

Domain 4 – Clinical Practice

Indicator 1 – Clinical Design

There are several moving parts in Indicator 1.

- The first part asserts that clinical experiences are designed/developed on the basis of collaborative input.
- The second is that they articulate specific learning and performance goals.
- The third is the idea that clinical designs incorporate “learning while doing” and provide structured space for reflection and feedback while also:
 - Having opportunities to connect theory with practice
 - Require candidates to authentically address complex/adaptive leadership challenges
 - Challenges addressed should include those related to equity

I will organize these notes according to those moving parts.

- Concerning the first bullet pertaining to collaboratively designed clinical experiences:

There are three purposeful structures that systemically support this kind of structure. Those are:

- Semi-Annual Field Supervisor Meetings that occur in Sept/October and typically in April – though we want to move the April meeting back to the beginning of the spring term. We’ve been having these meetings since Fall 2018. Because we have folks in operational school and district leadership roles serving as Field Supervisors, this structurally brings district partners to the discussion. Related artifacts include:
 - Agendas for two of those meetings (more are available on request)
 - Meeting Summaries from two of those meetings (more are available on request)
 - Field and Site Supervisor Handbooks – I am only including the most recent iteration and the very first version of the Handbook. A review will illustrate changes over time that have been informed by our discussions. Intermediate iterations are available upon request. Those are titled UT Permian Basin Field and Site Supervisor Handbook and Site and Field Supervisor Handbook...
 - An example of an innovation contributed by a Field Supervisor (Ms. Tracie Burrow). The “Form C...” Excel document includes an embedded formula that auto-calculates time
- A new Advisory Committee launched on 5/18/2022 – This committee has in active membership (active defined as in attendance for at least one of the two meetings to date) representation from three different school systems – 2 ISDs and one charter – and UTPB Department faculty and College leadership. We also have two other district superintendents who have expressed an interest in the work and are included in the information distribution. This group has directed us to organize information related to how we equip and prepare candidates for their work as Instructional leaders, Human Capital leaders, and campus managers. Artifacts related to this group include

- Updates over time,
- Agendas for our May and September 2022 meetings, and
- Meeting summary notes with a response from one of the members
- Sept. Meeting Supplement document used to support conversation about Instructional Leadership
- See also how district-level input is structurally invited and captured as part of a candidates internship experiences by reviewing pages 23-55 of the Site and Field Supervisor Handbook in the most recent iteration. I recommend reviewing the more updated version but either has evidence.
- POP Cycle structure of observation and support built into the candidate’s internship experience – Each candidate in the Practicum I&II courses is supported through three pre-observation, observation, post-observation cycles paced at roughly the first third, second third, and last third of the collection of their Practicum hours. These cycles have documents that guide Field Supervisors in basic components for a successful process (components are revisited at almost every semi-annual meeting). Part of the structure includes a prompt to discuss the interns experience with consideration for their needs. This practice offers multiple structurally supported opportunities to solicit and be responsive to candidate needs and experiences and offers a purposeful vehicle for considerations of equity in addressing candidate timely and local needs. Artifacts include:
 - See pages 20-21 and 56 through 58 of the most recent iteration of the Site and Field Supervisor Handbook for more about how candidates can contribute.
- Concerning the second bullet in the introductory notes – Articulation of Specific Learning and Learning goals:

I recommend we define “clinical design” as something more broadly than just the Practicum I & II courses. The rationale for this recommendation is connected to the reality that candidates are involved in Mini-Internships in all EDLD courses from EDLD 6361 through EDLD 6370 (and 6371 for those who take that elective). Thus, while the major clinical emphasis is in fact in EDLD 6392 and EDLD 6393, candidates are in clinical experiences throughout the program. Artifacts that illustrate how we accomplish this in our programming include:

- The Candidate Practicum Handbook (titled “Practicum I and II Handbook Fall 2022). This is the most recent iteration of a document that has been dramatically updated from what it was when I arrived in Fall 2012 – We have many, many iterations of this. I can offer examples on request.
- See also the Domain 2 Thinking Frame document in the Domain 2 folder for information about clinically relevant projects
- See also the major project rubrics that are accessible in the “Selected Current Rubrics” folder in the Course Syllabi, Assignment Rubrics... folder that is accessible in the main “Working EDC Folder”
- Finally, some course syllabi (“Most Recent Syllabi” folder) may be helpful to this part of the review

Concerning the third bullet in the introductory notes – Clinical designs incorporate “learning while doing” – I think the narrative for the last two points address this as well as I can. That said, please let me know if you have additional specific questions.

I will also note that principles of equity are implicitly and explicitly addressed throughout the Practicum Handbook (a key word search will illustrate). Such principles are also addressed as noted in the Domain 2 Thinking Frame document.

