

---

# 2F

## Information

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

### **Update on Cohort Four and Report to the Legislature on the 2018 Teacher Residency Grant Program**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item provides an update on the fourth year of the Teacher Residency Grant Program authorized by 2018 legislation and presents the final report that was submitted to the State Legislature on December 1, 2023, as required by statute (Education Code §44415). The report to the Legislature includes summary information for all four years of the 2018 Teacher Residency Grant Program project period.

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenters:** Kristina Najarro, Lynn Larsen, and Sarah Barwani, Consultants, Professional Services Division

---

# Update on Cohort Four and Report to the Legislature on the 2018 Teacher Residency Grant Program

---

## Introduction

This agenda item provides an update on the fourth year of the Teacher Residency Grant Program authorized by 2018 legislation and presents the final report that was submitted to the State Legislature on December 1, 2023, as required by statute (Education Code §44415.) The report to the Legislature ([Appendix A](#)) includes summary information for all four years of the Teacher Residency Grant project period.

## Teacher Residency Programs Authorized by 2018 Legislation

This section of the agenda item provides brief a background on the Teacher Residency Programs—Capacity, Residency, and Expansion—authorized by 2018 legislation and provides an update on program partners, data related to Teacher Residency grant program enrollment for 2022-23 (Cohort 4), as well as retention and other related data to Teacher Residency cohorts in 2019-20 (Cohort 1), 2020-21 (Cohort 2), and 2021-22 (Cohort 3).

## Background on Teacher Residency Programs Authorized by 2018 Legislation

The Teacher Residency Grant Programs—Capacity, Residency, and Expansion—were included in the 2018-19 state budget to support the development, implementation, and expansion of teacher residency programs. [Authorizing legislation](#) provided a total of \$75 million for competitive grants for local education agencies (LEAs) to work in partnership with institutions of higher education (IHEs) with Commission-approved teacher preparation programs to offer a teacher residency pathway to earn a teaching credential in special education, STEM, or bilingual education. Grant funding for all three program types was available for encumbrance through June 30, 2023.

In accordance with the provisions of the authorizing statute, the Teacher Residency Grant Programs:

- Address teacher shortages in special education, STEM, bilingual, and other shortage areas.
- Help to recruit and support the preparation of more individuals in the teaching profession.
- Promote and provide support for teacher residency program models.
- Support the induction of educators into the profession.

Twenty-two programs in total were awarded Teacher Residency Capacity Grants between [Round 1](#) and [Round 2](#), five programs were awarded [Teacher Residency Expansion Grants](#), and thirty-three programs were awarded [Teacher Residency Grants](#). Commission staff has reported on the progress of the Teacher Residency Grant programs at the [February 2023](#), [February 2022](#), [December 2020](#), and [April 2019](#) Commission meetings.

### 2018 Teacher Residency Capacity Grant Program Data

Teacher Residency Capacity grant funds are designated for developing an LEA/IHE partnership and for planning a residency model, not implementing one. Commission staff requested data as outlined in the Request for Proposals (RFP), and the tables below present data from Teacher Residency Capacity Grant Programs as of October 6, 2023. Twenty-two LEA grantees have been funded to collectively develop their partnership capacity with IHEs to design and be prepared to implement 51 residency programs. Table 1 indicates the number of grantees that have completed all planning activities outlined in their proposals to the Commission. It is important to note that ten grantees completed activities in previous academic years. As such, Table 2 shows the categories in which Capacity grantees spent grant funds during the 2022-23 fiscal year. Of the 12 grant recipients required to submit 2022-23 reports, one did not submit their expenditure report by the October 2023 due date or after multiple reminders.

**Table 1: 2018 Teacher Residency Capacity Grant – Planning Activities Completed as of October 2023**

<b>Report Question: Has the LEA-IHE Partnership Completed All Activities Outlined in the Proposal?</b>	<b>Number of Grantees Selecting this Option (n = 21)</b>	<b>Percent of Those Reporting</b>
Yes	17	81%
No	4	19%

**Table 2: 2018 Teacher Residency Capacity Grant – Grant and Matching Funds Expended in the 2022-23 Fiscal Year**

<b>Type of Funding</b>	<b>Grant Funds (\$1,050,010 awarded)</b>	<b>Matching Funds</b>
LEA Personnel (Salaries)	\$28,876.35	\$712,988.09
LEA Personnel (Stipends)	\$49,437.25	\$0
LEA Personnel (Release Time)	\$0	\$0
IHE Personnel (Salaries)	\$0	\$102,370.00
IHE Personnel (Stipends)	\$0	\$9,600.00
IHE Personnel (Release Time)	\$0	\$0
Mentor Teacher Professional Development/Training	\$30,109.30	\$30,000.00
Mentor Teacher Stipends	\$31,182.65	\$0
Mentor Teacher Release Time	\$93,923.52	\$0
Travel for LEA Personnel	\$0	\$2,500.00
Travel for IHE Personnel	\$0	\$2,500.00
Program Administration	\$9,398.75	\$2,000.00
Other	\$25,144.48	\$23,000.00
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$268,072.30</b>	<b>\$884,958.09</b>

### 2018 Teacher Residency and Expansion Grant Program Data

To analyze the impact of the 2018 Teacher Residency and Expansion Grant Program, Commission staff requested data as outlined in the RFP. The 2019-20 academic year represented Cohort 1 of the grant programs and initial data was reported to the Commission in [December 2020](#), Cohort 2 (2020-21) data was presented at the Commission’s [February 2022](#) meeting, and Cohort 3 (2021-22) data was reported at the Commission’s [February 2023](#) meeting.

The results of data collected about residents enrolled in Cohort 4 (2022-23) for all 2018 Teacher Residency and Expansion grantees are described below. As a reminder, the data represented is a combination of the Expansion and Residency grantee data as reported by grantee LEAs. Two of the 38 Teacher Residency grantees reported incomplete data for the 2022-23 academic year so the data in the item excludes those two programs.

### 2018 Teacher Residency Grant Program Enrollment

To understand the ebb and flow of educator preparation programs, it is important to note that not all programs begin in the fall and end in the spring, including Teacher Residency Programs. As a result, Teacher Residency Programs reported the following information regarding program start dates:

- Twenty-six (26) grantees enroll residents in August or September.
- Three (3) programs enroll residents in January.
- Seven (7) programs enroll residents in May-July.
- One (1) grantee enrolled two cohorts of residents then subsequently elected not to continue the residency program because of local constraints.
- One (1) grantee did not determine a start date and has since elected not to implement a Teacher Residency Program.

The following tables reflect the number of teacher residents enrolled at any time in the 2022-23 academic year, July through June.

### Number of Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Residents Enrolled by Credential Area and Clinical Placement

For Cohort 4 (2022-23) of the 2018 Teacher Residency Grant Programs, LEAs reported a total of 222 teacher residents between July 2022 and June 2023. Table 3 indicates the number and percent of teacher residents by credential area and Table 4 shows the type of clinical placement.

