



\*\*\*\*\* DRAFT 9-28-2016 \*\*\*\*\*

# **Guidance Document for the Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences for EPPs and District Partners**

**Funded by the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development,  
Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR) Grant**

## **Connecticut Workgroup:**

Suzanne Robinson, University of Kansas, CEEDAR Facilitator  
Georgette Nemr, Connecticut State Department of Education  
Joan Nicoll-Senft, Central Connecticut State University  
Louise Spear Swerling, Southern Connecticut State University  
Rosemary Tralli, Glastonbury Public Schools

DRAFT 9-28-2016

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
DRAFT 9-28-2016

Contents

Introduction	Page 3
How to use this document	Page 4
Principles followed in the development of this guide	Page 4
Role of practice in coursework, in structured field experience, in student teaching	Page 5
Evidence-based practice strategies & Table 1	Page 6
Shared responsibility and partnership between EPP faculty and school-based educators	Page 8
Defining quality partnerships	Page 8
Suggested planning processes	Page 9
Example sequence, roles and responsibilities in providing practice-based experiences & Table 2	Page 11
Planning tools for charting field experiences with EPP faculty	Page 13
Figure 1: Clinical experience planning template	Page 14
Considerations for designing and implementing field experiences & Table 3	Page 14
Final note	Page 18
Appendices listing	Page 18
References	Page 19
Glossary of terms	Page 20
Appendices	

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
DRAFT 9-28-2016

## Introduction

Reforming anything while implementing it is challenging at best, just like living in your house while renovating it. However, we all believe in improving how we train teachers to get us closer to the goal: *learner ready teachers on day one of teaching*.

Our work on the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR) grant is no minor task. It has been a five-year process. The goals of aligning and improving educator preparation systems in the state are complicated and time consuming. There are barriers, to be sure: institutional, philosophical and emotional. However, educator preparation programs (EPPs) and district representatives who have contributed to this work did so because they believe that this will improve what they do as individual faculty and district partners in preparing future teachers. The work of the Connecticut's CEEDAR team, in concert with the work of the Educator Preparation Advisory Council (EPAC), has encompassed many aspects of our state's educator preparation system simultaneously (e.g., data systems, initial teacher performance assessment, inclusion of evidence-based practices in preparation across a wide range of programs – general and special education, improving partnerships and practice opportunities, etc.). As Michael Fullan (2006) describes in his discussion on change, motivation is extremely important:

If you take any hundred or so books on change, the message all boils down to one word: motivation. If one's theory of action does not motivate people to put in the effort- individually and collectively- that is necessary to get results, improvement is not possible. Let me make two points.

Fullan goes on to state that of the seven core premises of change theory – motivation, capacity building, learning in context, changing context, a bias for reflective action, tri-level engagement and persistence and flexibility – in staying the course] are all about motivation and engagement– ie, they are about accomplishing the first premise [motivation], without which the change strategy will fail. (p. 32)

Reforms are not “quick fixes,” and require tremendous capacity building. We value the lessons learned from the EPP reform work within our state, across our institutions and across states – what Fullan calls “lateral capacity building.” We don't all approach improvement and change the same way, and our contexts vary widely, but the cross-institutional relationships (EPP, school districts and state) and the dialogue provide us important opportunities to think beyond our own roles to engage in this work collaboratively.

We look forward to seeing this work come to fruition not only in Connecticut but across the country.

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
DRAFT 9-28-2016

### **How to use this document**

This guidance document is designed to assist professionals within educator preparation programs (EPPs) and local education agencies (LEAs) who are involved in teacher preparation to develop a common vocabulary and an informed method of planning fieldwork experiences for teacher candidates.

This guide will provide information for university faculty and school-based educators on defining and planning field experience strategies that are aligned, carefully sequenced, practice-based. These strategies will aim to define roles and responsibilities of participants who can make meaningful contributions in developing the next generation of teachers.

### **Principles followed in the development of this guide**

1. Teacher preparation is a shared responsibility among school administrators, practicing teachers, and faculty within EPPs.
2. Collaboration among professionals in the field and professionals within EPPs improve preparation experiences and benefit teacher candidates.
3. Practice-based preparation improves teacher candidates' readiness to address diverse learning needs from the first day of their teaching careers.
4. Practice experiences occur throughout a preparation program, from beginning coursework to culminating student teaching.
5. Practice experiences are scaffolded carefully and thoughtfully to facilitate the development of confidence and success of teacher candidates addressing varied student needs.
6. Practice experiences are designed based on research on effectiveness and impact.
7. Educator preparation program and practice experiences are designed to be responsive to varied community and cultural contexts.
8. Educator preparation program improvement is iterative and ongoing; regular feedback on practice strategies, partnership agreements and configurations, responsiveness to context, etc. is solicited regularly and used to further improve the preparation programs.

