

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at

**Pleasanton Unified School District
Professional Services Division
June 2021**

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Pleasanton Unified School District**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For All Commission Approved Programs Offered by the Institution**

Common Standards	Status
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Not Met
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met with Concerns
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met with Concerns
4) Continuous Improvement	Not Met
5) Program Impact	Met with Concerns

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Teacher Induction	6	1	4	1

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Documentation and Evidence
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: Pleasanton Unified School District

Dates of Visit: March 22 – 24, 2021

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations.

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Report	Accreditation Status
March 2012 Site Visit Team Report	Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with site administrators, district leadership, program leadership, coaches, candidates, completers, and local school personnel. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit’s operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All General Institutional Preconditions and Teacher Induction Preconditions have been determined to be **Met**.

Program Standards

Teacher Induction Program Standard 1 is **Met**, Program Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6 are **Met with Concerns**, and Program Standard 3 is **Not Met**.

Common Standards

Common Standards 2, 3, and 5 are **Met with Concerns** and Common Standards 1 and 4 are **Not Met**.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of Pleasanton Unified School District’s Teacher Induction program documents, interviews with candidates, completers, coaches, site administrators, and program and district leadership. Based on the findings from this review, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations: that within one year, the Pleasanton Unified School District:

- 1) Provide evidence that the unit actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs and evidence of a collaborative, cohesive, coordinated district-level leadership structure.
- 2) Provide evidence that the unit implements a credential recommendation process that ensures only candidates who have met all credential requirements are recommended for a credential. Including evidence:
 - a. Of procedures that, prior to recommending a candidate for a Clear credential, the Induction program sponsor verifies that the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements.
 - b. That the unit monitors the credential recommendation process.
- 3) Provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive continuous improvement process inclusive of:
 - a. The unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness and make appropriate modifications based on findings.
 - b. The systematic collection, analysis, and use of candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations.
 - c. The collection of feedback from all key stakeholders about the quality of the program.
 - d. How the program regularly assesses the quality of services provided by coaches to candidates.
 - e. How the program provides formative feedback to coaches on their work, including establishment of collaborative relationships.
- 4) Provide evidence documenting the process through which the program ensures that all candidates know and demonstrate the knowledge and skills required by the standards prior to recommendation for a credential.
- 5) Provide evidence that the program receives sufficient resources to allow for effective operation of the educator preparation program. The resources must enable the program to effectively operate in terms of coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development and instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.
- 6) Provide evidence of the identification of appropriate information and personnel that are accessible to guide each Education Specialist candidate's attainment of program requirements and that a clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.
- 7) Provide evidence that the site-based supervisors (coaches) are certified, carefully selected, and trained to provide effective support for candidates in the specified content and/or services authorized by the credential the candidates are seeking to clear.
- 8) Not be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation and that the Pleasanton Unified School District notifies all current and prospective candidates of the accreditation status.

- 9) Provide quarterly written documentation to the team lead and Commission consultant documenting all actions to remove the stipulations noted above.
- 10) Host a revisit to verify required changes have been made in the program design and implementation is aligned to the Common and Program Standards and collect evidence of actions to address the stipulations noted above.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements:

Teacher Induction

In addition, staff recommends that:

- Pleasanton Unified School District’s responses to the preconditions be accepted.
- Pleasanton Unified School District continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Carol Clauss
Lancaster School District - retired

Programs Reviewer:

Jill Barnes
Napa County Office of Education

Common Standards:

LaVonne Chastain
Kings County Office of Education

Staff to the Visit:

Poonam Bedi
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
PNTTP Candidate Handbook
PNTTP Accreditation Website
PUSD PD Website
PNTTP Coach (Mentor) Handbook
Candidate ILPs (Journey Map)

Budget Report
Coach (Mentor) Survey Results
Candidate Survey Results
Site Administrator Survey Results
Candidate/Coach Interaction Logs
PNTTP Organization Chart
Regional Coach Connection Website
Program Monthly Newsletters

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	14
Completers	10
Site Administrators	8
Institutional Administration	5
Institutional Directors/ Coordinators	9
Program Leaders	2
Coaches (Mentors)	5
Integration Specialists	4
Credential Analysts	2
Regional Collaboration Partners	5
Other- Program Specialists	2
TOTAL	66

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

Pleasanton is a suburb located in the Tri-Valley region of the Bay Area. The Tri-Valley includes the San Ramon Valley, Livermore Valley, and Amador Valley. This region is located east of San Francisco, north of San Jose and west of Tracy. Pleasanton's population, of over 80,000, closely mirrors that of its nearest neighbor Livermore. The city is known for its "pleasant" weather, the high socioeconomic status and education levels of the residents, and the various business companies that are located there.