**Table 3: Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Residents Enrolled in Special Education, STEM, and Bilingual Programs**

Teacher Residency Programs Credential Areas	2022-23 Cohort 4 (n = 222)	Percent
Special Education	72	32%
Special Education with Bilingual Authorization	1	0.4%

<b>Teacher Residency Programs Credential Areas</b>	<b>2022-23 Cohort 4 (n = 222)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Multiple Subjects with Bilingual Authorization	81	36%
STEM	51	23%
STEM with Bilingual Authorization	9	4%
Single Subjects non-STEM with Bilingual Authorization	8	4%

**Table 4: Cohort 4 (2022-23) Clinical Placement of Enrolled Teacher Residents**

<b>Teacher Residents Clinical Placements</b>	<b>2022-23 Cohort 4 (n = 222)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
TK/2 Bilingual	55	25%
3/5 Bilingual	23	10%
6/8 Bilingual	5	2.2%
Subject Specific Bilingual	10	4.5%
Math	35	16%
Science	22	9.9%
Special Education, Elementary	43	19%
Special Education, Secondary	27	12%
Special Education, Early Childhood	1	0.4%
Other	1	0.4%

**Number of Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Residents Enrolled by Race/Ethnicity and Gender**

For Cohort 4 (2022-23) of the 2018 Teacher Residency Grant Program reporting cycle, LEA grantees reported the number of teacher residents by self-identified race, ethnicity, and gender. Tables 5 and 6 provide this information.

**Table 5: Race/Ethnicity of Enrolled Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Residents**

<b>Teacher Residents Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>2022-23 Cohort 4 (n = 222)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	0.9%
Asian (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Asian Indian, Laotian, Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong)	20	9%
Black/African American	11	5%
Hispanic/Latinx (of any race)	133	60%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0%
White	30	14%

Teacher Residents Race/Ethnicity	2022-23 Cohort 4 (n = 222)	Percent
Two or more races	5	2.2%
Decline to state	21	9.4%

**Table 6: Gender of Enrolled Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Residents**

Teacher Residents Gender	2022-23 Cohort 4 (n = 222)	Percent
Female	178	80%
Male	34	15%
Non-binary	2	0.9%
Decline to state	8	3.6%

**Number of Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Residents Enrolled by Credential Program and Race/Ethnicity**

At the February 2022 meeting, Commissioners requested that staff provide data related to enrollment by race/ethnicity and credential type. Table 7 presents Cohort 4 (2022-23) teacher residency enrollment by credential type and race/ethnicity for the 222 residents enrolled in the 2022-23 academic year.

**Table 7: Number of Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Residents Enrolled by Credential Program and Race/Ethnicity (n = 222)**

Credential Program Type	Asian	Hispanic/ Latinx	Black or African American	White	Other Race/ Ethnicity	Decline to State Race/ Ethnicity
Special Education	7/3%	23/10%	10/4.5%	23/10%	1/0.5%	8/4%
Special Education with Bilingual Authorization	0	1/0.5%	0	0	0	0
Multiple Subjects with Bilingual Authorization	3/1%	74/33%	0	0	4/2%	0
STEM	8/4%	20/9%	1/0.5%	7/3%	2/1%	13/6%
STEM with Bilingual Authorization	2/1%	2/1%	0	0	5/2%	0
Single Subjects non-STEM with Bilingual Authorization	0	8/4%	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	20/9%	128/57.5%	11/5%	30/13%	12/5.5%	21/10%

### Teacher Residency and Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA)

Additional data required of the LEA grantees as outlined in the RFP include the results of Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) pass rates for the 222 teacher residents enrolled in the 2022-23 academic year. Table 8 provides the TPA passage figures. LEA grantees reporting that a TPA was not attempted by a resident indicates that the TPA was postponed because of the length of program or as a result of an unforeseen extension of the program.

**Table 8: Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) Pass Rates**

Number of Residents required to take each TPA Type	Residents that have not yet attempted the TPA	Residents that passed the TPA on the first attempt	Residents that passed the TPA on the second attempt	Residents that did not pass the TPA on first or second attempt
CalTPA – 43 residents	12/5%	20/9%	4/2%	7/3%
EdTPA – 95 residents	11/5%	74/33%	3/1%	7/3%
FAST* – 61 residents	61/27%	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	84/37%	94/42%	7/3%	14/6%

*\*Three grantees require residents to take and pass the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) before being recommended for a preliminary teaching credential. All three programs enroll residents in May to begin their placement as a mentor’s classroom the following year. The FAST pass rates for these programs will be reported to the Commission with the 2023-24 data once those residents have attempted the TPA.*

### Teacher Residency Programs Completers

In addition to providing information about the residents enrolled in the Teacher Residency Programs and the TPA pass rates, LEA grantees were required to provide data regarding the successful completion of the preparation program. Tables 9 and 10 provide data regarding the number of completers from programs that had a fall 2022 start date, and reasons for residents who did not complete the program.

For review of this data, it is important to note that of the 33 Teacher Residency Programs with a fall start, 16 programs enrolled teacher residents pursuing an Education Specialist credential, and many Education Specialist preparation programs are longer than one academic year. Thus, these teacher residents will not be noted as completers until 2023-24 data is collected.

**Table 9: Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Residency Program Completers, Recommended for a Preliminary Credential**

Teacher Residency Program Completers	2022-23 Cohort 4 (n = 165)	Percent
Yes	67	41%
Yes, with TPA Code	1	0.5%
No	96	58%
Not Reported	1	0.5%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 10: Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Residency Program, Reasons for Not Completing**

Teacher Residents Gender	2022-23 Cohort 4 (n = 96)	Percent
Education Specialist Program (18 month) or otherwise still enrolled in the teacher preparation program	20	21%
Exited Program	1	1%
Did Not Pass Exams and/or Assessments	24	25%
Did not pass the RICA exam	6	6%
Other	10	10.5%
Unreported (programs submitting incomplete data)	35	36.5%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Teacher Residency Completers Ethnic and Racial Diversity Compared to LEA and State Data**

Local education agency grantees reported the ethnic and racial diversity of completers and the external evaluator, WestEd, compared this information to two sets of data: (1) the race/ethnicity of PK-12 teachers in the grantee LEA and statewide, and (2) the race/ethnicity of the PK-12 students in the grantee LEA and statewide. Tables 11 and 12 present these data.