We want to encourage those involved in designing and delivering teacher preparation to follow the tenets of:

- **Evidence-based instructional practice (EBP)** (i.e., determining what teacher candidates should learn in a preparation program should be based on valid research); and
- **Practice-based preparation** (i.e., ensuring that teacher candidates have substantive opportunities to engage and enact certain key teaching practices in carefully planned and scaffolded experiences – in coursework with thoughtfully designed practice activities, in fieldwork across a variety of placements, and in schools and with students - by the time they begin their careers as teachers).

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
DRAFT 9-28-2016

Teacher candidates need many opportunities to practice key aspects of teaching while learning about high quality teaching throughout an EPP. Student teaching, the culminating clinical experience that is typically required, is located at the end of the program, and is often the only practice activity in which there has been an investment in identifying learner outcomes with an aligned evaluation system. **However, student teaching is not the focus of this guidance document.**

As Richard Elmore (2004) says:

Improvement is more a function of learning to do the right things in the settings where you work.

Zeichner (2010) further identifies that:

Since the early days of teacher education programs, colleges and universities in the United States, scholars have argued against unguided school experience and for carefully planned and purposeful school experiences based on the quality of teacher learning that is associated with each.

**Therefore, this guide is about a commitment to increased quality practice opportunities *throughout* teacher preparation, and is focusing on structured fieldwork experiences that will occur *prior* to the culminating student teaching experience, to ensure that EPPs scaffold these opportunities from admission to student teaching, focusing on the critical outcomes and strategies for practice that lead the teacher candidate to be ready not only for student teaching, but for day one of teaching as fully certified teachers.**

### **Role of practice in coursework, in structured field experiences, in student teaching**

Practice is essential to improving and mastering specific techniques for all performance-based professions. Medicine, plumbing, cosmetology, and the law are examples of professions, like teaching, that require demonstrated performance skills as a component of obtaining a license to practice. Certainly in education, recommendations proliferate on increasing the opportunities for teacher candidates to develop their craft through improved, scaffolded, and extended practice opportunities (Ball, Sleep, Boerst, & Bass, 2009; Leko, Brownell, Sindelar, & Kiely, 2015; NCATE, 2010). However, research demonstrates that the way practice opportunities are designed **matters** in developing skilled practitioners. “Deliberate practice” is the term often used to differentiate better practice opportunities from other, less effective practice. Based on research from psychology, neuroscience, sports, and other disciplines where the study of excellence in performance is central, deliberate practice is defined as carefully sequenced and calibrated practice that builds on one’s current knowledge and skill in conjunction with performance feedback (Ericsson, 2014, Ericsson, Krampe, & Tesch-Romer, 1993). Given the limited time teacher candidates spend in preparation programs, utilizing available opportunities in carefully calibrated pedagogical knowledge acquisition activities aligned with pedagogical

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

application practice is critical. Therefore, it is important to understand what types of practice work best at different stages of teacher preparation and at different points in a program.

**Evidence-based Practice Strategies**

Research demonstrates that certain practice strategies are most effective within the contexts of different teacher preparation activities. What follows is a brief delineation of evidence-based practice strategies that are most applicable for:

- learning “*how to teach something or someone*” within courses,
- learning “*how to teach something or someone*” within structured field experiences, and
- practicing “*how to teach something or someone*” within the more immersive student teaching experience.

These three learning contexts represent the most frequent learning opportunities found in initial educator preparation experiences.

**Table 1: Evidence-based Practice Strategies\***

Evidence-based Strategies	Coursework	Fieldwork	Student Teaching
<b>Case-study instruction</b> – Use instructional case studies that exemplify a unique teaching/learning scenario in a particular context.	X		
<b>Micro-teaching</b> – Plan a learning activity and practice it with peers.	X		
<b>Virtual simulations</b> – Use digital simulations that utilize avatars to “practice” on.	X		
<b>University constructed teaching environments</b> – Practice in teaching/learning settings constructed by the preparation program faculty.	X	X	
<b>Field experiences aligned to coursework</b> – Guided observations or mini-practice situations in the field tied to a particular learning objective from courses. <b>See Sample Observation Guide in Appendix C.1.</b>	X	X	
<b>Video analysis</b> – Novice teacher or experienced teacher practice captured on video for use in critical dialogue about observed teaching/learning events. <b>See</b>		X	

