

Clinical Practice Work Group Regional Meeting Feedback

The Clinical Practice Work Group held 11 regional meetings across the state to collect feedback on their draft recommendations during February and March 2018. The meetings were hosted by the following institutions/organizations: SUNY Potsdam (February 26), NYC DOE (February 26), Syracuse University (February 27), CUNY Lehman College (February 27), CUNY Graduate Center (March 5), Ulster BOCES (March 6), Nazareth College (March 19), Cohoes High School (March 20), SUNY Buffalo State (March 20), Tompkins-Seneca-Tioga BOCES (March 21), and SUNY Old Westbury (March 26). The 286 meeting attendees included members of the higher education (66%) and P-12 (30%) communities and other community members (4%) with an average of 26 individuals at each meeting.

During the meetings, the participants were provided with copies of the draft recommendations that were divided into the categories of clinical partnerships, clinical experiences, and clinical supervision. They engaged in small group discussions on the draft recommendations and recorded their 1) feedback on the recommendations and 2) new ideas for the recommendations in each of the three categories. They also wrote additional questions on notecards. The written feedback from the participants is provided below and sorted into the categories of clinical partnerships, clinical experiences, clinical supervision, and questions.

Clinical Partnerships

Feedback on the Draft Recommendations

- What will be in the MOU? We could use guidance.
- What are the expectations of both sides in the MOU?
- How will communication work its way down from superintendents to classroom teachers?
- How can the Board incentivize being a cooperating teacher? (school based teacher educator)
- Have continuing education, evaluation-criteria, incentives for cooperating teachers!
- How will this be rolled out so the schools (P-12) are on board?
- Only adding MOU – we favor and already have them
- In rural areas – community-based organizations are not as common as in urban environments.
- Need to define community-based organization.
- What is the duration before the MOU is established?
- How does the B-2 clinical transpire?
- What tool or data device will be used to calibrate the demonstration of formal relationships and the promotion of faculty involvement?
- Good additions with no concerns
- It was a good idea to include the MOU
- What resources does Higher Ed and P-12 have for each other?
- How do we partner to mutually benefit each other?
- What are other ideas for win-win experience. Principals could act as supervisor and \$ that would have been paid to supervisor could go to principal's building.
- Host teacher and college prof. have several co-teaching seminars or/and on campus visits so host is in front of student teacher.
- Higher Ed partner with host teacher and admin K-12. All need to talk with each other.
- We like it! "meaningful relationships" and "collaborative experiences"
- Do agency agreements qualify as MOUs?
- How are we defining MOU? Is it open to interpretation or is it something specific?

- Do districts have the option of not entering into an MOU?
- What must be addressed in the MOU?
- What are the legal ramifications of an MOU for the districts/higher education?
- Who constitutes “all involved”?
- Who at a given institution will know what MOUs exist, what they contain?
- What if districts opt out of/choose not to enter into MOUs where the placements have the diversity that candidates need?
- How can attention be paid to nurturing partnerships that are new while carrying out all expectations?
- What about our overseas student teaching placements? Would they be required to enter into MOUs?
- Discussion of MOUs and their necessity
- CAEP/accreditors ask for difference between partnerships and PDS
- “School-based teacher educator”, Who is in charge of professional development? CEUs? Partner who’s in charge?
- What does this mean?
- Some can [illegible] work as mentor
- Operationalize meaningful
- Bargaining unit for recongition
- Articulate what graduates need to do
- Explicit regs, no less than
- Love that its added to existing regs.
- Memorandum of understanding – With DOE? With school partners? Would worry if its for each potential partner because that would create logistical/admin/legal challenges
- MOU for all clinical phases?
- Criteria for meaningful mutually beneficial partnerships?
- Meaningful partnerships – what does it look like? Definition (YMCAs, urban)?
- CAEP coming in September – people come in early to review, community partnerships a significant issue
- Where candidates are doing work
- Whats an incentive for schools to partner? Hard to find teachers and students who are committed.
- The institutions we work with affect how the student teaching placements go on
- Increasing regulations may keep out potential educators.
- Why is TPA the driver of this work?
- Partner at summer schools – a possible alternative – but then the pipeline to preK may be greater
- Teachers leave settings for higher salaries and then the teacher leaves – teacher sustainability is a problem.
- Consider whole cohorts of people and construct a new kind of program and settings through financing in a K-12 setting. Ex. One day a week substitute teach, split paraprofessionals for half days
- Student teacher and cooprating teachers – is a team – this is exciting but who is the coop teacher is mportant. A student teacher with a variety of teachers – engagement, intermed. Guidance pieces will give options.
- Trusting on the professionals. How do we learn from what people are doing.

- MOUs should be created locally and initiated by IHEs or CEAs/organizations
- Providing info on how this is being implemented now
- Samples of MOUs. IHEs share schools. How does that alignment look at? MOU expectation too vague.
- Would the MOU be written in collaboration with administration (e.g., teacher candidate working with after-school programs, tutoring help, regents prep). Agree-able to both parties
- NYU pushing-back – now
- Explain “community-based educator”
- Wish more classrooms were child centered and allows for immersion.
- Early Childhood program at Hunter works with NYCEECs and more and more community based programs are being sought
- We need school improvement plans and financial models that allow the participants to serve as subs, paraprofessionals, etc.
- I like that some of this allows for innovation and room for interpretation
- Will this lead to a cohesive infrastructure and system that will produce the change we want to see from the city and the state?
- We agree the ed. prog. should collaborate with schools and communities that we will be working with to improve teacher preparation.
- Great idea to have partnerships in theory, but harder to implement in reality.
- Once partnerships are established things tend to become rigid unless there are opportunities for exchange.
- Closer partnerships between college faculty and principals
- Some of the people at the table use MOUs and it required meeting with principals, clarifying expectations, which is good. Principals were happy to be able to set down their expectations for student teachers from the start.
- Relationships make it possible to have teachers that want student teachers.
- Have MOU signed by teacher, student teacher so everyone is clear about the goals and expectations.
- Students should be in the school from the beginning of the school year.
- Professional development should be included in MOU as well as quality of clinical practice.
- MOUs are crucial, and will cut across all program and clinical expectations
- How often does the partnership have to be evaluated?
- Will there be an understanding between IHEs and the DOE to create parameters for partnership?
- The partnership has to be well defined and structured from MOU to administrative responsibilities
- “We are in the business of teacher preparation and partnerships.”
- Invaluable to have student teachers – connected to working with them when understanding what they need to do, help with edTPA
- Connections between Higher Ed and P-12 is critical
- Having partners helps with hiring of adjuncts
- Relationships within a network help with hiring
- Developing MOUs has been optional with many schools
- Benefits of supervising teachers are immense
- How do you change when you’re already the teacher and your practice is what you’ve been doing or what the Director of a CBEC wants you to do

- Partnerships have been working well with student teaching but not as well with field experiences
- Consequences of MOUs – have you considered:
 - Cost of time for developing MOU (pay staff/faculty).
 - Competitions between institutions for MOUs with districts. Will districts develop MOU with multiple teacher prep places.
 - How are MOUs developed, monitored, reviewing, maintained over time (administrative tasks)
 - Do the districts develop these or higher ed.?
 - Have you considered what happens when #s in teacher prep programs rise again.
- P-20 partnerships
- EdTPA written in final semester – how to prepare P-12 schools to prepare student teachers to be successful with it
- Templates for MOU – exclusive partnership
- Equal investment from both sides.
- CTLE credits for P-12 teachers to obtain training.
- Operationalize – “meaningful partnerships”
- Does every school of education need to have a “meaningful partnership” for every field experience?
- How many “meaningful partnerships” do they require?
- What is meaningful? Definition needed.
- Is there a number that determines how many students mean it is “meaningful”?
- MOU – not a one size fits all
- Some districts have different policies regarding partnerships
- Some programs work with districts across the state (many different districts, e.g., 100s districts). Adds a level of complexity to a process that is already complex at district level
- What is the definition of “meaningful partnerships”?
- Appears to be giving schools more of a voice in how teachers are prepared.
- Partnerships are a part of CAEP accreditation – having this appear in both places is positive
- Stakes may be different at different grade levels – grades without high stakes testing versus those with high stakes testing.
- MOUs will take a significant amount of time. Could the state manage the MOUs between themselves and the schools?
- In guidance: provide guidance in how to draft, develop and sustain MOUs
- Present this in a way that brings forward and highlights and unpacks what “meaningful partnerships” means.
- Provide multiple models of what this looks like – one size does not fit all
- Unpack “all involved” – P-12 learners, teacher candidates, classroom teachers, college faculty, BOCES faculty
- Scalability – large contexts vs. small contexts. Please keep in mind that across NYS we have huge universities and school districts as well as small independent colleges and tiny rural districts. We all have different strengths and abilities. Please make space for those differences.
- Basic info including contact info, procedures (supervision), expectations on both sides for candidates and teachers
- Encourage inclusion/consideration of predictive analytics (info about positions and upcoming staffing needs)
- Multiple year MOUs would be helpful, especially when the players change

- I like the vagueness of the regulations (leave it open to interpretation)
- How will schools match candidates with teachers?
- Clarkson Graduate School reported that they already have a process for partnering with school districts and formalize the partnership with an MOA
- Empire State College also reported that they have an MOA process for their partnerships.
- Everyone agreed that the MOAs ensure that expectations/responsibilities/duties are clear among all parties involved.
- Clarkson also reported that they have a number of partner schools who make up their advisory board and meet 2x per year.
- How will districts centralize or make more consistent the contact point for MOU and partnership development?
- Formalizing definitions of terms like collaboration as a guidance tool. School districts don't need to be uniform, but increased shared understanding would be helpful.
- Not all partnerships are districts, such as CBOs for Early Childhood. MOU practices may be different. What about other school-aged children situations, like phys ed for home schooled students
- Will there be uniform MOUs through NYSUT, other groups?
- Would or could curriculum maps/guidelines be part of the MOU to show mutual responsibility
- What defines a "meaningful partnership". If this came out of the idea of having good mentors, the mentor role will need to be fully fleshed out. Hold meetings just to hold meetings (CAEP)
- MOU requirement for every district is cumbersome. All stakeholders should be required to sign (CTS first, ultimately to leadership for final signature) – need to know all components/expectations. What happens in the classroom isn't what's always on the MOU
- No district requirements to take student teachers/only higher ed. regs. How can we include P-12 partners in these conversations; no incentive for master teachers to take on a student.
- Define "community-based org"
- What kind of partnership (beyond fieldwork) can improve prep. of teachers
- Definition of "partnership" one-sided? May be misused in the draft
- No accountability of schools to mentor. Nothing says they have to.
- Calendar of when we (EPPs) can provide students
- P-12 not held "accountable" to assist
- District "restrict" the who – only colleges not on Long Island (but they are from Long Island)
- NYSED – should have P-12 accountable to assist – to host – if "partnership" then hold P-12 to comply
- Guidelines for P-12?
- MOUs = contract, funds for schools. For every school? – what's in it for the P-12 schools? Have NYSED provide incentives!
- It's possible to have strong partnerships without this contract
- CAEP model – co-construction – more substantive evidence. Instead of MOU, mutually beneficial partnerships where P-12 partners co-construct curriculum for new teachers
- Why MOUs as so central? P-12 partners want a role forcing a contract between 2 parties. Does MOU make the difference for P-12 partners to have a voice? Should teachers have a voice?
- We like word "collaborative"!
- Fits with what St. Francis has been aiming for; fits with moving towards more meaningful relationships.

