



Report to the Legislature on the Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants Program

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

December 2024

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
May Lee State Office Complex
651 Bannon Street, Suite 600
Sacramento, CA 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 2024 Annual Report on the California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program in December 2024. 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
Johanna Hartwig
Ira Lit
Monica Martinez
David Simmons
Phuong Uzoff

Ex-Officio Representatives

Kathryn Williams Browne
Annamarie Francois
Shireen Pavri
Jerell Hill

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
Public Representative
Faculty Member Representative
Public Representative
Human Resources Administrator Representative
Teacher 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 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants Program.....	4
Introduction	4
Background	4
Year 1 Annual Data Report on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program	5
Partnerships Between Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and California Community Colleges	7
Implementation/Expansion:	8
Program Implementation Progress.....	9
Program Completion.....	11
Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of Candidates and Completers	12
Program Funding.....	14
Program Narratives.....	17
Summary and Conclusion	18

Executive Summary

This 2024 Annual Report to the Legislature on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants provides an update on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants (Integrated Grants) as required by statute (Education Code §44259.1).

The 2022-23 Committee on Budget, Education Finance: Education Omnibus Budget Trailer Bill, AB 181, authorized the Commission to allocate \$20 million in one-time grants to regionally accredited institutions of higher education (IHEs) for four-year integrated teacher preparation programs, including student teaching, and/or to adapt an existing Commission-approved five-year integrated teacher preparation program to a four-year program. These grants support the planning for, creation of, or expansion of four-year integrated programs of professional preparation that produce teachers in the designated shortage fields of special education, bilingual education, science, health, computer science, technology, engineering, mathematics, transitional kindergarten, or kindergarten and/or that partner with a California community college to create an integrated program of professional preparation. This 2024 state report includes information on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program and reflects the first year of program data collected for 2023-24 fiscal year.

This report is organized with the following headings:

- Introduction
- Background
- Year 1 Annual Data Report on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program
- Partnerships Between Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and California Community Colleges
- Program Implementation Progress
- Program Completion
- Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of the Participants and Completers
- Program Funding
- Program Narratives
- Summary and Conclusion

Overall findings for the 2023-24 fiscal year are summarized below:

- All grantees reported progress planning and/or implementing grant programs, including 70 percent of grantees developing partnerships with California Community Colleges.
- In the first year, 64 candidates earned their undergraduate degree and preliminary credential in the first year of the grant program to address the teacher shortage, for a total of 69 credentials.
- Over 67 percent of candidates and completers belong to an underrepresented ethnic/racial group.
- Grantees will continue to plan and/or recruit integrated candidates to complete their undergraduate education and preliminary certification.

- Commission staff will continue to provide technical assistance and host office hour sessions in 2024-25 to support program planning and implementation and annual data collection.

Report to the Legislature on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants Program

Introduction

Authorizing legislation requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to annually report to the Legislature regarding the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants Program. Grantees must report program and outcome data for at least five years after receiving the grant. The reported information includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- The program design and features.
- Effective practices in program design and implementation.
- The number of graduates.
- The number and type of credentials earned.
- The time taken to earn a degree and credential.
- The progress of community college partnerships and institutions relative to the following assurances:
 - A commitment to implement a planned integrated program of professional preparation.
 - The recruitment and retention of candidates for educator shortage areas.
 - Coordination with existing sources of candidate support, such as the Golden State Teacher Grant Program established pursuant to Article 5.1 (commencing with Section 69617) of Chapter 2 of Part 42 of Division 5 of Title 3, and other forms of financial aid.
 - A demonstrated commitment to expand enrollment in, and access to, teacher preparation programs, including enrollment in programs of integrated professional preparation.

Background

In the 2016-17 fiscal year, the Legislature approved \$10 million the Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants (Integrated Grants). The [final report](#) to the Commission was presented June 2021.

