

Report of the Accreditation Revisit to Pleasanton Unified School District June 2022

Overview of Report

This item presents the accreditation report on the revisit to Pleasanton Unified School District. The revisit occurred April 27–28, 2022. This item includes the stipulations from the 2021 initial site visit and the findings of the 2022 revisit team.

Background

Pleasanton USD hosted an initial accreditation site visit March 24 – 26, 2021. The [Pleasanton USD March 2021 Accreditation Site Visit Report](#) was presented to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) at its June 2021 meeting. On the basis of the March 2021 accreditation team’s report, the COA took action to make the following accreditation decision:

Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations for Pleasanton USD. The stipulations placed on the institution by the COA are listed below:

Within one year, the Pleasanton Unified School District must:

- 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 completer 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.

The Accreditation Revisit Team Recommendation

The April 2022 accreditation revisit, conducted by a three-member BIR team, focused on the stipulations from the March 2021 initial site visit. Based on the evidence provided through Pleasanton USD's Quarterly Reports and in subsequent documentation, in addition to interviews conducted during the revisit, the team recommends that all ten stipulations be removed, and that Pleasanton USD's accreditation status be changed from **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** to **Accreditation**. The revisit team further recommends that the institution submit two follow up reports in the coming year. The report of the accreditation revisit team follows.

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

Institution: Pleasanton Unified School District

Dates of Revisit: April 27– 28, 2022

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
<u>June 2021</u>	<u>Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations</u>

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation to **remove all stipulations** and to change the accreditation status from **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** to **Accreditation** was based on 1) a thorough review of all Quarterly Reports, and other institutional and programmatic documentation, information, and materials available prior to, and during the accreditation revisit and 2) interviews with program and district leadership, administrators, candidates, induction coaches, Education Specialist mentors, and induction program 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.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the evidence provided by **Pleasanton Unified School District** through Quarterly Reports and information that was confirmed through interviews and additional documents requested, the team recommends **Accreditation**.

The team further recommends that the institution submit two follow-up reports in the coming year at six month intervals. At the time of the revisit, some actions to address stipulations were still being planned or initially implemented. The team feels continued attention to the development and establishment of these new practices is essential to meet accreditation standards and that the follow-up reports will provide opportunities for support and/or guidance from Commission staff. Thus, a follow-up report will allow Pleasanton USD to provide updates on:

- The impact of the Advisory Team (which may include, but is not limited to providing meeting agendas, minutes, and attendance).

- The evolution of the system of support for Education Specialist (EdSp) candidates, including the role and impact of the new EdSp Induction coach - who will begin the position in the 2022-23 school year - and the EdSp mentors.
- The outcome of the May 2022 Colloquium and the subsequent process and planning for the Colloquium in the 2022-23 school year.

The team recommends two follow-up reports be provided – one report within six months and one report within twelve months – from the date of the COA’s action.

The team’s recommendation is based upon the following findings:

2021 Site Visit Stipulations	April 2022 Revisit Team Finding	April 2022 Revisit Team Recommendation
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.	Met	Remove Stipulation
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Met	Remove Stipulation

2021 Site Visit Stipulations	April 2022 Revisit Team Finding	April 2022 Revisit Team Recommendation
<p>3) Provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive continuous improvement process inclusive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Met	Remove Stipulation
<p>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.</p>	Met	Remove Stipulation
<p>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.</p>	Met	Remove Stipulation
<p>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.</p>	Met	Remove Stipulation

2021 Site Visit Stipulations	April 2022 Revisit Team Finding	April 2022 Revisit Team Recommendation
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.	Met	Remove Stipulation
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.	Met	Remove Stipulation
9) Provide quarterly written documentation to the team lead and Commission consultant documenting all actions to remove the stipulations noted above.	Met	Remove Stipulation
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.	Met	Remove Stipulation

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 be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- 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

Program Reviewer:

Jill Barnes
Napa County Office of Education

Common Standards Reviewer:

Loy Dakwa
Antelope Valley Union High School District

Staff to the Visit:

Poonam Bedi
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

First Quarterly Report	Foundations in Coaching Training Agenda
Second Quarterly Report	and Slidedeck
Third Quarterly Report	SpEd Website
Advisory Team Meeting Minutes, Agenda, Attendance, Data Sets	PNTP Website
Colloquium Planning Documentation	PNTP Accreditation Website
DOSE-PNTP Collaborative Meeting Minutes	Sample ILPs
SpEd Induction Coach Job Description	Organizational Charts
Induction Coach Job Description	SpEd Support Graphic
Coaching Foundations Facilitators' Guide	PNTP Mid-Year Protocol
Slidedeck, Attendance	PNTP Year-End Protocol
Candidate Advisement Materials	Pathway to a Clear Credential
	Interaction Logs

