opportunity to access a simulated school district and all of its functions, responsibilities, procedures, etc. from the district office

to individual grade-level classrooms from kindergarten through high school. A demonstration of the virtual school will occur during the onsite visit.

The unit has also developed a Technology Resources Library containing the latest links and content relevant to integrating technology into P-12 curriculum and teaching that is available to faculty and candidates. To address this trend from a faculty perspective, professional development training is available to support faculty with incorporating technology into their own instruction as a model for candidates.

6000 character limit

5.1.c Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding modeling best professional practices in scholarship.

The University encourages professional currency and a culture of disciplined inquiry. Given the University's primary role as a teaching institution, special focus is dedicated to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Faculty scholarship is based on the context of the Boyer Scholarship Model, which covers the dimensions of Discovery, Integration, Application, and Teaching.

Ernest Boyer's model of scholarship gives faculty support and accolades for a wide variety of activities in the following categories:

Teaching - Systematically studying and improving teaching models and practices to achieve optimal measurable learning outcomes, including the development of innovative instructional approaches based in emerging educational theory. Because we are primarily a teaching institution, the majority of our University-wide efforts emphasize scholarship of teaching and learning.

Discovery – The activities traditionally associated with academic work, such as presenting at conferences, publishing in journals, and winning research grants.

Integration - Interpreting how knowledge might be used across disciplines, such as producing work that isn't necessarily research-driven, but that bridge gaps between two fields.

Application - Aiding society and professions in addressing complex practical problems that fall outside of the University's traditional scope, such as research consultancy or data analysis for schools.

University faculty members are actively involved in a variety of academic and professional scholarly activities. The following list includes professional and scholarly activities reported by the faculty:

• Research initiatives with a faculty member as principal or co-principal investigator.
• Authorships or co-authorships of texts, and receipt of academic recognition and awards.
• Research activities, course development work outside University of Phoenix, and post-doctoral fellowships.
• Academic presentations
• Participation on community boards, memberships in professional associations, voluntary service, and community presentations.

The University uses a practitioner faculty model so that University faculty members are engaged in P-12 education on a daily basis. Faculty members are chosen based on their experiences, service, scholarship, and commitment to advancing the educational profession. Faculty are asked to update and maintain their faculty profile with scholarship activities that align to the four elements of Boyer's Model: Discovery, Integration, Application, and Teaching. Scholarship details are included in Exhibit 39 HI Local Campus Faculty Information and Exhibit 40 HI Online Faculty Information. Examples of faculty scholarship works will be available at the on-site visit.

Support for faculty scholarship has been growing in recent years at both the university and unit levels. The university established an Office of Scholarship Support to provide guidance, training, and support for faculty scholarship across the university. As part of that initiative, all locations are required to host multiple faculty scholarship events each year. On September 21, 2013, the Hawaii Campus Academic Affairs Department hosted a Research and Scholarship Symposium for its faculty members at the Hawaii campus. The Scholarship Symposium is an opportunity for University of Phoenix Faculty in Hawaii to present before other University faculty and professional colleagues. The symposium focused on research and scholarship topics related to education. Additional details are included as Exhibit 41 Research and Scholarship Symposium Descriptions.

Faculty scholarship is supported by the university through stipends paid for some scholarship work such as conference presentations and publications. In addition, the Office of Scholarship Support (OSS) offers three more programs, a general research grant program, up to $5,000, a teaching and learning fellowship program, up to $10,000, and an Excellence in Publishing Award for peer-reviewed publications of $500. The teaching and learning research fellowship is awarded to provide funding and other resources for faculty scholarship focused on teaching and learning. The general grants are awarded to provide funding for a wide variety of faculty scholarly endeavors, including those summarized earlier. The publishing award recognizes faculty contributions in peer-reviewed publications.

To further support and encourage faculty scholarship, the unit provides a professional development workshop for faculty on research and scholarship. The workshop prepares participants for faculty scholarship. Participants learn the domains of scholarship, how the domains align with the University of Phoenix model of scholarship, and how faculty can participate in scholarship. The workshop is available to all faculty members.

6000 character limit

5.1.d Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding modeling best professional practices in service.

University of Phoenix faculty members engage in service through their teaching as well as through activities that aid society and education professions in addressing problems, such as serving as external consultants, assuming leadership roles in professional organizations, and advising student leaders to foster professional growth. Individual faculty members model professional practice in service through their scholarship service activities. Some examples of faculty service activities include:

• Volunteering instructional time at local public schools.
• Organizing fundraising and supply drives for several organizations, including Boys & Girls Clubs of Hawaii.
• Supporting community efforts through Habitat for Humanity.
• Serving in leadership roles for professional associations.

• Conducting trainings and professional development for other Hawaii Campus faculty.
• Supporting schools during Adopt a School Day.

These activities and other service work examples are included in the faculty qualifications, scholarship, and service summary in Exhibit 39 HI Local Campus Faculty Information and Exhibit 40 HI Online Faculty Information.

The unit itself strives to present a model of service for its candidates and to provide service opportunities for faculty. The unit's service activities focus on support for local schools, youth, and literacy. For example, the unit donated computer equipment and office furnishings to several local area schools recently in an effort to support technology use in P-12 programs. The unit has conducted school supply drives where they collected and donated school supplies to the Boys and Girls Clubs and local schools. The unit has an established service partnership with Junior Achievement that has been on-going for several years, providing consultation and resources to support the educational goals of the organization. Through these partnerships and activities the unit provides on-going opportunities for faculty and staff to model best practices in service.