The Pleasanton Unified School District (PUSD) was originally founded in 1988. Currently, the district has a TK – 12th grade student enrollment of nearly 15,000 of which 11.4% are classified as English Learners, 8.5% have IEPs, 8.3% are considered socioeconomically disadvantaged, and no foster youth. Nearly 46% of the student population is Asian, followed by White at over 35%, and Hispanic at nearly 10%. The district employs 1,476 staff across nine elementary schools, three middle schools, two high schools, and one alternative high school, with a Virtual Academy expected to begin in 2021-22. Beginning in March 2021, the district began a staggered return to in-person learning through concurrent teaching.

Education Unit

The Pleasanton Unified School District is comprised of five divisions: Teaching and Learning, Student Services, Business, Human Resources, and the Superintendent's Office. The teacher induction program, currently called the Pleasanton New Teacher Project (PNTTP), was originally housed under Human Resources and is now under the Teaching and Learning division. The PNTTP began operating on its own in the 2020-21 school year. Previously, PUSD was the lead program sponsor for the Tri-Valley Teacher Induction Project (TVTIP) which was a multi-district consortium that included the following school districts: Castro Valley, Dublin, and Livermore Valley Joint. Sunol Glen Unified School District was also a part of the consortium and is currently partnered with Pleasanton. (There is currently one candidate from Sunol Glen that participates in the PNTTP). PUSD originally received approval to operate a General Education Induction program in 2004 and then received approval to offer an Education Specialist Induction program in 2011.

The PNTTP is run by a director and a coordinator who also serves as a coach to eight teachers in the program. Currently, there are 54 candidates of whom 25 are Year 1 (17 General Education teachers and eight Education Specialists) and 29 are Year 2 (25 General Education and four Education Specialists). The program operates a full-release model with 4.2 FTE for the mentors (coaches) and a ratio of 16 teachers to 1 coach when including eight additional educators (some of whom are on emergency permits/ waivers) who are also receiving support services.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2019-20)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2020-21)
Teacher Induction	191	54

The Visit

This site visit, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, was conducted virtually so stakeholders were interviewed virtually and/or via phone calls. The site visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols. It is worth noting, however, that this was the first academic year in which Pleasanton Unified School District was operating as a single-district Teacher Induction program, under the title Pleasanton New Teacher Project, rather than as the lead sponsor of the TVTIP consortium. Additionally, the Program Review and Common Standards responses were submitted when the PUSD was the program sponsor for the TVTIP, so, even with the addenda, it was difficult at times to distinguish which parts of the program were current and relevant to the site visit review. A veteran secretary, with historical and operational knowledge about the program and the Commission’s accreditation procedures, also retired prior to this school year and her position remained unfilled. The secretary’s job duties and responsibilities were subsumed by the PNTTP program leadership and staff in the Human Resources department. Finally, the site visit occurred in the same month that the TK – 12 district transitioned from distance learning to hybrid/concurrent instruction.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

PROGRAM REPORT

Teacher Induction

Program Design

Pleasanton Unified School District separated financially from the TriValley Teacher Induction Project (TVTIP) beginning in the 2020-21 school year. As a result of the separation, Pleasanton New Teacher Project became the name of the new program which consists of Pleasanton USD and Sunol Glen USD. Due to recent fiscal changes because of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), significant changes in district personnel and leadership have led to gaps in oversight of the program's needs.

The heart of the program consists of the full-release coaches who meet with candidates between four to six hours per month. Coaching support includes "just in time" and long-term analysis of teaching practice to help candidates develop enduring professional skills. The PNTP helps candidates bridge preliminary preparation skills and knowledge to the induction journey through meetings with an assigned induction coach. Together, candidates and coaches review the Individual Development Plan (IDP) from the preparation program, if available, during the initial program orientation.

At the time of the site visit, review of documents and interviews confirmed that the General Education candidates were fully supported by their coaches. The General Education candidates stated in interviews that the program helped them become better teachers and shared sentiments of appreciation for their support, including "checking on my emotional and mental health" and "helping me reach out to the right people and find resources and materials."

