

Report on Institutions Requiring a 7th Year Report

August 2012

Overview of this Report

This report presents information on two institutions that were required to submit a 7th year report to the COA: 1) the University of the Pacific and 2) Modesto City Schools. In addition, this report provides information about California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo and actions it has taken to address one standard deemed less than fully met.

Staff Recommendation

No action is needed on this item.

Background to this Report

The accreditation system allows the COA to request a 7th year report from any institution. In cases where the institution receives stipulations, the 7th year report requirement is fulfilled in submitting a response to the stipulations. However, the COA may request institutions receiving **Accreditation** to also provide a 7th year report. These reports typically are requested when one or more Common or program standards are less than fully met, but may be required even in cases where the team has deemed all standards met. These reports require no action by the COA, however, they do provide some assurance that the institution is taking steps to ensure alignment with all standards or are continuing to meet all standards.

For the 2010-11 accreditation year, three institutions were granted the accreditation status of Accreditation with a request by COA that they submit a 7th year report. These institutions are Hayward Unified School District, University of the Pacific, and Modesto City Schools. Hayward Unified School District's 7th year report was discussed at the June 2012 COA meeting. This agenda item includes information from the 7th year reports of University of the Pacific and Modesto City Schools. In addition, Commission staff has included information about California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. Although not required to do so, this institution has continued to work with the Commission to address the one standard deemed less than fully met after a revisit.

University of the Pacific

The COA acted to grant the status of **Accreditation** to the University of the Pacific on June 23, 2011. The University of the Pacific offers numerous credential programs. The full team report is available at the following link: [https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/18-UOP-FINAL.pdf?-db=PSD Program Sponsors DB&-lay=web Accreditation Reports&-recid=114&-field=COA Report Site Visit](https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/18-UOP-FINAL.pdf?-db=PSD%20Program%20Sponsors%20DB&-lay=web%20Accreditation%20Reports&-recid=114&-field=COA%20Report%20Site%20Visit) The team determined that all Common Standards and program standards were met with the exception of Common Standards 2 and 6 which were met with concerns, and two program standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist program and two standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services programs, all of which were Met with Concerns. In granting **Accreditation**, the COA required the following:

- The Commission also requests that University of the Pacific address all standards less than fully met in their 7th year report, due no later than May of 2012.

The information provided by the University of the Pacific in response to this requirement is included in Appendix A.

Modesto City Schools

The COA acted to grant the status of **Accreditation** to Modesto City Schools on June 23, 2011. Modesto City Schools offers a General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction program. The full team report is available at the following link: https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/10-Modesto%20City-FINAL.pdf?-db=PSD_Program_Sponsors_DB&-lay=web_Accreditation_Reports&-recid=249&-field=COA_Report_Site_Visit. The team determined that all Common Standards and all program standards were met.

In granting **Accreditation**, the COA acted to require a 7th year report with the following direction:

- That the Modesto City Schools report on its plan to increase recruitment of diverse support providers.
- That Modesto City Schools report on its efforts to formalize stakeholder participation in the program.

The information provided by Modesto City Schools in response to this directive is summarized in Appendix B of this agenda item.

California Polytechnic State University. San Luis Obispo

The initial accreditation visit to Cal Poly SLO was conducted April 17-20, 2011. Due to the finding that three Common Standards were Met with Concerns and four program standards were Met with Concerns, the COA granted **Accreditation with Stipulations** and required Cal Poly SLO to host a re-visit within one year. Four stipulations were agreed upon by the COA.

A revisit was held March 26-28, 2012. The revisit team found that all stipulations had been addressed, all Common Standards were Met and that all of the program standards were Met with the exception of Education Specialist Program Standard 15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork, which continued to be Met with Concerns. The COA acted to remove all stipulations and grant **Accreditation**. No additional report was required. The full team report is available at: https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/23-SLO%20Revisit%20Report-FINAL.pdf?-db=PSD_Program_Sponsors_DB&-lay=web_Accreditation_Reports&-recid=3&-field=COA_Report_Site_Revisit

The 2012 revisit findings with respect to Education Specialist Program Standard 15 is included below.