- What is “meaningful”? Who determines? Need clarification around what “meaningful” means; what is the measure of successful partnership
- Look at Comprehensive Education Plans to see how they address and involve that in the clinical feedback
- Grounding expectations
- Minimal criteria needed
- Overwhelming data
- Insufficient focus on partnership itself and review of quality of partnership; focuses entirely on the outcomes
- Likes addition of CBOs to language of regulations
- Teacher involvement (how do you get them to come out) how / who?
- Falls on school/LEA leaders
- Trust in partnerships – principal/LEA/higher education – to allow for this to work
- Stakeholder engagement is key
- What does a partnership look like?
- Unclear if there are requirements around what goes in MOU
- Can regulations explicitly name stakeholders outside leaders of districts and IHEs? For example, role of teachers.
- Small institutions vs. large institutions (MOU)
- Where’s capacity & support?
- What will MOU look like? Will samples be provided?
- How will MOU be funded? What do institutions have to offer in terms of resources and support?
- How will the state support these Initiatives in a non-competitive way?
- High stakes assessment results are tied to teacher evaluation and this would affect teacher participation. Why would you let a novice teacher have 70 days of instructional time?
- Capacity for small schools of education – what does a small school have to offer?
- Will sample MOU be available?
 - PL for IHEs to learn
 - MOU for all levels of engagement
- Research for signing for MOUs? Is this a positive?
- Funding available for the partnerships?
- With CAEP schools are beginning to do this.
 - In the past, freedom to choose schools
- EdTPA – teachers are not as successful when placed in more challenging schools
- Exactly what has to happen when you look at accreditation issues?
- Necessary to increase the quality of preparation
- What does a good clinical partnership look like
- Geographic challenges re: articulation agreements and clinical partnership
- “Meaningful” is not specific enough
- Put more responsibility on P-12 schools, not as much on the IHE faculty
- Good start. Collaboration is positive
- Why MOUs w/ District? School are undertaking implementation. DOE should support.
- Meaningful partnerships – what does that mean? Looking for quality and examples of meaningful partnerships
- DOE and IHEs should work together for real partnerships
- Teachers are not in this language of regulations

- We like that the new regulations include “community-based organizations”.
- MOU created for an entire district would also need to have building level support.
- MOUs will need to be monitored and reviewed.
- What are the attributes of a meaningful partnership?
- What are the attributes of systematically improving the preparation of teachers? Clinical partnerships – micromanagement does not make teachers more effective. Cookie cutter approach does not work for everyone. Systematically does not equalize the best for all.
- We don’t see evidence that these changes are needed; is the effort, cost and time to make these changes to our programs worth the possible benefits of these alterations?!
- Don’t make it a regulation (instead guidance) because may discourage schools from partnering. (If we are too restrictive, the rules might fit higher ed. but not the school). (There is a lot of variability between schools and schools might hesitate to partner). We want flexibility by institution of higher ed.
- This is an area of concern for smaller/private institutions.
- This should not result in a monopoly. MOU seems to be synonymous with a specific agreement and with one institution (exclusivity).
- MOU - Guidance not regulation; MOU in itself can’t be standardized.
- “Centrality of partnerships between the higher education and P-12 communities”. How will P-12 schools be required to partner with higher ed.? Will districts be giving higher ed. “high quality” teachers to partner with?
- Will there be a standard MOU or will each institution have their own?
- What about Canadian/international schools? They will not sign MOUs – this will greatly impact institutions near the border.
- Are MOUs needed for smaller placements, groups or individual student?
- Guidance – where can candidates student teach (Canada, Houston, etc.)
- What about Teach for America? What about alternative cert?
- Concern about these as “regulations”. It’s the outliers, unusual circumstances
- MOU is critical; should include language that enforces the relationship between the district, and the candidates. Focus on the trust that needs to be built between the partners.
- At district level not building level – include BOCES level partnerships (CTE, Special Education)
- LIU Post – has met least resistance with districts. MOUs have stated basic expectations.
- Should be updated regularly with broad enough regulations to enforce with multiple districts
- Clinical partnerships – Important! Higher ed and K-12 are powerful, but...where is the compensation for these teachers who take on changes for many hours?
- Very hard to have partnerships on Long Island.
- MOU documents shouldn’t under any circumstances be required!

New Ideas for the Recommendations

- Have continuing education, evaluation-criteria, incentives for cooperating teachers!
- Need to encourage regular formal meetings between colleges and P-12 partners – perhaps through BOCES?
- Common language to be utilized in the memorandum across NYS
- Important to underscore the needs of individual school districts while highlighting the colleges’ expectations.
- Professional development for P-12
- Bring Higher Ed students into buildings and classrooms to speak to a classroom of students.

- Host teacher and college professor have several co-teaching seminars and/or on campus visits so host teacher is in front of student teacher.
- Guidance could support specific examples and language for MOUs
- Narrow correct/better host teachers to make sure both partners are getting the best experience.
- Guidance on recruiting teachers/schools. For example, more overt communication between CTLE and number of hours for supervising student teachers.
- Recommend simple MOUs that document partnerships. MOUs should be broadly defined and flexible. Avoid rigid contracts so that programming can remain flexible.
- Prestige – title for teachers/recognition
- Involve guidance departments
- Incentive for teachers
- APPR?
- High schools involved – Future Teachers of America
- Professional development (district) work with higher ed
- edTPA is a [illegible]
- Make more explicit what and with whom MOU is intended
- Defining meaningful partnerships and what that can look like re: student/teacher experience for each phase
- Criteria for meaningful partnership can be clarified, and then serve as a starting point for deeper collaboration between IHE/school to arrive at a mutually beneficial relationship
- Requirement/suggested yearly review of MOU to maintain engagement
- Emphasize that it should be a co-development of an MOU. Add to the language throughout co-development
- If increasing the hours and meaningful partnerships?
- Internships – sustainable funding. What can they do?
- Follow and collaborate with schools, community (B.A.), districts, etc. to create a plan of action that correlates in a meaningful way.
- Incorporate principal ratings into the partnership equation to ensure true participation and school supervision
- How do you ensure communication between parties?
- Clinical experience might include professional development and extended day work.
- Take it one step more and include school in signing off on student teachers as being ready
- Consortium to build in reciprocity and a mutual benefit for PD of SBTE [school-based teacher educator]
- It would be very difficult to develop a “meaningful partnership” with districts where colleges place only 1 or 2 students!
- Would like to understand what P-12 actually wants to do in collaboration with higher education.
- This section needs more details.
- Could NYSED develop a template MOU that could be used?
- Inclusion of teachers in the construction of MOUs.
- Could the MOU be housed with BOCES or a common MOU that could be used instead of various MOUs with various schools?
- Parallel language for both parties (EPPs and schools) in the regulations. The regulations that are placed on higher ed. should also be placed on P-12 entities.

- Understandings that are mutually agreed to will be easier for both parties to agree to, implement and sustain = MOU
- The language and examples of settings acceptable for teaching experience (certification) should be mirrored in these regs
- Placements and partnerships need to reflect real-time need and not be tied to where you have an MOU
- What is a guideline for student requirements to access field experience settings? Fingerprinting, workshops?
- Could we put selection process into MOU? (selection of host teachers)
- Getting to know Teacher Education partners
- Focus on establishing the partnership
- Providing minimal criteria needed.
- DOE should provide a list of schools that meet qualifications.
- Putting programs into place
- How can institutions entice schools to partner with colleges? Models and supports are needed.
- Regulations do not map out the supports to be given to IHEs
- Clarifying WHO signs the MOU.
- What goes into the MOU? Is it mutually beneficial
 - Letter of understanding – or support in actually developing an MOU because it's a legal document.
 - How IEPs/IEP meetings will work
- Selling the partnership w/ schools (models and supports)
- IHEs should understand P-12 schools' CEP and have that guide partnership
- In partnership, clarify what the IHE is "giving" schools
- Schools to shift to having a cluster of partnerships
- Partnership with at least one or multiple partnerships that are meaningful
- Pipeline for all school districts
- Define and describe what meaningful is
- Guidance documents should be provided. Give examples
- Develop criteria for a MOU
- Involve students
- Guidance documents should include (1) elements of strong/great partnerships, (2) good partnership model documents
- Define foundational experiences better
- Information should be shared out.
- Example of field work experience – specific activities?
- Do schools share an incentive to host? (IHE)
- Take into consideration different models that promote the best and most productive ways for clinical partnerships to work.
- Add new wording to old wording (as mentioned in the document)
- Regulations should be for IHE – school, not necessarily the district. Concern that the district would shut down the partnership whereas individual schools, comm. agencies, etc. are more likely to partner because of relationships we've developed with principals and building leaders
- Provide sample MOUs that could be adapted for each IHE? Each IHE would be unique in how it implements.
- Remove unenforceable language.

- Can districts have multiple MOUs with IHE (i.e., Daemen and Buffalo State)
- Can it be at the building level? Include a sample document in the guidance document. How long are they valid?
- Consider Canadian or other international partners
- Guidance on the specifics of what the MOU should include will be helpful to determine if this is feasible, i.e. “yes we are accepting students for field experience/student teaching in the following areas ...”
- Create a state template for MOUs. Areas that are saturated with teacher prep programs need to sign each MOU, which often cost school districts legal fees
- Parameters for determining community-based organizations. For example, CBOs must be supervised by certified educational professionals
- How will funding affect the life or partnerships?
- K-12 or terminal degree
- What constitutes a meaningful partnership – is it active? is it reciprocal?
- We need or would like a standard MOU. It is with a district? Is it with a school? Broad vs. narrow
- Are MOUs needed for early field experiences – foundational, intermediate, not just culminating
- Is this really about meaningful partnerships or paper work.
- How does this all benefit teacher candidates?
- This will negatively impact relationships
- Guidance language for utilizing libraries as a resource during student teaching (co-teach model). Remove silos to create a richer, more authentic learning experience for the candidates. Include observation/experiences with social worker, counselor, administrators, ELL.
- Should we include mentor teacher acknowledgement with MOU. Vouchers not effective. How do we change the culture of teachers to view experiences as value for the field.
- CTLE credits for being a mentor teacher (career ladder).
- Compensation for the cooperating teachers who support student teachers and cooperating teachers – stipend from the college/ability to sell credits/stipend from districts?
- Meet with superintendents to design ways that can further [illegible] placement of student teachers/observers. Should be formalized.
- (Allow public colleges to carry insurance, if necessary, to cover student teachers in the schools.)
- State Ed must send the message that taking on student teachers is important and necessary.
- The state should mandate partnerships (very difficult to have on Long Island). One more partner and at least a public college.
- Cooperating teachers/districts should get real incentives to work with colleges/universities (college credits that teachers can really use...)
- “MOUs”, districts should be required to have more than one partner one state/one private.

Clinical Experiences

Feedback on the Draft Recommendations

- The language for culminating clinical experience in Section II.c should also say “...or in a related area” to match 111.2. (This will provide needed wiggle room for areas with few placements, i.e., theatre and dance.)

