

## **PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT**

---

### ***Institution***

***University of Phoenix  
Bachelors of Science in Education,  
Early Childhood Education***

### **Review Team Members**

***Beth Driscoll, NBCT, M.Ed Arizona Dept. of Education  
Donna Jurich, University of Arizona  
Vicky Young, Prescott College***



**Arizona Department of Education  
1535 W. Jefferson Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007**

## ***INTRODUCTION***

---

Arizona State Board rule R7-2-604(A) states: The Board shall evaluate and may approve the professional preparation programs which request Board Approval. Rules R7-2-604 and R7-2-604.01 apply to all professional preparation programs in teacher, administrator, school guidance counselor, and school psychology programs that lead to certification. The Board may grant approval for a period not to exceed five years. A copy of Board rules governing the Professional Preparation Approval Process is attached to this document.

The professional preparation program review for University of Phoenix Bachelors of Science in Education, Early Childhood Education was conducted on September 10, 2013.

The Arizona State Board of Education and the Arizona Department of Education regard the approval process as a collaborative endeavor to maintain, improve, and ensure educator preparation quality in Arizona. Following are the findings of the review team.

**PROGRAM REVIEW**

---

**Program Name:**

**University of Phoenix Bachelors of Science in Education, Early Childhood Education**

**Program Description:**

The Bachelors of Arts in Education with a specialization in Early Childhood Education is an undergraduate degree program preparing candiadtes for teacher licensure in the field of early childhood.

Program/Course sequence (number of credit hours)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Program Description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Unique coursework (one course number cannot reflect an internship for supervisor, principal or superintendent)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013

- Confused regarding entry requirements of full time employment.
- There is not a GPA requirement for admissions or continuation in the program. GPA is one measure of academic knowledge.
- Lacking evidence that required child guidance and classroom management course(s) are being met.
- Lack of addressing birth through pre-K requirements throughout program submission. All program documents need to state" birth through age 8 or through grade 3".
- Concerned about the sequence of the coursework. Unclear whether the course sequence is as stated on the course sequence document or the order of the syllabi.
- Unclear whether methods courses are prerequisites for student teaching.

- The conceptual Framework (seven themes) mentioned in ECH 300 are not present in the program description.
- ECH /420 is an Elementary Methods Science course. Needs to be Methods of Teaching in Early Childhood
- There is no program handbook that clearly lays out the sequence of courses, the assessment points and measures, pre-requisites, and policies. This has made it difficult to have a clear understanding of the program. Though this information is located in the syllabus for ECH 300—a non-credit course—ECH is not a pre-requisite for any course.
- Student teaching does not seem to be rigorous. For example, one of the benchmark assignments for ECH 498 is a self-assessment.
- Editing notes were left in electronic submission.
- Several course syllabi are missing rubrics and grading systems.
- Commendations for requiring a B or better in Student Teaching Seminar B to complete the BSED-ECH program.
- Lacking evidence of field experience in infant/toddler setting. Must include field experience in birth through preschool.
- What is being done to address common core preparation?

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (A):** At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards (InTASC, NAEYC, NETS).**

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (1):** Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence, descriptions** of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.**

**R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D):** **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

9/2013

- Address common core preparation.
- Remove editing notes from electronic submission.
- Clarify program entry requirements.

12/2013

- Common core is being addressed in ECH416, ECH 420, RDG 416, and RDG 351.
- Editing notes have been removed
- Program entry requirements have been clarified

If Unmet, further action required:

- Provide evidence that required child guidance and classroom management course(s) are being met.
- All program documents need to state "birth through age 8 or through grade 3".
- Provide evidence of addressing birth through pre-K requirements throughout program submission.
- Program must include field experience in birth through preschool.
- Provide early childhood science methods syllabi.
- Provide rubrics and grading systems for all required courses.
- Provide program handbook.