The standard requires that candidates have planned experiences “that reflect the full range of grades/ages.” While changes made in program field experiences since the initial visit provide candidates with the opportunity to observe and participate in classrooms at more than one grade level, the fieldwork design does not provide significant opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate program competencies at more than one grade level. Candidates interviewed reported that the program provides significant opportunities to “learn about” instruction and service delivery systems at a range of grade levels, but they did not have systematic opportunities to apply that learning at more than one grade level.

Although there was no requirement to do so, institutional representatives continued to work with the Team Lead and Commission Consultant to address the concerns related to Program Standard 15. Following the April COA 2012 meeting, the institution presented proposed plans for program improvements and supporting documentation for consideration. In July 2012 the institution presented a revised plan to address the concerns. Per the Team Lead, key factors in the revised plan include the addition of 70 hours of field work in the candidate's minor field placement, and the requirement that mentor teachers evaluate candidates on selected TPE requirements during this placement. These are essential in enabling candidates to demonstrate competence at more than one grade level and in more than one service delivery model. Submission of the above information and documentation demonstrated that Program Standard 15 is no longer Met with Concerns and is now Met.

Next Steps

Staff will take COA direction as to whether additional information is needed in the future for the University of the Pacific and the Modesto City School District.

APPENDIX A
University of the Pacific 7th Year Report

Common Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation—Met with Concerns <i>The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.</i>	
Findings on Standards:	Update Provided by Institution
<p>In the M.A. in Educational Administration/preliminary services credential, candidate assessment data are not regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.</p> <p>Rationale: Data for the M.A. in Educational Administration/preliminary services credential is inadequate. Multiple interviews and review of pertinent exhibits indicate collection of data is limited to two of the four unit assessment points. In addition, analysis and dissemination of data are not supported by evidence.</p>	<p>The Benerd School of Education (BSE) and the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership take assessment seriously. The Preliminary Administrative Services program has developed and implemented an assessment system that is aligned with the system used by all programs within the Unit. That is, the program collects data at the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to enrollment (often at the point of admission); • During the program (in the form of course and program embedded, specific, consistent course and program assessments); • At the end of the program and prior to credential recommendation (in the form of capstone assessments and surveys); and • Post program (in the form of one year follow up surveys). <p>These data are aggregated, analyzed, and used by the faculty to make decisions related to individual candidates and to program improvement.</p> <p>To ensure that data are collected systematically for the Preliminary Administrative Credential program, we have developed a handbook for students and faculty. This handbook includes admission and credential requirements and course requirements for the MA and/or the credential. The handbook outlines entry points for students where they will participate in a program orientation, advising. Candidates meet with their advisor (who is also the program coordinator) and are given a course planning sheet. Selected assignments from the following courses: EDUC 278, EDUC 295C, EDUC 286, EDUC 285 serve as “within program” embedded signature assessments. These are specific, consistent, standards-based assessments that are used throughout the program – from year to year – regardless of</p>

	<p>the instructor. Data from these assessments are included in the unit's biennial reports.</p> <p>End of the program assessment of the candidate includes a competency exit interview by two professors, review of candidate's performance in fieldwork (by a university and field-based supervisor), examination of the professional portfolio, and an exit survey to evaluate the candidate's experience in the program. The professional portfolio consists of the candidate's reflections on the leadership standards completed while the candidate was participating in the 3 units of field experience in diverse school settings. It also includes evidence submitted by the candidate to demonstrate he/she has met all leadership standards at an acceptable level. The portfolio contains a section for background, demographic, and student learning information about the fieldwork placement.</p> <p>The following attachments provide evidence of the development and implementation of the Preliminary Administrative Credential program's assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Standard 2: Attachment 1: Overview of the Preliminary Administrative Credential Assessment System • Common Standard 2: Attachment 2: Assessment data: Report to Faculty EADM On Preliminary Administrative Credential Data
--	--