The 2022-23 Committee on Budget, Education Finance: Education Omnibus Budget Trailer Bill, AB 181, authorized the Commission to allocate \$20 million in one-time grants to regionally accredited institutions of higher education (IHEs) for four-year integrated teacher preparation programs, including student teaching, and/or to adapt an existing Commission-approved five-year integrated teacher preparation program to a four-year program. These grants support the planning for, creation of, or expansion of four-year integrated programs of professional preparation that produce teachers in the designated shortage fields of special education, bilingual education, science, health, computer science, technology, engineering, mathematics, transitional kindergarten, or kindergarten and/or that partner with a California community

college to create an integrated program of professional preparation. Integrated Grants program funding was divided into two program types - Integrated *Planning* Grants and Integrated *Implementation/Expansion* Grants. Integrated Planning Grants were funded up to \$250,000, and Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants were funded up to \$500,000 in one-time grant funds.

Grantees must provide program and outcome data for at least five years after receiving the grant, through the 2027-28 fiscal year. This 2024 state report includes information on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program and reflects the first year of program data collected for the 2023-24 fiscal year. The report includes information on both Integrated Planning and Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants, and addresses the following topics: grantee information, California Community College partnerships, implementation progress, credentials issued, candidate demographics, program expenditures, and direct narratives from grantees. To support annual data collection, the Commission staff hosted three forums (i.e., office hours) for grant managers, and any additional staff grant managers included, to ask the Commission and the broader Integrated Grant community questions and to share best practices. All IHEs successfully submitted the annual data reporting requirements.

Year 1 Annual Data Report on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program

In November 2022, the Commission published the first Request for Application (RFA) for the Integrated Grants Program. Following a competitive RFA process, in March 2023, the Commission conditionally funded 19 Integrated Planning Grants and 15 Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants to Intuitions of Higher Education. Round One awarded a total of \$8,069,833. With \$11,930,166.45 grant funds remaining, the Commission published Round Two of the Integrated Grants RFA in March 2023 and awarded six Integrated Planning Grants and three Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants in May 2023. After conditionally funded requests for additional information were received, the Commission funded 26 Integrated Planning Grants for a total of \$6,175,077.87 and 18 Integrated Implementation/Expansion grants for a total of \$8,675,848.58, for a combined total of \$14,850,926.45 in one-time grant awards.

Table 1 shows the summary of grant awards and grant funds, per type of Integrated Grant Program. Appendices A and B provides a complete list of each grantee, the total grant award, 2022-23 expenditures, and the amount of grant funds remaining for the Planning Grant and Implementation/Expansion Grant, respectively. The Integrated Grant funds are one-time awards, and all grantees must expend grant funds by the end of the 2024-25 fiscal year.

Table 1: Summary of Integrated Grants Award, per grant type

Type	Total Grantees	Total Funding
Planning	26	\$6,175,077.87
Implementation/Expansion	18	\$8,675,848.58
Totals	44	\$14,850,926.45

Eligible regionally accredited institutions awarded include California State Universities, private institutions, and Universities of California. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the type of institutions of higher education (IHEs) that were awarded for both types of Integrated Grants Programs. The percentage of the type of IHE represented differs between Planning Grants and Implementation/Expansion Grants. Overall, private IHEs were awarded the most Integrated Grants.

Table 2: Type of IHE Awarded, per grant type

Type of IHE	Planning (n=26)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=18)	Total (n=44)
California State University	34.62%	50%	40.91%
Private	65.38%	38.89%	54.55%
University of California	0%	11.11%	4.55%

IHE grantees are planning, implementing, or expanding one or more credential program focus areas. Per credential focus area, IHE grantees reported whether it was a new program area being implemented as an integrated program, a program being adapted from a five-year program to an integrated four-year program, expanding the size of the program, or adding new community college partners to support an integrated program. Table 3 summarizes the type of planning and implementation across both Integrated Grant type at the time of the grant award. Most Integrated Planning grantees reported planning a new credential program focus area (66.67%), which was the least common planning type for Implementation/Expansion Grants (8.51%). In Table 3, “Adding Community College Partner(s)” indicates that the grantees’ sole focus is to plan with California Community College partners to developed integrated pathways. The zero percent noted for Planning grantees does not suggest that IHEs are not planning with CCCs. At the time of the grant application process, grantees submitted partnership agreements with current CCC partners, and throughout the project period, grantees may continue to plan and partner with current and/or new community college partners.