The Education Specialist candidates, who account for over 20% of the candidates in the Pleasanton New Teacher Project, were being supported by General Education coaches with Special Education Program Specialists and site administrators providing additional support as there was no specific Special Education coach for Education Specialist support. Program Specialists are a part of the PUSD support structure for all Education Specialist teachers in the district and there were four of these positions during the time of the site visit. However, through interviews with administrators, Program Specialists, and Education Specialist candidates, it became apparent that there were not enough programmatic supports in place to support the Education Specialist candidates. Additionally, these candidates are not receiving content-specific support necessary to strengthen the candidate's professional practice and contribute to their future retention in the profession. As one candidate expressed: "It would have been helpful to have a coach that has a [special education] background." Another candidate expressed how there is no designated support for Education Specialists from the

program and that “Program Specialists are super busy.” While the program identified Program Specialists to fill the gap between Education Specialist candidates and their coaches (who do not have Education Specialist credentials), interviews with candidates, coaches, and the Program Specialists themselves revealed that the Program Specialists are currently part of a more general system of support for all Education Specialist teachers in the district and are not filling the need for individualized candidate support specific to Education Specialist subject matter as it relates to the PNTTP Teacher Induction program. The same candidate quoted previously also expressed how they “made a good connection with a co-worker for urgent questions” and how they “reach out to admin all the time.”

When asked about the type of support needed for Education Specialists, the PNTTP program leadership stated that the program was aware that they need to tighten up their support for these candidates. Although Pleasanton provided a Spring 2020 job posting for the Special Education coach position, the team was informed that this position was put on hold for the 2020-21 school year due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

As confirmed in interviews with Program Specialists, every week all PUSD Education Specialist teachers have a team meeting with their site administrators, school psychologist, intervention specialist, counselor, and a Program Specialist. As stated by a Program Specialist during an interview, “there are so many prongs to special ed, and an induction coach can do basic lesson planning, but we need the next layer of specialized academic instruction to help new [special education] teachers.”

Although additional Program Specialist positions are open in the district, the district has had difficulty hiring for these. According to PNTTP program leadership, this is because teachers are unable to be released from their current contracts to take on this position. Site administrators confirmed in an interview that they are “trying to find resources and extra support for my special education teachers to fill the gap for no program specialist.” Reviewers heard from both candidates and site administrators of the lack of individualized support for the new Education Specialists. Site administrators expressed deep concerns at the lack of value PUSD seems to place on its Education Specialist teachers. As this concern relates to the program, a Program Specialist and an induction coach shared excitement over the potential of having an Education Specialist coach for the PNTTP in the 2021-2022 year.

Interviews with administrators and candidates confirmed that full-time release coaches are vital to the program’s success. Many candidates proclaimed they did not know what they would do without their mentor, referred to as “coaches” in the program. One candidate said, “My coach helped me grow as a professional. They observed me and helped me change my teaching practice.” Candidates noted that their coaches were instrumental in helping them adjust their inquiry given the transition from distance learning to in-person instruction. Interviews also confirmed that the program is held together by the Program Director and Program Coordinator/Coach. The program's historical knowledge and success rests on their shoulders. This program staff is working tirelessly to run the program, take care of administrative duties

(due to the vacant secretary's position), facilitate meetings and professional learning, and also serve as a coach for eight teachers.

The PNTP leadership team, consisting of the program director, coordinator, and coaches, meets bi-weekly to learn, problem solve, and share expertise. The team also meets bi-monthly to network with regional coaches from neighboring school districts that were part of TVTIP in addition to San Ramon Valley Unified School District. The PNTP program leadership and coaching team collect survey data from participating teachers twice a year (midyear and end of year) and coach and administrators once a year (end of year). At the time of the site visit, data was being collected, but limited data is analyzed or shared with all stakeholders, partly due to a lack of a systematic process to analyze their data.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The coach and candidate create a professional learning and support plan called the Journey Map: ILP. Under the second section “Developing & Reflecting on Professional Goals” they use an ILP goal setting tool, PNTP Professional Goals HyperDoc, and respond to guiding questions such as, “What resources or professional development will support your progress towards this goal and what are your next steps?”