6000 character limit

5.1.e Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Summarize unit's expectations for and evaluations of its professional education faculty regarding faculty performance.

The University of Phoenix faculty model is based on the use of practitioner faculty and does not include tenure. Faculty members are responsible for understanding and following the policies and practices outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 37), including regular evaluations of instruction. The University is committed to providing excellent instructors, which necessarily calls for an ongoing system of faculty evaluation. Faculty members receive classroom performance reviews to assist them in identifying areas for further development and improvement.

The Classroom Management Tool and Classroom Performance Review (CMT and CPR Overview in Exhibit 38) are the primary methods of faculty evaluation based on a class observation. Based on the observation, campus academic leadership and the faculty member discuss strengths and areas for improvement relevant to the faculty member's presentation skills, facilitation of individual and group activities, assessment and feedback practices, coverage of course objectives, and class management. Reviews are conducted by lead faculty to provide suggestions that assist faculty in improving their performance as faculty members and to ensure that faculty are meeting all the expectations outlined in this response.

Faculty receive an evaluation every two years, conducted by a lead faculty that includes observation of the faculty member during class instruction. As a component of this review, faculty are invited to engage in self-assessment and reflection on their own teaching skills. Additionally, faculty may engage in self-assessment and sharing of best practices during regularly scheduled faculty meetings. Faculty are encouraged to engage in self-assessment and self-reflection as a key component of collegial dialogue surrounding the teaching and learning process. This is encouraged within the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 37) and supported by specific performance criteria defined in the CMT and CPR Overview in Exhibit 38. A summary of faculty evaluations are included as Exhibit 39 HI Local Campus Faculty Information and Exhibit 40 HI Online Faculty Information.

The University is committed to providing the best educational experience for candidates and faculty during every class. To remain in good standing with the University, faculty members are expected to comply with the Instructional Requirements and Faculty Code of Conduct outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 37) in addition to meeting the performance expectations summarized earlier. For instances in which concerns regarding a faculty member are brought to the attention of the University, each allegation is thoroughly investigated. If the concern is substantiated, the faculty member is notified and coached as appropriate. Faculty members are provided with information and resources pertaining to the issue. The University will work with the faculty member using a faculty coaching process to ensure all contractual obligations are met and to bring the faculty member's facilitation within University standards. Faculty members are requested to self-assess and self-reflect using the Classroom Management Tool as a part of the coaching process.

In some situations, future class scheduling may be put on hold until a faculty member successfully completes a required faculty workshop or a new faculty certification session. In extreme circumstances, such as (but not limited to) repeated failure to fulfill instructional requirements after clear notice of the need for improvement, the Director of Academic Affairs will notify a faculty member that he or she will no longer be offered University teaching contracts. Faculty whose actions are alleged to constitute a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct will be notified by the Director of Academic Affairs.

6000 character limit

5.1.f Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Summarize resources, opportunities, processes, and outcomes regarding unit facilitation of professional development.

As supported in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 37), the University is firmly committed to lifelong learning through ongoing professional development for its faculty members. The unit offers on-going professional development activities for all faculty, as well as those identified as needing assistance with their performance.

The unit maintains a Hawaii Faculty Development Plan (Exhibit 35). As part of that plan, the unit offers professional development to all faculty within the two general faculty meetings per year and the four Content Area Meetings per year that they are required to conduct. All faculty meetings must have a development component. A variety of developmental topics may be presented and are focused on the following areas:

• Teaching methodology – Such as grading and evaluation, classroom assessment, use of rubrics, or facilitation techniques
• Best practices – Groups of faculty members in the same discipline or courses meet to share effective practice ideas and to review curriculum
• Professional development – Presentation on some aspect of theory or practice in one or more disciplinary areas
• Specialized training—such as the Taskstream for Education Faculty or data analysis on candidate performance

Professional development needs for individual faculty members are identified through the bi-annual Classroom Performance Review described earlier in this report. A variety of workshops are available through the Online Learning System or in a face-to-face format at the campus such as classroom assessment, handling difficult students, integrating critical thinking across the curriculum, and evaluating performance. The workshops are mandated for those with identified performance needs and

are open to all faculty members who wish to take them for professional growth. The Campus College Chair is responsible for identifying specific faculty needs and scheduling training accordingly. In addition, education-related workshops available in the Online Learning System include topics such as TaskStream, Student Teaching Seminars, Classroom Assessment Techniques, and Action Research. Faculty development workshop topics are selected and scheduled annually based on stakeholder input. Some examples of professional development workshops offered to faculty are provided below:

Critical Thinking: This workshop will introduce faculty to the components of the critical thinking process and identify various methods for teaching critical thinking skills. Topics include critical thinking at University of Phoenix, taxonomies and frameworks for understanding critical thinking, and cognitive abilities and affective dispositions in critical thinking.

Difficult Student: The workshop will focus on difficult situations which may occur in the classroom and address various approaches for resolving different types of conflict with individuals or learning teams when teaching.

Feedback that Makes a Difference: This workshop provides faculty the opportunity to review, discuss, and complete exercises associated with providing candidates useful feedback in a supportive and nurturing manner. Special attention will be paid to ensure participants understand the specific requirements, procedures, and policies for providing student feedback in classes at University of Phoenix. Learning methodology includes information presentations, discussion responses, exercises, high-frequency online interaction with classmates, and a workshop summary.