- (1.) Defining foundational...are we talking about just observation? But how is observation “meaningful engagement”?
- But if 150 of 200 hours must be in a classroom with students how can they get necessary foundation while learning basics?
- (2.) OK
- (3.) For b and c, hard to find appropriate classrooms that fulfill reqs.
- (3e.) Virtually requires trading off content in order to graduate “on time” therefore making program most costly.
- Are we forcing them into classrooms too much so that they start having scheduling and transportation issues.
- To require 70 consecutive days of student teaching you essentially are requiring a full year of student teaching.
- Does 70 consecutive days mean placement must be with same teacher?
- 200 hours clinical will be a challenge when it’s hard to secure placements already (lack of incentives, APPR, etc.)
- 20 hours with English Language Learners will be a challenge in some regions (such as the North Country)
- Schools/teachers need to support teacher candidates by letting them apply/practice their skills in the classroom.
- We see the 200 hours as a benefit. However, it is important to maintain the openness/choices/options in meeting the 200 hours (specifically the ELL requirements)
- Define meaningful engagement, community-based
- Do foundation experiences have to be with a teacher certified in the same area as the license being pursued?
- Will theatre and dance still have flexibility with culminating clinical experiences? (i.e., placement with someone other certified)
- (3c.) How will students get their 20 hours with students learning English as a new language?
- The more hands-on the better!
- 70 days cuts it close with vacations, snow days, etc.
- Considerations for graduate programs with considerable courseloads in summer sessions
- Addressing ELL-SPED requirements
- Rural challenges about fully addressing ELL requirements
- Rural challenges to #2 “variety of communities” also #3(c)
- Increasing number of hours for virtual/non-“in-class” hours to address requirements, i.e., greater “alternative hours”
- Mandating 200 hours exp. is unrealistic and undoable. We have significant difficulties now with the required 100 hours placing students with mentor teachers. Lack of schools/teachers in rural NY limits our options.
- Like the idea of having heavier time spent with foundational, intermediate experience before culminating student teacher experience.
- Definition of days vs clock hours
- 200 clock hours is good
- 70 teaching days seems like it might be tight – can we really do that many in a semester? (60 might be more realistic)
- Like “consecutive”
- Like continuum – foundational, intermediate, culminating

- OK with 200 hours for foundational and intermediate
- Liked 20 hours required for SWD, ELL
- Liked flexibility of hours
- (1 a & b) do not indicate need for subject-specific placement; (3a.) seems to imply this. These need to be reconciled.
- Allow flexibility in wording of experience requirements
- Additional 50 hours for additional certs – could be a hardship for some programs
- Increases will keep CTE candidates from completion of teacher ed. Most CTE teacher candidates are non-traditional students (i.e., worked 20 yrs., families, own homes) they cannot afford to spend more time observing and student teaching. We have a huge teacher shortage in CTE – this will create a crisis for us
- Discussion of flexibility
- Language – “high-need” vs “high needs” (schools to determine which it is)
- Would methods “mock lessons” = simulation
- Specificity: 20 clock hours for students with disabilities, ENLs – keeping track is burdensome (20 hrs. here and there)
- Space for hours in programs – where? credits?
- Who will manage data?
- Candidates need to experience all weeks of the school year (most notably, week before winter recess and last week in June – especially secondary ed majors to experience Regents week)
- (1a) “meaningful engagement” – needs definition
- (1b) “community-based educators” needs definition and limits – also needs more specificity – would coaching a little league team apply for someone seeking high school math certification?
- (2) “Variety of communities” may be a hardship in some areas of the state
- (4) For consistency, should 70 days be stated in hours? (70x6=420 hrs.)
- Love how experiences are defined across the different phases – foundational, intermediate, culminating
- Appreciates going up to 200 hrs. – recognizes it may serve a problem for students working jobs
- Intent of 150 clock hours in actual classrooms?
- For each additional certificate for dual cert., which is the additional and which is the main, i.e., main: gen. cert, additional: SPED, or, main: SPED, add. gen. cert? State will define main cert. as Gen. Ed. To answer this, could main/additional split in half? 100 hrs. in each
- How many hours per program? And what about cert. age level?
- How are actual classrooms/schedule defined?
- Are paraprofessional hours counted towards clinical experience hours?
- What does full range mean?
- Seems consecutive
- Virtual hours – like this if the whole class observes and seeing the [same?] act. Hard to get a quality video to observe and critique
- Where did the 200 come from?
- In order to get the two age groups – how do we do the 70 days?
- (3f.) important to be assessed before going to find student teach
- Are foundational clinical experiences pre admission requirements to the college
- NYC 40 days leave for paraprofessionals – how will paras be able to move into teaching positions?
- Having the ed video is too much a barrier

- Programs had to register around 2006 – regs. are old
- Centered partnerships can create better clinical experiences but this may not lead to building an infrastructure and a system that will produce desired outcomes.
- Have system with uniformity and structure. There is not a system in USA. Opt for a structure that incentivizes
- Coop teachers need financial support
- Need communication that is uniform
- We still need multiple paths with innovations
- Institutions make partnership with districts and schools.
- This reg will not undo what is working well
- Trans Ba are a problem but not a solution – teaching with 30 hours of observation
- CBOs can contribute to collaboration and partnership. Natl Board. “We as Working Teachers”
- Regs do not come with \$. What we see in other states when higher ed takes opportunity they can reallocate human resources and restructure programs – here is what we can do and here is where we need “gap money”. Restructure programs to
- We operate in separate circles
- Who do we want to become teachers – traditional 4-year students
- Need workshops on how to raise sustainable funding
- Culminating teacher experiences – hours in A and B need to be in intermediate
- Entire semester – 70 days – university calendar is not helpful
- If the partnership is set up – new way of supporting teacher candidate
- Does the pedagogical core incorporate content? Has to include this. Mapping out the clinical experiences is important. Do we have a task force on the pedagogy core – this is needed
- 20 hours for special populations is not enough
- IHEs have heard from principals that they’re concerned to allow teacher candidates do more than observed. Need for co-development to create buy-in on both sides.
- Need to increase special ed hours as all teachers will be exposed to SWD in any setting. How will IHEs and LEAs ensure teacher candidates are actually exposed to SWD. Will they complete their 20 hrs with a SWD teacher?
- How will we implement 70 days with candidates who work full-time? There’s a risk of diminishing diversity among teacher candidates. There’s a huge need for funds for teacher candidates to be able to sustain their finances while completing clinical practice of 70 days
- 250 for dual certificates.
- (3f.) liked because it warrants assessment before student teaching.
- (1a.) Word “meaningful” remove.
- Milestones define the experiences (e.g., critical attributes to differentiate one clinical experience from another).
- Placement of teacher candidate for the specific experience (e.g., ELL, special ed) may be difficult.
- Recommendations for the assessments/rubric/Danielson? If Danielson, what is the score required to move forward with each clinical experience?
- (2.) On page 2, challenging for other IHEs that do not have diverse demographics (not clear on how it would be implemented). What are the criteria to identify a high-needs population or culturally-diverse? Need for a glossary.
- Increase in hours and days, then how do you ensure commitment from the school-based teacher to mentoring and supporting new teacher candidates.

- Appreciate that teacher candidates have to spend more time in the classroom, especially prior to student teaching and hopefully take on more teaching over the 70 days.
- The 200 field hour expectations and 70 days of culminating experiences need to be clear and not overlap.
- Is there flexibility in the number of days?
- “Consecutive” days may negatively impact undergraduates who are registered for another course (particularly math/science).
- Can Friday be an exception?
- Teacher candidates to have the opportunity to experience teaching and learning in other settings (not specifically in formal classrooms)
- The regulations focus on time (hours/days) vs dispositions and the quality of teaching and instruction for the clinical supervisor/school-based educator.
- The edTPA should be for the professional cert and not initial because we shouldn’t expect undergrads and grad students to deliver the same product.
- Student teachers should be expected to be in the classroom alongside teachers, full day, everyday whether it’s 70 days or not.
- Birth –2 programs feel as though they have to compromise expectations for candidates due to the need to place teacher candidates in three grades for the culminating experience.
- How are schools, administrators, teachers being supported to understand and implement the new regs?
- There should be the option for the culminating experience to be in one classroom with one grade level for the 70 days to ensure teaching and growth of candidate takes place.
- We disagree on increasing 100 clock hours of field experience to 200 hours
- Many of these recommendations are already in place – problem is funding for clinical faculty and pay for working adult students.
- We feel 70 hours [days] are a good idea for a variety of reasons, in particular the investment of time allows schools to get to know them.
- Perhaps the 70 days could include traditional student teacher and then they complete the rest of the days as a substitute teacher.
- Has to be a way to economically support students who need income.
- Like the combination of virtual/simulated and face-to-face experience, but the balance may not be applicable to all situations/schools. Only 50 hours of virtual – could there be more?
- Concerns were expressed about the consistency and programming during the intermediate clinical experience.
- Missing supervision of the candidates in the field. How do the schools and IHEs work on this together?
- Intentional places
- A lot of time needed by faculty to oversee the foundational, intermediate, and culminating experience.
- Students should have more time in the classroom before student teaching.
- Partnership with Saturday programs, after-school and YMCA programs and more can support the additional hours needed to meet the 200 hours prior to the culminating experiences.
- We shouldn’t make top down decisions before we hear from the students, and that this proposal may be viewed as another barrier to entering the teaching profession, especially for different demographics.
- They need to know more about kids before entering the profession.
- This should be field tested in a particular part of the state, not NYC, and see how it works.

- The field hours are more manageable when tied to coursework.
- The culture shift will take a while but is possible.
- We need to make sure teacher candidates are having experiences across their grade bandwidths for their certification.
- Many candidates are already teaching full-time and are using a rigid curriculum
- What students are learning at the university is different from what's happening in a DOE school – how do students navigate this?
- For ECE, student teachers need to do a 10-week and a 4-week rotation – how will the new regs be flexible enough to accommodate this?
- The teachers in grad courses have no experience with children – most assignments require them to work with kids and they don't necessarily have access to kids
- 10 weeks is too little – they're just getting settled at that time; a full year of student teaching is what needs to happen
- Field experiences should be monitored by the faculty and make connections to the theory of the coursework
- Communication between the faculty and the host sites should be frequent and focused on supporting individual student teachers
- The reality is that students may not be able to afford to commit 200 hours and 70 days without pay. How can financial aid support students in this continuum?
- Very glad to see that there is more structure around the field experiences prior to student teaching. Would like to see guidance around what types of activities would be included, and how they would be assessed (and by whom).
- 20 hours is not enough for SWD or ELLs but within the 200 hours, there are likely to be students in classrooms with special needs or ELLs
- Flexibility re: where field experience can happen is crucial – esp for those students who are already employed and engaging in their degrees
- If we make things too difficult, we would be cutting out many aspiring teachers, potentially those who we most want to be teachers.
- Implementation idea: don't charge students for their student teaching semester.
- Virtual experiences are not the same but are a wonderful resource if curated appropriately, ideally by the State.
- Teachers need the moment-to-moment interactions with children. Teaching candidates need to experience the every day moments of being with children.
- Teaching candidates need to be able to experiment and ask questions of their mentor teacher.
- Confusion around hours vs days
- Regulations around Pre-K require two placements. How will this be achieved with the 70 consecutive days?
- Student teachers should be given cerebral work, not just grunt work
- Does the regulatory framework allow for the teacher prep programs to define for themselves what parts of their programs are foundational and intermediate
- Additional time required is a credit hour issue. More contact hours – more credit hours. How does this impact program hours
- This might require 5-year program. But Excelsior Program requires 4 yr. graduation – doesn't cover 5 yr. programs
- Financial impact (cost to students) for implementing cost of supervising if this has to go beyond college academic years.
- Rural – higher ed. – trouble finding districts nearby with ELL

