



Report to the Legislature on the California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

December 2023

This report, like other publications of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution is requested.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95811

This report is available on the [Commission's website](#).

State of California
Gavin Newsom, Governor
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

This list reflects the composition of the Commission at the time of adoption of the 2023 Annual Report on the California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program in December 2023. Current membership of the Commission is available on the [Members of the Commission](#) webpage.

Commission Member

Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, Chair
Bonnie Klatt, Vice Chair
Danette Brown
Jose Cardenas

Cheryl Cotton
Juan Cruz
Christopher Davis
Michael De La Torre
Megan Gross
Johanna Hartwig
Susan Heredia
Ira Lit
Monica Martinez
David Simmons

Ex-Officio Representatives

Kathryn Williams Browne
Annamarie Francois
Shireen Pavri
Kimberly White- Smith

Executive Director

Mary Vixie Sandy

Representing

Public Representative
Teacher Representative
Teacher Representative
Non-Administrative Services Credential Representative
Designee, Superintendent of Public Instruction
School Administrator Representative
Teacher Representative
Teacher Representative
Teacher Representative
Public Representative
School Board Member Representative
Faculty Member Representative
Public Representative
Human Resources Administrator Representative

Representing

California Community Colleges
University of California
California State University
Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities

Representing

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Report to the Legislature on the 2021 California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program	3
Introduction	3
Background	3
Year 1 Annual Data Report on the 2021 Classified Grant Program	4
Summary of All Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program Participants	8
Partnerships Between LEAs and Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)	9
Academic Standing of the Participants	11
Program Completion	12
Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of the Participants and Completers	14
Program Funding	17
Program Narratives	19
Summary and Conclusion	21

Executive Summary

This report provides an update on the 2021 California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program and presents the 2023 Annual Report to the Legislature on the California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program (Classified Grant) as required by statute (Education Code §44393(f)).

The 2021-22 state budget appropriated \$125 million one-time funds, available for five years through June 30, 2026, to expand the existing California Classified School Employees Teacher Credentialing Program (Classified Grant), which was initially funded with \$20 million in 2016 and an additional \$25 million in 2017 and had a project period that ended June 30, 2021. The 2022 annual state report was the final report for the 2016 and 2017 Classified Grant rounds, and the first report on the 2021 Classified Grant. This 2023 state report includes information on the 2021 Classified Grant Program and reflects the first year of program participant data collected for the 2021 Classified Grant Program. The local education agencies (LEAs) that successfully applied to this competitive grant program use these funds to support tuition, fees, books, and related services for participating classified staff; up to ten percent of grant funds may be used for program administrative purposes. This report responds to the requirements specified in statute and provides an update to policymakers and others interested in the California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program.

This report is organized with the following headings:

- Year 1 Annual Data Report on the 2021 Classified Grant Program
- Summary of All Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program Participants
- Partnerships Between LEAs and Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Academic Standing of the Participants
- Program Completion
- Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of the Participants and Completers
- Program Funding
- Program Narratives
- Summary and Conclusion

Overall findings for the 2022-23 fiscal year are summarized below:

- Ninety percent of the annual 5,208 slots were awarded to LEA grantees, and 2034 of the awarded slots had enrolled a classified employee in the grant program (43.31%).
- Programs enrolled a total of 2063 participants, including 29 replacement participants.
- Seventy-two percent of participants made sufficient annual progress, as defined by the LEA, towards earning their BA/BS degree or preliminary teaching credential.
- After one year in the grant program, 51 participants completed the program and earned a preliminary teaching credential (2.47% of total participants).
- Of the completers that are staying to teach with the grantee LEA, a hundred percent are teaching in a locally defined teacher shortage area and 89 percent are teaching at an LEA with a high unduplicated pupil count.

Report to the Legislature on the 2021 California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program

December 2023

Introduction

Education Code §44393(f) requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to annually report to the Legislature regarding the California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program. The requirements of the report are specified in Education Code §44393 and must include, but not limited to, the following:

- The number of classified school employees recruited.
- The academic progress of the classified school employees recruited.
- The number of classified school employees recruited who are subsequently employed as teachers in the public schools.
- The degree to which the applicant meets the teacher shortage needs of the school district, charter school, or county office of education.
- The ethnic and racial composition of the participants in the program.

Background

The 2021-22 state budget appropriated \$125 million one-time funds, available for five years, to expand the existing California Classified School Employees Teacher Credentialing Program (Classified Grant), which was funded with \$45 million in 2016 and 2017 and had a project period that ended June 30, 2021. The 2021 Classified Grant provides grants to TK-12 local educational agencies (LEAs) to recruit and support non-certificated school employees to become certificated classroom teachers. Per authorizing legislation, the 2021 Classified Grant funds increased the annual grant award per participant from \$4,000 to \$4,800, for up to five years. The local education agencies (LEAs) that successfully applied to this competitive grant program use these funds to support tuition, fees, books, and related services for participating classified staff; grantees may also use up to ten percent of this funding for program administration purposes.

Education Code §44393(e) required the Commission to contract with an independent evaluator with a proven record of experience in assessing teacher training programs to conduct an evaluation to determine the success of the 2016 and 2017 Classified Grant Programs. The results of the [evaluation](#) led by Shasta College, the lead evaluator, in collaboration with Sinclair Research Group (SRG) were presented at the June 2021 Commission meeting. The Commission updated the 2021 Classified Grant program requirements and data collection to reflect the following recommendations from the 2021 Classified Grant legislation and program evaluation:

- The Commission provides additional structure in the Request for Application (RFA) to set more explicit expectations of LEAs. The RFA has been updated to include:
 - standardized allowable expenditures across all programs,
 - a cap on program administration funds to ten percent of grant awards,

- assurances that plans are in place to support participants securing preservice placements and teaching positions, and
 - a description of the plans for data collection and continuous improvement.
- The Commission requires articulation agreements between LEAs and partner institutions of higher education (IHEs) to clarify expectations and desired outcomes for collaboration and to encourage stable leadership and management.
- The Commission has expanded required data collection fields to support continuous improvement across all programs, including all allowed expenses to identify the broadest possible scope of financial support for participants.
- The Commission published a "Program Management Guide" that includes reporting requirements, rules, procedures, and allowable expenses on the Classified Grant webpage under "Resources for Funded Classified Grant Program Grantees." All grant managers have access to the published guide to safeguard continuity during management changes.
 - Published resources for grantees also provide clarity that Classified Grant Program funds can be received by participants in addition to receiving alternative sources of financial aid, such as the Golden State Teacher Program, other scholarships, grants, and loans.
- The Commission hosts a forum (i.e., office hours) for grant managers, and any additional staff grant managers include, to ask the Commission and the broader Classified Grant community questions and to share best practices. Five sessions were hosted during the 2022-23 fiscal year, and nine are planned for the 2023-24 fiscal year. Additionally, the Commission provides ongoing technical assistance opportunities to Classified Grant programs individually and as a group to support programs with on-going program implementation. After office hours are held, questions and their respective answers are published on the Classified grant webpage disseminated to all grantees.