**Table 11: Cohort 4 (2022-23) Race/Ethnicity of Teacher Residency Program (TR) Completers Comparison to PK-12 Teachers in Grantee LEA and Statewide Data**

Race/Ethnicity	TR Completers	Teachers in TR LEAs	Teachers Statewide
Asian	10.29%	7.93%	6%
Black/African American	1.47%	7.92%	4%
Hispanic/Latinx	50%	29.66%	21%
Two or more races	1.47%	.97%	1%
White	22.06%	45.75%	60%
Other	0%	3.22%	3%
Decline to state	14.71%	4.55%	5%

**Table 12: Cohort 4 (2022-23) Race/Ethnicity of Teacher Residency Program (TR) Completers Comparison to PK-12 Students in Grantee LEA and Statewide Data**

Race/Ethnicity	TR Completers	Students in TR LEAs	Students Statewide
Asian	10.29%	8%	10%
Black/African American	1.47%	8%	5%
Hispanic/Latinx	50%	63%	56%
Two or more races	1.47%	4%	4%
White	22.06%	13%	21%
Other	0%	3%	3%
Decline to state	14.71%	1%	1%

**Teacher Residency Program Costs**

The next set of the data required of the LEA grantees includes the range of total financial support provided to teacher residents, such as stipends or tuition support, and the matching funds provided by the grantee and the sources of these funds.

Table 13 shows the types of financial support that the Teacher Residency Programs provided to residents enrolled in the 2022-23 academic year and the overall costs of those supports. It is important to remember that the costs in Table 13 reflect grant and matching funds expended for residents who entered the program at any point in the 2022-23 academic year. Thus, not all spending on residents spanned an entire year. Additionally, not all program spending is earmarked for residents in only the residency year; for example, many LEAs proposed matching funds in subsequent years for such supports as induction and signing bonuses which is the reason that matching funds do not yet equal grant fund expenditures. Over \$5 million dollars of grant and matching funds have been expended on Cohort 4 of the Teacher Residency Grant Programs.

**Table 13: Cohort 4 (2022-23) Teacher Residency Program: Grant and Matching Funds Ranges of Financial Support**

Type of Support	Grant Funds	Matching Funds
Teacher Preparation Costs (tuition, fees, etc.)	\$630,522.16	\$438,434.71
Salary/Stipends for Residents	\$1,904,448.13	\$385,644.18
TPA and/or Other Exam Fees	\$1,745.65	\$465.00
Other (signing bonuses, etc.)	\$0	\$67,014.84
Master/Mentor Teacher Professional Development/Training	\$141,577.24	\$92,627.64
Master/Mentor Support/Stipend/Release Time	\$370,302.02	\$152,824.34
Faculty Stipends/Release Time	\$28,301.14	\$56,106.80
Induction Support for Residents Who Complete the Program	\$0	\$16,000.00

<b>Type of Support</b>	<b>Grant Funds</b>	<b>Matching Funds</b>
Program Administration	\$94,973.70	\$1,101,302.02
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$3,171,870.04</b>	<b>\$1,871,984.82</b>

In reviewing Table 13 data, it is important to note that many grantees allocate matching funds in the years after residents' initial year of preparation in the form of teacher induction support, signing bonuses, etc. In the coming years, Commission staff will monitor the matching funds figures in Table 13 to ensure that they match the grant funds that were expended.

### **Teacher Residency Cohort 3 (2021-22) Employment Data**

This section of the agenda item revisits the Cohort 3 (2021-22) residents. Table 14 shows the number of Cohort 3 (2021-22) residency program completers who were hired as teachers of record for the 2022-23 academic year. It is important to note that many LEAs do not complete their hiring until late summer or have unexpected vacancies mid-year. Any updated Cohort 3 employment data will be presented to the Commission in future reports from staff.

**Table 14: Cohort 3 (2021-22) Employment Status**

<b>Employment Status of Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>2021-22 Cohort 3 (n = 356)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired	274	77%
Not Hired	34	10%
Not Yet Completed the Program	48	13%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>100%</b>

The next two tables provide additional employment data for the residents that completed their residency in Cohort 3 (2021-22) and were hired as teachers of record for the 2022-23 academic year. Table 15 indicates whether a resident was hired by the LEA in which they completed their residency program or if they are fulfilling their service commitment in another California LEA. Table 16 shows the number of residents hired as teachers of record in hard to staff schools and in schools where 50% or more of pupils are eligible for free or reduced-price meals.

In reading these tables, it is important to note that residents assisted by Teacher Residency grant funds must fulfill a four-year teaching commitment in order to avoid having to repay all or a proportion of the grant funds received. It may happen that the resident will need, for a variety of reasons and/or personal circumstances, to finish that four-year teaching commitment in a different California LEA than the grantee LEA. In keeping with the intent of authorizing legislation to address California's teacher shortage, if an LEA does not have employment available for a teacher resident who participated in the LEA's teacher residency program, the candidate may begin and/or complete the four-year teaching requirement in another California public school district, county office of education, or charter school. It is the responsibility of the LEA grantee to keep track of the employment of teacher residents whether employed in the

grantee’s LEA or another California LEA and report such employment to the Commission in the required yearly reports.

**Table 15: Cohort 3 (2021-22) Employment Status – Hired for the 2022-23 Academic Year in the Same LEA as Residency Program**

<b>Employment Status of Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>2021-22 Cohort 3 (n = 274)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired in Grantee LEA at the Same School as Residency Placement	55	20%
Hired in Grantee LEA at a Different School than Residency Placement	173	63%
Hired in a Different California LEA	36	13%
Missing Data from Program Reports*	10	4%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 16: Cohort 3 (2021-22) Employment Status – Hired for the 2022-23 Academic Year in Hard to Staff Schools and Schools in which 50% of Pupils are Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals (FRM)**

<b>Employment Status Teacher Residency Program Completers (n = 274)</b>	<b>Hard to Staff School</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>50% Eligible for FRM</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired in Grantee LEA at a Hard to Staff School	195	71%	197	72%
Hired in a Different California LEA at a Hard to Staff School	26	10%	30	11%
Missing Data from Program Reports*	53	19%	47	17%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*A significant portion of the data that was not reported is associated with teachers who have been hired outside of the grantee LEA; it has been challenging for grantees to obtain this information from former residents.*

**Number of Cohort 3 (2021-22) Residents Hired by Race/Ethnicity**

In the February 2022 meeting, Commissioners requested that staff provide further analysis of the cohort hiring data by race and ethnicity. Table 17 presents the numbers of Cohort 3 (2021-22) teacher residency program completers hired as teachers of record for the 2022-23 academic year data by race/ethnicity.

**Table 17: Cohort 3 (2021-22) Cohort Employment Status Hired in the 2022-23 Academic Year by Race/Ethnicity**

Hire Status	Asian	Hispanic/ Latinx	Black or African American	White	Other Race/ Ethnicity	Decline to State Race/ Ethnicity
Hired	36/10%	138/39%	10/3%	57/16%	21/6%	12/3%
Not Yet Hired	1/<1%	21/6%	4/1%	4/1%	2/<1%	2/<1%
Not Yet Completed Program	6/2%	30/8%	2/<1%	7/2%	0/0%	3/<1%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>43/12%</b>	<b>189/53%</b>	<b>16/4.5%</b>	<b>68/19%</b>	<b>23/6.5%</b>	<b>17/5%</b>

**Teacher Residency 2019-20 (Cohort 1) and 2020-21 (Cohort 2) Retention Data**

This section of the item revisits the first and second cohorts of residents from the 2019-20 and 2020-21 academic years. Many residency program completers from the first two cohorts have now been teachers of record for two to three full school years, making them eligible to have completed a teacher induction program and to have been recommended for a clear teaching credential. Tables 18 and 19 present the number of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 residents that have completed an induction program and been recommended for a clear credential.