Table 3: Type of Program Planning and Implementation, per grant type

Type of Program Planning and Implementation	Planning (n=26)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=18)
New Program	66.67%	8.51%
Adapting form a 5-year to a 4-year Program	16.67%	19.15%
Program Expansion	16.67%	61.70%
Adding Community College Partner(s)	0.00%*	10.64%

*Indicates the grant focus, not that there are zero CCC partners. See Table 5 for more information.

Table 4 below provides a breakdown, per Integrated Grant type, of the program focus areas that grantees explored in the first year of the grant program. Grantees applied to one or more

program focus areas, so the total number of program focus areas in Table 4 is larger than the total number of grantees. Note that Single Subject Science in Table 4 includes Biological Science, Chemistry, Geosciences, and Physics. PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Instruction Credential was the most common program focus area for Integrated Planning Grants (27.91%). At the time Integrated Grant applications were submitted, there were no ECE Specialist Instruction Credential programs approved that could apply for an Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grant. For Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants, Education Specialist (Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs) was the most common program focus area (31.91%). For a complete list of program focus area(s) per grantee and the type of program planning and implementation, see Appendices C and D.

Table 4: Program Focus Area, by Grant Program Area

Program Focus Area	Planning (n=43)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=47)
Multiple Subject	8.89%	14.89%
Multiple Subject with kindergarten and/or transitional kindergarten focus	0%	2.13%
Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization	2.33%	21.28%
Single Subject: Science	16.28%	12.77%
Single Subject: Mathematics	2.33%	12.77%
Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs	11.63%	31.91%
Education Specialist with Bilingual Authorization	9.30%	0%
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education	18.60%	4.26%
PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Instruction Credential	27.91%	0%

Partnerships Between Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and California Community Colleges

Authorizing Legislation for the Integrated Grants Program supports IHEs that are interested in creating an integrated program of professional preparation with California Community College (CCC) and/or California Community College District partners. Integrated Grant Planning and Implementation/Expansion grantees using grant funds to implement integrated pathways with CCC partners are required to submit signed partnership agreements confirming planning and implementation timelines, and budgets included in the application. Grantees submitted partnership agreements with the initial grant application and grantees have submitted additional partnership agreements throughout Year One of the grant program. Grantees may continue to submit partnership agreements through the project period. Table 5 provides a breakdown, by program type, showing the percentage of grantees that have at least one CCC or CCC District partner, followed the total number of CCC and CCC District partners. Table 5 includes all grantees that are collaborating with CCCs, and expands on the information provided

in Table 3, which only reflects the number of grantees that are solely focused on planning with CCC partners. Across both program types, close to 70 percent of grantees have at least one CCC partner as of the first year of the grant program. Appendices C and D provide a complete list of each grantee and CCC partner(s) across both grant types.

Table 5: California Community College Partners, by Grant Program Type

Program Implementation Status	Planning (n=26)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=18)
At least one CCC or CCC District Partner	72.22%	69.23%
Total number of CCC Partners	35	35
Total number of CCC District Partners	1	2

In an open-ended narrative response asking about successes of the Integrated program, 50 percent of Planning grantees and 33 percent of Implementation/Expansion grantees cited their collaboration with community college partners as a success. Specifically, grantees mentioned collaboration to develop aligned coursework and articulation agreements (54% of Planning Grants and 17% of Implementation/Expansion Grants) and recruitment and marketing support (31% of Planning Grants and 50% of Implementation/Expansion Grants). The following are direct comments from grantees describing the positive impact of their partnerships with community colleges:

Planning:

- “Our collaboration with community college (CC) partners has been central to our planning efforts during this first year. We were intentional to include CC voice in our initial kick off meeting in October 2023, and all subsequent planning drafts, program models and products have been developed in coordination with our CC partners.”
- “Our partnership has enabled us to offer contextualized general education (GE) courses that are difficult for [community college partner] to provide on their own. This arrangement not only benefits [community college partner] students by broadening their access to specialized coursework but also strengthens the overall educational framework by ensuring consistency in the quality and relevance of the courses offered.”
- “Collaborating with our community college partners has been essential to the success of the program. We have periodically consulted with them to compare course development and course descriptions. We have examined current articulation agreements and opportunities to make future students' educational experiences more positive and effective, in terms of courses that transfer and comparable.”