This 2023 state report includes information on the 2021 Classified Grant Program, as the 2016 Classified Grant project period ended June 30, 2021, and the 2017 Classified Grant project period ended June 30, 2022. The 2023 annual report reflects the first year of program participant data collected for the 2021 Classified Grant program and includes information on the following topics: program enrollment, IHE partnerships, academic progress, number of credentials issued, participant and program completer demographics, and direct narratives from grantees. All Round One (June 2022) and Round Two (January 2023) LEAs successfully submitted the annual data reporting requirements.

Year 1 Annual Data Report on the 2021 Classified Grant Program

In April 2022, the Commission published the first Request for Application (RFA) for the Classified Grant Program. Following a competitive RFA process in summer 2022, the Commission awarded 40 local education agencies (LEAs) with grants of up to \$56,160,000 across four years of the grant program. With \$68,840,000 grant funds remaining, the Commission published Round Two of the RFA in December 2022 and awarded thirty-four LEAs in January 2023 with grants of up to \$34,003,200 across four years of the grant program. \$34,836,800 remained after Round Two, and the Commission published Round Three of the

RFA in June 2023 and awarded seven LEAs with grants up to \$1,800,000 across the remaining three years of the grant program. At the start of fiscal year 2023-24, \$33,036,800 in grant funds remain. The RFA for Round Four was published September 2023, and applications are due to the Commission on December 8, 2023. Grant competitions will be offered twice a year until the 2025-26 fiscal year or until \$125 million has been awarded. Table 1 below shows the summary of grant awards and remaining grant funds, per Round.

Table 1: Summary of Classified Grant Award, per Round

Rounds	Award Date	Total Grantees	Total Funding	Remaining Funds
One	June 27, 2022	40	\$56,160,000	\$68,840,000
Two	January 27, 2023	34	\$34,003,200	\$34,836,800
Three	July 14, 2023	7	\$1,800,000	\$33,036,800
	Totals	81	\$91,963,200	\$33,036,800

All three types of eligible LEAs, school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools, were awarded Classified Grants. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the total number of LEAs and the number of total awarded slots, per type of LEA. While county offices of education (COEs) were 25 percent of awarded grantees, COEs were awarded 64 percent of participant slots.

Table 2: Number of Grantees and Number of Awarded Slots, per type of LEA

Type of LEA	# of LEAs	% of LEAs	# of Awarded Slots	% of Awarded Slots
School District	43	53.09%	1531	31.76%
County Offices of Education	21	25.93%	3088	64.05%
Charter School	17	20.99%	202	4.19%

Tables 3a, 3b, and 3c, respectively, provide the complete list of Rounds One, Two, and Three grant recipients, the LEAs' annual awarded slots, the number of participants enrolled in the 2022-23 year, and the annual grant award. Twenty-six out of seventy-four (35.14%) programs in Round One and Round Two did not enroll any participants. Note that Round Three grantees did not report any participant data for the 2022-23 year, as Round Three was awarded June 2023. Grantees in Rounds One and Two reported that the three biggest implementation challenges to enroll participants were:

- Implementation timeline: Programs implemented the grant program late, impacting recruitment. Additionally, the January 2023 grant award timing impacted Round Two grantees' ability to recruit and enroll participants in an IHE (36.49%).
- Recruitment: Programs overestimated the interested classified staff and requested more grant slots than programs could fill. LEAs reported it was challenging to get participants that showed interest at the time the grant application was submitted to then commit and enroll in the grant program (36.49%).
- Participants wanted to pursue their degree and/or credential with non-partner IHEs or out-of-state IHEs that do not have a Commission-approved program. Additionally, the IHEs' application and enrollment timeline and program start date did not always align with the LEA's program or participants' personal lives (40.54%).

Table 3a: Round One Classified Grant Recipients, Number of Participant Slots Awarded Annually, Number of Participants Enrolled in 2022-23, and Annual Grant Award

Local Education Agency (LEA)	# of Participant Slots Awarded	# of Participants Enrolled, 2022-23	Annual Grant Award
Berkeley Unified School District	12	11	\$48,000.00
Clovis Unified School District	40	36	\$192,000.00
Davis Joint Unified School District	135	78	\$648,000.00
Dinuba Unified School District	20	0	\$96,000.00
Fresno Unified School District	30	28	\$144,000.00
Garden Grove Unified School District	90	41	\$432,000.00
Glenn County Office of Education	30	8	\$144,000.00
Hawthorne School District	36	5	\$172,800.00
Huntington Beach Union High School District	20	8	\$96,000.00
Kern County Office of Education	75	44	\$360,000.00
Lighthouse Community Public Schools	10	0	\$48,000.00
Long Beach Unified School District	20	9	\$96,000.00
Los Angeles County Office of Education	50	36	\$240,000.00
Los Angeles Unified School District	100	10	\$480,000.00
Madera Unified School District	25	19	\$120,000.00
Merced County Office of Education	20	16	\$80,000.00
Modesto City Schools	27	5	\$129,600.00
Moreno Valley Unified School District	25	5	\$120,000.00
Oakland Unified School District	50	40	\$240,000.00
Orange County Department of Education	600	600	\$2,880,000.00
Pajaro Valley Unified School District	10	0	\$48,000.00
Placer County Office of Education	85	57	\$408,000.00
Pomona Unified School District	30	3	\$144,000.00
Riverside County Office of Education	200	196	\$960,000.00
Sacramento County Office of Education	150	100	\$720,000.00
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools	200	62	\$960,000.00
San Diego Unified School District	20	5	\$96,000.00
San Francisco Unified School District	25	3	\$120,000.00
San Juan Unified School District	25	6	\$120,000.00
San Mateo County Office of Education	50	11	\$240,000.00
San Mateo Union High School District	60	2	\$288,000.00
Santa Ana Unified School District	60	60	\$288,000.00
Santa Barbara County Education Office	30	16	\$144,000.00
Santa Clara County Office of Education	250	9	\$1,200,000.00
Santa Maria Bonita School District	115	41	\$552,000.00
Torrance Unified School District	50	7	\$240,000.00

Local Education Agency (LEA)	# of Participant Slots Awarded	# of Participants Enrolled, 2022-23	Annual Grant Award
Ventura County Office of Education	50	5	\$240,000.00
Visalia Unified School District	35	4	\$168,000.00
West Contra Costa Unified School District	25	6	\$120,000.00
Yuba City Unified School District	40	11	\$192,000.00
Totals	2925	1603	\$14,014,400