Common Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources—Met with Concerns
The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Findings on Standards:	Update Provided By Institution
<p>The education unit does not directly manage or coordinate all programs offered at the institution for the initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.</p>	<p>We have implemented the process of expanding the coordination between and among the Department of Speech Language Pathology (SLP) and the Benerd School of Education (BSE) by establishing a coordinating working group comprised of faculty within the Speech Language Pathology program who work most directly with schools, appropriate School of Education faculty, and the credential analyst within the Benerd School of Education. The decision to address this concern in this matter is the result of a collaborative process involving leaders of Speech Language Pathology (SLP), the Benerd School of Education, and the University's provost. Issues considered</p>

by the leadership team as they designed a collaborative process included:

- Developing a plan for addressing the concern related to CTC Common Standard 6 while simultaneously honoring Standard 1.4 of the American Speech and Hearing Association’s (ASHA) accreditation standards which require that program faculty of any ASHA accredited program have “authority and responsibility” for the program and that the program’s faculty can “initiate, implement, and evaluate decisions affecting all aspects of the professional education program”;
- Developing a plan for addressing the concern related to Common Standard 6 that is aligned with the University’s governance structure; and
- Developing and implementing an efficient and useful approach that ensures effective collaboration and coordination.

Members of the coordinating committee have been appointed and charged. The leadership team made the deliberate decision to initiate quarterly meetings of the Speech Language Pathology/School of Education in September 2012 because the SLP program was completing its ASHA reaccreditation process during the 2011-2012 academic year and the larger University community was actively preparing for its Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Educational Effectiveness Review (completed in April, 2012) and simultaneously engaging in an intensive year-long strategic planning process. The coordinating committee is scheduled to meet in September 2012 and will meet quarterly. The goals of the group are as follows:

- To share information about respective programs including program changes, new developments in credential requirements, etc.;
- To share relevant assessment data and review department plans to use these data;
- To explore additional and deeper mechanisms for coordination;
- To consider additional collaborative courses and/or programs; and
- To consider ways to share resources to extend and strengthen the respective programs.

The following attachments provide evidence of progress toward addressing this concern:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Standard 6: Attachment 1: List of members of the Speech-Language and BSE coordinating working group. • Common Standard 6: Attachment 2: Letter to members of the Speech-Language and BSE coordinating group that includes the “charge” to the group and a description of scope of work.
--	---

Education Specialist

Findings on Standards:	Update Provided by Institution
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------