- 150 hrs. sounds better – 75 in intermediate; 15 ELL; 15 disabilities; 5 hrs. a week in a semester is reasonable.
- Need to be able to complete major in discipline. Need to be able to be on campus for discipline class.
- Do all ed. classes need to be at night
- Do P-12 institutions demanding clinical experiences as outlined here? (ex. Cooperating teachers saying no to taking student teachers for 70 days)
- Depending on teacher load (AP, rural districts, college level courses) may not see ELL/disability
- Why 200 hours? Does the number matter more than the quality of experience?
- What is the buy-in from teacher unions?
- More information needed regarding what can count for “non-classroom” experiences.
- Please qualify if student teaching/culminating experience must be 2 placements for dual certification or can it be 1.
- 200 hours seems excessive especially for dual cert programs
- Virtual and simulated experiences need to be clearer. Would rather drop to 150 than try to handle/administer/approve these.
- Clarify “virtual experiences”
- Part 2(II), 1.C. – language is not consistent with Part III, 2. “or the equivalent”
- SED making more recommendations to higher ed. teacher prep but then still allowing back door certifications easier (Charter School cert.)
- What was the thinking behind 200 hrs. and the 50+ for each additional credential?
- Student teachers should follow the calendar of the school placement
- The regulations need to be written so that the P-12 and EPP can design the experience to be most appropriate for the teacher candidate.
- What will be the influence on the increase of “clock hours” (100 to 200) be on undergraduate vs. graduate students? What about program completion? Financial costs?
- What does “consecutive” mean? Please clarify.
- What is the difference between “school days” (original) to “teaching days” (recommendations)?
- We believe that all school days matter – the school PD days matter as much as the actual teaching days.
- 14 weeks/70 days will barely fit within the college calendar, we recommend 12 weeks minimum (leaves room for remediation).
- Provide multiple models of “intentionally designed, sequential, and scaffolded learning experiences” or opportunities to develop these
- By doubling the foundational and intermediate clinical experiences (clock hours), our students and our partnering schools will be over extended.
- The requirement for a supervised intermediate experience is an unfunded mandate.
- It seems that only 20 hours for students with learning differences and 20 hours for ENL seems low.
- II. 1c. – use consistent language as III. 2 – or related area
- Can full 20 hours of ELL be virtual
- Can you double up with 20 hours ELL and disabilities – achieve both at same time
- Some programs not located near diverse groups – change word “must” in II.2 to recommend
- What does increase 50 hours for additional certificate look like? Simulated ok?
- Impact on students’ schedules
- Is true valid reflection of P-12 teachers’ interest for these changes

- Inclusive programs (multiple certs embedded in them) how complex do hours get? Is it still 200 hours?
- Focus is more to 4-year colleges as opposed to accelerated master's programs whose students have jobs
- What is evidence to increase 200 hours?
- Should we have different recommendations for grad level
- Change 70 teaching days to a "full semester" and doesn't also fit with accelerated graduate programs; can't add more days beyond semester; seminars/workshops need to be kept as well
- Are field experience hours flexible for dual cert programs?
- Is 200 hrs. realistic for all programs. Not for many adolescent programs! Or graduate programs. High needs, diverse.
- Flexibility needed so programs can make this work for their students. Programs should look different!
- 70 days not doable in fall semesters. 2 consecutive quarters (Wisconsin)
- 200 hours! Where will they come from? Secondary content courses offered Monday, Wednesday, Friday during the day. University faculty willing to teach in summer, but not allowed to count that as load. Graduate program – fit in courses and 200 hours
- Dual core add-on numbers cumbersome
- Like the scaffolding
- Colleges/universities compete for placements already
- Experiences (after school, tutoring) outside of certification area not allowed
- Continuum is helpful – foundational to culminating
- Like STAGES
- Where is literature/research on 200/more is better
- No mention of "mentor"/quality of supervision
- Why doubling load – rolling out a sequence
- Even 100 hrs. can challenge some educators
- Why 200 hours, 70 days?
- Where? Doesn't say that length of time impact teacher practice
- We are at the "mercy" of the P-12 on quality or not a good fit
- Need clarity in the number of days and "consecutive"
- Unclear regulations: 1) placement; 2) placement – how long; 3) placements. EPPs unable to meet the 70 days in a spring semester with P-12 calendar, testing, vacation
- Dual cert programs – impact? Number of hours for dual cert. ??? 250 hrs. – 200 + 50 hrs. Where?
- Keep old regulations and up the days for student teaching!
- How will the virtual/simulated hours be defined? Will they be able to use for ELLs or special ed? We think all of these 50 hours should be spread out not used to fulfill all hours for any subgroups?
- Consider the increased burden on school districts with the doubling of field experience to 200 hours. It's a lot. It's good experience for candidates but it's tremendous pressure on programs and K-12. For ex., IHE will have to recalibrate classes and will have to extract components from the curriculum. It's a tradeoff. You add something then you have to take something away. May have to add some credits.

- 200 clock hours. There is more time at the undergrad level but this is a challenge at the graduate level – there just isn't enough time. Grad students are working full-time in addition to their coursework.
- It wouldn't be too difficult to increase hours in SPED and EWL
- Clarkson – our students do a residency for 80 days. This is where they exceed the draft.
- Empire State College – residency 100 hours for field work but 200 is a lot.
- 3c. depending on local district populations, is this practical?
- Will the overall increase to 200 become a checklist rather than meaningful connections to courses, specific goals, etc.
- Inconsistency in district requirements for field experience access. Is fingerprinting required?
- For foundational field experience, how can we ensure that community colleges are on board? What documentation does the student carry from the community college to the recommending college?
- Questions about 70 day student teaching. Should it say 14 weeks? Or "one semester"? Hours?
- All members were in favor of the 70 teaching days.
- Items 1 and 2 are positive changes – more scaffolded experiences for pre-service teachers.
- Combining the levels is very positive - is it up to the college
- Designated high need schools – who and how does the designation? Not clear in regulations.
- Section 1b – "Facilitation" by P-12, "supervision" by IHEs – impact on partnership? Supervised by higher education might undercut partnership.
- Section 1c – NYS standards should come in sooner on continuum; not culminating.
- No references to content or pedagogical content knowledge. Regulations only stress pedagogical knowledge; room for reference to content? Where, when?
- Like focus on assessment between points on continuum.
- Like virtual experiences
- What if teachers do not advance to culminating?
- Content seminar –is edTPA hurting the student teaching. Should content of seminar be addressed in regulations? Possibility that some IHEs are overly focused on edTPA.
- Data from year 2 once in field
- 20 hours for SWD and ELLS - How is that decided, can it be with one child or has to be majority of class? Need guidelines.
- Unclear if it is up to IHE on how to distribute 200 hours
- Many student teachers are parents and supporting themselves
- Fitting college calendars to schools
- Where do these numbers come from? What's the research?
- Define "community based educator"
- Clarify Section 3f
- How will paraprofessionals be supported?
- How does this match to accreditation and registration?
- Section 1a – why are foundational clinical experiences not facilitated by certified P-12 educators as is described in 1b?
- Section 1c – Might be difficult, though each candidate should be supervised by a certified P-12 teacher in their subject area
- Section 3d – What does virtual and/or simulated experiences mean?
- Wondering about the hours – what counts toward the hours? Coursework? Online components?
- The reality of the number of hours may be challenging for students

- New regulation is specific
- Distinguishes among 3 stages
- Program hours are good, likes increase
- Appreciate that the field hours increased
- Language of the foundations – this will force us to look at the structure of our programs 70 days seems unrealistic – may be too many (14 weeks, 35 hours a week is approximately 450 hours for semester)
- Consecutive days are positive!
- Schools should be able to exceed the state requirements
- Don't want to create more obstacles for teachers to completing these requirements
- Assessed? What does it mean? Who assesses?
- What does mapping field work experience mean? How do they link?
- More description/guide book. Leave broad and general as possible. Include appendices.
- Foundational and intermediate appear combined
- Get faculty buy-in. Can be an issue.
- How do we know that vast changes are needed? What data was looked at?
- Access to IEPs – an issue in higher education
- Planning instruction and assessment?
- Specialized licenses for P-12 art teachers – not a model for specialized license areas like art
- Residency Model – 70 teaching days consecutively – not a model but preferred for specialized programs like art and other specialized licenses within P-12
- Will there be anything done to address the misalignment between Part 80 and Part 52.21? There is already a huge misalignment and any changes will make it worse. (Part 80 Individual Evaluation through BOCES/OTI; Part 52.21 – Regulations for approved teacher prep programs).
- Will CTE be handled differently in the recommendations
- 200 hours is FAR too much to be required, particularly for the content area certifications. It would be incredibly difficult for some programs to graduate students in 4 years.
- Hours for hours does not necessarily result in improvement.
- Students have to be prepared to go into the classroom, but this many hours means there's no time to do that prep
- "Just because you can does not mean you should."
- Different programs are distinctive because of the way they do things differently, not all the same
- School infrastructure does not support this.
- Concern that increased field hours would reduce amount of time available for content instruction.
- Where do the field hours come from? Will our students be able to pass certification exams if so much time in the field?
- Concern about teacher shortage – will this increase negatively impact recruitment into teacher ed. programs?
- What counts as hours? We need to bring students to campus for edTPA prep, for example. Does this still count as hours?
- Designed and scaffolded are fine; sequential could be a problem for some.
- Concerns regarding CTE – clinical experiences are different for Trade & Tech students as opposed to other CTE areas.
- 200 hours – logistics very difficult

- CTE, with all of its nuances, should be part of a separate discussion or at the table for this discussion.
- Need clarification for those seeking additional certification (i.e., already have initial certification).
- A distinction needs to be made between graduate and undergraduate requirements.
- This reads/applicable for undergraduate programs, not graduate. #1 A, B, C does not meet/exceeds graduate requirements, not evident in current programs.
- 200 hours may be difficult to reach. We recommend 150 hours.
- We appreciate the addition of devoting hours to SWDs and ELLs.
- For letter “e” #3, who/which area requires the extra 50 hours? The extra 50 hours does not seem feasible.
- Not all programs are currently designed to more than 40 days, 70 days does not seem feasible. (#4)
- Should not be consecutive. Does not align with program revisions.
- 50 hrs. as guidance not reg - #3.
- We offer triple cert. For rural settings, it’s sometimes hard to find ENL students (not for long [illegible])
- Like: foundational, intermediate, culminating experience
- Dislike: most institutions have dual programs. How could a candidate be able to set all these hours in a 4-year program! What about middle school extension and a dual program?
- #4 Culminating clinical experience should be kept as is. If an institution wants to have a semester-long model, it should be a choice. Some institutions will have trouble finding semester-long models.
- Keep 100 hours!!! Do not increase at all.
- Concerns – Transportation – candidates without vehicles already have a hard time getting to placements with only 100 hours. No transportation for some campuses, for example Fredonia.
- Course work – how are candidates going to take classes and do field work? And then get back to campus in time for class!
- Sharing schools – number of institutions looking for placements is already saturated. How would institutions find “quality” placements?
- Costs for candidates – not practical for students and their families!
- #3f/4d – How is readiness defined for culminating experience? “Must be assessed” is a check off the box phrase.
- #3e – 50 clock hours for an additional cert seems too low to be able to fully grasp and demonstrate ability to successfully work with students with disabilities, ELL, TESOL, etc. No mention of hours needed for culminating experiences for additional certification.
- #3 - hours too short for students with disabilities and students learning English as a new language.
- The word “understanding” is not strong enough or sufficient.
- Concern about finding excellent ENL teachers, mentorship for our candidates in these areas.
- Creating unnecessary layers. All classrooms have students with disabilities.
- How will you document this
- Concerns about finding acceptable classrooms for the regulation.
- 200 hours will impact our programs, including course work outside of education. Up the hours and you must increase costs: stipends and incentives for mentor teachers.