12/2013

- Child guidance requirements are met in ECH 321
- Programs documents have been changed to reflect "birth through age 8 or grade 3"
- Syllabi have been reviewed and revised to ensure birth through pre-K is covered throughout the program
- ECH 498 has been changed to early childhood birth through preschool practicum/student teaching (4 credits)
- ECH 420 science methods has been included
- Rubrics and grading system have been provided
- Electronic handbook provided

**COURSE INFORMATION**

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Topics/objectives, competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Competencies aligned to national standards (InTASC,NAEYC, NETS)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

<p>9/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The syllabi do not tie to the conceptual framework stated in ECH 300.</li> <li>• The assignments in the syllabi do not align with the standards listed.</li> <li>• Fieldwork requirements tied to assignments are not present in all syllabi with fieldwork (example ECH 301).</li> <li>• Objectives for each week are not tied to standards (See ECH 205 objectives for each week.)</li> <li>• ECH 205 has an assignment (Teacher Interview Questions and Presentation) which is listed as evidence of a standard. Yet, the syllabus shows that it has fewer points than the research paper. It might be good to have the interview be part of the research paper so that it is weighted appropriately.</li> <li>• Courses focus on K-3. For example, ECH 211, there is little evidence of how to plan for birth to pre-k.</li> <li>• Benchmark assignments and their rubrics are not embedded in syllabi. Statement on most benchmark assignments “See the Gradebook Directions document on the course Materials page for directions on how to add benchmark assignments to your Gradebook.” How would student know what is expected of them for the benchmark assignments if they are not embedded in the syllabus along with the rubric?</li> <li>• Benchmark assignment rubrics for ECH 321, 302, 416, 498, and 499, are only aligned with NAEYC. They are not aligned with InTASC or NETS.</li> <li>• ECH 211 which has a benchmark assignment has no standards identified on the benchmark rubric</li> <li>• “Step Two” document states: All Course Design Guides (CDGs) are in Appendix B. Note that CDGs provide an overview of the course for faculty; each faculty member is responsible for creating his/her own syllabus with specific course policies, assignment due dates, and additional readings/activities as appropriate for the course and candidates in the classroom. Faculty members are not allowed to change</li> </ul>
--

course descriptions, topics and objectives, required field experience, and benchmark assessments.” This does not ensure that courses are aligned to standards.

- NETS standards appear on syllabi but are not tied to assignments or benchmarks.
- ECH /420 is an Elementary Methods Science course. Needs to be Methods of Teaching in Early Childhood
- Several course syllabi are missing rubrics and grading systems
- Descriptions for many courses appear to be for elementary certification not for teaching children birth to pre-K which is part of early childhood education.
- Topics/objectives, competencies are identified on syllabi. They are not tied to the standards; assignments; benchmark assignments and the benchmark assignment rubrics.
- ECH498 and ECH499 do not include required 4 semester hours of practicum in a birth through preschool setting:” Practicum must include a minimum of 4 semester hours in supervised field experience, practicum, internship or student teaching setting serving children birth through preschool”

Recommendation(s):

- 

If Unmet, further action required:

9/2013

- Syllabi must address birth through pre-k, as well as K-3
- Competencies must be aligned to appropriate national standards
- Topics/objectives, competencies must be clearly identified
- Course syllabi need rubrics and grading systems
- Program submission can't be recommended for approval without reviewing the actual syllabi for the program.

12/2013

- Resubmitted syllabi address the age range of the certificate
- Competencies are aligned to national standards

- Topics/objectives, competencies are clearly identified
  - Courses syllabi and handbook include rubrics and grading system
  - All syllabi have been provided
-

**SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

Clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Aligned with evidence on program matrix	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

<p>9/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmark assignments are not clearly identified.</li> <li>• The Portfolio Assignments and Benchmark assignments are sometimes equated—and sometimes they are not.</li> <li>• Appendix I benchmark assignments don't align with matrix or syllabi</li> <li>• Unclear of weighting of signature assignments or whether they are required to receive an A or B on signature assignment to pass the course</li> </ul>
---

