
4D

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Field Experience Requirements for the Preliminary Teaching Credential

Executive Summary: This agenda item continues the discussion of the range of recommendations presented by the TAP Panel. In this item, the Commission will continue to examine the TAP recommendations related to field experience for possible staff direction and/or adoption.

Policy Questions: Do the proposed recommendations presented in the agenda item reflect Commission priorities?

Recommended Action: That the Commission discuss and adopt or provide direction concerning the recommendations as appropriate.

Presenters: Teri Clark, Director, and Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- ◆ Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

September 2013

Field Experience Requirements for the Preliminary Teaching Credential

Introduction

At the August 2013 Commission meeting, staff presented a plan for addressing the 40 recommendations made by the Teacher Preparation Advisory (TAP) Panel concerning educator preparation (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-08/2013-08-3A.pdf>) for Commission consideration. The panel was established by the Commission to review and make recommendations concerning potential improvements in teacher preparation in California. The membership of the Panel is included as Appendix A. Panel members worked over a fifteen month period and held a total of seven meetings, with the final two-day meeting in February 2013. The Commission took action on a number of the recommendations and agreed on a work plan and directed staff to return with further discussion of some of the remaining recommendations. This agenda item continues the discussion begun at the August 2013 Commission meeting regarding the recommendations from the Panel focused on field experience required for preliminary teaching credential candidates. The Commission is asked to provide input and direction on a number of key considerations as it relates to requirements for fieldwork for all preliminary teacher preparation candidates.

Background

The August 2013 Commission meeting focused attention on the critical issue of ensuring that candidates for preliminary teaching credentials have rigorous and meaningful field experiences that allow them sufficient opportunities to apply and master the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective new teachers. (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-08/2013-08-3B.pdf>) In recent years, the educator preparation and research communities as well as policymakers have refocused attention on the importance of fieldwork and clinical practice to high quality teacher preparation and to ensuring that all new teachers are classroom ready at the end of their preparation programs.

The August 2013 Commission meeting included presentations by three Commission-approved multiple and single subject preparation programs (Stanford University, the University of California, Irvine, and California State University, Chico) regarding the fieldwork and clinical practice components of their programs. Information was shared about the length of their fieldwork and clinical practice component, the types of support provided to candidates, the criteria for selection of sites and master teachers, the training provided to personnel supporting candidates during this component, how the programs ensured the connection between the coursework and practice, and how they established effective partnerships with their K-12 school sites.

In addition to the presentations, the August 2013 agenda item included information about current research on the importance of the fieldwork component in teacher preparation which suggests that teachers who become teachers of record without having completed carefully structured and

supervised field experiences are less effective in promoting student learning in their first years of teaching (Boyd, et al.2008; Zeichner & Conklin, 2005). Some of the research suggests that states should require all individuals who are seeking initial licenses to complete a minimum amount of carefully supervised field experience prior to becoming legally responsible for a classroom of students.

The August agenda item also discussed the national focus on the importance of fieldwork. In particular, the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel report (2010) argued that fieldwork be at the core of teacher preparation and integrated into all aspects of teacher education. The NCATE panel noted that extensive clinical experience affords multiple opportunities for candidates to gain deeper understandings of the teaching profession, extends possibilities for collaboration and ensures a reasonable timeframe and opportunities for the review of teacher candidates' practice and their impact on students.

TAP Panel Recommendations

The TAP Panel included two recommendations intended to strengthen the fieldwork component:

Recommendation 13. *The Commission should set minimum requirements for field experiences and provide greater clarity and specificity about minimum requirements for the types of field experiences, components of field experiences, and duration.*

Recommendation 14. *The Commission should revise the current Preliminary program standards addressing field experience and the quality of cooperating teachers and university supervisors. The revised standards need to delineate more clearly the Commission's expectations.*

In making the first recommendation, the TAP panel provided a strong rationale. Below is an excerpt from the TAP panel's rationale (For the full text of the rationale, see Appendix B).