While reviewing these tables, it is important to keep in mind the myriad reasons why a resident may not have completed an induction program or been recommended for a clear credential. These reasons include: the high percentage of residents enrolled in an 18-month education specialist credential program who were not eligible for a preliminary teaching credential after just one academic year, residents having other (non-induction) related requirements to complete before an induction program can recommend a candidate for a clear credential, residents leaving grantee LEAs making it difficult for the LEAs to have accurate data, local induction program enrollment caps or procedures, etc.

**Table 18: Cohort 1 (2019-20) Teacher Induction Completion and Clear Credential Recommendation as of July 2023**

Teacher Induction Completion Status of Cohort 1 Teacher Residency Program Completers	2019-20 Cohort (n = 297)	Percent
Teacher induction program completed, and teacher has been recommended for a clear credential	185	62%
Teacher induction program NOT completed, and teacher has NOT been recommended for a clear credential	112	38%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 19: Cohort 2 (2020-21) Teacher Induction Completion and Clear Credential Recommendation as of July 2023**

<b>Clear Credential Recommendation Status of Cohort 2 Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>2020-21 Cohort (n = 281)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Teacher induction program completed, and teacher has been recommended for a clear credential	71	25%
Teacher induction program NOT completed, and teacher has NOT been recommended for a clear credential	210	75%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>100%</b>

The first year that Cohort 1 (2019-20) residents could have been hired as teachers of record was the 2020-21 academic year. As such, teachers from the first cohort may have completed their third year of teaching at the end of the 2022-23 school year. Table 20 presents up to three years of retention data for Cohort 1 and Table 21 provides up to two years of retention data for Cohort 2.

**Table 20: Cohort 1 (2019-20) Retention Status**

<b>Retention Status of Cohort 1 Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>2019-20 Cohort (n = 297)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired as a teacher of record in California for three consecutive academic years (2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23)	224	75%
Did not earn a preliminary teaching credential at same time as other Cohort 1 Residents but have been teaching consistently since hired.	52	17.5%
Never hired as a teacher of record in California	21	7.5%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 21: Cohort 2 (2020-21) Retention Status**

<b>Retention Status of 2020-21 Cohort 2 Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>2020-21 Cohort (n = 281)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired as a teacher of record in California for both 2021-22 and 2022-23 academic years	187	66.5%
Hired as a teacher of record in California for 2021-22 but not 2022-23	2	0.5%

<b>Retention Status of 2020-21 Cohort 2 Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>2020-21 Cohort (n = 281)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired as a teacher of record in California for 2022-23 academic year but not 2021-22	50	18%
Never hired as a teacher of record in California	42	15%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>100%</b>

During the February 2022 meeting, Commissioners requested that staff provide further analysis of teacher residency retention data by race and ethnicity. Tables 22 and 23 present Cohort 1 (2019-20) and Cohort 2 (2020-21) retention data by race and ethnicity.

**Table 22: Cohort 1 (2019-20) Retention Status by Race/Ethnicity**

<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Hispanic/Latinx</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Other Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Decline to State Race/Ethnicity</b>
Hired as a teacher of record in California for three consecutive academic years (2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23)	24/<1%	114/38%	4/1%	56/19%	8/3%	18/6%
Had later completion date than rest of cohort – retained once hired	11/4%	13/4%	2/<1%	8/3%	0/0%	2/<1%
Other	3/1%	7/2%	2/<1%	4/1%	0/0%	0/0%
Never hired as a teacher of record in California	2/<1%	11/4%	0/0%	6/2%	1/<1%	1/<1%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>40/13%</b>	<b>145/49%</b>	<b>8/3%</b>	<b>74/25%</b>	<b>9/3%</b>	<b>21/7%</b>

**Table 23: Cohort 2 (2020-21) Retention Status by Race/Ethnicity**

<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Hispanic/ Latinx</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Other Race/ Ethnicity</b>	<b>Decline to State Race/ Ethnicity</b>
Hired as a teacher of record in California for both 2021-22 and 2022-23 academic years	27/10%	78/28%	10/4%	58/21%	8/3%	6/2%
Hired as a teacher of record in California for 2021-22 but not 2022-23	1/<1%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	1/<1%	0/0%
Hired as a teacher of record in California for 2022-23 academic year but not 2021-22	2/<1%	0/0%	0/0%	3/1%	0/0%	0/0%
Had later completion date than rest of cohort – retained once hired	5/2%	31/11%	0/0%	8/3%	0/0%	1/<1%
Never hired as a teacher of record in California	4/1%	18/6%	4/1%	10/4%	1/<1%	5/2%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>39/14%</b>	<b>127/45%</b>	<b>14/5%</b>	<b>79/28%</b>	<b>10/4%</b>	<b>12/4%</b>

**Next Steps**

Staff will continue to monitor and provide technical assistance to all Teacher Residency grantees until all funds disseminated to grantee LEAs have been liquidated. As mandated by authorizing legislation, staff will continue gathering and analyzing data until all residents have completed the mandated four-year service requirement.

# Report to the Legislature on the Teacher Residency Grant Program Authorized by 2018 Funds

---

### Introduction

Education Code §44417 required the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to provide a report to the Department of Finance and the appropriate fiscal and polity committees of the Legislature on the Teacher Residency Grant Program by December 1, 2023. Statute mandated the Commission to conduct an evaluation determine the effectiveness of these programs in recruiting, developing support systems for, and retaining special education, and bilingual education, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) teachers.

### Background

The Teacher Residency Grant Programs—Capacity, Residency, and Expansion—were included in the 2018-19 state budget to support the development, implementation, and expansion of teacher residency programs. Authorizing legislation provided a total of \$75 million for competitive grants for local education agencies (LEAs) to work in partnership with institutions of higher education (IHEs) with Commission-approved teacher preparation programs to offer a teacher residency pathway to earn a teaching credential in special education, STEM, or bilingual education. Of this total allocation, \$1.5 million was appropriated specifically for capacity grants to partner with IHEs to expand or create teacher residency programs that lead to more credentialed special education, and bilingual education, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teachers. Grant funding for all three program types was available for encumbrance through June 30, 2023.

In accordance with the provisions of the authorizing statute, the Teacher Residency Grant Programs:

- Address teacher shortages in special education, STEM, bilingual, and other shortage areas.
- Help to recruit and support the preparation of more individuals in the teaching profession.
- Promote and provide support for teacher residency program models.
- Support the induction of educators into the profession.