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

Evidence-based Strategies	Coursework	Fieldwork	Student Teaching
<a href="#">sample Video Analysis Guide in Appendix C.2.</a>			
<b>Tutoring</b> – Candidate teaches a K-12 student in a one-on-one dyad to develop and practice a particular set of skills across a series of lessons. <a href="#">See sample Tutoring Guide in Appendix C.3.</a>		X	
<b>Lesson study</b> – Collaborative team of teacher candidates work together to analyze data, plan a lesson, each teach the lesson, and debrief about outcomes of the lesson design and implementation. <a href="#">See Lesson Study Guide in Appendix C.4.</a>		X	
<b>Coaching</b> – Observation and feedback provided to a novice by a “coach” (someone with specific <i>expertise</i> in whatever is being learned, or by a <i>peer</i> learning similar skills). <a href="#">See Observation/Coaching Guide for School-Based Practitioners in Appendix C.5.</a>		X	X
<b>Action/practitioner research</b> – Analysis of a teaching/learning sequence through the collection and analysis of baseline data and intervention data to understand cause and effect relationships.		X	X
<b>Deliberate practice</b> in specified, controlled ( <b>simplified</b> ) classroom contexts with feedback – Instructional responsibility that is limited to maximize learning and feedback for the teacher candidate without extraneous events complicating the experience.		X	X
<b>Deliberate practice</b> in unconstrained ( <b>complex</b> ) classroom contexts with feedback –Teacher candidate assumes all instructional responsibility to understand the complexity of student learning in groups, while addressing individual needs, over time, in various classroom and curricular arenas.			X

(\*See the CEEDAR and GTL practice guide [Learning to Teach: Practice-Based Preparation in Teacher Education, 2016](#) and [Learning to Teach: A Framework for Crafting High-Quality Practice Based Preparation, July 2016](#) for more information on evidence-based practice strategies and the research supporting their inclusion above.)

## Shared Responsibility and Partnership between EPP Faculty and School-Based Educators

We believe that shared and informed planning and decision-making among preparation faculty and supervisors from EPPs and school-based educators about teacher preparation experiences will benefit teacher candidates. The Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standard 2 states the following expectations for EPP and LEA partnerships on clinical experiences:

2.3 The provider [Educator Preparation Program] works with [School-Based] partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

## Defining Quality Partnerships

Research suggests that teacher candidates best learn how to teach when learning is in context and they interact with the materials and tools of teaching practice. They learn *from* teaching and by embedding within a broad community, including experienced teachers, other teacher candidates, teacher educators, and students (Darling-Hammond, Hammerness, Grossman, Rust & Shulman, 2005). Thus the **quality** of each LEA and EPP partnership is of great importance.

A report by the blue ribbon panel on clinical preparation and partnerships for improved student learning commissioned by NCATE (2010) recommended that "School districts, preparation programs, teacher unions, and state policy makers must form strategic partnerships based on the recognition that none can fully do the job alone. Each partner's needs can be met better by defining clinically based teacher preparation as common work for which they share responsibility, authority, and accountability covering all aspects of program development and implementation," (p. 6). The authors of the NCATE report also acknowledge that partnerships exist along a continuum of partnership development that is linked to the development of the preparation program's and district's shared vision of partnership outcomes, institutional resources, identification of mutually beneficial goals, and ultimately systemic changes in policy and practice in the partnering institutions. In other words, partnerships will vary in level of intensity and scope, but regardless, attention must be paid to fostering quality collaboration.



Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
DRAFT 9-28-2016

Quality indicators for consideration in partnership development (King, 2014) can be grouped within the following categories:

1. Partnership vision
2. Institutional leadership
3. Communication and collaboration
4. Joint ownership and accountability for results
5. System alignment, integration, and sustainability
6. Response to local context

In the references list, we provide a link to the *Partnership Effectiveness Continuum* (King, 2014) which includes a rubric that can be used to direct and assess partnership development and quality.

### **Suggested Planning Processes**

One resource available for facilitating EPP self-assessment or faculty dialogue about the design of clinical experiences is the [TPA Model for Assessing Clinical Teacher Preparation](#) (see references). This tool may point to gaps in clinical experiences that could focus the planning and reform of these clinical activities across programs and with LEA partners.

An intended outcome of shared planning between preparation faculty and school based educators and school leaders is to ensure that pedagogical knowledge acquisition focused on in courses in EPPs will be tightly linked to application in LEA classrooms and with students.

EPPs vary depending on age of intended students (elementary or secondary), discipline (content or specialization), and level of license (initial, advanced, specialized). Also, educator preparation programs are structured differently depending on undergraduate or graduate education contexts. Regardless, all educator preparation programs move along a sequence from beginning, to middle, and end of the program leading to acquisition and demonstration of the competencies that a teacher candidate needs before being recommended for certification or licensure.