- We are in agreement with the progression of foundational, intermediate, and culminating experiences.
- SUNY – 200 hours acceptable – presented as a balanced progression through prog.
- Aim for 30 hours field exper. for SWD. The rationale for my request is that over two thirds of students with disabilities spend over 80% of their day in general education settings. Thus, I would urge the workgroup to consider the proposal that our general ed teacher candidates spend additional contact hours with students with disabilities (i.e., above the 20 hour requirement), given that this is actually a proportional DECREASE in time candidates spend focusing on this population of learners. Alternatively, if the 20 hour requirement is maintained, consider a recommendation that the hours with these students be slated for integration into intermediate level clinical experiences, and not only foundational. This would ensure candidates are actually taught to apply strategies to support this population of learners instead of merely observing them in a school setting.
- LIU – concerned with district commitment to support more fieldwork hours.
- Adelphi – hours may impact program and when can hours be earned.
- Recommendation to be flexible with foundational hr. earned.
- Need more focus on number of hours student teaching.
- State should trust/allow colleges to run their programs.
- How to implement/regulate the clinical experience. (How to train cooperating teachers) – back to partnership.
- 200 hours is too much. Many students on Long Island are working full time.
- Do we want to discourage working class/minority students to become teachers!!!

New Ideas for the Recommendations

- (3d.) Alter to allow reflection time to count towards hours.
- Compensation for teachers provided at each level of clinical experience since mentor role and expectations will increase significantly.
- Connect to MOUs
- Teachers need to be involved.
- ELL program could be simulation or video based. (Is the Board developing resources for the ELL requirement?)
- Addressing ELL in field
- How do they define “in the classroom”?
- Funding for transportation considerations (especially undergrad. programs) \$\$\$
- Give us at least one full year before adoption/implementation
- Considering graduate programs that only span one calendar year
- Closer wording to NAEYC standards regarding variety of clinical experiences counting for 150 hours (more than just traditional standards)
- Increase in clinical hours is appreciated, we just need time for proper program implementation. (We don’t want another “Common Core” disaster.)
- Increase education funding
- Incentives needed to host a student teacher, so revisit concept of incentives. Pay – consider, professional development funds (many teachers can’t attend due to local district costs), modify district BEDS form to incentivize, acknowledge districts actively take student teachers or clinicians.

- Integrate BOCES, SUNY and local districts to create a partnership(s). Smooth transitions; monitor (is it working?); communication, sharing of ideas; develop new ideas to bridge gaps and make mutually beneficial.
- Full year student teaching
- Must find the correct host teacher, not a problem when conversations are with host teacher, Higher Ed, and school admin.
- If residency is included in clinical experience, it needs to be spelled out more
- Provide guidance or revision, Section 2: 3d. – include or in a community-based organization
- Non-traditional students may not be able to complete the 100 hours if they are working full time.
- Foundation is not the right word. The first experiences are initial, not foundational.
- “Culminating experience” seems to be (is) a synonym for student teaching in this document, yet full-year residency models, where candidates spend one semester at a developmental level – moving from practicum to student teaching and then a second semester doing the same, 70 days consecutive doesn’t happen yet. Student teachers have many days.
- Might initial (foundational) level have general pedagogical requirements, while intermediate and culminating be general- and subject-specific pedagogy?
- Hone from development to demonstration – how about deepen/expand/refine or some other word? With collaboration and co-teaching, hone doesn’t seem to be the right word.
- Any chance to count some work experience as part of field hours?
- Recommendation: Associate hours (maybe not 50) with courses
- Avoid pinpointing number of hours
- Required seminar with culminating – Be flexible with this? Define?
- Keep 100 hrs/40 days for CTE. We already have different certification requirements for CTE vs. classroom – doing this would not be a departure from current regs. CTE admins I have spoken to (at least 10 of them) are highly opposed to adding any requirements for certification of CTE teachers.
- Quarter placement – candidate not doing well? Count first placement AND alternative/second placement days together towards total days
- Discussion: foundations = cultural/historical foundations of ed. Change “foundational” to “introductory” to include early observation/“early” or “introductory” instead
- (3d.) Virtual/simulated = 5 hours in front of screen pretending to be a teacher. NO! Take this out. Instead, allow flexibility in face to face hours – (after school, tutoring, Saturday academies)
- Virtual should be part of courses. Need to clearly define “virtual” and “simulation”
- Recommend document the experience...High needs
- 20-hour field chunks should be connected to courses – so – flexible documentation wording: “range” vs “20 hours” here and there
- (4.) Culminating 70 days – new, can we get 70 days with all the vacations/PD days? Recommend flexible “counting” of PD days
- “Residencies” at SUNY Oswego – recommend flexible language (vs “consecutively”), recommend “residency” as aspiration for ideal placements
- edTPA – move to professional certificate – student teachers not getting enough “authentic” teaching
- Expose to other members of school – ex. speech, social work, spec. ed., ELL, etc. – fieldwork hours
- Co-teaching model/collaboration
- Alumni connections

- Mentor programs
- Making explicit recommendations for IHE [illegible] practice that conducts in-class school-teaching experience on campus, i.e., designate IHE as “actual classrooms” – such as learning labs at Hunter
- 70 consecutive days needs to be clarified re: placement (1 placement?)
- Supervision in and how much is needed?
- Remove the word consecutive. Option to spread 70 days over [illegible]
- So hard – could you lower it to 150 hours total this year so students can
- Could you provide virtual fieldwork – take classes while completing their student teaching, i.e., 3 days a week. This way students can see students for the whole 2 semesters. State for the 50 hours.
- Could 1a and 1b be combined into one intermediate experience for graduate programs?
- Incentives – no incentive for fieldwork – not that helpful
- Those who go right into intermediate right away struggle with the school
- (3e.) if students are in a dual EC and elementary degree – can the 250 hours be in one place
- Rubric for th host teacher
- Need to include unions in discussion to address experiences, i.e., review lesson plans before hand.
- We should consider steps towards 70 days as there a lot of challenges to complete. beginning with 60 days
- Is the definition of consecutive flexible? Could it be done 8 weeks in the fall and 8 weeks the following year?
- Adding the option of home visits to complete the 200 hrs.
- We suggest that we keep the 100 hr. requirement, but also add hands-on experiences inside and outside the classroom, including technology.
- At graduate levels – Colleges should provide model classrooms for candidates to get feedback before they go into classroom.
- More behavioral interventions should be part of training – de-escalation training.
- Would it be possible for student teachers to share a portfolio or a short set of questions to know where a student teacher is in their knowledge and beginning practice.
- Can candidates work in similar ways to paraprofessional to support the funding stream in an enhanced model?
- Over 4 years is more doable, but still difficult – can’t control schedules of rest of campus
- Regulation becomes law, what if you break the law?
- No less than “100” hours, strongly rec. “200” – hard and fast minimum instead of a maximum
- Graduate programs should have different regs. than undergrad. 3 semesters vs. 8. Also grad students are adults vs. an 18 year old undergrad
- Spring Break? Dorms closed, no break – 3 FT weeks? Childhood/early childhood, but wouldn’t work for secondary
- Separate/differentiated requirements for undergrad/grad
- Of the 200 “this many” needs to be X and “this many” in Y setting
- “Video library” (see National Board, SUNY Cortland) to watch, identify, tag observe good teachers, etc. to help meet a portion of the hours
- Allow more flexibility here to help meet hours – 5th and 6th grade? – set % of hrs. in cert area! How much can be outside of certification area.
- Teacher release time – need coordinators, credit of some kind

- 3d. Simulated experiences – virtual? – vague – who will provide this?
- Better to say no less than. . .
- Attend to language
- Please use terminology of “mentor” to support quality of experience
- Keep recommendations of “no less than 100” – work with 100 hours and assure stages get beyond observation
- Concern about how to make this happen without funding
- What support can you offer to school-based teacher educators?
- Clarity!
- Guidance
- “Wiggle room” on regs. Allow flexibility
- Time to “study abroad” could affect time to allow
- Need to consider what the “hours” include...sitting in back of classroom
- Make regulations that address the “quality” not the quantity
- Require 100 hrs. at intermediate level
- Will program like “AVID” continue to meet the regulations?
- Need impact financial study done for: students, higher ed programs, districts/administrators at district/higher ed. to maintain MOU review; cooperating teachers
- Have IHEs demonstrate effective clinical preparation through deep descriptions of clinical experiences.
- Use micro-credentialing as a way of endorsing competence to move to culminating experience.
- Define clear expectations of the additional hours required; can we divide the hours as we want?
- 70 ST days is untenable as colleges do not have that many days in a semester. Please lower to 60 or 65.
- Could the culminating clinical experience be based on the college’s semester? (instead of “70 days”). There is a financial impact on teacher candidates; dorms are closed at times.
- How does this effect additional certification programs (ex. Literacy specialists, ed tech)
- Guidance around virtual hours.
- Reword 70 consecutive days as “the equivalent of one semester”. 70 days is problematic for academic calendar.
- Don’t make #2 more prescriptive. Keep it flexible.
- Don’t make all hours required in grade level being certified. Exposure to all grades can be useful to see continuum of learning. Help cand. learn more about diff. grade levels.
- Can’t: May require changes to NYSED program registration.
- Supervision and assessment of the extra hours will require increased costs to program.
- 200 hours will cause transportation issues. Many cand. don’t have cars. It’s already difficult. Will cause scheduling logistics/challenges.
- 70 days can blow up dual degree programs.
- Many candidates have jobs outside of school and increased requirements may get in the way.
- No dispute about benefits of additional clinical experience but these increases may cause problems for programs.
- Grad programs will have big impact on us. Timeframe is quite different from 4 year. No time to fit in more requirements.
- We will be doubling our ask on school districts (field experiences should not be disruptive to the schools K-12).