Implementation/Expansion:

- “Some of our [community college] partners have also discussed how many of their students don't see themselves at a four-year college and that feelings of not belonging or imposter system hold many back. We are asking our Liberal Studies students who have transferred to work with us on these events to share their stories and how they have managed the move to [four-year college]. We are hopeful that this strategy will be

a powerful one--that the community college students will connect with our current students and learn some strategies to manage the change to [four-year college].”

- “Collaboration has provided us with new recruitment opportunities, communication channels to promote the ITEP program for junior transfers, and supportive ideas to engage students.”
- “From its inception, this partnership facilitated the creation, implementation, and expansion of the program by providing essential resources, expertise, and institutional support. [Community college partner]’s involvement allowed for the seamless integration of the program into the community college’s existing infrastructure, leveraging its established networks with local school districts and community organizations. This collaboration enhanced the program’s accessibility and relevance to the needs of the community, ensuring that aspiring bilingual educators received high-quality training and support.”

However, only Planning grantees reported challenges in collaborating with community college partners, with 19 percent indicating they were still trying to determine the best way to approach working with these institutions as they plan their programs. The following are direct comments from Planning grantees:

- “One of our biggest challenges in this first year was working with two community colleges that have different infrastructures and visions for building a teacher pipeline into special education.”
- “While many of our community college partners are eager to collaborate with us on integrating the TPEs, the development of new courses and limited availability for joint meetings pose significant challenges.”
- “The program’s success hinges on collaboration between multiple institutions, each with its own curriculum approval process. Navigating these internal and external approval processes, alongside course updates and articulation agreements with community colleges, can be time-consuming.”

Program Implementation Progress

Program implementation and candidate completion data in the state report reflects year one (2023-24) data that was submitted at the end of June 2024. Table 6 provides an updated implementation status for each Integrated Grant program type as of the end of the 2023-24 academic year across all the program focus areas listed in Table 4. Note that Appendix C reflects the estimated implementation date Planning grantees indicated on the initial planning grant applications, which may have changed for grantees in the first planning year. Across both Integrated Grant program types, the majority of IHE grantees plan to enroll candidates in the 2024-25 academic year, Planning (61.11%) and Implementation/Expansion (46.81%) Grants. Close to 39 percent of Planning grantees will continue planning efforts in the 2024-25 academic year, and only four percent of Implementation/Expansion grantees will continue to plan before enrolling candidates.

Table 6: Program Implementation Status, by Grant Program Type

Program Implementation Status	Planning (n=43*)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=47*)
Program In-Progress	0%	27.66%
Implemented Fall 2023-24	0%	14.89%
Implemented Spring 2023-24	0%	6.38%
Plan to Enroll Candidates in 2024-25	61.11%	46.81%
Planning will continue in 2024-25	38.89%	4.26%

*The total numbers reflect the total program focus areas, not the total grant program. See Table 4 for mor information.

Two of the most significant challenges grantees faced in program implementation were primarily related to timing considerations (50% of Planning grantees and 61% of Implementation/Expansion grantees). First, many grantees noted that their internal approval processes for new curricula and programs often require substantial time, involving multiple individuals, steps, and approvals. Second, some grantees reported experiencing difficulties with the Commission’s Initial Program Review (IPR) process, finding aspects of the process occasionally challenging to navigate. The following are direct narratives from both Planning and Implementation/Expansion grantees related to timing considerations:

1. Internal Curriculum and Program Approval Process:
 - “The biggest challenges were the aspects of implementation that had to await decisions or approvals from other individuals or departments.”
 - “The process of having eight new courses, in addition to the required catalogue adjustments passed through the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and then have faculty approve of all program revisions/changes/additions at the bi-annual faculty assembly meeting was a long and arduous process, taking almost nine months. Future grantees, need to be aware of how quickly changes can be made in their institutions and the support they will have from various key stakeholders which will be vital in ensuring necessary programmatic changes can be made.”
2. Initial Program Review (IPR) Process:
 - “We wish we had better estimated the amount of time it would take for us to prepare the IPR application and revisions so that we could have budgeted for additional course releases when applying for the grant.”
 - “The only major challenge is synchronizing the IPR timeline with a timely recruitment window necessary to maximize marketing and enrollment for the proposed Fall 2024 launch, which we acknowledge that this timing is outside the control of our institution and the CTC.”
 - “Our biggest challenge has been writing the lengthy, intricate, intersecting, cross-sectional, scaffolded, and corkscrewed credential proposal that is followed by a very long approval timeframe.”

In addition to the timing challenges, 15 percent of Planning Grantees and 39 percent of Implementation/Expansion grantees reported difficulties in recruiting students to the program. These recruitment issues stemmed primarily from two factors. First, grantees found it challenging to attract students when the programs were still in development. Secondly, grantees noted that student engagement was low and that some students were hesitant to commit to an undergraduate career pathway. The following are direct narratives from grantees related to recruitment challenges:

1. Recruitment challenges due to program being in development:
 - “Since the program is currently being created and has not been officially approved by CCTC, recruiting is somewhat challenging. We are working to recruit students and faculty to participate in a program that has not been fully established.”
 - “It was also challenging to recruit when the status of the program was in flux for the Fall 2023 semester. Now that we have a solid curriculum plan that we are working to have approved, we are sharing these updates with our partners.”
2. Student Interest and Engagement:
 - “Many students are young and may not feel ready to commit to this vocational pathway. This is a time that many students are still figuring out what they want to do... Students may be overwhelmed by having to complete all major degree requirements in 3 years.”
 - “The most difficult aspect has been identifying candidates who possess the qualities, desire, and ability to pursue an integrated [...] program who are willing to complete the requirements of such a comprehensive program in less than 5 years.”
 - “Some of the challenges we encountered for the recruitment and retention of candidates for the [IHE] program were that some of the community colleges faced low levels of in-person engagement after the pandemic, which caused low attendance at in-person events. While the number has gradually increased again to pre-pandemic levels, this challenge is attributed to low attendance at in-person events and low engagement at college fairs.”

Program Completion

Completion data in the state report reflects candidates in Implementation/Expansion Grant programs, as Planning grantees have not had program completers in the first year of the grant program. Table 7 provides a summary of candidates’ progress, by credential area, indicating the number of integrated candidates with junior class standing (minimum of 60 semester units), senior class standing (minimum 90 semester units), other candidates, candidates that dropped out or left the program, and candidates that earned their undergraduate degree and credential. Note that the percentages in Table 7 are calculated by credential area and the completer data percentages are calculated using the total number of completers, not the total number of candidates across each credential area. Some of the reported “other” candidate standing circumstances include enrolling candidates with freshman and sophomore standing, community college students supported by the grant, and candidates that have earned their undergraduate degree, but are still working on completing credential assessments (i.e., TPA, RICA). While Single Subject Science (Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geoscience, and Physics combined,

49.81%) and Single Subject Mathematics (29.26%) were the two largest groups of candidates, Multiple Subject without Bilingual Authorization and Mild to Moderate Support Needs preliminary credentials were the two largest groups of credentials earned (37.68% and 20.29%, respectively).

Table 7: Candidate Progress, by Credential Area

Credential Area	Total Candidates	Junior Class Standing	Senior Class Standing	Other Candidates	Dropped or Left Program	Completers
Multiple Subject	51 (6.43%)	25 (49.02%)	26 (50.98%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.92%)	26 (37.68%)
Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization	50 (6.31%)	10 (21.28%)	32 (68.09%)	8 (17.02%)	1 (2.13%)	7 (10.14%)
Single Subject-Mathematics	232 (29.26%)	144 (62.07%)	53 (22.84%)	35 (15.09%)	0 (0%)	11 (15.94%)
Single Subject- Science	395 (49.81%)	272 (68.86%)	80 (20.25%)	43 (10.89%)	0 (0%)	6 (8.70%)
Mild to Moderate Support Needs	45 (5.67%)	12 (24.49%)	29 (59.18%)	4 (8.16%)	9 (18.37%)	14 (20.29%)
Extensive Support Needs	20 (2.52%)	6 (30%)	11 (55%)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)	5 (7.25%)
Totals	793	469 (59.14%)	231 (29.13%)	93 (11.73%)	12 (1.51%)	69 (29.87%)

Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of Candidates and Completers

Integrated grantees reported candidates' self-identified ethnic/racial composition and gender identity. The data in Tables 9 and 10 break down the demographics of the total Integrated Grantee candidates and program completers. Implementation/Expansion Grants were the only program type with completers in 2023-24. Note that the total numbers reported are less than those reported in Table 7, as some candidates and completers are working on or have earned more than one credential. Additionally, 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 describing how the Integrated program is meeting local teacher shortages, 20 percent of Planning grantees and 22 percent of Implementation/Expansion grantees specifically mention their programs' intention to recruit diverse participants. Overall, over 90 percent of candidates and completers reported their ethnicity/race and over 67 percent belong to an underrepresented ethnic/racial group. In the first year of reporting racial/ethnic demographics, the largest racial/ethnic group are Hispanic or Latinx for both candidates (48.98%) and completers (43.75%), followed by Asian Candidates (20.54%) and White completers (20.13%). The White ethnic/racial subgroup had the largest increase between

candidates (15.31%) and completers (28.13%), while Hispanic/Latinx had the largest decreased between candidates (48.98%) and completers (43.75%).

Table 8: Ethnic/Racial Composition of Candidates and Program Completers

Race/Ethnicity	Total Candidates (n= 784)	Completers (n= 64)
American Indian or Alaska Native	1 (0.13%)	0 (0%)
Asian	161 (20.54%)	11 (17.19%)
Black or African American	23 (2.93%)	2 (3.13%)
Hispanic/Latinx (of any race)	384 (48.98%)	28 (43.75%)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	5 (0.64%)	1 (1.56%)
White	120 (15.31%)	18 (28.13%)
Two or more races	41 (5.23%)	1 (1.56%)
Decline to state Race/Ethnicity	49 (6.25%)	3 (4.69%)

Overall, 93 percent of candidates reported their gender identity; reporting this information to the Commission is voluntary for candidates in the program. Female candidates were the largest group (66.33%), followed by male candidates (28.83%). The percentage of completers represented increased for female candidates (78.13%) and decreased for male candidates (15.63%).

Table 9: Gender Identity of Candidates and Program Completers

Gender Identity	Total Candidates (n=784)	Completers (n=64)
Female	520 (66.33%)	50 (78.13%)
Male	226 (28.83%)	10 (15.63%)
Nonbinary	7 (0.89%)	0 (0%)
Decline to state	31 (3.95%)	4 (6.25%)

In narrative responses, Integrated grantees detailed their progress and strategies implemented to recruit a diverse candidate pool. Among the various approaches described, grantees

emphasized the critical role of leveraging partnerships with community colleges and highlighted the importance of underscoring the value of a diverse workforce in their marketing materials. The following are direct narratives from grantees:

- “Recruiting has prioritized students of color...[Our] network of partners has helped with efforts in linking all students, but especially students of color, low SES, first generation, and those historically marginalized to have role models as successful STEM students at the university level.”
- “Our programs are addressing several issues relevant to the local teacher shortage by developing a diverse population of teachers that match student demographic profiles.... We describe the teacher shortage in our awareness materials, coursework and in person events, emphasizing the need for equity-centered, highly qualified teachers that can change the landscape of teacher diversity in urban or rural high-needs schools.”
- “Through our community college partnerships, we are also anticipating an increase in the number of minority and students of color transferring to [IHE] and joining the teacher pipeline.”