In addition, the unit supports professional development of faculty through the scholarship activities detailed in response 5.1.c.

Of the 18 associate faculty members at the local campus, 100% have completed one or more professional development activities offered by the unit during the last 3 academic years. Of the 28 online associate faculty members, 100% have completed a minimum of one or more professional development activities offered by the unit during the last year.

6000 character limit

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

□ Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
□ Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
□ Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

Not applicable

36000 character limit

5.2.b Continuous Improvement

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

Based on recommendations and data analysis, several continuous improvement projects are underway related to faculty performance evaluation, ongoing faculty professional development, and support of faculty scholarship.

Based on recommendations from campus staff, faculty, and clinical experience supervisors, specialized training for faculty supervisors has been updated and expanded. The new training was released for existing faculty as well as new faculty candidates in summer 2013. The specialized training focuses solely on clinical experiences and will better support candidates in the field and enhance the reliability and validity of our assessments.

A review of faculty performance data indicated low performance variance in faculty evaluations with all faculty members performing above standard. Efforts are underway to review the Classroom Performance Review criteria and measurements. Additional calibration training activities are under development for those who conduct classroom performance reviews to ensure differentiation in performances are noted if they exist. Calibration training is scheduled for the 2013-2014 academic year. In addition, the Classroom Management Tool and Classroom Performance Review tool were significantly revised and combined into one document and released in summer 2013. The new evaluation tool has an increased focus on classroom teaching methodologies. The unit will monitor the effectiveness of the revised evaluation tool.

Feedback from external stakeholders and candidates indicated the need for additional professional development to support faculty with the integration of educational technology to enhance instruction and model skills for candidates. The initial workshop focused on the use of various presentation tools and resources in the classroom and creating learning activities to encourage faculty and candidate technology use. Additional professional development focusing on instructional technology will be conducted in fall 2013 and spring 2014 in areas such as the use of video lectures, multimedia, audio tools/podcasts, and social media.

5000 character limit

Exhibit 5.3.a - Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty. This table can be compiled below from data submitted in the Manage Faculity section of AIMS or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit.

5.3 Exhibits for Standard 5

5.3.a	Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty (This table can be compiled in the online template from data submitted for national program reviews or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit. See Appendix D for an example.)
5.3.b	Data table on qualifications of clinical faculty (i.e., P–12 school professionals and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice)
5.3.c	Policies and practices to assure clinical faculty meet unit expectations

5.3.d	Policies, expectations, and samples of faculty scholarly activities
5.3.e	Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools (e.g., collaborative project with school faculty, teacher professional development, and addressing the needs of low performing schools) and with the professional community (e.g., grants, evaluations, task force participation, provision of professional development, offering courses, etc.)
5.3.f	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation (including promotion and tenure) and summaries of the results in areas of teaching, scholarship and service
5.3.g	Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results

Exhibit 37 Faculty Handbook
Exhibit 38 CMT and CPR Overview
Exhibit 39 HI Local Campus Faculty Information
Exhibit 40 HI Online Faculty Information
Exhibit 41 Research & Scholarship Symposium Descriptions

See **Attachment** panel below.

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 Unit Governance and Resources

6.1.a Unit Leadership and Authority

Summarize unit's leadership and authority in the design, delivery, operations of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators and other school professionals.

The governance structure of the University of Phoenix is intended to insure quality control for all centralized management processes while also insuring local control and academic integrity at its campuses. The Hawaii Campus has the authority and capability to lead and direct all academic programs offered at the campus.

Structure at the Central Administration Level

The President of the University, Provost, Vice Provosts, and the Deans preside over their programs in the Central Administration offices in Tempe, Arizona. Program design and development, curriculum oversight, and unit policies are coordinated by the Dean's Office and are implemented by each campus. At the local campus the programs are administered by the Academic Affairs team, consisting of the Director of Academic Affairs, the Campus College Chairs, and the support personnel for the department.

At the University level, college deans and members of the Faculty Councils are significantly involved in the determination of program and course development. College deans are full-time administrative faculty members who have accountability and responsibility for curriculum and the official approval of the faculty within their respective colleges. Faculty Councils exist within each college and are comprised of Associate and Core Faculty. These councils formulate and inform the curriculum for their

respective programs and create the annual Master Curriculum Agenda. In addition, Academic Program Councils may be utilized for focused work on the design and development of specific degree programs. These councils are chaired by the college dean or associate dean and include faculty representatives and/or Campus College Chairs.

Deans Office Leadership

The College of Education has one dean, three associate deans, and five regional assistant deans who provide leadership and direction for all education programs on a full-time basis. One of the Regional Assistant Deans (Dr. Gay Lynn Smith) specifically works with the Hawaii Campus to ensure compliance with state regulations and policies in program implementation and serves as the liaison between the Dean's Office and the campus. Dr. Sandra McCarty, Associate Dean-Regulatory and Accreditation, is also serving as the NCATE Coordinator for the Hawaii Campus. There is an educational staff consisting of directors and curriculum managers who monitor state regulations and work with faculty to develop curriculum for all programs in the College of Education. The College of Education Dean's Office Organizational Chart is included as Exhibit 42.

Hawaii Campus Governance and Leadership

The Hawaii Campus has a Campus Director (Kristine Averill) responsible for campus functions including personnel, admission, student services, fiscal activities, and quality. Academic Affairs is under the management of the Director of Academic Affairs (Dr. Deborah Hornsby) who reports to the Campus Director.
The Director of Academic Affairs assumes responsibility and authority for all matters related to academic affairs, including faculty recruitment, assessment, appointment, development and evaluation, and academic effectiveness at the campus level. The Director of Academic Affairs is also responsible for supervising the Campus College Chairs and departmental staff. The Campus College Chair for the College of Education is George Carroll.