The PNTP Journey Map: ILP is designed to support and inform candidates about their professional practice in the context of an ongoing, job-embedded, collaborative partnership with a trained coach. Formative assessment structures not only help candidates identify and strive for high levels of learning and classroom instruction, but they also establish professional habits of inquiry, data-driven dialogue, collaboration, and reflection through an array of processes that occur over the course of each year in induction. PNTP assists candidates and coaches by providing professional learning opportunities and resources necessary to accomplish the ILP, such as the PUSD Professional Development (PD) website, PUSD PD calendar, PNTP website, PNTP newsletters, a Coach Connections website, regional coach forums, PNTP Leadership Team meeting calendar and agendas for 2020-21, and *Coaching for Equity* book study.

Interviews verified that candidates were working on their Induction Journey Map: ILP document throughout the year; however, there appeared to be few opportunities for Special Education professional development catered to the needs of Education Specialists candidates in the program. In interviews, one Education Specialist candidate communicated, “We are the oddballs of the teaching world because we rarely have targeted professional development designed for educational specialists.”

Assessment of Candidates

Evidence was found that the induction program’s coaching design is informed by theory and research and provides multiple opportunities for candidates to demonstrate growth through an established formative assessment system. PNTP utilizes the Journey Map: ILP in the work with candidates to monitor progress throughout the year. It serves as the Individual Learning Plan. At the orientation meeting with the coach, the Journey Map provides the overarching goals of

creating an optimal learning environment for students, the year-at-a-glance, and the processes candidates and coaches engage in collaboratively during the school year. Throughout the year, coaches update the Journey Map with the tools used to engage in each of the formative assessment processes. Mid-year, coaches conduct check-ins with each candidate and engage in a review of the Journey Map. The coaches mentioned during interviews, the importance of their mid-year interviews that they individually complete with their candidates.

At year end, coaches conduct meetings to review the year, share expectations, and next steps with candidates. The mid- and end-of-year review serves a dual purpose – professional learning for coaches and program accountability in order to verify completion of mid-year and end-of-year program requirements. However, candidates mentioned in interviews that the only documentation they themselves complete is the end-of-year reflection, otherwise all coaches scribe for the candidates on every other document. Although coach documentation of "just in time" support, observation protocols, and inquiry work supports easing the burden on candidates, it may lead to a candidate's lack of awareness in the ILP process. This contributed to the struggle candidates showed during interviews to share the focus of their work in the CSTPs. For example, a Year 2 candidate, when asked what they produce at the end of the program to clear the credential expressed that they need to complete "a reflection component where they a) fill out where they stand on the standards and b) where they improved." This raised a concern regarding the design of the program as candidates do not know exactly what is required for a clear credential, cannot describe the CSTP areas of focus from the ILP, and are not responsible for documentation of growth (outside of a year-end reflection) which leads to a question of the level of ownership for the candidates.

A caseload spreadsheet is provided to each coach as an additional place to verify completion of Year 1, Year 2, and ECO candidates. This information is submitted to PNTP program leadership to complete the recommendation for a clear credential once all program requirements are met, including any additional credential requirements listed (e.g., English Learner Authorization, U.S. Constitution, etc.). Although completers are being recommended for a credential on the basis of their coach's recommendation, there was no evidence of a system of checks and balances. Additionally, no written evidence was found documenting the basis on which the recommendation for the clear credential is made, including: a 1) defensible process of reviewing documentation, 2) a written appeal process for candidates, and 3) a procedure for candidates to repeat a portion of the program, as needed.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, site administrators, coaches, and institutional leadership the team determined that Standard 1 is met, Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6 are Met with Concerns and Standard 3 is Not Met.

Standard 2: Components of the Coaching Design – Met with Concerns

There were many inconsistencies in the individualized support for Education Specialist candidates. Even though each Education Specialist was supported by a General Education coach, there was no specific training in special education strategies or content that was provided by the PNTP to the coaches, program specialists, and Education Specialist candidates. Some of the Education Specialist candidates had additional specialized support from district program specialists and site administrators at their school site. However, this support was sporadic, depended on the resources their coach could connect them with, and was not a consistent part of the induction program. Coaches were not trained to meet the needs and context of their Education Specialist candidates. With this gap in expertise and lack of success in brokering additional support from the PUSD Special Education Department and unit leadership, the overall mentoring design struggles to develop enduring professional skills for the Education Specialist candidates and support their future retention in the profession.

Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System – Not Met

Interviews and review of documentation did not provide the site visit team with sufficient evidence that the ILP is collaboratively developed by candidate and coach with input from the employer regarding the candidate's job assignment. Coaches are tasked with the completion of induction documentation including the ILP, resulting in less understanding and clarity for candidates when discussing growth in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Evidence shows the program provides the necessary resources for General Education candidates to accomplish goals in the ILP, however Education Specialist candidates receive no direct support from coaches in credential and assignment specific needs such as the use of SEIS (Special Education Information System), adhering to legal requirements within Special Education, and assessment of students with IEPs (Individualized Education Plans). Although the program reported additional support is provided for Education Specialist candidates through the district Program Specialists, Education Specialist candidates mentioned that they sometimes only meet with their Program Specialist, among other staff, at a weekly Special Education meeting and not at a scheduled individual time.

Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors – Met with Concerns

Review of documentation did not provide evidence that the PUSD coaching team includes faculty with knowledge of the context and content area for Education Specialist candidates. Evidence was found that the program regularly trains General Education coaches in research-based practices. However, since the General Education coaches were supporting the Education Specialist candidates, there was no evidence of specific training around Special Education practices to help support the Education Specialist candidates and coaches.

Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competency for the Clear Credential Recommendation – Met with Concerns

Reviewers did not find evidence of a defensible process of reviewing documentation, and a procedure for candidates to repeat a portion of the program, as needed. There is a defensible

grievance process in the PNTF handbook, but it was for any grievance that a candidate may have and it was unclear to candidates the types of grievances that could be addressed through the grievance policy as there are separate policies for transferring districts or requesting a program extension, leave of absence, or coach reassignment. Also, the individuals a candidate can contact when filing a grievance are all within the program so there is no neutral party that is a part of the process. There was no specific defensible process of reviewing documentation, written appeal process for the candidate to question non-completion requirements, or process in writing for repeating a portion of the program.

An additional component of this standard, specific to the verification by the induction program sponsor that a candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements and that the program has documented the basis on which the recommendation for the clear credential is made, was also of concern to the team. The only evidence found that documented the basis on which the recommendation for the Clear credential is made, was an Excel file on which coaches marked a candidate complete with a check or “x” mark. The team found through interviews that the process that PUSD has in place to review documentation is that the coach notes on this spreadsheet when a candidate has completed program requirements. The coach then notifies the Program Director who submits documentation that the candidate has completed all requirements to the Commission. Once the Clear credential is issued, the Program Director notifies the credential analyst in Human Resources who updates the completer’s personnel records. As the process in PUSD currently stands, the coach is the final decision-maker of whether the candidate completed all credential requirements. This process differs from the one noted in PNTF documentation that states, “When the candidate has successfully completed induction, the program submits an approved list of completers to the credential analyst, who recommends each teacher to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.”

Candidates are provided with step-by-step instructions on how to obtain their Clear credential and pay the fee through the Commission’s website. A document was created after the mid-visit report that listed the Year End Protocol for candidates that noted what the coach must complete versus what a candidate must complete, including “Level 1 Ed[ucation] Specialist Requirements: *Discuss with coach and/or coordinator.*” It was unclear if this document was provided to candidates as it was not listed in the handbook, nor did candidates refer to this in interviews. The Master List of Year-End To-Dos for 2019-20 noted that coaches were to “use protocol as talking points to review year end program expectations with PTs [participating teachers]”; however, there was not a Master List of Year-End To-Dos provided for the current year. Interviews confirmed a lack of clarity with Year 2 candidates on the process by which to complete the program, as previously noted.

Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services – Met with Concerns

Though the program collects survey data from candidates bi-annually, no evidence was found to support regular data analysis to assess the quality of program services. In addition, when asked to provide evidence of how the program assesses the quality of services provided by

coaches to candidates, a PowerPoint presented to the Board of Trustees at a November 2019 meeting -- when the PUSD was still operating as the lead program sponsor of the TVTIP -- was one of two pieces of evidence offered. The second piece of evidence was a February 2021 bulletin to the school board that contained an overview of the PNTP with a quote from a candidate's mid-year survey. There is little evidence that the current system includes a regular practice of program review for quality of services to provide a coherent system of support to candidates through the collaboration, communication, and coordination of candidates, coaches, school and district administrators, and all other induction stakeholders.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The PNTP has a strength in relationships. The candidates, coaches, and site and district administrators commented on the positive relationship that the program has in supporting teachers across the district and that it is very people-centered. In particular, two staff members with deep knowledge and expertise are key to operations in this program. Their efforts are critical to this program's success. However, the team was concerned that these operations are reliant on individuals rather than on sufficient structures for sustainability and continued success.