Table 3b: Round Two Classified Grant Recipients, Number of Participant Slots Awarded Annually, Number of Participants Enrolled in 2022-23, and Annual Grant Award

Local Education Agency (LEA)	# of Participant Slots Awarded	# of Participants Enrolled, 2022-23	Annual Grant Award
Acalanes Union High School District	8	0	\$38,400.00
Alhambra Unified School District	30	0	\$144,000.00
Allegiance STEAM Academy	10	0	\$48,000.00
Alpha Jose Hernandez	6	0	\$28,800.00
Alternatives in Action High School	6	1	\$28,800.00
American Indian Public Charter School II	24	0	\$115,200.00
ARISE High School	20	0	\$96,000.00
Butte County Office of Education	600	342	\$2,880,000.00
Caliber Beta Academy	16	0	\$76,800.00
Castro Valley Unified School District	5	0	\$24,000.00
Citizens of the World Charter School Silver Lake	20	0	\$96,000.00
Coalinga-Huron Unified School District	20	0	\$96,000.00
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District	20	6	\$96,000.00
Fontana Unified School District	15	0	\$72,000.00
Inglewood Unified School District	12	0	\$57,600.00
Larchmont Charter School	8	0	\$38,400.00
Lighthouse Charter School	8	5	\$38,400.00
Long Beach Unified School District	10	0	\$48,000.00
Long Valley Charter School	4	0	\$19,200.00
Los Angeles County Office of Education	75	23	\$360,000.00
Math and Science College Preparatory	35	8	\$168,000.00
Montebello Unified School District	100	0	\$480,000.00
Multicultural Learning Center	2	0	\$9,600.00
Oxford Day Academy	12	0	\$57,600.00
Pleasanton Unified School District	15	2	\$72,000.00
Plumas Charter School	5	0	\$24,000.00
Redondo Beach Unified School District	12	0	\$57,600.00
San Diego County Office of Education	100	0	\$480,000.00

Local Education Agency (LEA)	# of Participant Slots Awarded	# of Participants Enrolled, 2022-23	Annual Grant Award
San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	40	25	\$192,000.00
Santa Clara County Office of Education	250	16	\$1,200,000.00
Siskiyou County Office of Education	115	0	\$552,000.00
Sonoma County Office of Education	100	2	\$480,000.00
Trinity County Office of Education	18	1	\$86,400.00
William S. Hart Union High School District	50	0	\$240,000.00
Totals	1771	431	\$8,500,800

Table 3c: Round Three Classified Grant Recipients, Number of Participant Slots Awarded Annually, and Annual Grant Award

Local Education Agency (LEA)	# of Participant Slots Awarded	Annual Grant Award
Community School for Creative Education	8	\$38,400.00
Covina-Valley Unified School District	33	\$158,400.00
Lancaster Elementary School District	10	\$48,000.00
Modoc Joint Unified School District	10	\$48,000.00
San Francisco Unified School District	16	\$76,800.00
Sycamore Creek Community Charter	8	\$38,400.00
Tracy Unified School District	40	\$192,000.00
Totals	125	\$600,000

Summary of All Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program Participants

The following data in the state report reflects the annual data Rounds One and Two submitted regarding enrolled participants and participants that completed the grant program and earned a preliminary credential. Legislation allocates grant funds for at least 5,208 participants, assuming all participants are funded at the maximum \$4,800 per year, across five years. The following summarizes the LEA grantees’ enrollment and completion progress by the total number of awarded slots, the number of participants enrolled, the number of program completers that earned a teaching credential, participants that exited the program early, and the number of replacement participants.

- Ninety percent of the annual 5,208 slots were awarded to LEA grantees, and 2034 of the awarded slots had enrolled a classified employee in the grant program (43.31%).
- Programs enrolled a total of 2063 participants, including 29 replacement participants.
- After one year in the grant program, 51 participants completed the program and earned a preliminary teaching credential (2.47% of total participants).
- Sixty-five participants exited the grant program early and did not earn a preliminary credential (3.15% of enrolled participants).

- Of the 65 early exit slots, 45 percent were replaced with new participants. Replacement participants receive any of the remaining grant funds from the slot of the participant that exited early; no new grant funds are awarded to replacement participants.

Table 4 highlights the classified employees' position at the time participants enrolled in the grant program. The three classified employment categories, paraprofessional, office/clerical, or other classified (e.g., custodians, bus drivers, food service staff), are reported by participants and completers. Above 80 percent of participants and completers are paraprofessionals at their LEA.

Table 4: Participant and Completer Classified Position at Program Enrollment

Classified Position	# of Participants (n= 2063)	% of Participants (n= 2063)	# of Completers (n= 51)	% of Completers (n= 51)
Paraprofessional	1671	81.00%	41	80.39%
Office/Clerical	155	7.51%	2	3.92%
Other Classified	237	11.49%	8	15.69%

Partnerships Between LEAs and Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)

Grantees are required to submit articulation agreements and signed partnership agreements to receive grant funds for participants enrolled in any institution of higher education (IHE), meaning California Community Colleges (CCC), the California State University (CSU), the University of California (UC), and private not-for-profit institutions of higher education that offer a commission-approved teacher preparation program. Appendix A lists the LEAs' approved IHE partners, in the following order: public institution (CCC, CSU, and UC), private institution, and any additional Commission-approved programs that were not previously listed (i.e., LEAs and out-of-state private institutions with Commission-approved programs). In grantees' narrative responses, LEAs' partnerships with IHEs were the most cited area of program success (44.59%). The following are direct comments as reported by the grantees describing the successes of their IHE partnerships:

- "The IHE partners collaborated with us to design articulation plans to support candidates throughout multiple years in the program as they complete BA degrees prior to entering teacher credentialing programs."
- "They were very flexible with their time and resources and accommodated our requests to meet with our classified employees. [IHE] also provided a workshop for applicants to guide them through the application process."
- "Our partner institution, [IHE], secured some tremendous professional development presenters Participants attended [PD] at a much higher rate than in previous years. We were able to provide our participants some strong PD in the areas of personal development and using visual and performing arts activities in all classrooms."

However, 35 percent of grantees reported in narrative responses that they struggled with the following factors regarding their IHE partnerships. Challenges with LEA/IHE partnerships included:

- Aligning with the IHEs’ timeline for program application, acceptance, and enrollment. This was a more significant challenge for Round Two grantees awarded in January 2023.
- Securing additional IHE partners to meet the needs and interests of classified participants and securing signed articulation agreements with new partner IHEs. This was especially challenging for programs that allowed participants to enroll in any IHE without first securing an articulation agreement and Commission approval.