- Last fall there were only 67 days possible in semester = make 1 semester not 70 days. Campuses have housing, dining, financial aid, exams, breaks, etc.
- Clarkson has clinically rich 1 year program and/but could not make 70 days since candidates spend 1 year (5 days a week) ½ days = barely cover!
- Occurs consecutively is problematic
- Given teacher shortages and recruiting diversity, increasing requirements may increase barrier especially for diverse candidates. We're building new barriers in a profession that is struggling to recruit.
- What about substitute teaching? Can't it count toward the 200 hours? This would allow teacher candidates an opportunity for compensation.
- Community-based organizations – can hours count in an after-school program (possibly tutoring?)
- Clinical experiences should explicitly include standards learning, curricular exposure, instructional planning, and assessment cycle. Understanding of children and families.
- 3a. and 4a. – the language about addressing pedagogical core could be more specific about what that means
- Funding for extended clinical work is key. Who has the ability to do this is key.
- More virtual – Hope guidelines will focus on what virtual experiences will entail
- What if teachers do not advance to culminating?
- Section 3b & c – Does IHE determine what “counts” as hours focus on SWDs and ENL students? Would a case study on one student suffice? Does it need to be a certain kind of classroom?
- Present more traditional samples vs. PDs and Residency programs
- Where's the added value?
- More than 40, but less than 70 hours
- What needs to be course-related?
- Mentoring, Induction programs and supports for new teachers
- Creating relationships because Teacher Education schools and P-12 schools
- Section 1a – meaning engagement with “certified P-12 educators”
- Section 1c – alternative suggestion?
- Section 3d – Clarify in guidance document
- Citation on the research about the number of clinical hours
 - Literature is only coming from these types of PDs, residency program
 - What does the research say about the traditional programs?
 - Name the added value – does it come in at 150 hours? 200? Same with the # of days
- Community based educators – please define
- Do the teachers have to be licensed?
- Do the field experiences need to be connected to course related in the foundational?
- Clarify around “virtual”
- Build practical hours into the coursework/credits/lab hours.
- Collaborative conversations between school districts and institutions. Include “collaborative agreements”
- Guidebooks should be exposed, practiced and demonstrated
- For particular programs, waiver should be submitted but not to commissioner
- No days – higher education uses hours. Keep language consistent; choose hours or days, not both.
- Please consider academic calendar

- Certification conversation should be taking place simultaneously to make sure that all educators are prepared in an equitable manner.
- Different certifications have different requirements, so consider them.
- We want the option to increase hours because it's good for our students – we don't want the state to mandate.
- Recommendations for different levels of hours? (not requirements) Don't do it! :)
- Need flexibility for students in different programs and who have different needs (non-traditional students, for example)
- If you are a combined major (seeking 2 certifications) need an extended time in field, but if only one of the current regs. are sufficient.
- Please leave sufficient things as are for longer so we can get better at what's already in existence. It is a HUGE amount of work to respond to these changes
- Please let us get good at the current rules – change too often is demoralizing and counter effective
- Guidance on how these regulations apply to graduate certificate programs (i.e., TESOL, bilingual cert)
- Guidance should include any applicable waivers/or exceptions to a regulation. (#2a)
- Guidance should include sample form for tracking.
- What about programs that are designed to use shared field experience? i.e., one field exp. used for 2 different certification areas.
- How do the hours apply to certificate programs (TESOL/bilingual)?
- At Buffalo State we have been designing a new dual-cert (spec. ed. and el. ed.) with a professional year – 2 student teaching placements (10 weeks each) across 2 separate semesters.
- Keep at 100 hours max and focus more on “quality” placements, U quantity.
- MOU will be very important!
- Meaningful engagement – who determines and enforces “meaningful engagement”
- 3e. Are the 50 hours required for teachers who have multiple certifications, for example, science (Earth Science, Bio, Chemistry) or LOTE (German, French) or does it refer to 2 completely different certifications – Art and Living Environment
- For teachers seeking extra certs in another discipline (ex., Art, LE, Chem) they are only required to complete 50 extra hours total.
- Does consecutively mean same school? If it does, 1) concerned about candidates seeking multiple certs; 2) losing diversity of placements
- What about splitting 70 days into two different settings if beneficial for the candidates' development? Specifically, might want to change wording in #4 from “shall” to “may”.
- What is meant by virtual and/or simulated experiences? Science at high school level cannot use virtual/simulated labs.
- Incorporate terms such as meaningfully assessed to include evidence of student outcomes and reflection on outcomes as related to implementation of strategies/interventions/lesson plan and lesson delivered.
- Teacher candidates should experience a school year beginning as well as the closing of a school year that includes the assessment cycle of state assessments.
- #4 should explicitly state the number of culminating clinical hours needed for an additional certification.
- Replace with targeted lesson to “meet the needs” of students with disabilities and students learning English as a new language.

- “Understanding” is not close to being sufficient. Candidates should be able to demonstrate meeting the needs of students with disabilities and or learning English as a new language.
- Won’t this negatively affect our ability to recruit people into teaching when we have a shortage?
- How is this making candidates better?
- How is this impactful, meaningful engagement. Takes away individuality of programs.
- There should also be attention placed on the workload for faculty teaching at schools and on campus.
- Need clarification on “diversity” placement.
- NYSED should support scholarship funds for student teachers during clinical experiences.
- We would like full year experiences.
- Possibly compensation.
- Accountability – resources are in the building – required that it be used.
- What’s the accessibility? To their faculty members.
- It’s about more time actually student teaching, not more observation hours.
- Does everyone have the same understanding of supervision?
- How does master teachers work with a student teacher? Needs to be defined (PD)
- Students already working in school (P-12).
- (Sub. teachers, TA) should not have to do 200 hours of clinical experience.

Clinical Supervision

Feedback on the Draft Recommendations

- (2.) Clarity. P-12 educators within districts are required to have tenure.
- (3.) Clarity – does this mean at the university or at the school districts?
- (1.) Regarding “shall participate in prof. dev.” – Part of this needs to be about working with adults (turn-key training). Need college prof/staff needs to attend PD with public school teachers
- Is #3 in current regs. being removed? Concerning if it is
- Requiring sponsor teachers to have professional development may be another impediment to participation.
- Typo in #2 “at least”
- (2.) With so many retirements, finding teachers with three years’ experience to host students may be tough.
- (3.) “in the past five years” is far too short of a timeframe and requires far too quick of a turnover of faculty if it means they couldn’t have been more than 5 years out of active P-12 teaching.
- How do we require school-based teacher educators to do professional development?
- Does P-12 teaching experience for university-based teacher educators have to be in the U.S.?
- What will supervision look like
- Reward school host teacher and administrators with being the main feedback along with feedback from Higher Ed supervisor. Feedback: Host teacher—school admin—Higher Ed supervisor
- Missing link – host teacher and student teacher need to connect before actual student teaching.
- Culminating student teaching must be with tenured teacher. Foundation and intermediate can be with
- (4.) great

- (III.2.) Distinguish school-based teacher educators with 3 years of full time for clinical experience only.
- (3.) Needs clarification in terms of requirements of at least 3 years of full time P-12
- Like PD for clinical supervision for cooperating teachers.
- (3.) Clarify what is meant by “related school experience”. Reword this paragraph.
- If a higher ed faculty member hasn’t been working in a school in 5 years – are they now ineligible to supervise?
- What constitutes the professional development that stakeholders must participate in? What’s acceptable? What can be made viable for programs that have students in large numbers of schools/districts?
- Who will train all educators, especially in-service?
- Can teachers get credit towards [CTLE]/professional cert
- Faculty must be in the field during field experiences?
- Faculty-required P-12 teaching experience – 3 years
- Looks great
- PD for school-based teacher educator good idea, but it could deter them from participating unless there is an incentive (CTLE, higher education course)
- School-based teacher educator should be required to be tenured or previously tenured (in another district/state) and subject to local policy
- Do cooperating teachers need to have degree requirements – and should it be explicit?
- Appreciate university-based teachers needing at least three years full-time P-12 teaching!!! Intentional and important, but may be challenge for some IHE/faculty that may currently not have substantial P-12 experience
- How much supervision by the Higher Ed faculty?
- How much professional development is required? How do we pay for this? This needs to happen but how do we do it and who does it?
- Mentor teachers should be the supervisors. Faculty visit 2-3 times a semester to check in. Pay the teachers – not the supervisors
- edTPA – doesn’t teach candidates – make formative instead of evaluative
- Fundraising – higher ed create a proposal to city council to expedite clinical experiences for teachers
- TQP GRANT – 750k – not very much – charter management organizations can find funds. How do we figure out developmental supports so public sector can realign existing funds. Studies show that education is in the middle – no more a cash cow – we need to stop thinking university is cheap to create a teacher
- In terms of regulations – regs touch what should our programs do?
- Problem – we will teach teachers what they need to know there is subject content vs delivering of instruction
- Need to identify strong mentors from LEAs
- Create consistency in experience requirement of holding certification in #3 and 1B in section 2
- Broaden language in #1 to not restrict location to a school, include community-based in section #1 and #3. Community base...home base...
- Add clarity on the 5 yr. requirement, it is 3 yr. teaching experience in the last 5 years?
- Proposed school-based teacher regulations seem to be less than the current regulations on the books. Add “effective”, “interest in mentoring”....
- How do you ensure supervision of the clinical hours?

- Is three years sufficient for supervision of student teaching?
- How can we compensate the teachers – PD hours
- In supervision, PD in prepaying for the role (higher ed or cooperating teacher) should be emphasized more than the years of experience.
- Make sure that clinical supervision is clear that this is about supervising student teachers, not supervising students for all 3 levels of clinical experience.
- The provision for PD for school-based and university-based teacher educators is important and welcome.
- Training and PD should be a requirement to host student teachers.
- The new reg around supervision should encompass all field experiences, student teacher, and practica similar to the current regs. Can we make that specific?
- Already reality to be paired with a licensed teacher in their certification area
- Costs money to have supervisors do PD – who's going to pay?
- Need funding for the clinically rich programs to be sustainable
- Faculty need to be compensated to do this work
- Bullet 3 has too many “or” statements and makes it unclear
- Does not say that teachers need to be certified to be supervisors – why not? Is it implied?
- Missing: supervisors effectiveness (for school-based, should they be rated effective or highly effective?)
- What does it mean that school-based educators shall participate in PD to provide clinical supervision (is this PD in effective supervision/being a teacher educator?) or is it the usual PD required by State Ed.
- What is the nature of PD for higher ed. faculty supervisors – are they doing PD themselves or creating PD for school-based educators. Compensated? More service?
- University educators may need grandfather clause for 3 yrs. full time P-12 teaching. Provide alternative pathways for university-based educators to meet criteria. We appreciate wanting 3 years full-time teaching. University faculty may not have this. Alternative pathway for educators to do supervision/teach. Current regulation requirements are better.
- III.1. What does the professional development look like? One time? What topic/areas? Orientation for cooperating teacher (school-based educators) and university-based educators to ensure all are on the same page.
- What is the expectation of “training” field experience school based educators? Can districts take that on?
- Clarify that initial and intermediate FE do not need to be supervised by college faculty or provide PD.
- Clarify that PD is required for ST – not field experiences.
- Professional development – what does this mean
- Why 3 years for field experience? (we understand student teaching) but teachers are turning over-predicted teacher shortage areas could be problematic
- For new hires? How do we consider part-time faculty who supervise and have been supervising for us over a longer than 5 year time? Many are retired but stay current through their work as supervisors for the university. Could there be more flexible language? Or language about PD, but not make 5 years a requirement (or just for new hires)?
- 3 years required experience may not indicate quality of the teacher
- Part III, 2 should say “certification in a related area”
- For school-based teacher educators (SBTE) there is no mention of the quality of the SBTE.
- We love and appreciate #1 and hope that it can be organic and purposeful for each context.