### Teacher Residency Capacity Grant Program

Twenty-two grantees were awarded Teacher Residency Capacity Grants between two rounds of funding, in October and November 2018. [Appendix B](#) includes the list of Capacity grantee LEAs, including partner IHE(s), grant award amounts, as well as planned residency focus areas. Capacity grant funds were disbursed, in full, at the time of the grant award. A total of \$1,050,010 was awarded.

Grantees were funded to collectively develop their partnership capacity with IHEs to design and be prepared to implement 51 residency programs. Of the 22 grant recipients, 17 report that all

planning activities outlined in their proposals have been complete, four grantees are still completing planning activities, and one did not submit their report by the October 2023 due date and after multiple reminders.

Table 1 lists the categories in which Capacity grantees spent grant funds during the project period.

**Table 1: 2018 Teacher Residency Capacity Grant – Grant and Matching Funds Expended**

Type of Funding	Grant Funds (\$1,050,010 awarded)	Matching Funds
LEA Personnel (Salaries)	\$135,230.20	\$1,433,606.29
LEA Personnel (Stipends)	\$55,524.58	\$5,500.00
LEA Personnel (Release Time)	\$19,753.11	\$12,651.00
IHE Personnel (Salaries)	\$64,175.00	\$643,832.39
IHE Personnel (Stipends)	\$6,106.87	\$25,220.00
IHE Personnel (Release Time)	\$9,876.13	\$8,000.00
Mentor Teacher Professional Development/Training	\$91,868.94	\$46,000.00
Mentor Teacher Stipends	\$178,216.24	\$7,889.37
Mentor Teacher Release Time	\$95,673.52	\$7,189.83
Travel for LEA Personnel	\$11,240.71	\$3,008.87
Travel for IHE Personnel	\$1,196.81	\$2,869.00
Program Administration	\$14,279.70	\$17,157.28
Other	\$343,872.30	\$131,830.37
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$1,027,014.11</b>	<b>\$2,44,754.40</b>

Grantees have a liquidation phase in which to continue spending grant funding as described in the funded applications, until all planning activities have been completed. In the coming years, Commission staff expect the figures in Table 1 to increase to the total \$1,050,010 in grant funds that was awarded.

### Teacher Residency Capacity Grant – Program Implementation

Teacher Residency Capacity grants are planning grants. As such, grantees are asked in annual reports about their readiness and intent to implement a teacher residency pathway. Of the 22 grantees:

- Six (6) grantees have implemented a residency pathway using funds from the grant program authorized by 2018 legislation.
- One (1) grantee has implemented a residency pathway using funds from the grant program authorized by 2021 legislation.
- Seven (7) grantees have implemented and expanded a residency pathway using funds from Teacher Residency Grant Programs authorized by both the 2018 and 2021 legislation.
- Six (6) grantees do not intend to implement a residency pathway.
- One (1) grantee wants to implement a residency pathway but is no longer eligible to apply for a grant-funded program because the institution is a non-public school. Non-

public schools are no longer eligible for Teacher Residency Grant Program funds as a result of Education Code §44415.5.

### **Teacher Residency and Teacher Residency Expansion Grant Program**

Thirty-three LEAs were awarded Teacher Residency Grants and five were awarded Teacher Residency Expansion Grants. [Appendix C](#) and [Appendix D](#) list the grantee LEAs, including partner IHE(s), as well as planned residency focus areas. Local education agencies received up to \$20,000 per resident and funds were distributed based on annual enrollment and projections reports submitted to the Commission. A total of \$31,157,623.04 was encumbered to programs during the project period. The final 10% of each grantee's annual award has not yet been disbursed, pending Commission requirements for data collection, evaluation, and reporting.

It is important to note that the Commission released a second Request for Proposals for Teacher Residency Grants with a focus solely on residents seeking an Education Specialist credential. The proposals were due to the Commission in April 2020 but prior to the due date, the funds were rescinded by the state due to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

WestEd has served as the external evaluator for the Teacher Residency Grant Program and has developed and maintained a [data dashboard](#) for the program. The data contained in the remainder of this report is current as of the date this report was written. It is important to note that Commission staff will continue to collect data until all residents supported by grant funds have completed their legislatively mandated four-year service commitment.

### **Teacher Residency Program Enrollment**

There is an ebb and flow of educator preparation programs, not all programs begin in the fall and end in the spring, including Teacher Residency Programs. As a result, Teacher Residency Programs reported the following information regarding program start dates:

- Twenty-six (26) grantees enroll residents in August or September.
- Three (3) programs enroll residents in January.
- Seven (7) programs enroll residents in May-July.
- One (1) grantee enrolled two cohorts of residents then subsequently elected not to continue the residency program because of local constraints.
- One (1) grantee did not determine a start date and has since elected not to implement a Teacher Residency Program.

During the project period, a total of 1,181 residents were enrolled in grant-funded teacher residency pathways. The following tables depict the enrollment numbers as well as resident self-reported race, ethnicity, and gender.

**Table 2: Teacher Residents Enrolled in Special Education, STEM, and Bilingual Programs During the Project Period (2019-2023)**

<b>Teacher Residency Programs Credential Areas</b>	<b>Cohort 1 (2019-20) Residents Enrolled</b>	<b>Cohort 2 (2020-21) Residents Enrolled</b>	<b>Cohort 3 (2021-22) Residents Enrolled</b>	<b>Cohort 4 (2022-23) Residents Enrolled</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Special Education	116/39%	124/44%	153/43%	72/32%	<b>465/40%</b>
Special Education with Bilingual Authorization	2/1%	1/>1%	7/2%	1/>1%	<b>11/1%</b>
Multiple Subjects with Bilingual Authorization	63/21%	53/19%	85/24%	81/36%	<b>282/24%</b>
STEM	98/33%	96/34%	86/24%	51/23%	<b>331/29%</b>
STEM with Bilingual Authorization	12/4%	5/2%	12/3%	9/4%	<b>38/3%</b>
Single Subjects non-STEM with Bilingual Authorization	6/2%	2/1%	13/4%	8/4%	<b>29/3%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>297/100%</b>	<b>281/100%</b>	<b>356/100%</b>	<b>222/100%</b>	<b>1,156/100%</b>

**Table 3: Number of Residents Self-Identified by Ethnicity and Race During the Project Period (2019-2023)**

<b>Resident Self-Identified Ethnicity and Race</b>	<b>Cohort 1 (2019-20) Residents</b>	<b>Cohort 2 (2020-21) Residents</b>	<b>Cohort 3 (2021-22) Residents</b>	<b>Cohort 4 (2022-23) Residents</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Hispanic/Latinx (of any race)	145/49%	127/45%	194/54%	133/60%	<b>599/52%</b>
Asian (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Asian Indian, Laotian, Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong)	40/13%	39/14%	43/12%	20/9%	<b>142/12%</b>
Black or African American	8/3%	14/5%	17/5%	11/5%	<b>50/4%</b>
White	74/25%	79/28%	69/19%	30/14%	<b>252/22%</b>
Other/Not Reported/Decline to State	30/10%	22/8%	33/9%	28/13%	<b>113/10%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>297/100%</b>	<b>281/100%</b>	<b>356/100%</b>	<b>222/100%</b>	<b>1,156/100%</b>

The data reported for resident ethnicity and race has remained consistent, throughout the project period with the majority or 68% of residents self-identifying as people of color.