The Campus College Chair is the representative of the deans and the programs at the campus level. Although the Campus College Chair reports directly to the Director of Academic Affairs, he also reports to and works closely with the deans, paying particular attention to program compliance and policy adherence. The support personnel administer faculty processes such as course scheduling, hiring documentation, regular communication, and meetings and events. The College of Education also has four faculty members that serve as Clinical Placement Supervisors who oversee all field and clinical placement processes and procedures for the local campus and online. The Clinical Placement Supervisors report directly to the Campus College Chair and are:

• Sharon Inamine - Student Teaching Placement Supervisor
• Shirley Iwase - Student Teaching Placement Supervisor
• Joseph Trimarche - Outer Island Student Teaching Placement Supervisor
• Kathy Kamauu - Field Experience Site Coordinator

The governance structure of the campus consists of the Campus Academic Council and Campus College Management Meeting. The Campus Academic Council is under the direction of the Director of Academic Affairs and consists of all Campus College Chairs and Lead Faculty/Area Chairs, as well as the Campus Director. At the discretion of the Director of Academic Affairs, other directors of the campus may be ex-officio members. The council meets at least quarterly at each campus to facilitate communication between the faculty and administration relative to academic issues. This body also plans faculty training and development activities. The Campus College Management Meeting is formed for each college whose programs are offered at the campus and are chaired by the Campus College Chair.

Committee members consist of the Lead Faculty/Area Chairs from each of the content areas within the college. This committee provides feedback regarding curriculum and course issues to the deans, needs for faculty development, and faculty training. The Campus College Chair also works across the campus guiding student services personnel with academic program requirements.

The Lead Faculty/Area Chairs are Core Faculty on year-long contracts that include a set number of courses, mentorships, Classroom Performance Reviews (this is an evaluation required for faculty a minimum of every two years), attendance at Council meetings and Campus College Management Meetings, New Faculty Assessments, curriculum reviews, and content expertise. The Lead Faculty/Area Chairs for the Hawaii Campus are:

• Dr. Lorraine Mito – Elementary Education
• Joseph Trimarche – Secondary Education
• Sherri Gelbard – Special Education

The Hawaii Campus College of Education Organizational Chart is included as Exhibit 43.

Online Governance and Leadership

The online division of the Hawaii Campus has a Regional Director of Academic Affairs (Dr. Leonard Kelpsh) who has primary responsibility for College of Education programs and academics including oversight of personnel, admissions, student services, fiscal activities, and quality. Online Academic Affairs is under the management of the Provost's Office and Central Academic Operations.

Dr. Jonathan Lewis is the Director of Academic Affairs and assumes responsibility and authority for all matters related to College of Education academic affairs including faculty recruitment, assessment, appointment, development and evaluation, and academic effectiveness. Dr. Lewis also supervises the Online Campus College Chair (Patricia Wick) and other departmental staff.

The Campus College Chair is the representative of the deans and the programs at the campus level. Although the Campus College Chair reports directly to the Director of Academic Affairs, she also reports to and works closely with the deans paying particular attention to program compliance and policy adherence. The Campus College Chair works with Campus Operations to support and administer faculty processes such as course scheduling, hiring documentation, regular communication, and meetings and events.

Online Academic Affairs works closely with the local campus to oversee field placement processes and procedures. The local campus and online share clinical placement supervisors and processes. At the point that candidates are ready to student teach, they are transferred to the local campus for placement and supervision using the staff and processes described above for the local campus.

The Online College of Education Organizational Chart is included as Exhibit 44.

8000 character limit

6.1.b Unit Budget

Summarize budget allocation and its sufficiency in supporting both campus and clinical work that are essential to the preparation of educators and other school professionals.

The institution follows a Dynamic Planning Process for budgeting which allows for continual forecasting and planning and has been part of the institution's financial processes for over 3 years. This

process has allowed the institution greater agility in financial planning in order to be consistent with a more dynamic sector and operating environment. The Dynamic Planning Process has been extremely effective as it allows revision of performance estimates and investment proposals when visibility into program and campus performance and enrollment forecasts suggest a need for repositioned resources. Performance and forecast variance in one period can be effectively offset by revised targets in future periods so that resource allocation remains optimal and appropriate for effective candidate outcomes. The effectiveness of the process is measured as timeliness between performance identification and targeted action plans. The result is a more proactive anticipation of needs and optimal service levels to candidates across the enterprise.

Resources are allocated based on existing and expected enrollments, program specific requirements, learning delivery, and assessment objectives. Faculty planning in this system is agile to changing needs with respect to quantity and quality. For example, certain programs and candidates require greater media-rich content and/or highly engaged faculty. These programs and candidates receive those specific resources matched to needs in a timely and targeted manner.

Within the Central Administration budget, the College of Education is allocated approximately $2,600,000 per year. The College of Education is staffed and funded proportionately with the other colleges in the University based on size and scope of work. The College of Education maintains more state-specific programs and associated state program approvals nationwide. As a result, the staffing and budgetary requirements are greater.

The campus-based budget for the College of Education is funded proportionately with the other colleges based on size and scope of work. Although there may be some variance due to specialized requirements such as clinical placements for education candidates, the amount allotted per student is relatively constant across all colleges and the campus.