- Exclude rule saying supervision experiences must be in last 5 yrs. Professors and retirees can still be effective. There is no proof or research to say people's relevance expires in 5 years. Will make it impossible to run program.
- The 3 year rule for classroom teachers change to 4 years to be comparable with tenure limit liability/risk
- There was a lot of discussion about the requirements of the school-based teacher educator – some felt tenure should be a requirement – others liked the way it was.
- “We have accreditation (CAEP, AAQEP) standards we have to follow”. These are not consistent with regulations. “How do we make them consistent?”
- Emphasis on districts thinking about the qualities of a good host teacher, beyond who's available, tenured, etc.
- Worry about availability of field supervisors in rural areas, as well as host teacher. Need for better stipends for both resident student and host teachers.
- 3.3 Though not intended to exclude adjuncts, does the “involved in program development” limit involvement of adjuncts?
- Master Teacher program should be more involved. Expand to different disciplines. Expand cadre of cooperating teachers and supervisors. Master teacher as targeted mentor
- Less than three years P-12 partners/school-based teacher educator
- #3 at least 3 years school-based experience OR ...What is “related, school-based experience”? Other types of instruction
- Why prof. dev. for host teachers? We will not get hosts. What does it look like? Can't regulate it.
- Section 1
 - Who provides PD for school and university based educators?
 - Guidelines for what counts as professional development?
 - If PD is done w/ school & university-based teachers educators together/collaboratively?
- Data on PD – Feedback? Collection? Assessment?
- Section 1 – Provide options for PDs
- Section 2 – Clarify or the equivalent
- Section 3 – Clarify program development + past five years. This section is unclear.
- Section 2 – There are more highly effective 2 years certified P-12 educators than 15 year veteran teachers!
- Section 3 – Clarify language
- Can the regulation just state that you meet the accreditation processes?
- This simply makes good sense
- Small institutions will have to mobilize and work hard to do this but it's still doable
- This is on target but will force us to do more.
- This forces partnerships
- If we are talking about obs. hrs. problem with “at least 3 yrs. exp.” – there are some teachers who are excellent early on and observing teacher that is an excellent learning exp.
- Also, observing an early career teacher who is not so great helps students to see what not to do.
- Finally, just because a teacher has been teaching for XX number of years does not guarantee that the teacher is excellent.
- What is meant by “professional dev.” for teacher educators? Who decides what it will be and how it will be taught? Who will do it?
- We like that the language of “rated effective or highly effective in most recent annual professional performance review” has been removed.

- #3 is too restrictive for individual institutions doing hiring of faculty
- Clarify who needs PD, how will this happen? To what level will this occur?
- Should there be a variance for the 3-year experience for mentor teachers (i.e., in a high-needs area)
- We agree that prof. development related to supervision is valuable.
- Amount of time required for Trade & Tech student teaching is 300 hours, 3-5 years' experience
- Experience in the field is necessary for High Ed. teacher educators
- Cost to colleges would be monumental
- Many institutions partner with distant P-12 schools (e.g., SUTEC). How would you train someone in person? Virtual trainings would have to take place.
- #1 as stated "school-based" will limit schools/teacher accepting teacher candidates.
- #2 Change language from "three years of full-time P-12 teaching" to "qualified full-time P-12 teaching"
- #1 omit PD for school-based educators
- Regulations for professional development – who is providing? What does it look like? What's the content? How is this geared to the needs of the particular college? Seems like the creation of a "cottage" industry that is not necessarily meaningful and impactful.
- What about outliers – students student teaching out of the area.
- Supervision, even if done via DL, should be done in "real time" not recorded.
- III 3. Suggest that IHE evaluate supervisors other than classroom hours as they supervise. IHE could create rubric or framework.

New Ideas for the Recommendations

- (1.) Consider professional development in the MOU – needs to be clear.
- Discussions about workload implications for university-based teacher educators.
- State funded financial support for prov. dev. for college person to attend PD with practicing teachers
- PLEASE give us time to implement new recommendations (a full-year please)
- Inservice credit for mentor teachers
- Webinars for prof. development for mentor teachers
- Is training mandated
- If more than 5 years out, can a certain level of PD make up for the lapse/gap?
- Do they have to maintain certification in order to qualify as university-based educators?
- New name for host teacher, do not call them mentor
- (3.) confusing language, make sure it states supervisors.
- Guidance needed – at least 3 years of full-time P-12 (what does this mean?)
- Do we need to add language about certifications required by faculty and staff?
- Alignment of this document – conceptually and linguistically – with other guiding principles: TeachNY, CAEP
- Program development should also be under school-based faculty
- Comment – This document seems much more regulatory than aspirational, despite the introductory comment that it is aspirational.
- Reword (3.) University-based teacher educators must have at least three years of full-time P-12 teaching or related school-based experience and must have been employed in a higher ed or school district position within the last five years.
- Reward/credit system for all in-service educators for hosting candidates

- Re-word – add clinical supervision experience (III-#3)
- Many institutions do have effective teacher (without 3 years P-12 experience)
- Can [professional development] count for CTLE hours for the host teachers? Can it be an online course?
- You need to make a law that gives extra money/salary to support mentor teachers! \$500 a semester for each supervising teacher
- Will there be a defined number of observations?
- Source of funding/spread of work load?
- Ask P-12 to train teachers how to mentor teacher candidates. Take it off the responsibility for colleges.
- Be aware that rural vs. urban schools and undergrad vs. graduate is very different.
- Could there be selection and/or evaluation criteria of the teacher? The criteria for SBTE and university-based teacher educators would be jointly developed by the EPP and school and part of the MOU.
- Flexibility of the requirements for the SBTE for the different “levels” (foundational, intermediate, culminating) of clinical experiences
- Please clarify #2 – is this for all levels of clinical experiences (foundational, intermediate, culminating)
- Leave professional development vague – don’t define.
- There is some misalignment between the college calendar and public school calendar. Can flexibility in language allow for this if 70 consecutive days are problematic?
- Supervisors in clinical settings should also be kept up to date on curricular changes, new assessments, etc. See #1 about professional development. Could this language be more robust?
- Differentiating experience...for individual
- Reduce specificity – be in guidance not regs.
- Provide a minimum intermediate experiences. LANGUAGE
- Put in guidance. Recommendation use “preferred qualifications”!
- P-12 districts must have incentives to allow foundational-intermediate-culminating
- Why 3 year of P-12 when “fast track” programs do not need to? Need to be for all
- Does a “3 year” experience in P-12 make you any more qualified (get rid of it)
- Allow program to select “qualified” individuals to supervise
- Get rid of “hoops” that stop P-12 from hosting
- May be “guidance” on the prof. dev. more specific
- Regulations less specific
- Accreditation?
- Section 1 – Clarify if the PD is intended to be a collaboration between school & IHEs?
- Data on PD – feedback? Collection? Assessment?
- Can we obtain data on cooperating teacher (observation/evaluations) prior to letting student teacher learn from them
- Section 3
 - Change font of “or” to bold; bullet list
 - Add “OR one of the following: Related school-based experience employed as a higher ed faculty or staff member, classroom teacher, and/or educational leader in the past five years.”
- Options for defining /modeling for professional learning

- Section 1 – Change language to “during yearly clinical experiences”
- Section 3 – confusing language. Bold “or” because it’s difficult to read
- What does program development mean?
- 3 years of “equivalent” is unclear. Need clarify on this language
- Define the responsibilities that each school/institution will have
- Provide guidance
- Have a common set of standards for sign off.
- Meaningful partnership are collaborative partnerships
- Spend time up front on rubrics for assessing the candidate. Share the responsibilities for producing the candidates.
- Consider a waiver for the 3 year experience requirement to mentor. Less than 3 years ready to mentor (Exceptions can be made)
- Guidebook provided – criteria and by whom?
Add in assessing dispositions and content knowledge. On-going through clinical buckets
- Faculty members should have at least 5 years of experience in schools.
- Please increase the compensation of mentor teachers by SUNY because the responsibilities have increased.
- We also feel that the mentor leaders who work with candidates in leadership programs should be compensated for their efforts and time.
- The compensation for the hard work of our mentors tells them that their work is valued.
- It’s insulting to ask Ph.D. faculty who are researching and writing in the field to attend PD – not of their choice. It’s not meaningful.
- Put everything in guidance so institutions of higher ed. could make their own decisions.
- Enough with the restrictions
- Too much of a burden on programs as we deal with budget, enrollment and teaching shortages in our communities.
- CAEP monitors programs.
- #1 Provide guidance for PD: identify categories or sessions that would be most appropriate: instructional coaching, critical conversations, cognitive coaching, and feedback loop.
- #3 Needs to be defined more clearly; seems wordy, seems like “anyone” could do it
- We suggest a work group to examine the supervision of student teaching experience including compensation of co-op teachers.
- Colleges need to provide CTLE credits – Needs to be uniform for all the district – partnership (need the state to fix rules or chaos)

Questions

- What specifically needs to be included on the memoranda of understanding?
- Will there be guidance for the MOU?
- Will there be incentives for P-12 partnership?
- How do the classroom teachers benefit besides the give back to their profession?
- How does this information come to the partners as a collaboration not mandated from the college?
- How will these regulations be communicated to the classroom teacher?
- How can we ensure that teachers are part of the “consultation”?
- Language re: partnerships on P-12 side of regulations

- What implications does “partnerships” have for candidates who get an internship certificate?
- If increasing the hours and meaningful partnerships?
- Internships - sustainable funding. What can they do
- To support these efforts will the NYC public schools have a mandate to take more fieldwork interns/teacher candidates?
- What will be the criteria to establish or maintain meaningful partnerships?
- What incentives can there be to encourage schools to partner with universities for fieldwork and student teaching?
- It is especially challenging to find schools to host fieldwork students.
- How do we encourage the coaching and mentoring but not overburden teachers who serve as mentors for student teachers? How do we support their mentoring?
- How might you use a lead teacher to support that work?
- We need funding
- Can hours be flexible, more virtual hours, ex. diversity
- When will this take effect?
- Is this going to be a common core roll out? Need more time
- What about fall schedules being set and grad level program. We are only 1.5 year program/last 3 semesters
- We need more time – cannot be ready by Fall 2018!
- Definitions of concepts in document: clinical practice, clinical experience, intermediate, student teaching, community-based programs. All these terms are different in a rural area
- ELL in the classroom – what does in classroom mean
- Define distance learning, high needs school, diversity, RURAL area
- On campus school age programs on campus
- We lack number of schools diverse exp.
- (3d.) How will literacy-based school age programs on campus count toward hours
- Summer program for MST. MST considerations graduate level programs.
- Graduate students in a 1-year MST program – these programs will need more time to prepare for implementation than a program in undergrad who won’t have these hours until later
- Need a year to prepare for implementation after adoption.
- Is there any plan to change regulation for advanced programs (MSEDs)?
- Are we adding an extra course to a program?
- Does the cost of a program increase?
- Does the length of the program increase?
- Would the changes be attracting or repelling for prospective students?
- What about hours for student teaching?
- What if a school does not have ESL students?
- What does 70 consecutive days mean? Same person? How are snow days and school vacations considered? Where do the seminars go?
- Lack of transportation, no ELL learners in this area – barriers!
- 70 day student teaching – one placement? If so, will they be required to see/practice at the other level: K-6, 7-12
- Would the state provide resources (for example, virtual or simulated experiences) that rural areas could utilize, especially to assist with meeting hours that focus on ELL learners?