Candidates reported how appreciative they were of coach support including regular conversations about practice and a broad range of resources to support individual practice. As one candidate mentioned during an interview, "Knowing that someone was 100% guaranteed to have your best interest in mind and always in your corner is priceless!" Coaches also work consistently to grow their practice through research-based study and facilitated group meetings led by PNTP program leadership.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

<p>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:</p>	<p>Team Finding</p>
<p>The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks.</p>	<p>Consistently</p>
<p>The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.</p>	<p>Not Evidenced</p>
<p>The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.</p>	<p>Inconsistently</p>
<p>The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.</p>	<p>Inconsistently</p>
<p>The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.</p>	<p>Inconsistently</p>
<p>Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.</p>	<p>Inconsistently</p>
<p>The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.</p>	<p>Inconsistently</p>
<p>The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.</p>	<p>Inconsistently</p>

Finding on Common Standard 1: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among and is clearly represented in the Pleasanton New Teacher Project. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks.

The team was unable to find sufficient evidence that the unit monitors the credential recommendation process. Significant changes in district personnel and leadership have created a void in the oversight of the PNTTP program’s needs, including, but not limited to, the retirement and non-replacement of the veteran Induction secretary. The secretary had knowledge of the Commission’s accreditation cycle and the credential recommendation process, and the job duties have been subsumed by the Program Director and the Induction Coordinator.

The program’s credential recommendation process lacks sufficient monitoring by the unit. Interviews confirmed that the current recommendation process rests on the shoulders of the Program Director who completes the recommendation process after coaches have expressed that a candidate has completed the program. Then the Human Resources department is notified when a candidate has a clear credential. The site visit team did not find evidence that a system of checks and balances exists in which the coach’s recommendation to the Program Director and the Program Director’s subsequent recommendations to the Commission are double-checked. The Master List of Year-End To-Dos, a document that provided the process of reviewing end-of-year documentation leading up to the credential recommendation, was provided for the previous academic year 2019-20 and the current academic year 2020-21. Additionally, the process of reviewing documentation, as it relates to the requirements of clearing the preliminary credential, is not clearly articulated to candidates as noted in the finding on Program Standard 5 above.

The site visit team found little evidence that the PUSD provides the PNTTP with sufficient resources for the effective operation of the induction program and considers the interests of the program. Although the district pays for the program to operate on a full-release model, the Education Specialist coach and program secretary vacancies were not filled. Documentation from the PNTTP cited the COVID-19 pandemic as the reason these positions are unfilled; however, district leadership expressed during interviews that they are “committed to funding the program 100%.” District leadership also expressed that they annually review the program’s budget and look at needs – such as potentially “bringing on special education teachers or part-time teachers to support special education learning needs.”

When the site visit team expressed to the PNTTP program leadership that district leadership stated they are committed to financially supporting the Induction program, but these vacancies are still unfilled, the response was that they (meaning the program leadership) did not advocate

for a Special Education coach. Regarding the secretary position, the PNTP program leadership stated that training a new secretary during the academic year, and given the COVID-19 pandemic, would be more burdensome than just absorbing those job duties on their own. It should be noted, though, that the PNTP program leadership already mentor candidates, provide professional development to the district, works with district technology coaches, and cover the classrooms of TK -12 teachers who are out, among other responsibilities.

Based on the discussion above, it appeared to the site visit team that the PNTP program leadership is sheltering all stakeholder groups from the reality of lack of additional funding and resources to fill the unfilled positions. This sentiment was shared by the representatives from the other districts who were a part of the regional collaborators interview session: “not being with them was not our desire; the decision was made above us; this is still the best-case scenario” and “if you were not at our level of knowledge, you would never have known there was a change.” PNTP is attempting to operate as it did as the lead district in the TVTIP consortium, but the concern is that the program is attempting to do so without the ability to advocate for the resources they need to effectively operate the program and to support their Education Specialist candidates. Another concern was whether the district is truly considering the interests of the PNTP program. During interviews with district leadership, they referred to the program as one with a “marketable reputation” with an eye on expanding the program to other school districts. The district’s intention of expanding the program – which district leadership stated was “ranked 10th in the state due to our high quality” – without providing the adequate resources for the program to operate in accordance with Commission-adopted standards is concerning to the team.

