



Clinical Practice Work Group Meeting Notes
January 10, 2018 (12:30-3:30)
New York State Education Department
89 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY (Room EB 5 A/B)

Members present in Albany: Christine Ashby, April Bedford, David Cantaffa, Stephen Danna, Karen DeMoss, Terry Earley, Deborah Greenblatt, Ileana Infante, Leah Lembo, Margaret McLane, Deb Shanley

Members present virtually (WebEx): Deidre Armitage, Nichole Brown, David Gerwin, Colleen McDonald, Lesli Myers, Amy Way, Deborah Wortham

NYSED staff present: Laura Glass, Jhone Ebert (beginning of the meeting only)

1. Overview of the meeting and announcements
 - Co-chair April Bedford reviewed the agenda.
 - The AACTE Clinical Practice Commission white paper will be officially [released during a press event](#) at the National Press Club in Washington, DC on Wednesday, January 17, 2018. Information about the event and registration is available on the AACTE website.
 - Senior Deputy Commissioner Jhone Ebert thanked the work group members for their efforts.
2. Finalize the draft recommendations for the field to review
 - The work group revised the wording in the draft recommendations and engaged in conversations around particular topics. Points of discussion are described below.
 - Partnerships
 - Teachers should have a voice in the development of the memoranda of understanding (MOUs). Need to draw on the expertise of teachers and administrators in their development.
 - If an institution of higher education (IHE) makes placements in 25 districts, are they expected to have partnerships with all of them? This will be a problem for IHEs and districts who take candidates from multiple IHEs.
 - Delete the word “agreement” because it implies a legal document. An MOU is not as legally binding and provides a way to establish expectations. It is difficult to know if IHEs and schools/school districts have similar expectations without an MOU.
 - An MOU ensures systematic conversations between IHEs and schools/school districts and guarantees some level of consultation. Write the recommendation so that there is flexibility in the types of relationships.
 - Put into guidance what the MOU could look like. Could include indemnification and insurance in guidance.
 - Clinical practice has been seen as the purview of higher education up until now. This is no longer the case.
 - The Sustainable Funding Project provides support around partnerships for IHEs across the country. They have some techniques for MOUs to make them malleable and are willing to share them for the guidance. MOUs are the most important piece to build relationships and support aspirational goals.
 - From a P-12 perspective, we need the MOUs. Partnerships are really important and not cumbersome, providing a shared relationship between IHEs and schools/school districts.
 - Should collective bargaining be included in the recommendation? No, not sure that it is always part of the process. Put in guidance for stakeholders to consider.

- Clinical Experiences
 - Intentionally designed and scaffolded experiences are not necessarily sequential.
 - Want to stop candidates from walking into a building with a letter asking for 20 hours of field experience.
 - Intermediate clinical experiences are the biggest change for one work group member. There are ramifications for faculty and staff workload (a resource issue) if need to add time for supervision. The number of credits for candidates may also increase.
 - Could describe what some IHEs have done regarding this issue in guidance.
 - It is challenging to get supervisors out in the field.
 - One member wants intermediate clinical experiences incorporated into residencies.
 - Could intermediate clinical experiences be supervised by P-12 educators? This could be put into guidance. The group discussed the idea to replace “supervision by faculty” with “facilitation by someone from the partnership”. In NYC, the union does not allow teachers to supervise candidates.
 - Having supervising faculty is essential to having faculty involved in clinical experiences. Want to improve the performance of teachers. Deal with challenges later.
 - Put description of high-needs in guidance.
 - Where do residencies appear in the recommendations for the regulations? Residencies appear in the recommendations, but not explicitly; a waiver is not needed. Need to clarify in guidance how residencies appear in the regulation.
 - Assessment of the teacher candidates’ readiness to advance will be in guidance.
 - Multiple certification programs need to be addressed in the recommendations.
 - Candidate Support
 - Who selects the school-based teacher educator? Put in guidance to keep open for partners.
3. Provide feedback on the survey regarding the draft recommendations
- April explained that the co-chairs and subcommittee chairs revised the draft survey that was sent to the group prior to the last meeting. The survey is now shorter and streamlined for respondents. It also includes a mix of Likert-scale questions and open-ended prompts based on the feedback from the last meeting.
4. Determine the plan for regional meetings about the draft recommendations
- The regional meetings will:
 - take place across the state in Albany, Buffalo, Hudson Valley, Long Island, New York City (multiple meetings), North Country, Rochester, Southern Tier/Central, Syracuse;
 - be held in the late afternoon so that the P-12 community can participate;
 - be held at institutions of higher education and in school districts/BOCES; and
 - be scheduled for the end of January and February.
 - There will not be a work group meeting on February 15 because the regional meetings will be taking place during February, making the feedback from the field not available for review at a February meeting.
5. Review next steps
- Laura will send the group an email with information about the survey and regional meetings that can be shared with colleagues.
 - The co-chairs and subcommittee chairs will make a first pass at revising the draft recommendations based on feedback from the survey and regional meetings. Laura will send the revised draft recommendations to the group prior to the March meeting.

- The work group will finalize the recommendations based on the feedback from the survey and regional meetings at the March meeting.