Program Funding

Both Integrated Grant program types were funded as one-time grant awards in the 2022-23 fiscal year. Grantees have a two-year liquidation period to expend grant funds through June 30, 2025. Grantees will continue to report annual implementation and candidate progress after grant funds have been expended through the 2027-28 academic year. Table 10 provides the total grant award, the total amount expended in the 2023-24 fiscal year, the percentage expended, and the total amount of remaining funds. After the first year of expenditures, close to 27 percent of planning grantees have expended half or more of awarded funds, while none of the implementation/expansion grantees have expended half or more of awarded funds. Overall, 31 percent of grant funds have been expended, and all grantees must expend remaining funds by the end of the second liquidation year, the 2024-25 fiscal year.

Table 10: 2023-24 Grant Award Expenditure, per grant type

Type	Grant Award	Total Expended	% Expended	Remaining Funds
Planning	\$6,175,077.87	\$2,274,184.16	36.83%	\$3,900,893.71
Implementation/Expansion	\$8,675,848.58	\$2,278,189.84	35.61%	\$6,397,658.74
Total	\$14,850,926.45	\$4,552,374.00	30.65%	\$10,298,552.45

Integrated grantees reported that disbursed grant funds were expended across the following approved budget categories:

- Administration costs
- Coordination with California Community College(s) IHE personnel: Salaries
- Developing recruitment strategies for the integrated program
- IHE faculty/personnel: Release time for course redesign and/or creating summer courses for students in a four-year integrated program
- IHE faculty/personnel: Salaries

- IHE faculty/personnel: Stipends
- IHE faculty/personnel: Stipends for program coordinators to assist in collaboration with subject matter professors and pedagogy professors
- IHE faculty/personnel: Travel
- Integrated program consultant
- Other costs

Tables 11 and 12 further break down the total annual expenditures by approved budget categories across each Integrated Grant program type, Planning Grants and Implementation/Expansion Grants, respectively. For each budget category, the total grant award amount is listed and the percentage each budget category represents from the total grant award amount. Tables 11 and 12 also shows the amount expended per budget category, the percentage expended from the total grant award, and the percentage expended within each budget category. The column, “% Expended, from Total Category Budget,” reflects the percentage of funds that were expended from the total amount budgeted across each category. Note that Integrated grantees must expend funds from budget categories approved in the grant application for the specific program approved. Grantees must receive Commission approval for any budget changes that exceed 10 percent of the total grant award.

The amount of funding allocated to budget categories and the percent expended differed between the two types of Integrated Grant programs. However, the three smallest budgeted categories and expenditures were the similar across both grants: stipends for program coordinators to collaborate with subject matter professors and pedagogy professors, travel costs for faculty and personnel, and integrated program consultants.

For Planning Grants, release time for IHE faculty and/or personnel to support integrated course redesign and/or creating summer courses for students in a four-year integrated program (23.38% of total grant funds) and other costs (15.67% of total grant funds) were the two largest budget categories. However, for year 1, release time (28.54%) and IHE faculty/personnel stipends (14.74%) were the two categories with the highest total expenditures for the first year of planning. While expenditures for Planning Grants generally mirrored expenditures across each budget category ($\pm 8\%$), the percentage expended within each budget category differed more, with recruitment strategies expending the least amount of the total budgeted at seven percent, and stipends for program coordinators to assist in collaboration with subject matter professors and pedagogy professors expending close to 55 percent of what was budgeted. For Implementation/Expansion Grants, expenditures did not mirror budgets as closely as Planning Grants ($\pm 17\%$). Other costs (25.4%) and developing recruitment strategies (19.46%) were the two largest budget categories, however salaries for faculty and personnel (32.48%) and release time for course redesign and/or creating integrated summer courses (17.14%) were the largest expenditures in year 1. Lastly, salaries (53.58%) and stipends (44.29%) for faculty and personnel were the two categories that expended the most funds from what was initially budgeted.