Tables 5a, 5b, and 5c summarize the different types of IHE and LEA programs in which participants were actively enrolled. Table 5a provides a breakdown of participants’ type of enrollment, by California Community College (CCC), Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science (BA/BS), Commission-approved credential program, or an internal support program designed by the LEA grantee to assist participants in the credentialing process (i.e., advising, mentoring, exam preparation, professional development). Most participants (57.15%) were enrolled in a credential program. The 18 percent of participants enrolled in a CCC program met the required minimum of an AA or two years of college, and participated in a BA/BS satellite program, received exam preparation support, and/or credential program support. Table 5b provides a breakdown of the participants pursuing a BA/BS degree. The majority of BA/BS program enrollment was with CSUs (73.52%), followed by private IHEs (25.09%). Table 5c provides a breakdown of the types of credential programs participants enrolled in. Similar to BA/BS program enrollment, most participants enrolled with a credential program at a CSU. Most participants enrolled in a public institution (CSU, UC, District, County Office of Education, Charter) (59.03%), followed by California-based private IHEs (33.67%).

Table 5a: Type of Program Enrollment

Type of Enrollment	# of Enrollment (n= 2063)	% of Enrollment (n= 2063)
CCC Program	376	18.23%
BA/BS Program	287	13.91%
Credential Program	1179	57.15%
Internal LEA Support Program	221	10.71%

Table 5b: Type of IHEs Participants Pursuing a BA/BA Degree Enrolled in

Type of Institution	# of Participants (n= 287)	% of Participants (n= 287)
California State University (CSU)	211	73.52%
University of California (UC)	4	1.39%
Private	72	25.09%

Table 5c: Type of Commission-approved Credential Program Participants Enrolled in

Type of Institution	# of Participants (n= 1179)	% of Participants (n= 1179)
California State University (CSU)	312	26.46%
University of California (UC)	9	0.76%
Private, California-based	397	33.67%

Type of Institution	# of Participants (n= 1179)	% of Participants (n= 1179)
Private, Out-of-State	86	7.29%
County Office of Education	192	16.28%
District	180	15.27%
Charter	3	0.25%

Academic Standing of the Participants

Programs reported participants’ level of education at the start of the program and participants’ academic standing at the end of the 2022-23 academic year. Table 6a shows the education level of participants and completers at the time participants entered the Classified Grant program, by Associates of Arts/60 college units/two years of college, BA/BS degree, Master of Arts/Master of Science (MA/MS), and doctoral degree. Most participants enrolled in the program with at least a bachelor’s degree (59.91%). The vast majority of completers in the first year of the grant program also had at least a bachelor’s degree (98.04%). The one program completer with at least an AA/60 college units was enrolled in an integrated teacher preparation program.

Table 6a: Education Level at the Start of the Grant Program

Education Level	# of Participants (n= 2063)	% of Participants (n= 2063)	# of Completers (n= 51)	% of Completers (n= 51)
AA/60 units	827	40.09%	1	1.96%
BA/BS	1203	58.31%	48	94.12%
MA/MS	28	1.36%	2	3.92%
Doctoral	5	0.24%	0	0.00%

Table 6b highlights the academic standing of participants after one year in the Classified Grant program by participants that earned their BA/BS degree or their preliminary teaching credential, and the participants that did not make progress towards their BA/BS degree or preliminary credential. Annual progress in the Classified Grant program is locally defined. Fifty-one participants (2.47% of all participants) earned a teaching credential in the first year. In addition to the participants that earned their BA/BS degree or a preliminary credential, 72 percent of participants showed academic progress, as defined locally by the LEA grantee (e.g., successfully completing a minimum number of courses or units, studying/taking exams, etc.).

Table 6b: Academic Standing After Year One (2022-23)

Academic Standing	# of Participants (n= 2063)	% of Participants (n= 2063)
Number of participants that earned their BA/BS degree.	44	2.13%
Number of participants who did NOT make progress towards their BA/BS degree.	71	3.44%
Number of participants that earned their preliminary credential.	51	2.47%

Academic Standing	# of Participants (n= 2063)	% of Participants (n= 2063)
Number of participants who did NOT make progress towards their preliminary credential.	403	19.53%
Number of participants that made academic progress but did not earn a BA/BS or credential.	1494	72.42%

Program Completion

Completion data in the state report reflects 51 (2.47%) program completers’ progress as of July 2023 for Round One (awarded June 2022) and Round Two (awarded January 2023). Fifteen out of the seventeen LEAs that reported completers in the 2022-23 academic year participated in the 2016 and/or 2017 Classified Grant Program. Program grantees collected additional data regarding the type of preliminary credential earned, the number of completers that are now serving as a teacher with the LEA grantee, the number of participants that were not recommended for a preliminary credential and the reasons why, and the number of participants that exited the program early and the reasons why. Table 7a breaks down the types of credentials participants earned. Most completers earned a credential in Special Education (54.90%), followed by Multiple Subject (19.61%).

Table 7a: Preliminary Credentials Earned

Preliminary Credentials Earned	# of Completers (n= 51)	% of Completers (n= 51)
Multiple Subject	10	19.61%
Multiple Subject w/Bilingual Authorization	1	1.96%
Single Subject-English	2	3.92%
Single Subject-Language other than English	1	1.96%
Single Subject-Mathematics	3	5.88%
Single Subject-Science	3	5.88%
Single Subject-Other	3	5.88%
Special Education-Mild to Moderate Support Needs	21	41.18%
Special Education-Extensive Support Needs	2	3.92%
Special Education-Early Childhood	5	9.80%

For completers who are now teaching within the LEA, grantees reported the grade level completers are teaching, the number of completers teaching in a LEA’s teacher shortage area, and the number of teachers teaching at an LEA with a high unduplicated pupil count (above 50%, as defined by Education Code §42238.02). Tables 7b and 7c reflect completers’ employment status with the LEA as of July 2023. At the time of annual reporting, some newly credentialed teachers were not officially placed at a school site or may have changed their employment status during the summer months. The data in tables 7b and 7c also reflects the information LEAs reported to their best of their knowledge, and any updated completer data will be reflected in the 2024 annual report.

Two thirds of completers were offered a position to stay and teach with the LEA (64.71%) and over half of the total completers committed to teaching with the LEA (52.94%). Table 7b provides a summary of the 27 completers committed to teaching at the grantee LEA. Of the 27 completers committed to teaching at their LEA, all (100%) completers are teaching in a locally defined teacher shortage area. Program narratives reflected on the degree to which the first year of the grant program is meeting the LEA’s teacher shortage needs; 53 percent of grantees shared that their Classified Grant program is currently meeting or slowly addressing their teacher shortage needs. Most completers (88.89%) that committed to teach with the LEA are teaching at a school site with a high unduplicated pupil count (above 50%, as defined by Education Code 42238.02). At the time of the first annual report, program completers have not had sufficient time to complete their required years of service. Any program completers that have completed their year of service during the 2023-24 year will be reflected in the 2024 annual report. Note that table 7b shares multiple data points and not all completers were placed at the time of reporting, therefore the percentages will not add up to 100 percent.