<p>Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination</p> <p>Standard 1 <i>Integrated/Blended Program Delivery Model</i> states, “An <i>Integrated/Blended Program of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation provides candidates with explicit and supported mechanisms for collaboration among all involved in the design, leadership, and ongoing delivery of the program.</i>”</p> <p>Evidence suggests that not all appropriate stakeholders are involved in collaboration, due in part to the use of practicing professionals who also serve as university adjuncts, on the special education advisory board.</p>	<p>In order to ensure that all appropriate stakeholders are involved in collaboration around program design, assessments, etc., the unit has established an independent advisory board consisting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special education professionals who are not directly affiliated with the University of the Pacific special education program; • A district curriculum director not directly affiliated with the University of the Pacific special education program; • Principals not directly affiliated with the University of the Pacific special education program; • Faculty from programs within the School of Education who are not affiliated with the special education programs; and • Faculty teaching within the School of Education’s special education/educational specialist programs. <p>This group is co-chaired by the coordinator of special education and one other unit administrator (either the dean or the assistant dean). The group will meet quarterly to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review assessment data; • Consider program revisions, assignments, etc.; • Assist in the oral and other examinations as appropriate; • Examine the integration between and among all initial and advanced teacher education. <p>The following attachments provide evidence of progress toward fully meeting this standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ed. Specialist Standard 1: Attachment 1: List of members of the “Special Education Advisory Board”
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ed. Specialist Standard 1: Attachment 2: Letter inviting individuals to participate in the “Stakeholder Coordination Group: Special Education”
Findings on Standards:	Update Provided by Institution
<p>Standard 16. Assessment of Candidate Performance</p> <p><i>Standard 16 states, “Prior to recommending each candidate for a teaching credential, one or more persons responsible for the program shall determine on the basis of thoroughly documented evidence that such candidate has demonstrated a satisfactory performance on the full range of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) as they apply to the subjects and specialties authorized by the credential. Verification of candidate performance is provided by at least one supervising teacher and one institutional supervisor trained to assess the TPEs.”</i></p> <p>Evidence suggests that the rubrics designed to assess TPE achievement for various assignments, presentations, oral questioning, projects, and portfolios were not subject to review or a process that verifies lack of bias or subjectivity. There is additional concern that a formal process for collecting, examining, analyzing, reporting, and making use of the data to improve student learning and inform candidates about their progress has only been addressed informally in discussions and appears to be a work in progress.</p>	<p>The report accurately notes that, at the time of the CTC review of the University of the Pacific’s programs, the rubrics, process, etc. related to special education were “works in progress.” This was due to timing for submission of the Special Education program documents to CTC for review. The Special Education program documents reflecting the assessments and assessment process for special education candidates were completed and submitted in late March 2011.</p> <p>As a part of that submission, two special education professionals reviewed the document with special attention to the face validity of the assessments. We have proceeded with the assessments of TPEs as they are outlined in the documents as we await feedback from CTC. Two individuals within the unit – a faculty member and a special education professional – review candidate performance. The supervising teacher also participates in this review.</p> <p>Evidence providing evidence of progress toward fully meeting this standard includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational Specialist Standard 16: Attachment 1: Special Education program documents submitted to CTC in late March 2011. Discussion of process for assessing candidates begins on page 56. This is highlighted in this attachment. • Educational Specialist Standard 16: Attachment 2: Copies of Rubrics used to evaluate candidates in relationship to TPEs. These are taken from CTC Program Documents, Appendices B-E. • Educational Specialist Standard 16. Attachments 3 and 4: Samples of Summative Assessments of SPED students in relationship to TPEs • Educational Specialist Standard 15. Attachment 5: Tables documenting SPED students’ meeting of TPEs (Detailed assessment data are reported in the Educational Specialist biennial report.)

Preliminary Administrative Services

Findings on Standards:	Update Provided by Institution
<p>Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences</p> <p>Authentic and significant experiences addressing a variety of school levels and a variety of school settings are required for each candidate, including field experiences, at least one of which involves a site with a diverse school population. The program strives to place candidates in more than one level yet did not provide evidence that all candidates meet this requirement due to complications with employment at one setting.</p>	<p>Administrative credential candidates have opportunities to engage with diverse settings as they complete certain course-based assignments including diversity plans for their and other school sites and/or in-depth investigations of California distinguished schools. However, their significant administrative and leadership experiences occur as part of their 3 semester (3 unit) field experience requirement in schools with diverse student populations. We are committed to ensuring that every candidate has experience in diverse settings. This is not a difficult task because of the ethnic and socio-economic diversity within the Stockton community and surrounding school districts. For example, the most recent student ethnic data for the Stockton schools showed the following demographics: 58% Hispanic, 13% Black, 9% White, 5% Filipino, 11% Asian, and 4% other.</p> <p>Two mechanisms ensure that candidates complete their fieldwork in varied sites with diverse school populations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program coordinator, working with the dean, department chair, and credential analyst maintains an ongoing data base documenting fieldwork placements of administrative candidates; and • Candidates are required to provide evidence that they have completed their fieldwork in varied and diverse setting in their professional portfolios. This evidence is evaluated as a part of the candidate assessment process. <p>Evidence of progress toward fully meeting this standard includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary Administrative Services Standard 7: Attachment 1: Database documenting candidates' fieldwork placements in varied and diverse sites. • Preliminary Administrative Services Standard 7: Attachment 2: Syllabus EADM 292 – Fieldwork describing expectations for fieldwork including expectations for placement sites. • Preliminary Administrative Services Standard 7: Attachment 3: Handbook: Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program. Relevant portions are highlighted