**Table 4: Number of Residents Self-Identified by Gender During the Project Period (2019-2023)**

<b>Resident Self-Identified Gender</b>	<b>Cohort 1 (2019-20) Residents</b>	<b>Cohort 2 (2020-21) Residents</b>	<b>Cohort 3 (2021-22) Residents</b>	<b>Cohort 4 (2022-23) Residents</b>	<b>Totals and Percent</b>
Female	203/68%	207/74%	276/78%	178/80%	<b>864/75%</b>
Male	79/27%	64/23%	65/18%	34/15%	<b>242/21%</b>
Nonbinary/ Decline to State	15/5%	10/4%	15/4%	10/5%	<b>50/4%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>297/100%</b>	<b>281/100%</b>	<b>356/100%</b>	<b>222/100%</b>	<b>1,156/100%</b>

The data reported for gender has remained consistent, throughout the project period with 75% of those who provided data self-identifying as female.

#### **Teacher Residency Program Completers**

Local education agency grantees were required to provide data regarding the successful completion of the preparation program. Table 5 provides data regarding the number of completers from programs throughout the project period and reasons why residents did not complete the program.

For review of this data, please note that of the 26 Teacher Residency Programs with a fall start, 16 programs enrolled teacher residents pursuing an Education Specialist credential, and many Education Specialist preparation programs are longer than one academic year. Thus, these teacher residents will not be noted as completers until 2023-24 data is collected.

**Table 5: Teacher Residency Program Completers, Recommended for a Preliminary Credential During the Project Period (2019-2023)**

<b>Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>Cohort 1 (2019-20) Residents</b>	<b>Cohort 2 (2020-21) Residents</b>	<b>Cohort 3 (2021-22) Residents</b>	<b>Cohort 4 (2022-23) Residents</b>	<b>Totals and Percent</b>
Yes	184/62%	120/44%	209/60%	67/41%	<b>580/53.2%</b>
No	17/6%	48/15%	101/29%	97/59%	<b>263/24.2%</b>
Yes with TPA and/or RICA Waiver	89/30%	110/40%	33/10%	1/>1%	<b>233/21.4%</b>
Variable Term Waiver	7/2%	3/1%	3/1%	0/0%	<b>13/1.2%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>297/100%</b>	<b>281/100%</b>	<b>346/100%</b>	<b>165/100%</b>	<b>1,089/100%</b>

There are many reasons that grantee LEAs note when reporting on residents that have not been recommended for a preliminary teaching credential. The most common reason is that residents are enrolled in a program that is designed to run longer than one academic year.

Other reasons include any combination of the following:

- Residents did not complete preliminary preparation program coursework.
- Residents did not pass TPA.
- Residents did not pass the RICA.
- Residents did not satisfy the subject matter requirement.

Tables 6 and 7 report the number completers from the first two cohorts of the program who have earned a clear teaching credential. While reviewing these tables, please note that only Cohorts 1 (2019-20) and 2 (2020-21) have residents that have been teachers of record for two full school years and are, therefore, the only cohorts eligible to have completed teacher induction programs and be recommended for a clear credentials. Additionally, it is important to keep in mind the myriad reasons why a resident may not have completed an induction program or been recommended for a clear credential. These reasons include: the high percentage of residents enrolled in an 18-month education specialist credential program who were not eligible for a preliminary teaching credential after just one academic year, residents having other (non-induction) related requirements to complete before an induction program can recommend a candidate for a clear credential, residents leaving grantee LEAs making it difficult for the LEAs to have accurate data, local induction program enrollment caps or procedures, etc. Finally, these data were collected in July 2023 and in SB 114, Section 108, the Governor waived the TPA requirement for teachers who earned a preliminary teaching credential with a TPA code due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Thus, these teacher residents will not be counted as having cleared their credentials until 2023-24 data is collected.

**Table 6: Cohort 1 (2019-20) Teacher Induction Completion and Clear Credential Recommendation as of July 2023**

<b>Teacher Induction Completion Status of Cohort 1 Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>2019-20 Cohort (n = 297)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Teacher induction program completed, and teacher has been recommended for a clear credential	185	62%
Teacher induction program NOT completed, and teacher has NOT been recommended for a clear credential	112	38%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 7: Cohort 2 (2020-21) Teacher Induction Completion and Clear Credential Recommendation as of July 2023**

<b>Clear Credential Recommendation Status of Cohort 2 Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>2020-21 Cohort (n = 281)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Teacher induction program completed, and teacher has been recommended for a clear credential	71	25%
Teacher induction program NOT completed, and teacher has NOT been recommended for a clear credential	210	75%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Teacher Residency Employment and Retention Data**

At this time, employment data is available for the first three cohorts of residents. It is important to note that while some grantees offer priority hiring to residency program completers, many LEAs do not complete their hiring until late summer or have unexpected vacancies mid-year. Any updated cohort employment data will be presented to the Commission in future reports from staff.

Table 8 indicates whether Cohort 1-3 residents have been employed by the LEA in which they completed their residency program or if they are fulfilling their service commitment in another California LEA. Tables 9 and 10 show the number of residents hired as teachers of record in hard to staff schools and in schools where 50% or more of pupils are eligible for free or reduced-price meals.

Statute mandates that residents assisted by Teacher Residency grant funds must fulfill a four-year teaching commitment in order to avoid having to repay all or a proportion of the grant funds received. It may happen that the resident will need, for a variety of reasons and/or personal circumstances, to finish that four-year teaching commitment in a different California LEA than the grantee LEA. In keeping with the intent of authorizing legislation to address California’s teacher shortage, if an LEA does not have employment available for a teacher resident who participated in the LEA’s teacher residency program, the candidate may begin and/or complete the four-year teaching requirement in another California public school district, county office of education, or charter school. It is the responsibility of the LEA grantee to keep track of the employment of teacher residents whether employed in the grantee’s LEA or another California LEA and report such employment to the Commission in the required yearly reports.