Interviews Conducted

Constituents	TOTAL
Candidates	32
Site Administrators	5
Program Leadership	2
Induction Coaches	3
District Leadership	6
SpEd Department Leadership	2
SpEd Program Supervisors	4
SpEd Mentors	4
Credential Analysts and Staff	4
Advisory Team	5
TOTAL	67

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Pleasanton USD Teacher Induction Candidates as of the Revisit

Current Candidates (2020-2021)	Year 1	Year 2
General Education	22	13
Special Education	2	5
Dual (General Education & Special Education)	1	4

The Revisit

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this site revisit was conducted virtually. Relevant institutional constituents were interviewed via technology. The revisit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

FINDINGS OF THE REVISIT TEAM

Stipulation #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.

March 2021 site visit team findings:

The team found that, although survey data was collected, evidence of how the program assesses the quality of services provided by coaches (the term used by Pleasanton USD to describe their Teacher Induction mentors) to candidates was lacking. Also, the team found no evidence of the unit involving all relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for the program.

April 2022 revisit team findings:

Finding on Stipulation #1: **Met**

Stipulation #1 Recommendation: **Remove Stipulation**

Rationale for the Finding

The unit actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituents in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs through the practice of regular advisory team meetings. During these meetings, diverse educational partners meet and analyze program data, make program recommendations, and provide input and feedback on newly implemented policies, practices, and procedures to support induction candidates, Education Specialist (EdSp) mentors, and induction coaches. This was evidenced through documentation provided by the program, and through interviews where it was noted that, at advisory team meetings, participants now “have a voice and feel their participation is meaningful.” In addition, this academic year, the Pleasanton New Teacher Project (PNTTP) was moved from the Teaching and Learning division into the Human Resources division. Many constituents commented on how this was a positive shift that allowed for continuity of support of the induction program. Interviews with district leadership confirmed that the move to Human Resources has given the PNTTP “a voice at the table” with the PNTTP director now being a member of the extended cabinet. This has led to a collaborative, cohesive, coordinated district-level leadership structure as also exemplified by the advisory team. The team is recommending documentation and evidence of subsequent advisory team meetings be included in the follow-up reports since these are newly established practices.

Stipulation #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.*

March 2021 site visit team findings:

The team had concerns regarding the process by which clear credential recommendations are made and the discrepancies in program documentation and interviews about this process. The team was unable to find sufficient evidence that the unit monitors the credential recommendation process.

April 2022 revisit team findings:

Finding on Stipulation #2: **Met**

Stipulation #2 Recommendation: **Remove Stipulation**

Rationale for the Finding

Documentation and interviews conducted during the revisit confirmed that the unit implements a credential recommendation process that ensures only candidates who have met all credential requirements are recommended for a credential. The Pathway to a Clear Credential document depicted the process and steps required for the clear credential. The unit monitors the credential recommendation process utilizing PNTTP staff and Human Resources (HR) staff. The PNTTP staff confirmed a multi-step review process coordinated by coaches, the PNTTP/HR Coordinator, and the Director of Human Resources/PNTTP Director prior to handing off the Clear credential application for submission to the credential analysts. Next, the credential analysts submit recommendations to the Commission and communicate with candidates accordingly. In regard to the monitoring of candidate completion of credential requirements, candidates and credential analysts mentioned during interviews that regular email reminders were sent to candidates regarding any additional outstanding credential requirements (i.e., TPA, RICA, and/or other assessments).

Stipulation #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.*

March 2021 site visit team findings:

The team found no comprehensive continuous improvement cycle at the unit or program levels. The unit did not provide evidence of a system to regularly analyze data to identify program effectiveness and make modifications.

April 2022 revisit team findings:

Finding on Stipulation #3: **Met**

Stipulation #3 Recommendation: **Remove Stipulation**

Rationale for the Finding

Interviews and evidence provided by the program demonstrate the implementation of a comprehensive continuous improvement process. Through the establishment of the Advisory Team, the unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness and make appropriate modifications based on findings. During interviews, candidates, EdSp mentors, and induction program staff confirmed review of mid-year and year-end survey data of various constituent groups, prioritizing candidate feedback on support. Specifically, the urgent priority of ensuring EdSp candidates were receiving additional and adequate support was a focus of data analysis and review this academic year. Advisory Team participants reported the data review process was clear, “looking at data in breakout rooms and returning to the main room for group conversation” as was corroborated in the quarterly reports. Subsequently, program modifications were developed and implemented to provide more significant support to EdSp candidates and strengthen the clear credential process.