Table 7b: Summary of Completers Teaching within the Grantee LEA

Completer Teaching Information	# of Completers (n= 27)	% of Completers* (n= 27)
Meets the LEA's teacher shortage needs	27	100%
Teaching at an LEA with a high unduplicated pupil count (>50%)	24	88.89%
Teaching position by grade level (TK)	2	7.41%
Teaching position by grade level (K-5 th)	14	51.85%
Teaching position by grade level (6 th -8 th)	4	14.81%
Teaching position by grade level (9 th -12 th)	6	22.22%
Completer not placed at time of reporting	1	3.70%

*Percentages will not add up to a hundred percent. Table reflects multiple data points and not all completers were placed at the time of reporting.

The data in table 7c breaks down the reasons why a completer did not stay to teach with the grantee LEA. Fifty-three percent of completers committed to teach with the LEA during the 2023-24 school year and 20 percent of LEAs reported that positions were not available to offer to their completers. County offices of education reported that twelve percent of their completers committed to teaching with an LEA within the COE.

Table 7c: Reasons Completers Changed or Transferred LEAs

Reason for LEA Change or Transfer	# of Completers (n= 51)	% of Completers (n= 51)
N/A - completer committed to teach with LEA	27	52.94%
LEA decided not to hire participant	1	1.96%
No position available at LEA	10	19.61%
Did not want to stay with LEA	5	9.80%
Did not want to teach	0	0.00%

Reason for LEA Change or Transfer	# of Completers (n= 51)	% of Completers (n= 51)
Moved	1	1.96%
Personal	1	1.96%
Completer is teaching at an LEA within the COE (COE programs only)	6	11.76%

Table 7d breaks down the reasons participants were not recommended for their preliminary credential after completing their credential program. All seven participants that were not recommended for a preliminary credential did not pass their required exam(s). These program completers may continue to work on any missing credentialing requirements to earn a preliminary teaching credential and their completion data will be reflected in the 2024 annual report.

Table 7d: Participants not Recommended for a Preliminary Credential

Reasons Not Recommended for Preliminary	# of Participants (n= 7)	% of Participants (n= 7)
Did not pass required exam(s)	7	100%
Did not pass coursework	0	0%
Variable term waiver	0	0%
Some (or all) of the above	0	0%
Other	0	0%

Table 7e reports the reasons why participants exited the program early and did not earn a preliminary teaching credential. “Other” was the most common reason (60%), followed by participants no longer employed by the LEA (15.38%). Participants that changed their career path and determined that they no longer wanted to become a teacher was the third most common early exit reason (12.31%).

Table 7e: Reasons Participants Exited Early

Early Exit Reasons	# of Participants (n= 65)	% of Participants (n= 65)
Changed career plans	8	12.31%
Financial	3	4.62%
Moved	0	0.00%
No longer employed by LEA	10	15.38%
Personal	5	7.69%
Other	39	60.00%

Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of the Participants and Completers

Programs reported the participants’ self-identified ethnic/racial composition and gender identity. The data in tables 8a and 8b break down the demographics of the total program participants, program completers, completers that are committed to teaching with the LEA grantee during the 2023-24 academic year, participants that did not get recommended for a

preliminary credential, and participants that exited the program early. Note that the Asian ethnic/racial category includes Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Asian Indian, Laotian, Cambodian, Filipino, and Hmong. The Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ethnic/racial category also includes Guamanian, Samoan, and Tahitian.

In narrative responses, 38 percent of grantees reported one of their programs' strengths was the LEA's ability to recruit diverse participants. Overall, close to 90 percent of participants reported their ethnicity/race and 64 percent belong to an underrepresented group. In the first year of reporting participant racial/ethnic demographics, the largest racial/ethnic group of participants are Hispanic or Latinx (43.09%), followed by White participants (25.98%). Most participants that exited the grant program early were Hispanic/Latinx participants (49.23%), followed by White participants (26.15%). While Hispanic/Latinx participants were the largest racial/ethnic group of participants (43.09%), White completers represented the largest group of completers to stay and teach with the grantee LEA (40.74%). Asian participants were one of the three smallest racial/ethnic groups (6.11%); however, Asian program completers represented the second largest group that were not recommended for a preliminary credential (equivalent to White completers not recommended for a preliminary credential, 28.57%).

Table 8a: Ethnic/Racial Composition of Participants and Program Completers

Race/Ethnicity	Total Participants (n= 2063)	Completers (n= 51)	Completers Teaching with LEA (n= 27)	Not Recommended for Preliminary (n= 7)	Early Exit (n= 65)
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.41%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Asian	6.11%	5.88%	0.00%	28.57%	7.69%
Black or African American	6.69%	9.80%	11.11%	0.00%	7.69%
Hispanic/Latinx (of any race)	43.09%	37.25%	33.33%	42.86%	49.23%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
White	25.98%	37.25%	40.74%	28.57%	26.15%
Two or more races	6.54%	3.92%	3.70%	0.00%	1.54%
Decline to state Race/Ethnicity	9.69%	5.88%	11.11%	0.00%	7.69%

Overall, 98 percent of participants reported their gender identity; reporting this information to the Commission is voluntary for participants in the program. Female participants were the largest group (81.73%), followed by male participants (15.22%). Female participants were the largest group of participants that exited the grant program early (84.62%), followed by male participants (13.85%). Male participants were the largest group of completers that did not get recommended for a preliminary credential (57.14%), followed by female completers (42.86%).

The largest group of completers and completers teaching with the LEA were female (82.35% and 74.07%, respectively), followed by male completers (15.69% and 22.22%, respectively).

Table 8b: Gender Identity of Participants and Program Completers

Gender Identity	Total Participants (n= 2063)	Completers (n= 51)	Completers Teaching with LEA (n= 27)	Not Recommended for Preliminary (n= 7)	Early Exit (n= 65)
Female	81.73%	82.35%	74.07%	42.86%	84.62%
Male	15.22%	15.69%	22.22%	57.14%	13.85%
Nonbinary	0.58%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.54%
Decline to state	2.47%	1.96%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%

Tables 8c and 8d provide the demographics of completers by each credential area earned. Note that tables 8c and 8d does not include any racial/ethnic or gender demographic category for credentials areas that had zero completers (America Indian or Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and non-binary). The two largest completer credential areas by race/ethnicity were in Special Education, specifically Mild to Moderate Support Needs Credential. Twenty percent of Hispanic/Latinx completers and 18 percent of White completers earned a Mild to Moderate Support Needs Credential. By gender identity, Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Multiple Subject represented the two largest credentials earned, both by female completers (37.25% and 17.65%, respectively).