Using the construct of beginning, middle, and end, we recommend that educator preparation program designers think about:

- Beginning practice experiences might be more constrained (smaller or more focused) and guided (carefully scaffolded), and connected to knowledge development activities that occur in classes joined with, or separate from, practice sites.
- Middle program practice experiences will broaden and deepen teacher candidate expertise building on program focus and increase in complexity.
- Late in program practice experiences should continue to provide the candidate structure, guidance, and feedback, but increase the complexity of teaching experiences to include

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
DRAFT 9-28-2016

the myriad and overlapping responsibilities and decisions an in-service teacher encounters in a typical day or week (e.g., managing groups of students, addressing differing student needs individually and simultaneously, transitions, communication and collaboration responsibilities, etc.).

It is recommended that all stages incorporate partnership and collaboration between the EPP faculty and school-based educators in planning, executing, and evaluating the quality of the experiences.

Planning Field Experiences:

- Constitute a planning team made up of EPP faculty and LEA partner representatives (experienced teachers and administrators from districts where field experiences will occur).
- Think about national, state and local teaching standards to be met.
- Explore data about state educator needs, past graduates' performance, etc.
- Identify organizing beliefs that will become the context in which the program is situated and to which all clinical experiences will be linked (e.g., inclusive education, culturally responsive education, urban education, etc.).
- Clarify program unifying practices that will be emphasized throughout the program.
- Define the evidence-based practices that will inform methods class content across varied domains of instruction (e.g., literacy, mathematics, behavior management, etc.).
- Consider the flow of experiences candidates will experience to assist them in developing desired dispositions, knowledge, and skills to become a confident and effective beginning teacher.

Implementing and Evaluating Field Experiences:

- Ensure that there is ongoing dialogue between and among candidates, EPP faculty and school-based educators on evolving understanding of teaching ALL students effectively.
- Provide teacher candidates the criteria and assessment tools that will be used to evaluate their growth across the full range of field experiences (e.g., observations, analysis of lessons and teaching-their practice and others, etc.) so that all understand the expected growth trajectory of candidates.
- Develop strategies and tools for providing feedback to candidates, and communicate and delineate roles and responsibilities of the fieldwork supervisor and host teacher in providing feedback to the teacher candidate.
- Evaluate whether experiences were appropriately sequenced, spaced and repeating, provided sufficient practice with time for candidates to reflect with feedback, and practice again.

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

**Table 2: Example Sequence, Roles & Responsibilities in Providing Practice-Based Experiences**

<b>Beginning Experiences:</b> Ensure appropriate scaffolding of the practice based opportunities and field experience strategies across semesters or courses to ensure both knowledge and skill development as candidates begin their preparation experience.			
<b>Beginning of Program Experiences</b>	<b>Practice-Based Experience Strategy</b>	<b>Roles and Responsibilities of Partners</b>	
		EPP faculty	School Based Educators
	<b>Case studies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instructors develop realistic case studies with problems of practice embedded within full and rich characterizations of children, their families, and communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review case studies and verify the accuracy of the scenarios</li> </ul>
	<b>Guided observation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop observation expectations and guide in collaboration with LEA partner</li> <li>Agree of feedback strategy and construct a collaborative structure to provide it to candidate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop observation expectations and guide in collaboration with EPP partner</li> <li>Provide appropriate context and model</li> <li>Agree on feedback strategy and schedule to provide candidate</li> </ul>
	<b>Case studies Micro teaching</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instructors develop realistic case studies with problems of practice embedded within full and rich characterizations of children, their families, and communities</li> <li>Develop evidence-based micro teaching experiences tied to course content</li> </ul>	N/A
	<b>Tutoring experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify instructional evidence-based and high-leverage practices candidates will utilize in tutoring linked to student needs.</li> <li>Develop tutoring partners to improve feedback structure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers assist in setting up tutoring groups, identify student instructional needs, and appropriate evidence-based practices.</li> <li>Teachers provide feedback to candidate tutoring teams with faculty partner.</li> </ul>