**Table 8: Employment Status – Employed by the Same LEA as Residency Program**

<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>Cohorts 1-3 Residents</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired by Grantee LEA at Same School as Residency Placement	<b>173</b>	<b>22%</b>
Hired by Grantee LEA at Different School Than Residency Placement	<b>480</b>	<b>61%</b>
Hired by a Different California LEA	<b>122</b>	<b>15%</b>
Not Reported	<b>15</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 9: Employment Status – Employed in Hard to Staff Schools**

<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>Cohorts 1-3 Residents</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired by Grantee LEA	<b>552</b>	<b>70%</b>
Hired by a Different California LEA	<b>67</b>	<b>8%</b>
Not Reported	<b>171</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 10: Employment Status –Employed in Schools in which 50% of Pupils are Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals (FRM)**

<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>Cohorts 1-3 Residents</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired by Grantee LEA	<b>571</b>	<b>72%</b>
Hired by a Different California LEA	<b>91</b>	<b>12%</b>
Not Reported	<b>128</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>100%</b>

These tables show that a majority of residents are being employed by the LEA in which they completed their residency, in hard to staff schools, and in schools in which 50% or more students are eligible for free and reduced lunch. A significant portion of the data that was not reported is associated with teachers who have been hired outside of the grantee LEA; it has been challenging for grantees to obtain this information from former residents.

#### **Teacher Residency Cohort 1 (2019-20) Cohort 2 (2020-21) Retention Data**

The first year that Cohort 1 (2019-20) residents could have been hired as teachers of record was the 2020-21 academic year. As such, teachers from the first cohort may have completed their third year of teaching at the end of the 2022-23 school year. Table 11 presents up to three years of retention data for Cohort 1 and Table 12 provides up to two years of retention data for Cohort 2.

**Table 11: Cohort 1 (2019-20) Retention Status**

<b>Retention Status of Cohort 1 Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>2019-20 Cohort (n = 297)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired as a teacher of record in California for three consecutive academic years (2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23)	224	75%
Did not earn a preliminary teaching credential at same time as other Cohort 1 Residents but have been teaching consistently since hired.	52	17.5%
Never hired as a teacher of record in California	21	7.5%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 12: Cohort 2 (2020-21) Retention Status**

<b>Retention Status of 2020-21 Cohort 2 Teacher Residency Program Completers</b>	<b>2020-21 Cohort (n = 281)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Hired as a teacher of record in California for both 2021-22 and 2022-23 academic years	187	66.5%
Hired as a teacher of record in California for 2021-22 but not 2022-23	2	.5%
Hired as a teacher of record in California for 2022-23 academic year but not 2021-22	50	18%
Never hired as a teacher of record in California	42	15%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Teacher Residency Program Costs**

Table 13 shows the types of financial support that the Teacher Residency Programs provided to residents enrolled in grant-funded programs and the overall costs of those supports. It is important to remember that the costs in Table 13 reflect grant and matching funds expended for residents who entered the program at any point in the 2022-23 academic year. Thus, not all spending on residents spanned an entire year. Additionally, not all program spending is earmarked for residents in only the residency year; for example, many LEAs proposed allocating funds in subsequent years for such supports as induction and signing bonuses. This is the reason why grant funds have not been fully expended and why matching funds do not yet equal grant fund expenditures.

**Table 13: Teacher Residency Program — Grant and Matching Funds Ranges of Financial Support During the Project Period (2019-2023)**

<b>Type of Support</b>	<b>Grant Funds</b>	<b>Matching Funds</b>
Teacher Preparation Costs (tuition, fees, etc.)	\$3,614,052.09	\$36,489,56.11
Salary/Stipends for Residents	\$11,213,294.93	\$2,457,997.89
TPA and/or Other Exam Fees	\$44,220.45	\$38,084.13
Other (signing bonuses, etc.)	\$21,268.91	\$875,649.75
Master/Mentor Teacher Professional Development/Training	\$891,427.50	\$1,099,658.08
Master/Mentor Support/Stipend/Release Time	\$2,345,365.54	\$1,529,843.80
Faculty Stipends/Release Time	\$289,550.03	\$864,165.74
Induction Support for Residents Who Complete the Program	\$116,192.31	\$2,090,753.08
Program Administration	\$1,046,154.94	\$5,710,737.19
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$19,581,526.70</b>	<b>\$18,315,845.77</b>

In reviewing Table 13 data, it is important to note that many grantees allocate matching funds in the years after residents' initial year of preparation in the form of teacher induction support, signing bonuses, etc. In the coming years, Commission staff will monitor the matching funds figures in Table 13 to ensure that they match the grant funds that were expended. Additionally, grantees have a liquidation phase in which to continue spending grant funding as described in the funded applications, until all participants in the 2022-23 cohort have completed their expected activities. In the coming years, Commission staff expect the figures in Table 13 to increase to the total amount of grant funds awarded, \$28.6 million.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

Funds for the Teacher Residency Grant Program were appropriated for LEA grantees to partner with IHEs to expand or create teacher residency programs that lead to more credentialed special education, and bilingual education, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teachers. An additional intent of the legislation was to increase the numbers and retention of teachers in hard-to-staff schools and in schools where 50% or more of the students enrolled are eligible for free or reduced-price meals.

Local education agency grantees reported the ethnic and racial diversity of completers and external evaluator, WestEd, compared this information to two sets of data: (1) the race/ethnicity of PK-12 teachers in the grantee LEA and statewide, and (2) the race/ethnicity of the PK-12 students in the grantee LEA and statewide. Tables 14 and 15 indicate that Teacher Residency Grant Program completers are more diverse than teachers statewide and better match the is the diversity of California students.

**Table 14: Race/Ethnicity of Teacher Residency Program (TR) Completers Comparison to PK-12 Teachers in Grantee LEA and Statewide Data**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>TR Completers</b>	<b>Teachers in TR LEAs</b>	<b>Teachers Statewide</b>
Asian	14.04%	7.93%	6%
Black/African American	3.15%	7.92%	4%
Hispanic/Latinx	47.45%	29.66%	21%
White	25.3%	45.75%	60%
Other/Decline to State/Not Reported	10.05%	8.74%	9%

**Table 15: Race/Ethnicity of Teacher Residency Program (TR) Completers Comparison to PK-12 Students in Grantee LEA and Statewide Data**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>TR Completers</b>	<b>Students in TR LEAs</b>	<b>Students Statewide</b>
Asian	14.04%	8%	10%
Black/African American	3.15%	8%	5%
Hispanic/Latinx	47.45%	63%	56%
White	25.3%	13%	21%
Other/Decline to State/Not Reported	10.05%	8%	8%

As mentioned previously in this report, WestEd is conducting a formative evaluation of the Teacher Residency Grant Program administered by the Commission. The findings and recommendations to practitioners, policymakers, and technical assistance providers, can be accessed on the WestEd [evaluation webpage](#).

In conclusion, with data summarized in this report and in the WestEd evaluation, Teacher Residency Grant Program funds were effectively used to prepare more credentialed special education, and bilingual education, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teachers who serve in high needs schools.