Establishing minimum standards that extend beyond one grading period and two weeks (which in some LEAs could amount to as little as three weeks of experience) would better guide teacher preparation programs in the development of the field experiences needed for high quality teacher preparation. In addition, other aspects of the field experience standards should be examined and enhanced in the areas of observations, student teaching and community interactions. Stronger and more rigorous expectations should be included about the types, intensity and duration of experiences candidates have teaching English learners. Similarly, more clarity should be given to the definition of what candidates experience with respect to the different phases of the school year. Finally, changes to these standards should address the perennial tension in our teacher preparation programs between the background experiences and knowledge of the candidates and the social, cultural and linguistic contexts in which they will be teaching, especially at the beginning stages of their careers. Despite concerted efforts to diversify our teaching force, there remains a racial imbalance between our students and their teachers. While recruitment efforts should continue in earnest, the standards should be augmented to require programs to provide field experiences that evidence ways in which their candidates acquire knowledge of community resources and assets as

well as skills in integrating this knowledge into the curriculum and classroom experiences. These changes should not be prescriptive and should allow program sponsors to develop program responses that take their own institutional and other contexts into account. But currently the standards are so open to interpretation that they do not truly set a standard for the program sponsors that reflects what is increasingly agreed upon as high quality field experience.

The second recommendation specifically addressed those educators who help support and guide the work of the candidate in the field. The TAP panel expressed its concern that the Commission's current standards are insufficient to ensure that all candidates are supported in a manner that is optimal and that results in the highest quality field experience for candidates.

Excerpt of the rationale for this recommendation is as follows:

Enhancing the current standards for cooperating teachers and university supervisors can ensure availability, support, and a positive field experience for teacher candidates.

Linda Darling-Hammond states, "often, the clinical side of teacher education has been fairly haphazard, depending on the idiosyncrasies of loosely selected placements with little guidance about what happens in them and little connections to university work" (2009, p. 11)...

Central to promoting standards for cooperating teachers is providing support to cooperating teachers. Currently, the program standards indicate that cooperating teachers should hold an appropriate credential and have a minimum of three years of experience teaching in California. Similarly, the university supervisor plays a critical role in the learning-to-teach process as they often are the only link cooperating teachers have with the university. University supervisors are representatives of the university, provide invaluable support to teacher candidates and cooperating teachers, and are often the first responders in terms of support and knowledge of what occurs during field experience. It is important to ensure university supervisors are chosen for their abilities to represent the university, support teacher candidates and aide cooperating teachers in providing a quality experience for teacher candidates. Currently, the requirements for university supervisors are to receive ongoing professional development concerning TPEs, responsibilities, and expectations for supervision of candidates. The current standards also state supervisors should be experienced, understand current theory and practice, model collegial practices, and promote reflection...

Current Commission Standards Related to Field Experience

As was discussed in the August 2013 Commission agenda item on this topic, the Commission standards require all programs engaged in the preparation of teachers to provide fieldwork experiences to their candidates. Common Standard 7 and Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standards 14 (Multiple/Single Subject) and 15 (Education Specialist) address fieldwork expectations and are included in Appendix C. Together these standards establish expectations for length, type and range of experience as well as expectations related to personnel

supporting the candidate through the experiences such as the selection, training, and evaluation of cooperating teachers and supervisors.

Program Standards, adopted over a decade ago, set guidelines for clinical practice for single subject, multiple subject, and education specialists. The portion of the standards that address length calls for “one K-12 grading period, including a full-day teaching assignment of at least two weeks.”

Data on Field Experience

The August 2013 Commission agenda item on this topic also includes data from California institutions collected as part of the federal Title II reporting process. These data indicate that the current fieldwork and clinical practice components vary widely in terms of amount and nature of candidate experiences. The Supervised Clinical Experience section of the Title II process requires reporting data on (i) average number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to student teaching, (ii) average number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required for student teaching, (iii) number of full time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year, (iv) number of adjunct faculty (IHE and Pre K-12 staff) supervising clinical experience during this academic year, and (v) number of students in supervised clinical experience during this academic year.

The Commission’s 2011-12 Title II report found that the average number of clock hours required by institutions (traditional student teaching pathways only) prior to student teaching ranged from 40 to 480 with a mode of 60 hours. The average number of clock hours required for student teaching ranged widely from 135 hours to 1,600 hours with a mode of 480 hours. The data indicated that approximately 15% of programs in California required less than 399 hours for student teaching while about 37% required more than 600 hours. Nearly half the programs (48%) required between 400 and 599 hours.

New Developments in Teacher Preparation: The Potential Impact of SB 5 on Fieldwork

While the Commission’s standards related to fieldwork set minimum expectations around types of experiences for candidates such as requiring candidates to experience all phases of the school year and include opportunities to teach English learners, some preparation programs have argued that the one year restriction (“unit cap”) has made it difficult to employ some effective strategies for ensuring high quality field experiences in California. Aligning residency programs, for example, with the current fieldwork standards within the one year cap, when residency models are typically a one year placement, make implementing this pathway challenging at best. Some institutions have argued that the unit cap has prevented candidates from experiencing both breadth and depth of fieldwork experiences that are critically important to effective teaching practices. The passage of SB 5 (Padilla, Chap. 171, Stats. 2013), which eliminated the one year restriction and requires that programs be no more than 2 years in length, may provide some much needed flexibility in allowing institutions to implement field experience models and experiences that are known to be effective in preparing candidates to be classroom ready.