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

<b>Mid-Program Experiences:</b> Plan knowledge development and field experiences to build on prior knowledge developed earlier in the program and increase complexity in experiences.			
	<b>Practice-Based Experience Strategy</b>	<b>Roles and Responsibilities of Partners</b>	
		EPP faculty	School Based Educators
<b>Mid-Program Experiences</b>	<b>Micro-teaching</b>  <b>Virtual experience (TeachLive) in managing class and individual behavior</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop evidence-based micro-teaching experiences tied to course content.</li> <li>Work with virtual simulators on classroom and individual behavior management scenarios.</li> </ul>	N/A
	<b>Tutoring experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify instructional evidence-based and high-leverage practices candidates will utilize in tutoring linked to student needs.</li> <li>Develop tutoring partners to improve feedback structure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist in setting up tutoring groups, identify student instructional needs, and appropriate evidence-based practices.</li> <li>Provide feedback to candidate tutoring teams with faculty partner.</li> </ul>
	<b>Lesson study</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty facilitate teams of candidates who work collaboratively to: (1) analyze student data, standards and curriculum; (2) plan a lesson based on the analysis; (3) implement instruction with assigned students; (4) analyze impact of instruction on student learning; and (5) debrief and discuss subsequent instruction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May or may not be involved in facilitating lesson study.</li> </ul>
	<b>Practicum or Full immersion teaching experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instructional coaching strategy utilized, or</li> <li>Focused feedback strategies used tied to teaching performance rubric</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shared instructional coaching strategy utilized, or</li> <li>Shared and focused feedback strategies tied to teaching performance rubric are used in coordination with EPP supervisor</li> </ul>

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

<b>End of program experiences:</b> Plan field experiences, practica, and student teaching that allows candidates to experience the full complexity of teaching diverse students representing varied communities and needs.			
<b>End of Program Experiences</b>	<b>Practice-Based Experience Strategy</b>	<b>Roles and Responsibilities of Partners</b>	
		EPP faculty	School Based Educators
	<b>Lesson study</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty facilitate teams of candidates who work collaboratively to: (1) analyze student data, standards and curriculum; (2) plan a lesson based on the analysis; (3) implement instruction with assigned students; (4) analyze impact of instruction on student learning; and (5) debrief and discuss subsequent instruction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May or may not be involved in facilitating lesson study.</li> </ul>
	<b>Practicum or Full immersion teaching experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instructional coaching strategy utilized, or</li> <li>Focused feedback strategies used tied to teaching performance rubric</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shared instructional coaching strategy utilized, or</li> <li>Shared and focused feedback strategies tied to teaching performance rubric are used in coordination with EPP supervisor</li> </ul>
	<b>Student Teaching / Culminating experience</b>		

**Planning tools for charting field experiences with EPP faculty**

As part of the development of this guidance document, a field experience planning template (see Figure 1 below) was created and piloted with two EPPs. After discussion of the examples among the faculty developing them and the LEA representatives who might receive them, it was agreed that the field experience template information would be helpful to faculty, candidates and the district level as well as school level educators using it.

The blank clinical experience planning template, and the two examples are provided in Appendix B. The purpose of the planning document an EPP and their LEA partners create is twofold:

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

1. To map the field experiences for a particular program in which candidates will participate, where it falls within the program and course sequence, and what the roles and responsibilities for school based educators and faculty supervisors will be.
2. To outline for preparation program faculty the scope and sequence of field experiences to use in communicating with partner school district personnel so that all parties understand the expectations for field experiences, what comes before and after a particular experience, expected candidate outcomes, and how the candidate will be evaluated on those identified outcomes and by whom.

**Figure 1: Clinical Experience Planning Template**

<b>Clinical Experience Planning Template</b>					
<b>SEMESTER 1 of XXX Program (undergraduate or graduate and year)</b>					
<b>Course and Description</b>	<b>Objectives for clinical experience</b>	<b>Field Activities and Strategy Employed</b>	<b>Assessments and Standards to be Met</b>	<b>School Based Educator Responsibilities</b>	<b>Candidate Supervisor Responsibilities</b>

**Considerations for Designing and Implementing Field Experiences**

We propose five critical components to designing and implementing field experiences. The following table 3 organizes the design and implementation considerations into five groups:

- design of field experiences across planned programs,
- development of specific field experiences,
- coordination of shared responsibility between the EPP and LEA,
- communication with and between the EPP and LEA, and
- professional learning and calibration of faculty and school-based educators.

The design and implementation of these components involves the representatives of an EPP and the LEA, and of course candidates:

- EPP administration and committees involved in the clinical experience or curriculum designs and governance,
- Faculty, including full-time, adjunct and clinical experience supervisors, and
- LEA educators, including teachers, school leaders and central office administrators.

Table 3 below provides recommendations and examples of roles and responsibilities of EPP faculty and LEA educators.