Coaches described a multi-pronged process of formative feedback, including: 1) review of mid-year data from candidates on coach support, 2) review of end-of-year data from candidates and administrators on coach support, 3) the development of annual goals for growth in the coaching practice, 5) ongoing conversations to identify resources and next steps, based on coach goals, with the HR/PNTP Director, and 6) collaboration with colleagues in the Regional Forum for peer feedback.

Stipulation #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.

March 2021 site visit team findings:

The team found that the credential recommendation process was unclear to candidates finishing the program. The team found insufficient evidence that the ILP is collaboratively developed by the candidate and coach with input from the employer regarding the candidate's job assignment.

April 2022 revisit team findings:

Finding on Stipulation #4: **Met**

Stipulation #4 Recommendation: **Remove Stipulation**

Rationale for the Finding

Through the new development of a robust and clear process for the clear credential recommendation, interviews and documentation confirmed 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. Interviews confirmed a multi-step review process, within the Human Resources department, which now provides a balanced method of ensuring that all candidates meet the requirements for a Clear credential. This process includes initial, mid-year, and end-of-year reviews with the candidate, EdSp mentor, and induction coaches. During interviews, candidates and coaches described how they meet to plan Individual Learning Plan (ILP) goals for the year, which includes meetings with site administration to discuss the goals that will be focused on. Then, candidates complete an initial California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) self-reflection and discuss with their coach. Candidates' self-reflection and goals would be revisited periodically (mid-year and end-of-year) throughout the year.

For the first time, PNTP is conducting an end-of-year Colloquium which will include Advisory Team members, induction coaches, and EdSp mentors to showcase candidate growth in the CSTP. As heard in interviews, PNTP is "building the plane and flying it at the same time" for the upcoming Colloquium, and it will be essential that this new practice is subjected to the same continuous improvement process applied to other aspects of the program as it was established to confirm candidates demonstrate growth in the CSTP. As such, the team is recommending documentation and evidence of the May 2022 Colloquium and the 2022-23 Colloquium be included in a follow-up report.

Stipulation #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.

March 2021 site visit team findings:

The team found the support of EdSp candidates in the program was sporadic and was supplemented by district Program Specialists and site administrators. None of the program coaches, who serve as mentors, hold EdSp credentials or added authorizations. The position for an EdSp coach and program secretary remained unfilled at the time of the initial site visit.

April 2022 revisit team findings:

Finding on Stipulation #5: **Met**

Stipulation #5 Recommendation: **Remove Stipulation**

Rationale for the Finding

Interviews confirmed that, within current funding allocations, the program receives sufficient resources to allow for effective operation, in addition to district staffing, to support EdSp candidates within the induction program. A new EdSp coach role, which had been developed during the initial site visit, will be fully staffed starting Fall 2022. According to interviews, for the upcoming school year, the role of the new EdSp coach will be to mentor EdSp candidates in the program in addition to working directly with the Department of Special Education (DOSE) to coordinate needed support for EdSp candidates.

In the interim, during the 2021-2022 school year, on-site/district Education Specialist mentors have been assigned to provide “just-in-time” support to enrolled candidates and direct them to additional system-wide EdSp resources. The EdSp mentors are veteran teachers in the Pleasanton USD who work with EdSp candidates in the program and their induction coach to triangulate support. It was unclear in interviews with PNTP coaches and leadership, the new DOSE leadership, EdSp mentors, and other constituent groups exactly what role EdSp mentors would play in the 2022-23 school year, although the majority of interviewees stated that they believe that on-site EdSp mentor support would continue to be a part of the system of support for EdSp teachers in the district. How the new EdSp induction coach would coordinate support with these mentors is also unclear. The unit has also upgraded the Special Education Program Supervisor role from certificated to certificated management. Program supervisors work at the administrative level to coordinate support for all EdSp teachers across the sites they each cover. These new roles provide a more comprehensive system of support and a pathway for EdSp candidates to access resources as needs arise. The team is recommending a follow-up report with documentation and evidence of continued support of EdSp candidates since these are newly established practices. As EdSp candidates described “they would not have made it through this year without their EdSp mentor.”

Stipulation #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.

March 2021 site visit team findings:

The team found that the EdSp candidates lacked the support needed to demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek. Evidence of how candidates that needed additional assistance in meeting competencies was also lacking.