## Appendix B

### Teacher Residency Capacity Grants Round 1, October 2018

LEA	Partner IHE(s)	Award Amount	Residency Focus
AchieveKids (NPS)	Pacific Oaks College	\$27,975	Special Education
Davis Joint Unified School District	California State University, Sacramento	\$48,782	Special Education
Fountain Valley School District	Chapman University	\$50,000	Special Education
Los Angeles Unified School District	California State University, Dominguez Hills, California State University, Los Angeles, California State University, Northridge, California State University, Long Beach, University of Southern California, University of California, Los Angeles, Loyola Marymount University	\$50,000	Special Education; Special Education Bilingual; STEM; STEM Bilingual; Multiple Subject Bilingual; Single Subject Bilingual
Magnolia School District	Chapman University	\$50,000	Special Education
Moreno Valley Unified School District	Brandman University	\$50,000	Special Education; Special Education Bilingual; STEM; STEM Bilingual; Multiple Subject Bilingual; Single Subject Bilingual
Napa Valley Unified School District	Sonoma State University	\$50,000	Special Education
Patterson Joint Unified School District	California State University, Stanislaus	\$50,000	STEM
Poway Unified School District	Point Loma Nazarene University	\$50,000	Special Education
Santa Ana Unified School District	University of California, Irvine	\$50,000	STEM
Stockton Unified School District	University of the Pacific	\$49,973	Special Education
Sweetwater Union High School District	University of California, San Diego, San Diego State University	\$49,805	Special Education; Special Education Bilingual; STEM; STEM Bilingual; Single Subject Bilingual
Westside Union School District	Brandman University, California State University, Bakersfield	\$23,875	Special Education

**Teacher Residency Capacity Grants Round 2, November 2018**

<b>LEA</b>	<b>Partner IHE(s)</b>	<b>Award Amount</b>	<b>Residency Focus</b>
Centinela Valley Union High School District	University of California, Los Angeles	\$25,000	Multiple Subject Bilingual; Single Subject Bilingual
Elk Grove Unified School District	University of Pacific	\$50,000	Special Education
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District	University of San Francisco	\$50,000	Special Education; STEM
Monterey County Office of Education	California State University, Monterey Bay	\$50,000	Special Education; STEM; Multiple Subject Bilingual
Oakland Unified School District	Loyola Marymount University	\$50,000	Special Education
San Joaquin County Office of Education	Teachers College of San Joaquin	\$50,000	Special Education; STEM
Santa Ana Unified School District	California State University, Fullerton	\$50,000	Special Education
Santa Barbara County Education Office	University of California, Santa Barbara, Antioch University	\$50,000	Special Education; STEM; STEM Bilingual; Multiple Subject Bilingual; Single Subject Bilingual
Turlock Unified School District	California State University, Stanislaus	\$50,000	Special Education; Multiple Subject Bilingual

## Appendix C

### Teacher Residency Expansion Grants, December 2018

LEA	Partner IHE(s)	Grant Funds Encumbered During the Project Period	Residency Focus
Bakersfield City School District	California State University, Bakersfield	\$540,000.00	STEM; Multiple Subject Bilingual
Oakland Unified School District	California State University, East Bay University of California, Berkeley	\$840,000.00	STEM
Salinas Union High School District	California State University, Monterey Bay	\$468,000.00	STEM; Special Education
San Francisco Unified School District	San Francisco State University	\$320,000.00	STEM
San Francisco Unified School District	University of San Francisco, Stanford University	\$820,000.00	STEM; STEM Bilingual; Multiple Subject Bilingual; Single Subject Bilingual

## Appendix D

### Teacher Residency Grants, March 2019

Local Education Agency (LEA)	Institution of Higher Education (IHE) Partner	Grant Funds Encumbered During the Project Period	Residency Focus
AchieveKids (NPS)	Pacific Oaks College	\$820,000.00	Special Education
Clovis Unified School District	California State University, Fresno	\$1,590,994.34	Special Education
Davis Joint Unified School District	California State University, Sacramento	\$900,000.00	Special Education
Elk Grove Unified School District	University of the Pacific	\$1,200,000.00	Special Education
Franklin McKinley School District	San Jose State University	\$400,000.00	Special Education, STEM
Fresno Unified School District	California State University, Fresno	\$3,200,504.00	Special Education, STEM, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization
Humboldt County Office of Education	Humboldt State University	\$760,000.00	Special Education
Kern High School District	California State University, Bakersfield	\$500,000.00	STEM
La Mesa-Spring Valley School District	San Diego State University	\$518,200.00	Special Education, STEM, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization
Los Angeles Unified School District	California State University, Dominguez Hills	\$1,380,000.00	Special Education, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization
Los Angeles Unified School District	California State University, Los Angeles	\$1,340,000.00	Special Education, STEM
Los Angeles Unified School District	California State University, Northridge	\$2,020,000.00	Special Education, STEM
Los Angeles Unified School District	University of California, Los Angeles	\$2,060,000.00	STEM, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization
Madera Unified School District	California State University, Fresno	\$1,169,065.70	Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization
Monterey County Office of Education	California State University, Monterey Bay	\$840,000.00	Special Education, STEM, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization
Multicultural Learning Center	California State University, Northridge	\$49,000.00	Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization

Napa Valley Unified School District	Sonoma State University	\$1,220,000.00	Special Education, Special Education with Bilingual Authorization, STEM, STEM with Bilingual Authorization, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization, Single Subject Non-STEM with Bilingual Authorization
Oakland Unified School District	Loyola Marymount University	\$650,000.00	Special Education
Oxnard School District	California State University, Channel Islands	\$634,600.00	Special Education, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization
Pasadena Unified School District	California State University, Los Angeles	\$200,000.00	Special Education
Patterson Joint Unified School District	California State University, Stanislaus	\$140,000.00	STEM
Partnerships to Uplift Communities (PUC) Schools	Loyola Marymount University	\$280,000.00	Special Education, STEM
Sacramento City Unified School District	California State University, Sacramento	\$360,000.00	STEM
San Joaquin County Office of Education	Teachers College of San Joaquin	\$785,259.00	Special Education, STEM
Santa Ana Unified School District	California State University, Fullerton University of California, Irvine	\$920,000.00	Special Education, STEM
Stockton Unified School District	University of the Pacific California State University, Stanislaus	\$200,000	Special Education, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization
Sweetwater Union High School District	San Diego State University University of California, San Diego	\$2,160,000.00	Special Education, Special Education with Bilingual Authorization, STEM, STEM with Bilingual Authorization, Single Subject Non-STEM with Bilingual Authorization
Tracy Joint Unified School District	Notre Dame de Namur University	\$140,000.00	Special Education

Turlock Unified School District	California State University, Stanislaus	\$520,000.00	Special Education, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization
Upland Unified School District	California Polytechnic State University, Pomona	\$200,000.00	Special Education
Vista Hill Stein Education Center	San Diego State University	\$80,000.00	Special Education
West Contra Costa Unified School District	California State University, East Bay	\$840,000.00	Special Education
West Contra Costa Unified School District	California State University, East Bay University of California, Berkeley	\$80,000	STEM