Indicator 2 – Clinical Placements

Collaboration in the area of clinical placements and supervision is limited to:

- Considerations of convenience – Most candidates in our program complete their clinical work on the campus where they serve as a teacher. Candidates not in a campus-level position are given the flexibility to identify a most appropriate setting
- Considerations of compliance* – While there is little in the way of coordination between faculty and the district related to a deliberative placement strategy, our program does give “bumpers” that frame the requirements for eligibility to serve in the role. Artifacts that illustrate that include:
 - Form B found on page 31 of the most recent Practicum I and II Handbook (for candidates)
 - Incidentally, that same Form B is included in the Site and Field Supervisor Handbook as well – see page 7 of the most recent iteration of that document.
 - See also the previously referenced pages for Site Supervisors in the Site and Field Supervisor Handbook

*As a relevant aside – If we want to discuss it, I would make a case that principles of equity inform our approach; however, I would not try to make the case that equity considerations have been an explicit lens in assignment of mentors/site-supervisors to candidates. The state of Texas does require that we collect evidence that the Site Supervisor has been successful. Our approach to this has been at the compliance level (TAPR submission). This is a possible area for some updates. I will leave it to the wisdom of the group to determine how this summarily scores and what to do about it.

Indicator 3 – Clinical Quality

Departing from more academic vocabulary – I “kinda” think this is already addressed, at least insofar as the preceding narrative highlights relevant pieces of evidence that can support our review. The one note I can add here is that I am on the TASA Higher Education Committee. The current focus for that committee is to bring tighter alignment between needs in the PK-12 setting and the work of leader preparation. The TPESS_Principal Exam Domains – Correlation artifact illustrates early draft efforts to align Principal preparation standards to the TASA “visioning-document” also included. This working group is comprised of about 8 professionals representing higher education and PK-12 district leadership and the work is very collaborative in nature. The product, while not yet developed, will aspirationally inform our work in Higher Ed. As the reviewer will note, our Advisory Council has asked to be updated and looped in on these efforts.

Indicator 4 – Clinical Coaching

Without a doubt, a structured approach to clinical coaching is offered and Field Supervisors are oriented to and given resources in support of the work of clinical supervision. Our candidate coaching is organized around principles rooted in the T-TESS observation process in the sense that candidates are coached around an area of relative strength (reinforcement) and an area where there may be an opportunity for growth (refinement). Related artifacts:

- Page 80 of the Site and Field Supervisor Handbook illustrates the recommended flow for post-conference feedback.
- The following pages in that same document illustrate the reporting form that is required for post-conference reporting by the Field Supervisor.
- Previously referenced pages of the Handbook outline the recommended cadence and topical points for pre and post conferencing.
- I've also included a video of our April 2022 Field Supervisor meeting in the Domain 4 artifact folder.

Concerning whether and to what degree candidates receive culturally-responsive, equity-centered clinical coaching:

I will let the review committee make that determination in summary but I can acknowledge that our coaching is bathed in principles of differentiation and candidate-related responsiveness in an approach that should help cultivate in candidates a sensitivity for the local context (going back to our operational definition). That doesn't mean we cannot find ways to advance how we situate these ideas. I'll be very interested in the EDC Working group's analysis.

Indicator 5 – Clinical Supervision

There is not much more in the way of artifacts to offer here. I can say that four out of five of our working team members have engaged in the clinical supervision process. I trust those members will guide me if there are additional points of evidence to provide.

One more note here: Though previously acknowledged, the idea of pacing is centrally relevant to this Indicator – Field Supervisors have no fewer than five structurally expected points of contact:

- Initial indication of their role – we ask this happens in the first week
- Review of the Candidate's context video (which explicitly addresses issues related to cultural sensitivity, equity, and community context). The Field Supervisor reviews this and should offer evaluative feedback within the first two weeks of Practicum I
- The first POP Cycle is scheduled to happen at about the 5th or 6th week of Practicum I
- The second POP Cycle is scheduled to happen at about the 1st or 2nd week of Practicum II
- The third POP Cycle is scheduled to happen at about the 5th or 6th week of Practicum II

Field Supervisors also review and give feedback about a candidate's clinical experiences throughout the Practicum I & II courses.

Indicator 6 – Clinical Evaluation

Again, this Indicator is addressed organically throughout the Thinking Frame. By way of reminder:

- Mentors/On-campus Site Supervisors evaluate candidate

- Dispositions
- Skills in the ELCC Aligned Mentor Evaluation
- Summative evaluation of the candidate's Practicum experience
- University-appointed Field Supervisors evaluate candidates' performance through observation of candidates' active leadership (submitted via videos) and through dialogue with the candidate. This happens three times during the main clinical experience (Practicum I & II).
- University Field Supervisors also complete a summative evaluation as part of the Observation 3 report. The Supervisor deems the Practicum experience as successful or unsuccessful
- Both supervisors review the candidate's log of experiences in which the candidate is expected to not only cite what they have done but are also expected to offer some level of reflection that addresses why and/or how that activity is equipping/preparing them for leadership

Evaluation is aligned with both the ELCC National Standards for Campus-Level Leadership Preparation linked [here](#), and with Chapter 241.15 in the Texas Administrative Code linked [here](#).

The clinical log, Form C, includes columns for candidate alignment and supports Site and Field Supervisor evaluation of alignment.