Reviewers found recruitment and faculty development efforts inconsistent in the support of hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. Aside from the mandated EEO statement, there is no evidence of recruitment that would support diversity. In addition, although some of the mandatory professional development for all PUSD teachers touch on topics such as diversity and inclusion, the only evidence found for PNTP faculty development to support diversity was within the collaboration with their Regional Collaboration group where, during an interview, work on English learner strategies for teachers was mentioned. While interviewing completers about preparation for diverse learners, one said, "She [coach] prepared me as best as she could. Both coaches were always ready to talk about all students and ranges. They pointed out so many different things. I taught ELD my first year and wasn't prepared." In interviews with candidates, candidates mentioned that they wished the program provided more opportunities and training to discuss social matters and diversity so as to incorporate social justice issues into their classrooms.

Reviewers could not confirm that the institution involves faculty and instructional personnel in the collaboration and decision making for the Pleasanton New Teacher Project. With recent changes in program structure, there have been initial steps in forming an advisory board with a plan to hold a kickoff meeting in May 2021 to address program coordination and enact data-based decision making for the educator preparation program. The composition of the advisory

board and areas of focus are not yet clear, given that there are no minutes or agendas at the time of the site visit.

Rationale for the Finding

After becoming the PNTP program, the program did not establish any collaborative partnerships with institutions of higher education. The program did continue collaboration with their regional collaboration partners, comprised of the following districts: Livermore Valley Joint Union, Castro Valley, Dublin, San Ramon, and Sunol Glen. Beyond that, reviewers found inconsistent evidence that:

- a. The institution involves faculty, instructional personnel and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making.
- b. The faculty and instructional personnel systematically collaborate with the broader educational community.
- c. The unit monitors a consistent credential recommendation process that ensures candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.
- d. The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of the program, including fully considering the program’s needs, such as filling vacant positions. Significant changes in district personnel have resulted in an obscured oversight regarding the needs and support of new teachers.
- e. A systematic approach by the unit and all relevant stakeholders to make decisions about the program exists.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	Team Finding
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	Consistently
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	Inconsistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	Consistently
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

After a review of program documents and stakeholder interviews, inconsistencies surfaced regarding purposeful recruitment efforts to diversify the educator pool in addition to the retention of Education Specialists in the district. There was no evidence in program advisement and candidate support for those who need additional assistance to meet competencies, including those candidates who have additional credential renewal requirements. Although candidates who have additional renewal requirements, such as the EL (English Learner) authorization, were regularly reminded of these requirements by Human Resources and their coach, the level and type of support they would be provided was largely dependent on their coach rather than the program at large. One candidate mentioned that their coach helped them with resources for the CTEL (California Teachers of English Learners) exam and “she [the coach] checked in to make sure I was working on those requirements.” An Education Specialist candidate expressed during interviews, “luckily my coach was a Reading Specialist who understood goals, assessments, and the systems that need to be in place to meet those goals.” This candidate also wished they had a “specialized Special Education coach.”

Rationale for the Finding

The PNTF expressed that coaches engage in weekly conversations to problem solve issues and if issues continue to be unresolved, the coach meets with the PNTF leadership team for further discussion. Although this falls under the realm of “just-in-time support,” there is not an apparent, systematic process, that is clearly defined and written, to assist candidates who might need additional support to meet credential requirements, as previously noted. Evidence was inconsistent to reviewers regarding advisement and candidate support, including a clearly defined process to identify and support candidates who are struggling to complete program requirements and/or credential requirements.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	Inconsistently
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	Inconsistently
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	Inconsistently

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	Inconsistently
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	Inconsistently
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	Inconsistently
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Inconsistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Inconsistently
For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California’s students and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

PNTP implements a planned sequence of high-quality, job-embedded coursework to support General Education candidates’ induction experience. Interviews with General Education candidates, coaches, and program leadership confirm the program requirements to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards. Through many of those same interviews, however, the team learned that Education Specialist candidates' requirements are different from their General Education peers and are not integrated closely with their classroom experiences. The PNTP program does not currently employ a coach with a special education credential, and through stakeholder interviews, the team found that Education Specialist educators severely lack the support needed to demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek. Some site administrators who were formerly Special Education teachers filled the gap for the lack of support for some of the Education Specialist candidates. A year 2 candidate expressed that a Program Specialist, who was available last academic year but left halfway through this year, had “supported me more on the legal support for the job” and the coach “is academic” so “it would have been nice to have had a support in the Special Education aspect as [the coach] has not worked in Special Education.”