Commission Discussion

The Commission's discussion of appropriate requirements for field work and clinical practice to be provided all candidates within teacher preparation programs will help inform future efforts to update and strengthen preliminary educator preparation standards. To assist in this discussion, the Commission may want to consider the following policy questions:

Does the Commission support the establishment of a minimum number of hours for field experiences for all approved preparation programs as recommended by the Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel? If so, does the Commission have further direction to provide the standards writing panel?

Does the Commission support the concept of delineating more clearly the Commission's expectations with respect to the expectations for field experience and the quality of the cooperating teachers and university supervisors as recommended by the Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel? If so, in what ways?

Should the Commission make changes to the length, level, or types of field and/or clinical practice experiences that are required of candidates?

Should the Commission's standards be more specific as to the criteria for selection of clinical sites as well as for the criteria for selection of, and training for, the personnel responsible for supporting candidates during their field experience?

Does the Commission believe that other revisions are necessary to the next iteration of the teacher preparation program standards related to field experiences?

Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends the following:

- That the Commission establish a minimum number of field experience hours that candidates must complete prior to being recommended for a preliminary teaching credential or direct the standards writing panel to recommend a minimum number of fieldwork hours within the revised standards. Staff suggests the Commission consider establishing a 500 hour minimum.
- That the Commission direct the standards writing panel to more explicitly identify the important aspects of what constitutes a high quality field experience, and take into account best practices and new and changing context (such as residency models). In doing so, the panel should reconsider whether some of the requirements in the current standards should remain or whether they might impede a high quality field experience (for example, the requirement for multiple settings, two grade levels, etc.).
- That the Commission direct the standards writing panel to be more explicit about the expectations related to cooperating teachers. Examples of areas in which the Commission may wish to be more explicit include:
 - Identifying knowledge and skills required for cooperating teachers related to their roles as instructional models and mentors.

- Identifying the required components of training for cooperating teachers that adequately identify their role in mentoring and assisting in candidates' growth and development.
- Identifying required components of effective evaluation systems that institutions must employ in evaluating effectiveness of their cooperating teachers.
- Ensuring that cooperating teachers are fully knowledgeable about program goals, objectives, and candidate expectations including elements of the TPA.
- That the Commission direct the standards writing panel to be more explicit about the expectations related to program supervisors. Examples of areas in which the Commission may wish to be more explicit include:
 - Identifying the knowledge and skills related to current initiatives and realities of public school teachers.
 - Identifying the required components of training for supervisors that adequately reflect their role in candidates growth and development.
 - Identifying required components of effective evaluation systems that institutions must employ in evaluating the effectiveness of their program supervisors.

Next Steps

Should the Commission provide direction and/or take action on this topic, information will be provided regarding the Commission's direction and/or action(s) to the writing panel that will develop proposed revised standards for educator preparation.

Appendix A
Membership of the Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel (TAP)