April 2022 revisit team findings:

Finding on Stipulation #6: **Met**

Stipulation #6 Recommendation: **Remove Stipulation**

Rationale for the Finding

Interviews confirmed that appropriate information and personnel are accessible to guide each EdSp candidate's attainment of program requirements. In particular, EdSp mentors were noted as essential to making it through day-to-day instruction and urgent questions. One critical resource that was created this year was the Special Education website. As expressed by an Education Specialist candidate, "This year they rolled out the SpEd website. I cannot express how excited I was to see that come alive and see so many questions be answered in one place." EdSp candidates also shared how they accessed additional support, saying how "if they vented about a problem" their coach would "email them later with resources to resolve it." It was clear that when the answer was not readily available, additional support was brokered for the EdSp candidates within the system. When a candidate might require additional assistance to meet competencies, they are offered the opportunity to repeat portions of the program as necessary for a third year to meet all requirements successfully. The team is recommending a follow-up report since these are newly established practices.

Stipulation #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.

March 2021 site visit team findings:

The team found that program coaches (who serve as mentors) could not fully support their EdSp candidates to the extent that General Education candidates were being supported.

April 2022 revisit team findings:

Finding on Stipulation #7: **Met**

Stipulation #7 Recommendation: **Remove Stipulation**

Rationale for the Finding

Interviews and documentation provided during the revisit verified that the site-based supervisors (coaches) are certified, carefully selected, and trained to provide effective support for candidates. The coach role is advertised through the Human Resources department as a posted assignment in Pleasanton USD and open to all eligible applicants. The selection process follows established Human Resources policy and protocol for selection. During the 2021-22 school year, coaches worked in coordination with EdSp mentors. These mentors were matched by credential and like assignment. EdSp mentors are selected by induction program staff and/or assigned to the duties as part of their current role. The EdSp Induction Coach position had been posted for application through the Human Resources Department and remained open for a significant period of time. By the time of the revisit, applicants had been interviewed and a candidate selected to fill the role starting in the 2022-23 school year.

The role and responsibilities of the EdSp mentor were shared during a “Coaching in Foundations” training session and are focused on “just-in-time” support in Special Education case management and instruction. As this role has just been developed this school year to fill the gap in EdSp induction candidate support, no formal opportunities for formative feedback have been developed. EdSp mentors reported that they “have had meetings with coaches” and ask questions about their role to the induction coach. Current EdSp mentors were not aware of what their role would look like in the next academic year, but they felt that their involvement has strengthened support for EdSp candidates. Mentors shared they’re “excited to have the opportunity to support and retain quality teachers through this role.” Mentors also report how essential it is for EdSp candidates to have support from someone credentialed as an Education Specialist who understands the context of their assignment and duties.

Stipulation #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.

April 2022 revisit team findings:

Finding on Stipulation #8: **Met**

Stipulation #8 Recommendation: **Remove Stipulation**

Rationale for the Finding

Documentation provided in the Quarterly Reports showed that current and prospective candidates were informed of Pleasanton USD's Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations accreditation status through the PNTP Onboarding Protocol, completed by candidates at the beginning of the school year, and the PNTP Candidate Mid-Year protocol, completed by candidates midway through the year.

Stipulation #9:

Provide quarterly written documentation to the team lead and Commission consultant documenting all actions to remove the stipulations noted above.

April 2022 revisit team findings:

Finding on Stipulation #9: **Met**

Stipulation #9 Recommendation: **Remove Stipulation**

Rationale for the Finding

PNTP staff provided quarterly written documentation to the team lead and Commission consultant documenting all actions to remove the stipulations noted above. Additional requests were responded to in a timely manner.

[Pleasanton USD's First Quarterly Report](#) - Item 15 - Presented at the [October 2021 COA meeting](#)

[Pleasanton USD's Second Quarterly Report](#) - Item 21 - Presented at the [Feb 2022 COA meeting](#)

[Pleasanton USD's Third Quarterly Report](#) - Item 16 - Presented at the [March 2022 COA meeting](#)

Stipulation #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.

April 2022 revisit team findings:

Finding on Stipulation #10: **Met**

Stipulation #10 Recommendation: **Remove Stipulation**

Rationale for the Finding

Pleasanton USD successfully hosted an accreditation revisit to verify that required changes have been made in the program design and implementation in alignment to the Common Standards and Program Standards and provided evidence of actions to address stipulations. The revisit was conducted by a three-member BIR review team and occurred Wednesday, April 27 - Thursday, April 28, 2022.