Campus budgets to support academic programs are maintained at each individual location. Budget line items in a campus budget include items such as faculty pay, facilities and classroom maintenance, computer and data access services, technology support, student services, supplies, as well as costs associated with local commencement ceremonies.

Exhibit 45 Historical COE Multiyear Budget shows how resources have been allocated over the past few years. The budget for the current academic year is still in process of being finalized at the time of this IR submission. It will be made available at a later date for the BOE review team.

6000 character limit

6.1.c Personnel

Summarize policies, procedures, and practices of faculty workload; unit's use of faculty and personnel in ensuring coherency and integrity of programs and operations; and resources and opportunities for professional development.

The university practices a unique style of faculty selection and curriculum delivery by emphasizing the use of core administrative and associate practitioner faculty. All faculty have both the academic preparation necessary to teach discipline-specific theory and the practical experience to render the theory relevant and useful. The majority of faculty are practitioner-based and not full-time employees; they are contracted on a course-by-course basis. All faculty are P-12 classroom teachers and administrators in local Hawaii schools.

Core administrative faculty includes the Director of Academic Affairs, Campus College Chairs, Clinical Placement Supervisors, and Lead Faculty/Area Chairs. Administrative faculty are full-time, exempt employees assigned to Academic Affairs whose duties include a combination of instruction, curriculum oversight and development, and/or academic and faculty administration. There are 8 core faculty members at the local campus and 5 at online with 18 associate faculty at the local campus and 28 associate faculty at online.

The Lead Faculty/Area Chair positions are carried out under term contracts that are annual (12 months) in length. Lead Faculty/Area Chairs are faculty who are in good standing with the University and teaching a significant number of courses within their content area for an annual term. Lead Faculty/Area Chairs also teach primarily, but in addition are responsible for the following:

• Faculty Training & Certification
• Faculty Mentoring
• Content Interviews
• Faculty Assessment
• Participation in Content Area Meetings, Campus College Steering Committees & Academic Program Councils

Given that all faculty are connected to the field of endeavor in which they teach, the University pays special attention to the workload/course load that a faculty member may maintain. Owing to the accelerated structure of the University's courses and the experiential aspect of the faculty's practice, an upper limit of 20 courses per year is set as the standard. No faculty member of the University may teach more than two courses concurrently at any time in any single modality. The formal policy regarding faculty course load is included in Exhibit 37 Faculty Handbook. Faculty workload policies are the same regardless of modality.

The University Faculty Supervisor is eligible to teach the student teaching seminars as well as supervise candidates in the field during their clinical experience. Supervisors meet regularly with the candidates and cooperating teacher, hold appropriate credentials, and have supervisory experience. Faculty supervisors have the same teaching workload requirements; however, the faculty-to-student ratio for student teaching supervision on the island of Oahu is 1:5. The faculty-to-student ratio for student teaching supervision on the outer islands is 1:1.

In addition to the Campus College Chair, Clinical Placement Supervisors, and Lead Faculty/Area Chairs, additional campus personnel provide support for the unit. The support personnel consist of program managers, academic counselors/Teacher Education Specialists, finance advisors, and enrollment advisors collectively known as the Graduation Team. The Academic Counselor/Teacher Education Specialists (AC/TES) work with candidates from program entry to program completion. The AC/TES works with candidates to meet Level 1 and Level 2 admission requirements and assists with field and clinical placements. Through regular contact with candidates, these advisors function as a support system to ensure success from start to completion.

The University is committed to the ongoing professional development of its faculty. This commitment is evidenced by the variety of programs and activities available to develop and enhance faculty effectiveness. Regular training and development activities are offered at the campus and online at no charge to faculty. These activities provide opportunities for faculty to enhance and expand their teaching, assessment, and professional skills. Building on the professional experiences and educational preparation that faculty bring to the University, participation in these activities enhances their ability to become effective facilitators of student learning and managers of the learning process. Minimum campus requirements for faculty training include two General Faculty meetings per year; four Content Area

Meetings per year; and reinforcement and integration of faculty requirements through required professional development workshops. Of the 18 associate faculty members who teach at the local campus, 100% have completed one or more professional development activities offered by the unit during the last 3 academic years. There are 28 associate faculty members teaching in the online modality and 100% have completed at least one professional development workshop since March 1, 2013.

All faculty meetings must have a development component. A variety of training workshops may be presented and are focused on the following areas:

• Teaching methodology such as grading and evaluation, classroom assessment, or facilitation techniques.
• Best practices whereby groups of faculty members in the same discipline or course meet to share effective practice ideas and to review curriculum.
• Requested areas of professional development such as some aspect of theory or practice in one or more disciplinary areas.
• Specialized training by the college may also be provided to meet program specific needs.

New faculty development programs are created and offered as needs are identified. Often, faculty with expertise in training and relevant subject areas are selected to create and facilitate the session. Content for the development program may be created locally or with the support of Central Administration Academic Affairs. Faculty may receive an honorarium for this scholarship activity.

6000 character limit

6.1.d Unit Facilities

Summarize campus and school facilities to support candidates in meeting standards, including support for use of technology in teaching and learning.

All classrooms at University of Phoenix are similarly equipped and maintained. All classroom space provided by the University meets a business class standard and complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act. The decor and appearance of offices and classrooms are appropriate for a university designed for adult learners. Study rooms and faculty work rooms with computer access are available for use. Classrooms generally average about 900 square feet and are designed for a lecture/seminar format and for small group discussion.