TAP Panel Members	Employer	Rep.
Janet Kliegl, Superintendent (retired)	Lindsay Unified School District	ACSA
Jose Cintron, Faculty	CSU Sacramento	CTA
Nancy Farnan, Interim Associate Dean for Faculty Development, Research, & Special Projects	San Diego State University	CSBA
Cheryl Forbes, Lecturer & Coordinator of Teacher Education	UC San Diego	UC
Barbara Ledterman, Federal Advocate	Parent Teacher Association	PTA
Gary Ravani, President: Early Childhood/K-12 Council	CA Federation of Teachers	CFT
David Simmons, Director of Human Resources	Ventura COE	CCSESA
Kathy Theuer, Associate Dean & Director of Accreditation	Brandman University	AICCU
Beverly Young, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs	Chancellor's Office	CSU
Carlos Ayala, Interim Dean	Sonoma State University	
Conni Campbell, Associate Dean	Point Loma Nazarene University	
Lewis Chappellear, Teacher	Los Angeles Unified School District	
Cynthia Grutzik, Associate Dean	Long Beach State	
Tara Kini, Staff Attorney	Public Advocates	
Lisa Kirtman, Department Chair/Professor	CSU Fullerton	
Allison Kleinsteuber, Visual Art Educator	Visalia USD	
Mike Lawrence, Executive Director	Computer-Using Educators, Inc.	
Ira Lit, Director, Elementary Teacher Education	Stanford University	
Bob Loux, Intern Program Manager	San Joaquin County Office of Education	
Eloise Metcalfe, Adjunct Professor	UC Los Angeles	
Paula Motley, Cluster Regional Director BTSA Induction	Monterey County Office of Education	
Sean Nank, Mathematics Educator	Oceanside Unified School District	
Margo Pensavalle, Professor of Clinical Education	University of Southern California	
Robert Perry, Special Education Case Manager	Los Angeles Unified School District	
Chris Reising, Director of Teacher Recruitment and Support-Human Resources	San Diego County Office of Education	
Page Tompkins, Executive Director (TAP Co-Chair)	REACH Institute for School Leadership	
Colleen Torgerson, Special Education and Director of University Learning Communities	CSU Fresno	
Pia Wong, Professor (Co-Chair)	CSU Sacramento	
Liaison to the Panel	Affiliation	
Alicia Williamson	Commission on Teacher Credentialing	
Carrie Roberts	California Department of Education	
Staff to TAP	Affiliation	
Teri Clark, Professional Services Division	Commission on Teacher Credentialing	
Katie Croy, Professional Services Division		
Terri H. Fesperman, Certification Division		
Gay Roby, Professional Services Division		
Karen Sacramento, Professional Services Division		
Erick Schmitt, Professional Services Division		
Erin Skubal, Certification Division		

Appendix B

Full Text of the Recommendations and Rationales of the Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel Related to Field Experience and Linked Learning

Field Experience

Program Standards set guidelines for clinical practice for single subject, multiple subject, and education specialists. The portion of the standards that address length calls for “one K-12 grading period, including a full-day teaching assignment of at least two weeks.” The Commission’s 2010-11 Title II report found that the average number of clock hours required for student teaching ranged widely from 140 hours to 1600 hours with an average of 558 hours.

Rationale for Setting More Explicit Minimum Field Experience Expectations

Research suggests that teachers who become teachers of record without having completed carefully structured and supervised field experiences are less effective in promoting student learning in their first years of teaching (Boyd, et al.2008; Zeichner & Conklin, 2005). Zeichner (2010) makes a strong case for states to require all individuals who are seeking initial licenses to complete a minimum amount of carefully supervised field experience prior to becoming legally responsible for a classroom of students. He suggests at least one semester (450 hours) of fulltime student teaching, internship or residency is the absolute minimum amount of supervised field experience that should be required. The NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel report (2010) also addresses the importance of clinical preparation and advocates that this model be at the core of teacher preparation and integrated into all aspects of teacher education in a dynamic way. Extensive clinical experience affords multiple opportunities for candidates to gain deeper understandings of the teaching profession, extends possibilities for collaboration and ensures a reasonable timeframe and opportunities for the review of teacher candidates’ practice and their impact on students.

Establishing minimum standards that extend beyond one grading period and two weeks (which in some LEAs could amount to as little as three weeks of experience) would better guide teacher preparation programs in the development of the field experiences needed for high quality teacher preparation. In addition, other aspects of the field experience standards should be examined and enhanced in the areas of observations, student teaching and community interactions. Stronger and more rigorous expectations should be included about the types, intensity and duration of experiences candidates have teaching English learners. Similarly, more clarity should be given to the definition of what candidates experience with respect to the different phases of the school year. Finally, changes to these standards should address the perennial tension in our teacher preparation programs between the background experiences and knowledge of the candidates and the social, cultural and linguistic contexts in which they will be teaching, especially at the beginning stages of their careers. Despite concerted efforts to diversify our teaching force, there remains a racial imbalance between our students and their teachers. While recruitment efforts should continue in earnest, the standards should be augmented to require programs to provide field experiences that evidence ways in which their candidates acquire knowledge of community resources and assets as well as skills in integrating this knowledge into the curriculum and classroom experiences. These changes should not be prescriptive and should allow program sponsors to develop program responses that take their own institutional and other contexts into account. But currently the standards are so open to interpretation that they do not truly set a

standard for the program sponsors that reflects what is increasingly agreed upon as high quality field experience.

Recommendation

The Commission should set minimum requirements for field experiences and provide greater clarity and specificity about minimum requirements for types of field experiences, components of field experiences and duration.