Findings on Standards:	Update Provided by Institution
<p>Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence</p> <p>There is a systematic summative assessment administered by qualified individuals who are knowledgeable about the standards of candidate competence in Category III. Candidates are assessed using documented procedures or instruments that are clear, fair and effective. The program includes a Portfolio based on appropriate program standards that serves as a summative assessment at the completion of the program. The procedures for assessment of this culminating portfolio were not evident to reviewers as being well documented and the rubric has just been developed but is not currently in place.</p>	<p>The program advisor serves as the academic advisor for all candidates for the preliminary administrative services credential. This adviser monitors the candidate’s progress through the program. The advisor is knowledgeable about the educational leadership standards, having served as a district administrator for over 20 years. Selected assignments from the following courses: EDUC 278, EDUC 295C, EDUC 286, EDUC 285 serve as “within program” course embedded assessments. These are specific, consistent, standards-based assessments that are used throughout the program – from year to year – regardless of the instructor. Data from these assessments are collected and aggregated by the assessment coordinator, shared with the faculty, and included in the unit’s biennial reports. “End of program” assessment of the candidate includes a competency exit interview by two professors that occurs concurrently with an examination of the professional portfolio and an exit survey (completed by candidates and supervisors) to evaluate the candidate’s experience in the program.</p> <p>The professional portfolio consists of the candidate’s reflections based on the leadership standards while the candidate was participating in the 3 units of field experience in diverse school settings. It also includes evidence that demonstrates that the candidate has met all standards. The procedures for assessment of the portfolio are clearly outlined in the <i>Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and Masters of Educational Administration Handbook</i> and in the syllabus for EDUC 292. In brief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate is responsible for submitting a portfolio that fully demonstrates that he/she has addressed all CTC standards for the preliminary administrative services credential; • The portfolio and candidate performance are reviewed by a faculty and field based supervisor; • An exit interview is conducted. The exit interview process includes: the candidate’s reflection on the CTC standards 10-15, discussion of the career goals of the candidate, discussion of the candidate’s field experience, candidate’s perception of the educational leadership and administration program, a self-assessment of the candidate’s strengths for administrative service, self-

	<p>assessment of the candidate's areas of needed improvement prior to obtaining an administrative position, a thorough review of the professional portfolio, discussion of the strengths and weaknesses, suggestions for improvement of the Preliminary Administrative Services program, a review of the requirements for the Professional Administrative Services credential; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least two individuals (usually the supervising administrator/field-based faculty and the university fieldwork supervisor) participate in the exit interview and evaluate the candidate. The attached rubric – in draft form at the time of the CTC/NCATE review- has been revised and is now in use. <p>Candidates also complete an exit survey (attached) which evaluates the candidate's experience in the program, and an exit survey are sent to the site supervisor of the candidate to evaluate the candidate's potential as a future educational leader.</p> <p>All of the data noted above are collected and aggregated by the assessment coordinator. She completes a preliminary analysis and provides the program coordinator and program faculty with a report. The data are reviewed by program faculty who use them to make decisions about candidates and candidate support and to improve the program. The following attachments provide evidence of progress toward fully meeting this standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary Administrative Services Standard 9: Attachment 1: Rubric used in the evaluation of the final portfolio. • Preliminary Administrative Services Standard 9: Attachment 2: Exit survey completed by all candidates as part of the "end of program" assessment process. Please note, field and university based supervisors complete a similar survey to provide additional data on the candidate. • Preliminary Administrative Services Standard 9: Attachment 3: Samples of individual evaluation samples for candidates • Preliminary Administrative Services Standard 9: Attachment 4: 2011-2012 Data table for the exit interview/portfolio review • Preliminary Administrative Services Standard 9: Attachment 5: Assessment Report to EADM faculty (also included as Common Standard 2: Attachment 2)
--	--

APPENDIX B
Modesto City School District 7th Year Report
Response to Standards Not Fully Met During 2011 Accreditation Site Visit

Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership	
<i>The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs.</i>	
Findings	Update
<p>COA Decision: That Modesto City Schools address report on its efforts to formalize stakeholder participation in the program.</p> <p>From the Accreditation Report: p. 6 Currently, there is no group comprised of administrators, instructional personnel and outside “stakeholders” to assist in the governance and policy decisions related to the induction program. The Coordinator states that it is his intention this coming year to address this issue.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modesto City Schools (MCS) BTSA has established clear relationships with stakeholders connected to the BTSA program. Effort has been made this year to add additional members from all stakeholder groups; including administration and curriculum instructional leaders. The BTSA Leadership team serves as an advisory group to provide input and ensure program and common standards are being implemented, monitored, and reviewed. • The Leadership team supports the BTSA coordinator on oversight of the mentoring and induction program by reviewing state and district surveys and reports and advising on future steps. • The leadership team advises and supports the creation of policies and practices that meet state mentoring-induction program standards. • The leadership team advocates for conditions that promote high quality teacher support and induction within Modesto City Schools BTSA program. In 11/12, the leadership team collaborated to create an online induction portfolio for beginning teachers to submit electronically. • The leadership team reviews data collection, program improvement, and program accountability and advises BTSA coordinator on future steps for improvement. • Modesto City School BTSA coordinator regularly participates in the North Valley Collaborative Meetings which provide an opportunity to interact and gather input from local Institutes’ of Higher education. <p>Documentation of this work was provided and reviewed by staff.</p>

Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity.

Findings	Update
<p>COA Decision: That the Modesto City Schools report on its plan to increase recruitment of diverse support providers.</p> <p>From the Accreditation Report: p. 9 The ethnic makeup of the support provider team roughly reflects that of the teachers in the District, but not that of the surrounding population. Of the eight providers, one member is a person of color (12.5%), whereas approximately 17% of the teaching faculty is from an under-represented group. Currently, there is no mechanism to create a more diverse support provider group.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Law and Modesto City Schools (MCS) have adopted policies that ensure equal opportunities to all employees and applicants. MCS BTSA follows the same policy when hiring support providers. • Modesto City Schools (MCS) has established hiring procedures that do not discriminate. BTSA recruitment practices closely align with these hiring fair practices. • Modesto City Schools acknowledges that there is improvement needed in maintaining a diverse group of support providers. We strive to recruit members from diverse groups when choosing support providers within the current teaching workforce. • Support Provider Positions are advertised across the district to all employees. • Advertisement through Edjoin and district flyer is used to recruit support providers allowing all MCS employees the opportunity to apply. • Modesto City Schools uses a mailing and email list that we use for posting of vacancies. You will note that there several universities and colleges that are on the list aimed at diversity in recruitment. • As the workforce has expanded, MCS has increased the diversity of its support providers. In 11/12, 10.5% of SP's were Hispanic as opposed to 0% in 09/10. • MCS current teaching staff consists of 76% Caucasian and 16% Hispanic. Modesto City Schools BTSA Support provider ethnicity reflects 90% Caucasian and 10% Hispanic. In 10/11, 85% of support providers were Caucasian and 0% were Hispanic. This is a 10% increase in diverse support providers in just one year. • Modesto City Schools support provider diversity is in line with cluster, county, and state ratios. The district will continue to strive to maintain an equal ratio of diverse support providers when hiring. • Fair Hiring practices are in place for all certified employees. Per the agreement between Modesto City Schools and the Modesto Teachers Association, the school district is only allowed to recruit support providers from their current pool of teachers. MCS's current pool of support providers reflects the diversity of the current teachers within the district.

**EMPLOYEE-REPORTED ETHNICITY
(Teaching Staff Only) As of October 1, 2011**

Race	Employee Count	Percentage
Asian	21	
Asian Indian	2	
African American	16	
Cambodian	4	
Chinese	8	
Filipino	4	
Hispanic	194	16.4
Hawaiian	1	
Native American	12	
Japanese	8	
Korean	1	
Laotian	2	
Not Noted	6	
Pacific Islander	1	
Vietnamese	4	
White	898	76
Total	1182	

Documentation of this work was provided and reviewed by staff