Recommendation(s):

--

If Unmet, further action required:

<p>9/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly identify benchmark assignments.</li> <li>• Align signature assignments with evidence on program matrix</li> </ul> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signature assignment must either be weighted significantly or required to pass the course</li> </ul> <p>12/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmark assignments have been clearly identified and aligned with evidence on the program matrix</li> </ul>
--

**RUBRICS FOR SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS**

---

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria and performance levels	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

<p>9/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards are not clearly identified on all rubrics for benchmark assignments, ECH 498, and 499 are examples.</li> <li>These are generic and not assessment measure specific.</li> </ul>
---

Recommendation(s):

--

If Unmet, further action required:

<p>9/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards must be identified on signature assignments (InTASC, NAEYC and NETS when applicable)</li> </ul> <p>12/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards have been identified on signature assignments and corresponding rubrics</li> </ul>
---

**FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)**

Meets field experience definition (“scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience”) ARS R7-2-604.	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone).	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	Identified in embedded but not in stand-alone
Benchmark assignments related to field experiences are clearly identified.	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Aligned with evidence on program matrix	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

<p>9/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role of the field placement supervisor needs to be identified. From the materials, the students may place themselves versus being placed by the program.</li> <li>• The field experience list does not have enough birth to pre-k placement sites.</li> <li>• Students are directed to not spend more than 10 hours in a placement. If a student is expected to teach a lesson to children (for example: ECH 420, 430, 435), they would be with the children less than two days. Two days may not be an appropriate amount of time to assess children; create a lesson plan that meets the early childhood site or classroom curriculum; and build a relationship with the children &amp; teacher.</li> <li>• It is unclear according to syllabi how, “Some of these experiences are assigned in the professional preparation courses; others are independently conducted by the candidate under supervision by faculty and campus advisors.” How are field experiences consistent with multiple or possibly no supervision?</li> <li>• Are students held to: “Candidates are required to participate in field experiences in as many diverse settings as possible”? If the students’ record does not show diverse settings must they do additional hours? How is this monitored?</li> <li>• The accountability for fieldwork is primarily a log of hours.</li> </ul>
--

- Benchmark assignments are identified; however, they may not measure the course objectives or be weighted adequately.
- Only a few field experience assignments appear on the matrix.
- Unclear whether students are required to pass field experience when embedded in the course?
- Expectations for field experience in both birth through pre-k and k-3 aren't clearly identified

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

9/2013

- Requirements for all field experiences must be clearly identified and cover the range of the certificate
- Include evidence that field experiences are directed
- Clearly identify benchmark assignments related to field experiences
- Align field experiences with evidence on the program matrix

12/2013

- Field experience requirements have been clearly identified and require the range of the certificate.
- Faculty monitor completion of field experiences. Selected field experiences are evaluated by faculty and associated with coursework. Students must meet field experience requirements in order to be eligible to student teach.
- Benchmark assignments and related field experiences are provided in the program matrix

**EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE**

Evaluation instrument(s) tied to national standards (InTASC, NAEYC, NETS)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Clearly identified criteria and performance levels are evident in the evaluation instrument(s) for field experience.	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

<p>9/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field experience evaluation forms are generic and do not address different ages or contexts.</li> <li>• Field experience evaluation does not have standards listed.</li> <li>• Field experience form does not relate to field experience assignments.</li> </ul>
---

Recommendation(s):

--

If Unmet, further action required:

<p>9/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation instrument(s) must be tied to national standards with clearly identified criteria and performance levels</li> </ul> <p>12/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field experience evaluation has been revised and aligned to national standards</li> </ul>
---

**STUDENT TEACHING (CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE)**

Requirements are clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, signature assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