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

**Table 3: Considerations for Designing and Implementing Field Experiences**

Field Experience Design Consideration	Recommendations	EXAMPLE Roles & Responsibilities for EPP Faculty and School-Based Educators
<b><i>Design and sequence of field experiences within courses and across planned programs</i></b>	<p>Planned program field experiences should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be sequenced within a semester or across semesters to address coordination, alignment, and scaffolding of practice-based outcomes.</li> <li>Be directly linked to course learning objectives and content acquisition.</li> <li>Require teacher candidates to engage in and demonstrate meaningful teaching and “high leverage” skills rather than general awareness and observation of the classroom context.</li> <li>Be “owned and directed” by the program rather than individual faculty who might want to develop unique field experiences tied to his or her class.</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>EPP Faculty:</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Faculty must collaborate to identify practice-based strategies (see Table 1 for description) for each stage of candidate development and first teach, model or apply them in their individual classes and then in respective field experiences. Through collaborative review of the continuum of field experiences, redundancies and gaps can be identified.</li> <li>2. Faculty must communicate with each other and coordinate practice so that the experience of the teacher candidate moving from course to course and among field experiences build candidate knowledge and skills in a logical way to increase competence and confidence (and not overwhelm).</li> <li>3. Faculty need to include school-based educators in developing and/or providing feedback on the continuum of program field experiences to ensure adherence to EBPs and school contexts in which teacher-candidates will practice.</li> </ol> <p><b><i>School-Based Educators:</i></b></p> <p>School-based educators, including school leaders, must be included in EPP program development, particularly field experiences, a critical element of building EPP/LEA partnerships.</p>
<b><i>Development of specific field experiences</i></b>	<p>Practice-based activities included within each field experience should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be defined by national, state and institutional standards and focus on building critical instructional competencies.</li> <li>Define the roles and responsibilities of the school-based educator, EPP supervising faculty, and the candidate.</li> <li>Delineate the formative and summative assessment standards for candidate demonstration of competency.</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>EPP Faculty:</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Faculty within and across individual programs should collaborate to design sufficient field experience opportunities that allow candidates to develop and practice the application of knowledge and pedagogical skills from beginning of the program up to student teaching.</li> <li>2. To the extent possible, by time and credit load, faculty should consider using semester-based (as opposed to course-based) field experiences that span the timeframe and within which candidates can demonstrate application of knowledge and skill from multiple course perspectives and outcomes. This economy of scale allows ease of placement and focus for candidates within a semester and a</li> </ol>

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

Field Experience Design Consideration	Recommendations	EXAMPLE Roles & Responsibilities for EPP Faculty and School-Based Educators
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Coordination of shared responsibility between EPPs and LEAS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the learning trajectory of the teacher candidate with appropriate, sequenced, feedback strategies applied and shared with all school-based educators involved with the candidate.</li> </ul> <p><i>See Figure 1 or Appendix B.1. Clinical Experience Planning Template.</i></p>	<p>specific school or district setting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Discuss with school-based educators and come to agreement that the tasks used to assess candidates are:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. directly aligned with course and program objectives;</li> <li>b. measure critical and substantive demonstration of a set of skills that scaffold; and</li> <li>c. build candidate pedagogical knowledge and skills described in program, institutional and national standards.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><b>School-Based Educators:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. District partners should ensure that they are part of a coordinated planning process with an EPP around candidate placements.</li> <li>2. Teacher(s) or school leader(s) must take into account the goals of the educator preparation program and the practices they are instilling in their teacher-candidates, as well as the programs and practices supported by the district when planning with the EPPs. This behavior will open the door for learning, conversation, debate, and change to occur in both environments.</li> </ol>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Coordination of shared responsibility between EPPs and LEAS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality, aligned field work requires recognition of a reciprocal, collaborative relationship between educator preparation programs and fieldwork sites, and therefore, among all of the professionals who work within these entities.</li> <li>• Delineate specific responsibilities of a designated IHE field placement entity (or entities, e.g., by department or program) at the IHE, and likewise, at the partner district(s) and identify and confirm yearly specific timelines for field placement practices.</li> <li>• Identify teacher candidate responsibilities relative to expectations of communication, conduct, dress, privacy, etc. and confirm shared expectations.</li> </ul>	<p><b>EPP Faculty:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure all necessary parties at the EPP (e.g., curriculum committees, field experience/student teaching coordinating office, professional development school coordinating council, etc.) are informed about required field experiences.</li> <li>2. The EPP must be the point of contact with the identified LEA contact in making placements rather than having candidates make their own placements and contacting the LEA central office, school principal or individual teachers.</li> </ol> <p><b>School-Based Educators:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure all necessary parties at the LEA (e.g., student teaching/field experience coordinator, district curriculum directors, school administrators, etc.) are informed about required field experiences.</li> <li>2. A teacher or school leader should understand field experience timeframes, candidate expectations for demonstration of knowledge and skills at key points of the program, the outcomes to be supported, and who the EPP contact is.</li> </ol>



Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

Field Experience Design Consideration	Recommendations	EXAMPLE Roles & Responsibilities for EPP Faculty and School-Based Educators
<b><i>Communication with and between EPP and LEA partners and candidates</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All members of the partnership should be knowledgeable about the entire teacher preparation sequence of courses and clinical experiences. <i>See Figure 1 for Planning Template.</i></li> <li>Communication structures and strategies in place should be revisited and updated annually based on EPP, LEA and candidate need.</li> <li>All members of the partnership should understand their role in the preparation program, what comes before and after their participation, and what the teacher candidate should accomplish when with that partner.</li> <li>Resources and information about the partnership should be easily accessible in a common site for all (faculty, school-based educators and leaders, and candidates) to access.</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>EPP Faculty:</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop and enact a communication plan that includes participation by faculty at the EPP, adjunct instructors for the EPP, teacher candidates, LEA district and building administrators and host practicing teachers.</li> <li>2. Revisit and improve the communication plan on a yearly basis.</li> <li>3. Be informed about the program sequence, and their role in providing their particular component of the aligned course/clinical experiences.</li> </ol> <p><b><i>School-Based Educators:</i></b></p> <p>School leaders and host teachers should participate with the EPP in developing and implementing the communication plan to ensure consistent and accurate information for all parties.</p>
<b><i>Professional learning and calibration of EPP faculty and LEA educators on assessment standards and feedback</i></b>	<p>EPP faculty and school-based educators supervising candidates should engage in dialogue and collaborative discussions about various protocol and assessment expectations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The outcomes for the field experiences as based on teaching and content standards.</li> <li>Candidate formative and summative assessments that will be used to measure competencies.</li> <li>Calibration and application of the rubrics and proficiency levels for the assessment task.</li> <li>Use of assessment data for candidate feedback and, if necessary, remediation.</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>EPP Faculty:</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide professional learning opportunities for faculty about practice strategies, feedback strategies, and partnership expectations.</li> <li>2. Engage in professional dialogue to ensure that there is common understanding and agreement on assessment tasks and performance expectations for the various sections of the same fieldwork experience in the program and across programs.</li> </ol> <p><b><i>School-Based Educators:</i></b></p> <p>Engage in professional learning or dialogue opportunities about practice strategies, feedback strategies, partnership expectations and assessment of candidate competency.</p>

## **Final Note**

The faculty and school-based educators who contributed to this document acknowledge that this is not an exhaustive roadmap for developing, implementing and evaluating field experience. Our hope is that this provides a guide for EPP faculty and district partners to work collaboratively to develop quality practice-based training and fieldwork experiences that prepare our future teachers to be successful in student teaching but also to be “learner ready on day one of teaching.”

## **Appendices**

- A. ***Connecticut “Learner Ready Day 1” Definition***
  
- B. **Field Experience Planning Template and Examples**
  - B.1. Blank Clinical Experience Planning Template
  - B.2. Central Connecticut State University, MAT Program
  - B.3. Southern Connecticut State University, Undergraduate Special Education
  
- C. **Example tools for Field Experience Strategies Discussed in Tables 1 and 2**
  - C.1. Sample Observation Guide
  - C.2. Video Analysis Guide (CCSU)
  - C.3. Tutoring Guide (SCSU)
  - C.4. Lesson Study Guide Materials (TBD)
  - C.5. Observation/Coaching Guide for School-Based Educators (TBD)

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
DRAFT 9-28-2016

**References**

- Ball, D.L., Sleep, L., Boerst, T.A. & Bass, H. (2009). Combining the development of practice and the practice of development in teacher education. *The Elementary School Journal*, 109 (5), 458-474.
- Benedict, A., Holdheide, L., Brownell, M., & Foley, A. (2016) Learning to teach practice-based preparation in teacher education. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research, Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, and Gainesville, FL: University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform Center. Retrieved from [http://cedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Learning\\_To\\_Teach.pdf](http://cedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Learning_To_Teach.pdf)
- Benedict, A., Foley, A., Holdheide, L., Brownell, M., & Kamman, M. (2016) Learning to teach: A framework for crafting high-quality, practice-based opportunities. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research, Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, and Gainesville, FL: University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform Center. Retrieved from <http://cedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Learning-to-Teach-Rubric.pdf>
- CAEP (2015). *CAEP Accreditation Standards*. Washington DC: Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-2>.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F. & Shulman, L. (2005) The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & Bransford, J (Eds), *Preparing teachers for a changing world*. pp. 390-341, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Elmore, R. F. (2004) *School Reform from the Inside Out: Policy, Practice, and Performance*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2014). *The road to excellence: The acquisition of expert performance in the arts and sciences, sports, and games*. Florence, KY: Psychology Press.
- Ericsson, K.A., Krampe, R.T., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 100(3), 363-406.
- Fullan, M. (2007). Change theory as a force for school improvement. In *Intelligent leadership* (pp. 27-39). Springer Netherlands.
- King, C.L., (2014). *Partnership effectiveness continuum: A research-based tool for use in developing, assessing, and improving partnerships*. Waltham, MA: Education Development Center, Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/Quality-Measures-Partnership-Effectiveness-Continuum.pdf>