Additionally, there is no evidence that coaches are provided formative feedback by the PNTP program leadership for their continuous improvement. Although reviewers were provided a

copy of a coach’s “PNTN Coach Learning Plan,” in which a coach documented goals and articulated an action plan, there was no documentation of what happens with the plan, such as follow-up, in addition to the outcomes of the goal-setting, and how it ties into the coach’s mentoring practice.

Rationale for the Finding

While coaches in the PNTN program are highly regarded as well-trained individuals who provide a high level of support, through interviews with all stakeholders it is clear that Education Specialists do not receive appropriate support for their area of expertise. In addition, through interviews conducted with stakeholders, it was expressed that pairing Education Specialists with General Education coaches was “deliberate for pedagogical purposes” (i.e., provide course content/subject area support) although Education Specialists candidates repeatedly stated that they wished they had a coach with a Special Education background. Deeper and, ultimately, necessary support is not provided to Education Specialist candidates due to the limitations of the coach team and the lack of institutional resources allocated to support program needs. In regard to PNTN coaches, evidence of formative feedback provided by the program is lacking.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	Not Evidenced
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	Not Evidenced
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data.	Inconsistently
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	Not Evidenced

Finding on Common Standard 4: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Reviewers found no comprehensive continuous improvement cycle at the unit or program levels. Some data collection efforts were evident such as surveys from program candidates and completers and feedback from coaches. While these various pieces of data were collected, the unit did not provide evidence of a system to regularly analyze data to identify program effectiveness and make modifications. During interviews, constituent groups could not articulate a system to analyze data, who participates in data analysis, or how analysis of data is used to modify the program or improve unit effectiveness. Reviewers recognize PUSD’s plan to implement an advisory board made up of various stakeholders who will analyze data and provide feedback to the unit; however, this board had not yet met at the time of the site visit.

Site administrator interviews indicated they recalled completing a survey but were unclear as to how the results were used. They currently have no formalized way to provide feedback to the program except to speak to the director of the program informally. This is also the case for candidates. Although candidates have an opportunity to provide this type of feedback in the mid-year survey and end-of-survey conducted by the PNTF, candidates confirmed that program feedback is provided primarily in an informal manner to their coaches. The site visit team did not find evidence that supported the use of candidate feedback to make continuous programmatic improvements.

Rationale for the Finding

A comprehensive continuous improvement cycle at both unit and program levels was not evidenced during the site visit. The program has yet to implement a continuous improvement process to regularly assess the quality of services through data analysis and develop program recommendations with the partnerships of stakeholders, including institutions of higher education.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	Inconsistently
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The institution provides Induction activities that allow candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate P-12 students through the creation of an ILP. As part of the Induction program, the ILP is developed with guidance by the coach and includes goal setting and specific action research. And, although ILPs are being implemented in the program, the focus of the completion of documents and assignments by the coach raises concerns regarding the individualization and growth for each candidate. Candidates stated in interviews that they discussed concerns in their weekly meetings and their coach filled out the paperwork. There was a concern with reviewers that candidates had little knowledge of the CSTP or ILP process.

In addition, through interviews of stakeholders, it was not evident how the site administrators are involved in the oversight or collaboration of writing the ILP growth goals. In the absence of an Education Specialist coach, it is unclear as to how Education Specialist candidates can develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed to support all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. While the candidate and coach engage in the induction

activities as outlined above, the program does not consistently ensure (via assessment or evaluation of) these processes, although survey data is collected. The monitoring system is provided primarily by the coach and provides oversight for the completion of Induction “assignments” as mentioned by a candidate during the candidate interviews.

Rationale for the Finding

Due to the fact that there is no consistent formalized process by which the program analyzes its assessment or impact data in a way that leads to continuous improvement or program impact, the unit is thereby not able to evaluate and demonstrate whether they have a positive impact on candidate learning, competence, and teaching and learning for California’s students.