<p>9/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ECH498 and ECH499 do not include required 4 semester hours of practicum in a birth through preschool setting:” Practicum must include a minimum of 4 semester hours in supervised field experience, practicum, internship or student teaching setting serving children birth through preschool”</li> <li>ECH498 doesn’t specifically focus seminar assignments around the assumption that students are simultaneously in a birth through preschool practicum experience</li> <li>Information/requirements in the Overview of Student Teaching are not included/consistent with the student teaching syllabi</li> <li>The connections between the course syllabi 498 and 499 are not directly tied directly to the Student Teaching Supervisor Report, which is used for student teaching evaluation.</li> <li>One admission requirement is that the students are working full time. How do they complete student teaching?</li> <li>The pre-requisites are not clearly identified as mentioned in course sequencing.</li> <li>Unclear of the level of involvement of the field supervisor in placement: “Candidates are provided with a letter of introduction from the University as required by the school/district. This letter outlines the field experience requirements and expectations, guidelines for candidates’ behavior and responsibilities, and responsibilities of the placement/mentor teacher. This letter is intended to provide school administration with enough information to help the candidate conduct a worthwhile experience.”</li> </ul>
--

Recommendation(s):

--

If Unmet, further action required:

9/2013

- Evidence that students are required to complete 4 semester hours of practicum in a birth through preschool setting must be provided and that the associated seminar assignments are aligned to the field experience
- Rectify how students can complete student teaching if they are required to have full time employment as an admission requirement
- Clarify the role of the supervisor in the placements
- Use consistent requirements in all student teaching documents
- Ensure alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, signature assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework

12/2013

- Student teaching seminars have been revised to designate 4 credit hours for birth through preschool (ECH498) and 4 credit hours for kindergarten through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade (ECH499). Student teaching handbooks for each seminar/course have been provided.
- Required employment is not an admissions requirement. University of Phoenix is an institution geared towards working adults as part of its mission. Early childhood education students are informed at several points in the program that student teaching is full-time experience and that other employment during student teaching is not allowed.
- The supervisor role is clarified in the student teaching handbook.
- Requirements for student teaching are consistent in program documents.
- Submitted program matrix shows alignment in program documents with national standards

**EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING**

Evaluation instrument(s) tied to national standards (InTASC, NAEYC, NETS)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Clearly identified criteria and performance levels are evident in the evaluation instrument(s) for student teaching.	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evaluation instrument is only aligned to NAEYC</li></ul>
---

Recommendation(s):

--

If Unmet, further action required:

9/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evaluation instrument must be tied to NAEYC and InTASC standards (NETS if appropriate)</li></ul> 12/2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Student teaching evaluations have been included in the handbook and are aligned to appropriate standards</li></ul>
--

***PROGRAM MATRIX (SEE RUBRIC)***

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting national standards (InTASC, NAEYC, NETS) aligned with coursework, field experiences, student teaching, and assessments previously identified.	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 1	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 2	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 3	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 4	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 5	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 6	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 7	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 8	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

<p>9/2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting national standards (InTASC, NAEYC, NETS) aligned with coursework, field experiences, student teaching, and assessments previously identified, have not been met</li> <li>• The matrix provided a clearer picture of how standards were being met than the syllabi</li> <li>• Program Matrix was missing from hard copy submission</li> </ul>
---

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

**R7-2-604.01 (C) (5):** Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments, field experiences** and capstone experience (internship) align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

9/2013

- Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting national standards (InTASC, NAEYC, NETS) needs to be aligned with coursework, field experiences, student teaching, and assessments previously identified.

12/2013

- Program matrix has been provided with alignment of program components to appropriate national standards

**ASSESSMENT DATA**

---

Plan for collecting data to assess candidate's competency in meeting national standards (InTASC, NAEYC, NETS)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
---	---	--------------------------------	--

Findings of the Team:

--

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

<b>R7-2-604.01 (C) (3):</b> Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that <b>candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments</b> and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.
---

Recommendation(s):

--

If Unmet, further action required:

--

**RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

---

***Three (3) Year Approval –new program***

---