Rationale for Setting More Explicit Expectations for Field Experience Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers

Studies of teacher candidate placement point to the value and importance of high quality cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Enhancing the current standards for cooperating teachers and university supervisors can ensure availability, support, and a positive field experience for teacher candidates.

Linda Darling-Hammond states, “often, the clinical side of teacher education has been fairly haphazard, depending on the idiosyncrasies of loosely selected placements with little guidance about what happens in them and little connections to university work” (2009, p. 11). Additional elements should be added to the existing standards for cooperating teachers and university supervisors such that the following outcomes, at a minimum, are promoted:

- a. Clarification of the appropriate cooperating teacher and university supervisor knowledge and skills bases
 - For cooperating teachers, articulating this knowledge and skills base should be connected to ways in which they serve as both an instructional model and a mentor of pre-service candidates
 - For university supervisors, the knowledge and skills base must cover the realities of public school teaching as well as the use of effective strategies to mentor, guide, and redirect candidates in their development
- b. Evidence of structures of training and support that ensure adequate preparation for cooperating teachers and university supervisors to fully perform their roles
- c. Processes for periodic evaluation and review of educators in cooperating teacher and university supervisor roles such that quality standards for this aspect of teacher preparation programs are consistently monitored

Central to promoting standards for cooperating teachers is providing support to cooperating teachers. Currently, the program standards indicate that cooperating teacher should hold an appropriate credential and have a minimum of three years of experience teaching in California. Similarly, the university supervisor plays a critical role in the learning-to-teach process as they often are the only link cooperating teachers have with the university. University supervisors are representatives of the university, provide invaluable support to teacher candidates and cooperating teachers, and are often the first responders in terms of support and knowledge of what occurs during field experience. It is important to ensure university supervisors are chosen for their abilities to represent the university, support teacher candidates and aide cooperating teachers in providing a quality experience for teacher candidates. Currently, the requirements for university supervisors are to receive ongoing professional development concerning TPEs, responsibilities, and expectations for supervision and candidates. The current standards also state

supervisors should be experienced, understand current theory and practice, model collegial practices, and promote reflection.

A Commission sponsored standards writing panel should review the existing standards for the distinct roles that support the field experience. This panel should especially investigate support structures for cooperating teachers. This panel should also determine the kinds of specialized knowledge that cooperating teachers should possess; at a minimum, this should include subject matter and pedagogical knowledge as well as demonstrations of effective practice, special focuses on educating diverse learners, and skills, knowledge and abilities in mentoring. The panel should also focus on defining other types of support needed for successful operationalization of the role. This support might focus on special structures or resources at the classroom, school, district and teacher preparation program levels.

Furthermore, the panel should focus on the knowledge, expertise, experiences and skills needed to perform the unique role of the supervisor, particularly as program standards are updated and aligned to address trends and developments in the K-12 public education context (e.g., knowledge of Common Core, ability to effectively teach English learners, students with special needs, etc.).

Recommendation

The Commission should revise the current preliminary program standards addressing field experience and the quality of cooperating teachers and university supervisors. The revised standards need to delineate more clearly the Commission's expectations.

Appendix C

Current Field Experience and Clinical Practice Standards

Common Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice The *unit* and its *partners* design, implement, and regularly *evaluate* a planned sequence of *field-based* and *clinical experiences* in order for *candidates* to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and *support* all *students* effectively so that *P-12 students* meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and *certificate program*, the *unit* collaborates with its *partners* regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective *clinical personnel*, and site-based *supervising personnel*. *Field-based work and/or clinical experiences* provide *candidates* opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help *candidates* develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

MS/SS Program Standard 14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork

The teacher preparation program includes a developmental sequence of carefully-planned, substantive, supervised field experiences in schools selected by the program sponsor. All candidates plan and practice multiple strategies for managing and delivering instruction that were introduced and examined in program and/or prerequisite coursework.

Qualified members of the teacher preparation program determine and document the satisfactory qualifications and developmental readiness of each candidate prior to (a) being given instructional responsibilities with K-12 students, and (b) being given daily whole-class instructional responsibilities in a K-12 school. In addition, each candidate must demonstrate a fundamental ability to teach in the major domains of the *Teaching Performance Expectations*.

By design, this supervised fieldwork sequence (a) extends candidates' understanding of major ideas and emphases developed in program and/or prerequisite coursework; (b) contributes to candidates' meeting the *Teaching Performance Expectations*, and (c) contributes to candidates' preparation for the teaching performance assessment. Candidates have extensive opportunities to observe, acquire and use appropriate pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities.