Each classroom includes, at minimum, a computer and monitor for student and faculty use, an Internet connection, a projection system with computer connectivity, an overhead projector, a screen, and a flip chart. Classrooms are maintained by a student services coordinator. This individual performs a daily check of each classroom prior to class start to ensure that all equipment is accounted for and in working order. In addition, a periodic audit is conducted to address maintenance and access issues.

The majority of course materials (e.g., syllabus, supplementary materials) are located on the candidate and faculty Online Learning System (OLS). Through this site, candidates and faculty members access course materials, program handbooks, instructional materials, college-specific resources and tools, the University Library, financial aid information, software downloads, writing and mathematics tutorials, and interactive labs. In addition, candidate and faculty technical support is provided 24/7 free of charge. A demonstration of the variety of online resources and tools available to candidates and faculty will be conducted during the onsite visit.

The Student Resource Center provides candidates with computers, monitors, printers, photocopier,

supplies, and access to the Internet. The computers include the standard Microsoft Office® software suite. Candidates have access to academic assistance and meeting rooms. In addition, candidates may find job postings, reference materials, and a local fax machine. The center is available for candidate use during regular campus hours.

The quality control for basic facilities, equipment, and supplies is standardized across campuses. Periodic audits are held at the campus to address maintenance and access issues. Representatives at this audit may include faculty, campus IT and facilities staff, the student services coordinator, operations manager, and students. The campus also offers the services of a Student Platinum Support Specialist for technology issues.

6000 character limit

6.1.e Unit Resources including Technology

Summarize resource allocations to support candidates in meeting standards, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs when applicable.

The University's Dynamic Planning Process (DPP) operates on a 15-month rolling forecast. Shifting to a more flexible, dynamic process facilitates more rapid alignment with future changes to the business model. The DPP model allows for changes to be incorporated on a monthly basis to adjust to revisions, new initiatives, economic change, and student needs. Resources are available based on need. In general, all programs undergo significant revisions approximately every two years due to changes in state and national regulations and standards, as well as program improvements based on data analysis from the University's continuous improvement model.

Review of state and national regulations and standards is ongoing and supported by the unit. The unit employs a team of associate and assistant deans whose main responsibility is to collaborate with campuses, state and national agencies to monitor changes in regulation and curriculum and assessment needs. In addition, the curriculum team works to ensure alignment of coursework and assessments to state and national standards. Faculty Council members provide additional guidance and participate in continuous improvement and program design.

The following technology resources are available to all candidates and faculty through eCampus.

eCampus & Online Learning System (OLS)
Candidates and faculty access course and instructional materials, the University Library, Online Learning System (OLS), and support services through eCampus. Part of eCampus is the web-based portal used by all candidates and faculty to access learning assets and tools. Currently, the total number of electronically maintained courses to which 100% of candidates and faculty have access is 2,475.

University Library
The University is home to an extensive digital library that provides research and reference services available 24/7 to 100% of candidates and faculty. There are over 300 licensed databases, 100,000 scholarly journals and periodicals, 32,000 general interest e-books, as well as interlibrary loan services. The live librarian requests in the past year were approximately 15,600.

Center for Writing Excellence
The Center for Writing Excellence (CWE) is a comprehensive automated review online system that includes style guides, a plagiarism checker, tutor review, and Spanish Writing Labs. The Center

maintains a system called WritePoint® that provides feedback for students and faculty on grammar, punctuation, word usage, and style points. Feedback is provided through comments inserted into the text of a paper at the point of the error. The WritePoint® system processes papers quickly and is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. In an average month, more than 600,000 papers are processed through WritePoint®. Plagiarism Checker, powered by Turnitin.com, is an additional resource provided to students to promote originality in written work and improve student writing and research skills. The CWE also provides tutorials and worksheets on avoiding and identifying plagiarism. In an average month, approximately 700,000 papers are processed through Plagiarism Checker.

Center for Mathematics Excellence
The Center for Mathematics Excellence (CME) is designed to provide students and faculty with resources to assist with quantitative teaching and learning. The Center for Mathematics Excellence is an online center that continually expands to meet mathematics remediation needs. The CME was instituted to address the needs of students who may not have the requisite skills, have not practiced math for some time, or suffer from math anxiety. The site helps to address these issues by dispelling math anxiety myths and suggesting study and coping skills for those who struggle with math classes. In an average month, more than 40,000 students access the CME home page.

eBook Library
The eBook Library is a collection of books available for all candidates and faculty to search, browse, and read. The total digitized textbooks and references sources numbers more than 2,000.

Virtual School District
The Virtual School District was developed by the unit to provide a simulated educational environment for candidate use during coursework. The Virtual School is integrated into the course curriculum and provides candidates with unprecedented access to content and knowledge for a pre-service candidate. The fictitious nature of the school, student, and faculty provide for a FERPA-compliant environment to facilitate classroom discussions and provide a learning environment to support coursework. It is important to note that the Virtual School is not the University's Online Learning System or online modality. The Virtual School is a tool and resource that is used during coursework to complete some assignments.

Technology Resource Library
The Technology Resource Library serves as a resource for candidates to learn about current educational technology tools and resources. Organized in three sections, the first section exposes candidates to the types of instructional equipment they might find in their future classrooms. The second section provides tutorials for creating projects with podcasts, video clips, audio clips, various multi-media presentation tools, blogs, wikis, WebQuests, and other tools. The third section introduces a variety of educational Web 2.0 tools. The Technology Resource Library includes more than 50 quality sites that can be used in the classroom to enhance instruction and learning. Released in 2011, the college is in the process of collecting usage data for analysis and further development.