Table 8c: Ethnic/Racial Composition of Program Completers, by Credential Area

Completer credential area	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic/Latinx (of any race)	White	Two or more races	Decline to state
Multiple Subject	1 (1.96%)	1 (1.96%)	3 (5.88%)	4 (7.84%)	0	1 (1.96%)
Multiple Subject w/Bilingual Authorization	0	0	1 (1.96%)	0	0	0
Single Subject-English	0	0	1 (1.96%)	1 (1.96%)	0	0
Single Subject-Language other than English	0	0	1 (1.96%)	0	0	0
Single Subject-Mathematics	0	0	1 (1.96%)	2 (3.92%)	0	0
Single Subject-Science	0	1 (1.96%)	0	2 (3.92%)	0	0
Single Subject-Other	0	0	1 (1.96%)	0	1 (1.96%)	1 (1.96%)
Special Education-Mild to Moderate Support Needs	0	1 (1.96%)	10 (19.61%)	9 (17.65%)	1 (1.96%)	1 (1.96%)

Special Education-Extensive Support Needs	0	1 (1.96%)	0	1 (1.96%)	0	0
Special Education-Early Childhood	2 (3.92%)	1 (1.96%)	1 (1.96%)	0	0	0
Total (N= 51)	5.88%	9.80%	37.25%	37.25%	3.92%	5.88%

Table 8d: Gender Identity of Program Completers, by Credential Area

Completer credential area	Female	Male	Decline to state
Multiple Subject	9 (17.65%)	1 (1.96%)	0
Multiple Subject w/Bilingual Authorization	1 (1.96%)	0	0
Single Subject-English	2 (3.92%)	0	0
Single Subject-Language other than English	1 (1.96%)	0	0
Single Subject-Mathematics	2 (3.92%)	1 (1.96%)	0
Single Subject-Science	2 (3.92%)	1 (1.96%)	0
Single Subject-Other	0	2 (3.92%)	1 (1.96%)
Special Education-Mild to Moderate Support Needs	19 (37.25%)	3 (5.88%)	0
Special Education-Extensive Support Needs	2 (3.92%)	0	0
Special Education-Early Childhood	4 (7.84%)	0	0
Total (N= 51)	82.35%	15.69%	1.96%

Program Funding

For each Round of grant funding, table 9a provides the annual grant award, the total amount expended during the 2022-23 year, the percentage expended, and the total amount of remaining funds. All participants were funded up to the \$4,800 legislative maximum, except for two LEA grantees that requested \$4,000 per participant, per year for a total of 32 annual slots. 33 percent of annual grant funds were expended across both Rounds. Note that Round One was awarded June 2022 and Round Two was awarded January 2023. In grantees' narrative responses, 23 percent of grantees across both Rounds reported that program recruitment and implementation started late and found the timing of the grant award challenging.

Table 9a: Annual Grant Award Expenditure per Round

Round	Grant Award	Total Expended	% Expended	Remaining Funds
One	\$14,014,400.00	\$5,552,383.64	39.62%	\$8,462,016.36
Two	\$8,500,800.00	\$1,963,788.44	23.1%	\$6,537,011.56
Total	\$22,515,200.00	\$7,516,172.08	33.38%	\$14,999,027.92

Programs reported that grant funds disbursed were expended across the following budget categories:

- Recruitment activities (that are not included in program administration or release time)
- Collaboration activities with IHE partners (that are not included in program administration or release time)
- Release time for participants
- IHE tuition (including books, other college/university fees)
- Exams and credential fees
- Living stipends for participants
- Other support for participants (e.g., mentoring, advising, professional development)
- Program administration costs (ten percent maximum)

Table 9b further breaks down the total annual expenditures by approved budget categories. For each budget category, the annual grant award is listed and the percentage from the total annual grant award. Table 10b also shows the amount expended per budget category, the percentage expended from the total grant award, and the percentage expended within each budget category. IHE tuition, fees, and books was the largest budget category (46.57%), and the budget category that expended the most funds from the total annual award (41.92%). The program administration budget category expended the most funds within its own budget category (77.46%). While program administration costs were eight percent of the grant award budget, program administration costs accounted for 17 percent of expended funds across all budget categories, making this the largest difference between planned and actual expenditures. Note that grantees must receive Commission approval for any budget changes that exceed ten percent of the total grant award.

Table 9b: Annual Grant Award Expenditures by Budget Categories

Budget Categories	Annual Grant Award	% of Award	Expended	% Expended, from Total	% Expended, per Category
Participant Recruitment Activities	\$221,713.85	0.98%	\$69,231.73	0.92%	31.23%
Collaboration Activities with IHEs	\$316,350.00	1.41%	\$110,870.00	1.48%	35.05%
Release Time	\$351,692.00	1.56%	\$38,600.00	0.51%	10.98%
IHE Tuition, Fees, Books	\$10,484,905.04	46.57%	\$3,151,034.11	41.92%	30.05%

Budget Categories	Annual Grant Award	% of Award	Expended	% Expended, from Total	% Expended, per Category
Examination/ Credential Fees	\$495,265.00	2.20%	\$59,964.33	0.80%	12.11%
Living Stipends for Participants	\$6,847,180.00	30.41%	\$1,705,773.50	22.69%	24.91%
Other Support Services for Participants	\$2,104,008.00	9.34%	\$1,068,436.69	14.22%	50.78%
Program Administration	\$1,694,086.11	7.52%	\$1,312,261.72	17.46%	77.46%

Grantee narrative responses mentioned funding as one of several challenges their programs faced. 30 percent of LEAs reported the amount of grant funds allocated per participant was not sufficient, that the 10 percent cap on program administration costs was too low, and/or the allowable budget categories were restrictive, as grantees could not add new budget categories after program approval. The following are direct narratives from grantees:

- “Our largest challenge is that the grant costs our program budget to have. The combination of indirect costs charged and the cost of employees to manage the grant (applications, payments, assistance, etc.) is more than the allotted administration fees allowed.”
- “While the annual amount is certainly helpful some students still have a challenge in finding a way to fund the remaining balance. We have found that the financial burden of obtaining a degree and credential is the largest factor in potential students not going forward with the program.”
- “In the future, we would prefer to have the flexibility to reallocate unused funds to participants with greater financial need.” Note that this grantee is suggesting going above the legislative \$4,800 maximum per participant, by transferring unused funds to participants with higher financial needs.

Program Narratives

In addition to reporting participant data, grantees submit annual narratives reflecting on the following:

- the degree to which the program is meeting the LEA’s teacher shortage needs,
- program successes and challenges,
- the impact of LEA’s collaboration with IHE partner(s), and
- any lessons learned.