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

Leko, M.M., Brownell, M.T., Sindelar, P.T. & Kiely, M.T. (2015). Envisioning the future of special education personnel preparation in a standards-based era. *Exceptional Children*, 82(1), 25-43.

NCATE (2010). *Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice: a National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zzeiB1OoqPk%3D&tabid=7>

Rutherford, Paula (2005). *The 21st Century Mentor's Handbook*. Alexandria, VA: Just Ask Publications, Inc.

TPA (2014). *TPA Model for Assessing Clinical Teacher Preparation*. Teacher Prep Analytics. Retrieved from <http://teacherpreparationanalytics.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/TPA-Clinical-Preparation-Assessment-v1.23.14.pdf>

Zeichner, K. (2010) Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61 (1-2), 89-99.

**Glossary of terms**

Clinical experiences can occur at each stage of the teacher preparation process. Different terms are used to describe these events, and often, similar events are identified by different vocabulary. For the purposes of this guidance document, terms are defined and those we will use are highlighted with their definitions as used with Connecticut Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) and P-12 Public Schools.

Term	Definition
<b>Students[1]</b>	Defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools including, but not limited to, students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin.
<b>Candidate<sup>2</sup></b>	Individuals admitted to, or enrolled in, programs for the initial or advanced preparation of teachers, or other school professionals.
<b>Cooperating teacher</b>	A cooperating teacher is assigned by the school district in collaboration with the preparing institution to support a <b>student</b> teacher during the student teaching placement. Like mentor teachers, a cooperating teacher is a certified teacher selected by the school district who has completed state-mandated training and has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a provisional or professional educator certificate and a minimum of three years of</li> </ul>

Connecticut CEEDAR Grant Working Group  
**Guidance Document for Design and Implementation of Practice-Based Field Experiences**  
 DRAFT 9-28-2016

Term	Definition
	teaching experience, including at least one year of experience in the district in which they are presently employed. §C.G.S. 10-220a(d)
<b>Diversity<sup>2</sup></b>	Differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area. The types of diversity necessary for addressing the elements on candidate interactions with diverse faculty, candidates, and P-12 students are stated in the rubrics for those elements.
<b>School-based educators</b>	School-based practitioners in P-12 schools who provide instruction, supervision, and direction for candidates during field-based assignments.
<b>Partnership<sup>1</sup></b>	Mutually beneficial agreement among various partners in which all participating members engage in and contribute to goals for the preparation of education professionals. This may include examples such as pipeline initiatives, Professional Development Schools, and partner networks.
<b>Educator Preparation Program Faculty<sup>2</sup></b>	Those individuals employed by a college or university, including graduate teaching assistants, who teach one or more courses in education, provide services to candidates (e.g., advising), supervise clinical experiences, or administer some portion of the unit. See adjunct faculty, clinical faculty, full-time faculty, higher education faculty, part-time faculty, and P-12 school personnel.
<b>Educator Preparation Program<sup>2</sup></b>	A planned sequence of courses and experiences for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to work in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade settings. Programs may lead to a degree, a recommendation for a state license, both, or neither.
<b>Structured Field Experiences<sup>2</sup></b>	Activities designed to introduce candidates to increasingly greater levels of responsibility in the roles for which they are preparing. These activities are specifically designed to help candidates attain identified knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards.
<b>Student Teaching</b>	The culminating full-time, supervised clinical practice experience, typically at the end of a planned program of teacher preparation leading to certification in which a candidate must demonstrate institutional, state and national standards and competencies that lead to the determination of eligibility to complete the preparation program and for recommendation for certification. By state statute, student teachers must be placed with a “cooperating teacher” who has completed state-mandated training to serve in such a role.

[1] Excerpted from, in part or in whole, from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standards (2013).

[2] Excerpted from, in part or in whole, from the National Council For Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standards (2000, 2008).