PhoenixMobile 2.0
The University has released Smartphone applications for both faculty and candidates. The applications allow candidates and faculty to view and participate in classroom forums anytime through a Smartphone. Functionality includes alerts about class related activity including grade postings, new discussion questions, and instructor posts.

6000 character limit

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

□ Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
□ Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
□ Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

The University of Phoenix has a unique governance structure that insures an ongoing commitment to quality in all facets of operations. This also extends to unit operations. The President of the University of Phoenix has given authority to the Dean of the College of Education to serve as the unit head. The unit is widely seen as a leader in innovative teaching practices, use of technology in teaching and learning, assessment of student learning, and faculty development. The Hawaii Campus personnel, supported by the Deans in Central Administration, provide leadership in program design and implementation to prepare effective P-12 education professionals for Hawaii schools.

Candidates are provided ongoing guidance and counseling by their dedicated graduation team. Candidates receive advising prior to enrolling in a program so they know the standards and expectations of the program, during the program, and at time of program completion and graduation. Candidates receive a program orientation and periodic scheduled individual and class-based updates on policies and procedures.

Faculty collaborate on program design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit and its programs through regularly scheduled meetings (such as Content Area Meetings) at which they share best practice on instruction and updates on content.

The University is committed to the ongoing professional development of its faculty. Regular training and development activities are offered at the campuses and online at no charge to faculty. These activities provide opportunities for faculty members to enhance and expand their teaching, assessment, and professional skills. Minimum campus requirements for faculty training include two General Faculty meetings per year and four Content Area Meetings per year.

6b. Unit Budget

The campus-based budget for the College of Education is funded proportionately with the other colleges based on size and scope of work. Although there may be some variance due to specialized requirements such as clinical placements for education and counseling candidates, the amount allotted per student is relatively constant across all colleges at the campus. Budget line items in a campus budget include faculty pay, facilities and classroom maintenance, computer and data access services, technology support, student services, and supplies. University of Phoenix practitioner faculty members are supported in scholarship and service through honoraria. The Dynamic Planning Process allows the unit and the University to re-assess needs on a continual basis so if additional monies need to be spent in a certain area such as improvement in technology, this can be taken care of in an efficient manner rather

than waiting for the next budget cycle to request funds.

6c. Personnel

In alignment with the university's mission, the unique governance structure of the University of Phoenix provides the level of flexibility the institution requires in order to adapt to the needs of its candidate population and that of the employers it serves in an efficient and innovative manner. The suite of career services and technology resources available to incoming, existing, and graduating candidates are examples of this success.

Faculty members at the University of Phoenix are practitioners in their field and serve in P-12 schools as teacher, administrators, and counselors. In addition to serving their profession as current P-12 educators, they willingly prepare new educators for the field by sharing their best practice, scholarship, and experiences. Their commitment to University of Phoenix includes teaching, scholarship, service, and program and unit assessment and evaluation.

Faculty workload policies mandate an upper limit of twenty courses per year as the maximum standard. No faculty member of the University may teach more than two courses concurrently at any time in any single modality.

Clinical faculty members are paid for their contributions in the field but may not hold Associate Faculty status in the unit. Clinical faculty have the choice of solely providing supervision and mentoring during clinical experiences or also becoming a member of the unit's faculty and teaching courses within the programs. They also serve as subject matter experts for the continuous improvement of clinical and field courses, experiences, and corresponding forms and processes. Clinical faculty members receive ongoing support, training, and professional development free of charge from the University. The Clinical Placement Supervisors and the Campus College Chair regularly communicate with all faculty members including clinical personnel and serves as a resource for their ongoing development.

The University is committed to the ongoing professional development of its faculty. This commitment is evidenced by the variety of programs and activities available to develop and enhance faculty effectiveness. Regular training and development activities are offered at the campuses and online at no charge to faculty. These activities provide opportunities for faculty members to enhance and expand their teaching, assessment, and professional skills. Building on the professional experiences and educational preparation that faculty members bring to the University, participation in these activities enhances their ability to become effective facilitators of student learning and managers of the learning process.

6d. Unit Facilities

The Hawaii Campus consists of business-class site-based classrooms equipped with modern technology for candidate and faculty use including wireless technology in all spaces. The Hawaii Campus also has a Student Academic Skills Center, several student meeting rooms, and a Student Resource Center all equipped with educational technology and available free of charge to candidates and faculty. The Hawaii Campus is highly committed to serving its community and P-12 partner schools and regularly donates supplies and technology such as iPads, paper, pens/pencils, and staff time.

The unit is working with internal stakeholders to purchase additional educational technology for the Hawaii Campus. Equipment such as interactive white boards, document cameras, audience response systems, tablets, and the like will be added to unit facilities to provide candidates with greater experience prior to their work in diverse P-12 classroom settings in field experience and student teaching. In

addition, faculty will be provided training on the equipment and will be given opportunities to share best practices and instructional strategies for integrating technology into their facilitation. These new technologies will be in place in early 2014 at the Hawaii Campus and available for viewing/demonstration during the onsite visit.