Note that some of the grantees’ narrative responses were integrated into previous sections of the state report. The following section highlights additional program narrative responses.

Several grantees provided additional participant support through mentoring, advising, and/or professional development that was offered by either LEA staff or IHE partner(s). In the annual grant narratives, 42 percent of grantees mentioned mentoring, advising, and professional

development as one of their program's strengths. The following are direct narratives from grantees:

- "Through this initial advisement, [LEA] was able assist these individuals in understanding where they currently are in the credential preparation process as well as options for their next steps and how the Classified Employee Teacher Recruitment Grant will be able to assist them further."
- "In addition, we have learned that the cohort system of communicating and meeting with our classified candidates outside of the university process is an important support piece. At one meeting, we featured a new teacher as a guest speaker, giving tips to our classified credential candidates on navigating coursework, substituting, and other challenges. Also, in terms of the coursework completed by the candidates, we are very pleased to see the high grades earned on employee transcripts."
- "The program offered pedagogical support through monthly professional learning and classroom teaching experiences for the program participants. The participants engaged in hands-on STEAM lesson plan development and led classroom instruction during winter and summer STEAM camps. During the STEAM camp, participants taught with partners, received professional learning, and created daily lesson plans, all while receiving coaching and feedback to improve their teaching practices."

In addition to the program challenges that were reported in previous sections of the state report (implementation, recruitment, grant award timing, and funding), grantees also shared the following challenges:

- Interested classified staff need more time to adjust their family and jobs before committing and enrolling with an IHE.
- Some IHE programs required a modification to a classified employee's work status, which reduced classified staff's salary and benefits above the amount of grant funds they would receive.
- Participants struggled balancing work and family obligations while enrolled in a BA/BS or credential program.
- Participants experienced test preparation anxiety. Some participants with BA/BS degrees did not want to take the subject matter exams or they were unclear how else they could meet subject matter competency.
- Several classified staff were interested in the PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist credential. However, there wasn't a Commission-approved program available during the 2022-23 academic year.
- While the intent of legislation is to support classified employees, grantees shared that they would like to include employees with a Short-Term Staff Permit (STSP), Provisional Internship Permit (PIP), or substitute teaching permit.

Lastly, grantees shared lessons learned from their first year in the 2021 Classified Grant program that may support future grantees. The following responses were the most frequently shared recommendations:

- Programs should provide participants with additional support through the IHE application process.

- Programs should provide participants with support to understand the different credentialing pathways.
- Programs should regularly communicate with participants (e.g., cohort meetings, check-ins throughout the year, emails, sharing IHE resources). Some LEAs also recommended individualized advising and mentoring sessions to communicate participant-specific program requirements (e.g., transcript review for minimum qualifications, program enrollment, program expectations, progress monitoring).
- Programs should communicate and collaborate with IHE partners to clearly understand programmatic timelines. If possible, flexible timelines, including recruitment, application, acceptance, and enrollment, may support participants entering the program at different times.
- Programs should collaborate with their LEA's fiscal, business, and human resources departments.
- Program should not underestimate the amount of time needed to manage all aspects of the program (e.g., developing, planning, and refining program systems, early recruitment, developing local support, data management).
- Programs should utilize the Classified Grant Office Hours support sessions for questions and an opportunity to network with other LEAs to learn and share recommendations. Grantees should reach out to Commission staff for help as needed.

Summary and Conclusion

The 2023 annual state report reflects the first year of the 2021 California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program. Local education agencies supported 2063 participants and close to three-fourths (72.42%) of participants made sufficient annual progress, as defined by the LEA, towards earning their BA/BS degree or preliminary teaching credential. Additionally, 51 participants earned a preliminary teaching credential and is helping to address the teacher shortage. The number of recruited participants, successful program completers, and their areas of credential demonstrate a dedication to addressing teacher shortages in special education, multiple subject, and other local shortage areas. Of the completers that are staying to teach with the grantee LEA, a hundred percent are teaching in a locally defined teacher shortage area and 89 percent are teaching at an LEA with a high unduplicated pupil count.

Narrative data compiled from the annual reporting data sheets in July 2023 from Rounds One and Two show that LEAs reported using grant funds as a means to help meet their local teacher shortage needs, that the program is serving racially and ethnically diverse classified school employees, that all grantee LEAs have established collaborative articulation arrangements with IHEs, and the grant is serving classified school employees from a range of classified positions.

In conclusion, LEAs are making progress in the first year of the grant program, including LEAs in Round Two that had fewer than six months to implement a program in the 2022-23 academic year. Round Three, awarded June 2023, added 125 annual participant slots to the Classified Grant Program. Round Four applications are due December 2023, and awards will be announced December 2023. Rounds Three and Four will continue to support grantees to recruit

classified school employees into teaching careers and in completing their undergraduate education, professional teacher preparation, and preliminary certification.

Appendix A

LEA and IHE Partnerships

Local Education Agency	IHEs, by Public Institution (CCC; CSUs; UCs); Private Institution; Additional Credential Program
Acalanes Union High School District	CSU East Bay; Dominican University, St. Mary's College, University of Massachusetts Global
Alhambra Unified School District	Cal State LA
Allegiance STEAM Academy	University of Redland
Alpha Jose Hernandez	San José State; National University, Santa Clara University
Alternatives in Action High School	Reach University; Alternatives in Action
American Indian Public Charter School II	Reach University; Alternatives in Action
ARISE High School	CSU East Bay; Reach University; Alternatives in Action
Berkeley Unified School District	CSU East Bay, San Francisco State University; National University, St. Mary's College
Butte County Office of Education	Chaffey Community College, College of the Desert, College of the Siskiyous, Columbia College, Cypress College, El Camino College, Feather River College, Fresno City College, Mendocino College, Southwestern College; Cal Poly Pomona; CSU Bakersfield, Chico State, Fresno State, Cal State Fullerton, CSU Monterey Bay, Sacramento State, CSU San Bernardino, Stanislaus State, San Diego State, Sonoma State; Azusa Pacific, Fresno Pacific University, National University, University of Massachusetts Global; Western Governors University
Caliber Beta Academy	Alder Graduate School of Education
Castro Valley Unified School District	CSU East Bay
Citizens of the World Charter School Silver Lake	Cal State LA; Summit Preparatory Charter High School
Clovis Unified School District	Fresno State
Coalinga-Huron Unified School District	Fresno State; University of Massachusetts Global; Western Governors University
Davis Joint Unified School District	Sacramento State; UC Davis; University of Massachusetts Global
Dinuba Unified School District	Fresno State
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District	University of Massachusetts Global
Fontana Unified School District	CSU San Bernardino
Fresno Unified School District	Fresno State; Fresno Pacific University; Tulare County Office of Education