As part of the sequence, all candidates complete individual assignments and group discussions in which coursework-based strategies are used and reviewed in relation to (a) state-adopted student academic content standards and curriculum frameworks; (b) students' needs, interests and accomplishments; and (c) the observed results of the strategies.

The structured sequence of supervised fieldwork includes a formal process for determining the readiness of each candidate for advancement to daily responsibility for whole-class instruction in the program. Prior to or during the program, each candidate observes, discusses, reflects on and participates in important aspects of teaching, and teaches individual students and groups of students before being given daily responsibility for whole-class instruction. Prior to or during the program each candidate observes and participates in two or more K-12 classrooms, including classrooms in hard-to-staff and/or underperforming schools.

Prior to assuming daily responsibility for whole-class instruction, each candidate must have satisfied the basic skills and subject matter requirements.

During the supervised field experience, each candidate is supervised in daily teaching for a minimum of one K-12 grading period, including in a full-day teaching assignment of at least two weeks, commensurate with the authorization of the recommended credential. As part of this experience, or in a different setting if necessary, each candidate teaches in public schools, experiences all phases of a school year on-site and has significant experiences teaching English learners.

Prior to or during the program each Multiple Subject teaching credential candidate observes and participates in two or more of the following grade spans: K-2, 3-5, and 6-9. Prior to or during the program each Single Subject teaching credential candidate observes and/or participates in two or more subject-specific teaching assignments that differ in content and/or level of advancement.

Integrated/Blended Program Delivery Model: The field experience begins in the candidate's first year in the Integrated/Blended Program and provides meaningful opportunities for career exploration into the nature and characteristics of teaching in California schools.

Intern Program Delivery Model: The teacher preparation program collaborates with the employing district in designing (a) structured guidance and regular site-based support and supervision and (b) a structured sequence of supervised fieldwork that includes planned observations, consultations, reflections, and individual and small-group teaching opportunities.

The teacher preparation program in collaboration with the school district ensure that all interns participate in structured and guided observations or participates in instruction of students in settings and grade levels different from their regular assignment.

MS/SS Program Standard 15: Qualifications of Individuals who Provide School Site Support

Sponsors of programs define the qualifications of individuals who provide school site support. These qualifications include, but are not limited to a minimum of the appropriate credential (including EL authorization) and three or more years of teaching experience in California.

Sponsors of programs provide ongoing professional development for supervisors that includes the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and information about responsibilities, rights, and expectations pertaining to candidates and supervisors. Individuals selected to provide professional development to supervising teachers (a) are experienced and effective in supervising credential candidates; (b) know and understand current educational theory and practice, the sponsors' expectations for supervising teachers, state-adopted academic content standards and frameworks, and the developmental stages of learning-to-teach; (c) model collegial supervisory practices that foster success among credential candidates; and (d) promote reflective practice.

Each teacher who supervises a candidate during a period of daily whole-class instruction is well-informed about (a) performance expectations for the candidate's teaching and pertaining to his/her supervision of the candidate, and (b) procedures to follow when the candidate encounters

problems in teaching.

Program sponsors in collaboration with cooperating administrators provide opportunities for each candidate to work in diverse placements with English learners, students with special needs, students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, and hard to staff schools.

Intern Program Delivery Model:

Program sponsors and the participating district collaborate in the selection of individuals who provide school site support and the placement of interns in teaching positions. Program sponsors and employing school districts ensure sites/teaching assignment for intern placement that will enable candidates to meet the program requirements. Each intern receives support from one or more mentor teacher(s) who are assigned to the same school, at least one of whom is experienced in the curricular area(s) of the intern's assignment.

Ed Specialist Program Standard 15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options

The program will ensure that candidates have planned experiences and/or interactions with the full range of the service delivery system, the providers of such services, and parents and families, including experiences in general education. The experiences must reflect the full diversity of grades/ages, federal disability categories and the continuum of special education services outlined in the specific credential authorization. The experiences are planned from the beginning of the program to include experiences in general education, experiences with parents and families, and experiences with a broad range of service delivery options leading to an extended culminating placement in which the candidate works toward assuming full responsibility for the provision of services in the specific credential authorization and is of sufficient duration for the candidate to demonstrate the teacher performance expectations for special educators. The culminating placement may be in any school, agency or program as defined in Education Code Sections 56031, 56360, and 56361 for the purpose of providing special education services.

Intern Program Delivery Model:

This standard may be met by activities embedded in coursework and/or visits/interactions with service providers. It is not intended that interns leave their work assignments for an extended period to meet this standard.