6e. Unit Resources Including Technology

The University of Phoenix has been the leader in innovative teaching and learning practices for over three decades. The University has committed significant capital to ensuring that its proprietary online learning system is continuously improved upon to meet the ever-changing needs of our working adult learner population. The online learning system is available 24/7 worldwide and can be accessed via computer, tablet, or Smartphone. Major improvements are currently being implemented to the Online Learning System, known collectively as "New Classroom". A demonstration will be provided at the on-site visit of the New Classroom features.

The unit is committed to securing resources that support high-quality and exemplary programs and projects. The unit uses a variety of technology to help candidates meet standards including the online learning system, digital library, eBook library, virtual school, technology resource library, and Smartphone application where faculty and candidates can access program and course information. In addition, the College of Education uses an electronic portfolio (TaskStream) as part of its assessment system where benchmark assessments are collected and evaluated. The system provides tools for candidates in lesson and unit planning, creating assessment tools, and accessing national and state standards.

Each of these resources has contributed to candidate performance, access to human, physical, and technological resources, as well as quality of the educational experience overall. The unit is and has always been committed to being the nation's leader in innovative education. The governance structure and resources available allow the unit to fulfill this promise and prepare candidates for the 21st century.

Plans and Timelines

The unit has developed toolkits to provide candidates and faculty with the most current information available in four key areas: Common Core State Standards, Teacher/Principal Evaluation, P-12 Student Assessment, and STEM Initiatives. The toolkit for each area includes links to resources, tools and materials, information about upcoming professional development opportunities, and considerations for effective implementation as appropriate. These key areas also include Hawaii-specific information in Technology, Reading, and Native Hawaiian Studies and Content for Elementary and Secondary (Hawaiian Education, Culture, General Facts, Environment, Geography, Government, and History). The toolkits were made available to faculty and candidates in summer 2013. The tool kits will continue to be updated and added to as new categories are requested.

The unit has several established partnerships to promote the education profession and our role in preparing educators for the 21st century that we plan on continuing and utilizing to promote the positive aspects of teachers and teaching. The institution is a co-sponsor of NBC News annual Education Nation series of events nationwide that include teacher town halls, teacher appreciation events, and national news coverage highlighting current trends and hot topics for discussion. As part of this partnership, the unit has received subscriptions to the NBC Learns web site and its extensive video library featuring 80 years of broadcast archives. The unit can share this subscription with partner schools, faculty, and candidate's free-of-charge. This partnership is ongoing and our participation in Education Nation events occurs throughout the year. The curriculum development team continually looks for new ways to integrate the NBC Learns videos into the curriculum.

The unit is also a co-sponsor along with the GOOD organization in promoting the Great American Teach-Off. Each year we award two deserving teachers – one from grades K-6 and one from grades 7-12 – with a $10,000 classroom grant. The finalists and winners are voted on by peers and colleagues through the GOOD and University of Phoenix web sites. Contestants are chosen based on a video submitted with their responses to a series of questions highlighting their creativity and passion in the classroom, as well as their positive impact on the greater education community. Each year a member of the unit's staff is able to surprise the two winners by walking into their classrooms with a $10,000 check and accompanying fanfare to the complete surprise of the two finalists. The Great American Teach-Off is an opportunity to show our appreciation for teachers and provides a platform to share innovative classroom ideas. The unit participates in the Great American Teach-Off annually and plans to continue this partnership.

The allocation of resources that the unit is most proud of is our partnership with the prestigious National Teacher of the Year Program sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Besides sponsoring the inaugural dinner each year where the finalists for all of the state, district, and commonwealth Teachers of the Year first meet each other and begin their year long journey, the unit also provides all finalists with a Kindle and NBC Learns subscription for their school. During the dinner event, the Dean of the College of Education has the opportunity to announce that the University of Phoenix is awarding 55 full ride scholarships, called "Teach It Forward Scholarships," one for each state, each U.S. territory and the Department of Defense to each of the Teachers of the Year. The Dean asks that each Teacher of the Year select a scholarship recipient that they feel can benefit the most from the opportunity of receiving an education. The scholarship is available for any degree program at the bachelor's or master's level anywhere the University operates. The local campus celebrates their state's Teacher of the Year as well as the scholarship recipient through hosted events and local television coverage. The Hawaii Teacher of Year is invited to speak at faculty meetings, graduations, and other campus events. The unit continues to provide support and encouragement throughout the year-long journey of each Teacher of the Year and invites all qualified recipients to join the unit faculty. The University of Phoenix is very proud that numerous Teachers of the Year are graduates of the College of Education initial teacher preparation and advanced graduate degree programs. The unit participates in and sponsors events throughout the year and plans to continue this partnership.

The unit is committed to providing an innovative learning experience that prepares future educators to be leaders and role models in today's classrooms. The unit is committed to continuous improvement of programs and operations in order to meet its mission, vision, and purpose of "Impacting Student Learning, One Educator at a Time."

36000 character limit

6.2.b Continuous Improvement

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

Not applicable

5000 character limit

6.3 Exhibits for Standard 6

6.3.a	Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit
6.3.b	Organizational chart and/or description of the unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure
6.3.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising
6.3.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community
6.3.e	Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising
6.3.f	Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs when applicable
6.3.g	Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses
6.3.h	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload
6.3.i	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning
6.3.j	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates access have to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable

Exhibit 43 Hawaii Campus COE Org Chart 2013
Exhibit 45 Historical COE Multiyear Budget
Exhibit 44 Hawaii Online COE Org Chart 2013
Exhibit 42 COE Dean's Office Org Chart 2013

See **Attachment** panel below.