- Will the document be aligned conceptually and linguistically with other guiding documents and regulations?
- TeachNY, SUNY, CAEP, AAQEP, Prior Regs. Would be good to not work at cross purposes
- Good to have reference points by which to compare current thinking by the clinical practice work group
- Because of our rural area, the same teachers tend to be utilized over and over. More hours means more pressure on them. Is there a way the State can help compensate teachers for the extra effort and work that goes into hosting our teacher candidates?
- Specific needs for CTE teacher certification – has this been considered? (Most CTE teachers are full time employees with family/home responsibilities and cannot afford more time for clinical practice (unpaid time))
- Suggest leaving regs at 100 hr/40 days
- Will you consider field testing major changes in one area of the state before rolling out across entire state? For example, double clinical hours prior to student teaching (from 100 to 200). This is a major change. It would be best to test this idea before rolling out change.
- Will you present data on the experiences of Black and Latino/a teacher candidates in NY State? We need to assess the pipeline for teachers and how are NYSED policies affecting this pipeline.
- Align clinical experience with State exams for teachers, for example, edTPA
- I strongly agree with the points that were made. Student teaching should not only be observed but be hands-on. Students need to be exposed to more (e.g., going to museums, going to a show, experiencing and implementing lessons or field trips.)
- Can the State provide funding for candidates to be placed as interns? (sustainable funding)
- How would the 70 day culminating clinical experience provide for the dual placement for early childhood candidates? Currently the 14 wks. are divided into 2 placements – 10 wks./4 wks. – one placement in a birth-preK placement, the other in a K through Grade 2 placement.
- 40 school days helps paraprofessionals to get leave of absence to do their student teaching. By increasing it to 70 days will negatively impact them. Any plan on addressing their needs?
- I'm totally for – as are all my IHE colleagues – stronger teacher preparation, including clinical practice. However, strengthening practice requirements in one pathway while proliferating Trans-B and other low-quality pathways undermines the profession. What is Stat Ed going to do to make sure all teachers are certified through quality pathways before becoming a teacher of record?
- The idea that edTPA is being accommodated rather than the learners is another example of how education is being corporatized. Why not rewrite edTPA to be appropriate for professional certification not initial – teacher has experience in her own classroom – research addressing reflective practices points to need for experience
- Again – one must ask who do you want to be our classroom teachers? Increased hours outside of coursework are difficult for full time non-traditional students – DIVERSE
- Get \$ for students (TCs [teacher candidates]) to be interns and paid for time out of their work
- What will be the influence on the increase of “clock hours” (100 to 200 hrs.) on undergraduate versus graduate students? Impact on program completion for each (grad and undergrad)?
- What is the financial costs of making the “clock hours” credit bearing?
- What are the culminating clinical experience requirements for multiple certificates? 70 days split into 2?

- Our group recommends that the rollout of changes is a thoughtful pace that allows institutions, P-12 partners, directors, faculty, staff and students adequate time.
- PLEASE roll out these changes with care. Providing time for colleges and their partners to prepare for changes in a sustainable manner.
- Graduate programs vs. undergraduate – please remember that one size does not fit all.
- We recommend the rollout of these or any changes gives institutions, P-12 partners, faculty and staff time ample enough adjust accordingly.
- 70 consecutive days – change to one semester!
- 70 days are literally technically impossible to execute. Please consider 60-65 days as a requirement.
- Need to consider the impact of doubling student teaching time on P-12 students.
- 5 year requirement for supervisors is discriminatory and does not leverage the expertise of our retired teachers.
- Some of these changes, such as the increase to 200 hours of FE will create more of a gap between traditional and alternative certification. How will that be addressed? Will additional regulations be coming for trans B? If not, what will be the political fallout? Many, if not all, of these recommendations could be slightly adjusted and still improve clinical experiences for alternatively certified teachers.
- Adding hours/days will create challenges for districts, teacher prep and diverse students.
- 70 days of student teaching will challenge dual degree programs to convince students to expand their certification areas and will likely increase shortages in special education. Instead of 70 days why not 12 weeks or a full semester.
- Please think of the following guidance item: requiring a collaboration project with the school librarian
- Clinical Practices – I appreciate the goal of more time in schools, however, 200 hours is a big change that will put a lot of pressure on our P-12 partners. I would appreciate a change from 70-days to “the equivalent of one semester” of student teaching. There are not 70 days in our student teachers semester.
- Clinical Supervision – #3 to require university-based teacher educators to have 3 yrs. P-12 and to have been employed in the last 5 years limits participation and is not sound. These skill sets while overlapping are not one in the same. Other classroom based experiences (supervision and research) are also beneficial classroom (P-12) experiences.
- Clinical Experience – #4 – 70 days cannot be done within a semester timeframe which impacts semester tuition, housing, student meals, transportation, faculty compensation/contracts, etc. Why 70 days? Why not say a semester-long experience?
- Clinical Supervision – #3 – “in the past 5 years” discriminates against retirees who are a tremendous support for supervising.
- Please add a guideline including collaboration with the teacher-librarian! Even just a focused conversation would give a student teacher a sense of what this person can do to enhance the teaching and learning experience (growing life-long learners/readers, teaching information literacy skills, promoting the inquiry process, resource curation, fostering exploration, etc.)
- Where is the regulation is accountability of P-12 to take students. Nothing dictates their responsibility - APPR, \$ stipend, CTLE hours, districts – refuse – for some districts
- Guidance for P-12
- Clinical experiences – the math allows 40 hours with ENL/students with special needs to all be virtual/simulated. Is that correct?

- II.3.d. “occur in actual classrooms/schools” – what about after school programs? Community tutoring programs?
- How much will this discourage young people or career changers from becoming teachers?
- How much will this encourage potential teachers from seeking alternate (less regulated) pathways to becoming certified?
- According to existing data, how does an increase in pre-student teaching clinical hours (with a decrease in teaching and class hours) lead to an increase in quality of these clinical experiences?
- Will there be additional regulation (not guidance) that’s not currently included in recommendations? For example, will “seminar” be regulated in form, duration, etc.?
- Thank you for making this effort to help us improve our teacher preparation programs. It’s not easy work. I appreciate your efforts.
- Low response to surveys: who received the surveys? When? Was there a deadline? Did recipients understand why their response matters?
- Partnership is not an acceptable term – Higher ed held to standards of hours, calendar concerns, funds for teachers...both “sides” need accountability
- What resources and supports for the schools and participating teachers?
- Culminating experience – does 70 days include snow days, testing days, vacation days? What happens if spring semester doesn’t offer 70 consecutive days?
- Is there a list of “designated high-needs schools”?
- How will having a single student teaching placement prepare candidates to teach in the different ends of the grade range of their certification.
- Pre-student teaching clinical experience (when candidates are not expected to be ready to student teach) presumably does not and cannot replace the preparation of student teaching in this regard.
- Speech Language Path – TSSLD now has a separate clinical expectation in 52.21 (150 hours in different settings). Will that remain the same or will they be held to 200 hours, 70-day single placement? Will SLP faculty be held to 3+ years in P-12 and no more than 5 years out? They currently rely on ASHA cert requirements, not practice.
- Dual Certification – are dual candidates doing 250 foundational/intermediate hours, with 100 hours minimum in the cert area they will not be student teaching in? And only one student teaching in one cert area? So a Health/PE candidate could do 100 intermediate hours in health and everything else in PE and still be certified in health (if they pass the Health CST)?
- 70 consecutive days – change to one semester!
- 70 days are literally technically impossible to execute. Please consider 60-65 days as a requirement.
- Need to consider the impact of doubling student teaching time on P-12 students.
- 5 year requirement for supervisors is discriminatory and does not leverage the expertise of our retired teachers.
- Some of these changes, such as the increase to 200 hours of FE will create more of a gap between traditional and alternative certification. How will that be addressed? Will additional regulations be coming for trans B? If not, what will be the political fallout? Many, if not all, of these recommendations could be slightly adjusted and still improve clinical experiences for alternatively certified teachers.
- Adding hours/days will create challenges for districts, teacher prep and diverse students.
- 70 days of student teaching will challenge dual degree programs to convince students to expand their certification areas and will likely increase shortages in special education. Instead of 70 days why not 12 weeks or a full semester.

- Please think of the following guidance item: requiring a collaboration project with the school librarian
- Clinical Practices – I appreciate the goal of more time in schools, however, 200 hours is a big change that will put a lot of pressure on our P-12 partners. I would appreciate a change from 70-days to “the equivalent of one semester” of student teaching. There are not 70 days in our student teachers semester.
- Clinical Supervision – #3 to require university-based teacher educators to have 3 yrs. P-12 and to have been employed in the last 5 years limits participation and is not sound. These skill sets while overlapping are not one in the same. Other classroom based experiences (supervision and research) are also beneficial classroom (P-12) experiences.
- Clinical Experience – #4 – 70 days cannot be done within a semester timeframe which impacts semester tuition, housing, student meals, transportation, faculty compensation/contracts, etc. Why 70 days? Why not say a semester-long experience?
- Clinical Supervision – #3 – “in the past 5 years” discriminates against retirees who are a tremendous support for supervising.
- How will the university-based teacher educator’s workload be impacted?
- How do we get school-based educators to attend professional development?
- (3.) Does it need to be in the U.S.?
- Clinical prof. dev...define prof dev
- What does university-based teacher educator mean? What about student teaching supervisors who are often retired teachers? Do we fire them after 5 years?
- Who will be charged with professional development of school-based teacher educators?
- Can the PD for faculty and school based faculty be done through study groups, inquiry groups rather than only top down PD?
- Could the school based faculty receive CTLE credits?
- Need to explicitly require that supervision be provided across three kinds of clinical experiences (foundational, intermediate, and culminating)
- (3.1) What does prof dev look like? Different for school-based and univ.-based folks?
- (3.2) Would it be possible to stop using supervisors for episodic visits and filter some \$ compensation to coops – allow them to be both coop and supervisor?
- How much professional development is needed?
- If our students are spread out, how can we centralize that supervisor?
- CTLE credits should be provided when thinking about the PD.
- Creative ways to engage staff and faculty should be provided such as learning communities.
- What entering UG freshman class will have follow new regulations? Will all programs follow the same regulations?
- Will the regulations be the same for undergraduate and graduate programs?
- Put students first – no more than 100 hours
- Will all certification pathways have to meet the same rules (for equity)? (It doesn’t seem fair that IHE are held to rules that alternative pathways don’t also have to address.)
- What about Canadian boards (schools)?
- Will P-12 schools be required or highly encouraged to participate in MOUs?
- Will the district help higher ed. identify high-quality teachers?
- How do we handle MOUs when we serve a large Canadian population? Canadian schools would be resistant to signing MOUs
- Will we be saturating the schools with the requirement of 200 hours?

- Where do the students fit in these hours while taking classes, working, etc.
- Number of schools are rural; number of students have no vehicles. There is no public transportation system available for students. Districts are small. Saturation of schools.
- Teachers to not have time to participate in professional development at the college. If this is a requirement it has to be worked into an MOU.
- Virtual trainings for teachers would work best for rural schools.
- MOU – always an issue for us. Standard MOU for all schools with guidelines for schools to follow.
- No 200 hours – keep at 100
- Can students and programs use substitute days and teaching assistant experience be used towards expanded required hours?
- If SUNY uses 75 days for student teaching can the excess 5 days be used towards teaching time.
- CTLE credits for having student teachers. Have schools register with state if they are experiencing sub. Shortage.