Local Education Agency	IHEs , by Public Institution (CCC; CSUs; UCs); Private Institution; Additional Credential Program
Garden Grove Unified School District	Whittier College; CSU Channel Islands, CSU Dominguez Hills, Cal State Fullerton, CSU Long Beach; UC Irvine; Chapman University, Hope International University, National University, Vanguard University
Glenn County Office of Education	Chico State
Hawthorne School District	CSU Dominguez Hills
Huntington Beach Union High School District	Cal State Fullerton, CSU Long Beach; National University
Inglewood Unified School District	CSU Dominguez Hills
Kern County Office of Education	CSU Bakersfield; Point Loma Nazarene University, University of La Verne
Larchmont Charter School	CSUN
Lighthouse Charter School	Reach University; Alternatives in Action
Lighthouse Community Public Schools	Reach University; Alder Graduate of Education
Long Beach Unified School District	CSU Dominguez Hills
Long Beach Unified School District	CSU Long Beach, CSU Dominguez Hills
Long Valley Charter School	Lassen Community College; National University, Reach University; Alternatives in Action, CalState TEACH, Western Governors University
Los Angeles County Office of Education	East Los Angeles College, Pasadena City, Santa Ana College; CSU Dominguez Hills, Cal State Fullerton, CSU Long Beach, Cal State LA, CSUN; Azusa Pacific, National University, University of La Verne; Alder Graduate School of Education, Los Angeles County Office of Education
Los Angeles Unified School District	CSU Long Beach, Cal State LA, CSUN; Los Angeles Unified School District
Madera Unified School District	Fresno State
Math and Science College Preparatory	San José State; Loyola Marymount University; Summit Preparatory Charter High School
Merced County Office of Education	Stanislaus State; Fresno Pacific University, University of Massachusetts Global; Merced County Office of Education
Modesto City Schools	Stanislaus State
Montebello Unified School District	Cal State LA
Moreno Valley Unified School District	CSU San Bernardino; University of Massachusetts Global
Multicultural Learning Center	CSUN

Local Education Agency	IHEs, by Public Institution (CCC; CSUs; UCs); Private Institution; Additional Credential Program
Oakland Unified School District	Peralta Community College District; CSU East Bay; Dominican University, National University, Notre Dame de Namur, Pacific Oaks College, St. Mary's College, University of Massachusetts Global; Alder Graduate School of Education, CalState TEACH
Orange County Department of Education	Barstow Community College, Cerritos Community College, College of the Desert, Chaffey College, Cypress College, El Camino College, Feather River College, Fullerton College, Golden West College, Grossmont College, Mira Costa College, San Diego Mesa College, Santa Ana College, Santiago Canyon College, Southwestern College; Humboldt State, Cal Poly Pomona, CSU Channel Island, Chico State, CSU Dominguez Hills, Fresno State, Cal State Fullerton, CSU Long Beach, Cal State LA, CSU San Bernardino, CSU San Marcos, Stanislaus State, San Diego State, Sonoma State; UC Irvine; Alliant International University, Azusa Pacific University, California Baptist University, Chapman University, Concordia University Irvine, Fresno Pacific University, Hope International University, Los Angeles Pacific University, Mount Saint Mary's University, National University, Pacific Oaks University, Point Loma Nazarene University, United States University, University of La Verne, University of Redlands, University of Massachusetts Global; CalState TEACH, San Diego County Office of Education, Western Governors University
Oxford Day Academy	Reach University; Alternatives in Action
Pajaro Valley Unified School District	CSU Monterey Bay
Placer County Office of Education	University of Massachusetts Global; Placer County Office of Education
Pleasanton Unified School District	CSU East Bay; National University
Plumas Charter School	National University; CalState TEACH
Pomona Unified School District	Cal Poly Pomona; University of La Verne
Redondo Beach Unified School District	CSU Dominguez Hills
Riverside County Office of Education	CSU San Bernardino; University of Massachusetts Global; Riverside County Office of Education, Western Governors University

Local Education Agency	IHEs , by Public Institution (CCC; CSUs; UCs); Private Institution; Additional Credential Program
Sacramento County Office of Education	University of Massachusetts Global; Sacramento County Office of Education
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools	Cal Poly Pomona, CSU San Bernardino, Cal State Fullerton, CSUN; UC Riverside; Alliant International University, California Baptist University, National University, University of La Verne, University of Massachusetts Global, University of Redlands; Western Governors University
San Diego County Office of Education	San Diego State, CSU San Marcos; National University, Point Loma Nazarene University; San Diego County Office of Education
San Diego Unified School District	University of La Verne
San Francisco Unified School District	City College of San Francisco; San Francisco State University; National University, University of San Francisco; CalState TEACH
San Juan Unified School District	Alder Graduate School of Education
San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	Cuesta College; Cal Poly San Luis Obispo; University of Massachusetts Global; CalState TEACH
San Mateo County Office of Education	Fresno State, San Francisco State University; Alliant University, Notre Dame De Namur University; Western Governors University
San Mateo Union High School District	San José State; Summit Preparatory Charter High School
Santa Ana Unified School District	Santa Ana College; CSU Dominguez Hills, Cal State Fullerton, CSU Long Beach; Alliant International University, Azusa Pacific University, Chapman University, Concordia University Irvine, Hope International University, National University, Point Loma Nazarene University, University of Massachusetts Global, Vanguard University; Western Governors University
Santa Barbara County Education Office	UC Santa Barbara; University of Massachusetts Global
Santa Clara County Office of Education	San José State; National University, Santa Clara University; Santa Clara County Office of Education, Teachers College of San Joaquin
Santa Maria Bonita School District	Hancock College; California Baptist University, California Lutheran University, National University, University of Massachusetts Global; CalState TEACH
Siskiyou County Office of Education	Alternatives in Action

Local Education Agency	IHEs , by Public Institution (CCC; CSUs; UCs); Private Institution; Additional Credential Program
Sonoma County Office of Education	Humboldt State, Sonoma State; University of Massachusetts Global; Sonoma County Office of Education
Torrance Unified School District	CSU Dominguez Hills, CSU Long Beach; Alder Graduate School of Education
Trinity County Office of Education	Chico State, Humboldt State; National University, Simpson University; CalState TEACH, Lake County Office of Education
Ventura County Office of Education	CSU Channel Islands, CSUN; California Lutheran University, National University, University of La Verne, University of Massachusetts Global
Visalia Unified School District	Fresno Pacific University, National University, University of Massachusetts Global; Tulare County Office of Education
West Contra Costa Unified School District	CSU East Bay; Dominican University
William S. Hart Union High School District	CSUN; University of Massachusetts Global
Yuba City Unified School District	Sierra College, Yuba Community College; Chico State, Sacramento State; National University, Pacific Oaks College, University of Massachusetts Global