Table 11: Planning Grant Award Expenditures by Budget Categories

Budget Categories	Total Grant Amount	% of Total Grant Award	Expended	% Expended, from Year 1 Expenditures	% Expended, from Total Category Budget
Administration Costs	\$967,364.00	15.67%	\$381,772.54	16.79%	39.47%
Coordination with CCC(s): Salaries	\$321,134.00	5.20%	\$115,174.22	5.06%	35.86%
Recruitment Strategies	\$319,091.00	5.17%	\$23,459.07	1.03%	7.35%
Release Time	\$1,443,898.35	23.38%	\$649,086.47	28.54%	44.95%
Faculty/Personnel Salaries	\$883,241.00	14.30%	\$410,561.47	18.05%	46.48%
Faculty/Personnel Stipends	\$685,956.00	11.11%	\$335,274.51	14.74%	48.88%
Program Coordinator Stipends	\$157,698.00	2.55%	\$86,550.96	3.81%	54.88%
Travel	\$80,269.00	1.30%	\$10,808.43	0.48%	13.47%
Integrated Program Consultant	\$247,500.00	4.01%	\$41,975.00	1.85%	16.96%
Other	\$1,068,926.52	17.31%	\$219,521.49	9.65%	20.54%

Table 12: Implementation/Expansion Grant Award Expenditures by Budget Categories

Budget Categories	Total Grant Amount	% of Total Grant Award	Expended	% Expended, from Year 1 Expenditures	% Expended, from Total Category Budget
Administration Costs	\$952,637.00	10.98%	\$256,553.60	11.26%	26.93%
Coordination with CCC(s): Salaries	\$385,321.23	4.44%	\$90,890.48	3.99%	23.59%
Recruitment Strategies	\$1,688,401.00	19.46%	\$331,619.15	14.56%	19.64%
Release Time	\$1,448,943.00	16.70%	\$390,584.41	17.14%	26.96%
Faculty/Personnel Salaries	\$1,380,759.00	15.91%	\$739,866.45	32.48%	53.58%
Faculty/Personnel Stipends	\$374,250.00	4.31%	\$85,966.44	3.77%	22.97%
Program Coordinator Stipends	\$111,291.53	1.28%	\$49,288.27	2.16%	44.29%
Travel	\$77,268.00	0.89%	\$927.15	0.04%	1.20%
Integrated Program Consultant	\$52,941.00	0.61%	\$7,915.50	0.35%	14.95%
Other	\$2,204,036.82	25.40%	\$324,578.39	14.25%	14.73%

Program Narratives

In addition to reporting updated implementation timelines, CCC partnership information, annual expenditures, and candidate data, Integrated grantees submitted annual narratives reflecting on the following:

- the program’s candidate recruitment progress,
- program successes and challenges,
- the degree to which the program is meeting the local teacher shortage needs,
- the impact of LEA’s collaboration with CCC partner(s) and any partnerships supporting the creation, impletion, or expansion of integrated programs,
- efforts to coordinate with existing sources of candidate support, such as the Golden State Teacher Grant Program and other forms of financial aid, and
- any lessons learned.

Note that these qualitative insights have been integrated throughout the report to provide context and depth to the quantitative findings. The following section highlights additional key insights related to program successes, challenges, and lessons learned, as shared by grantees in their narratives.

In describing components that contributed to programmatic success, 73 percent of Planning grantees and 89 percent of Implementation/Expansion grantees spoke to the effectiveness of coordinating with existing sources of candidate support, such as the Golden State Teacher Grant Program, the Pell Grant, and other forms of financial aid, and how this was integral to the programs’ success in attracting and retaining candidates. However, effective summer 2023, IHEs accepting Federal Pell Grant funds had to choose between integrated program candidates and their post-baccalaureate candidates. Partly because of this change, some grantees reported challenges when it came to coordinating with existing sources of candidate support like the Pell Grant (35% of Planning grantees and 22% of Implementation/Expansion grantees). The following are direct narratives from grantees:

- “Our greatest challenge has been in managing statewide mandates around funding for potential future candidates. We recommend ongoing and strong collaboration with others at the school and University level, as well as coordination with University committees as new legislature necessitates shifts in original plans.”
- “Our primary challenge is in the area of seeking out funding. The limitation of public scholarship funds (PELL) to either undergraduates or post-bacc credential candidates means that we cannot have a successful ITPP program without sabotaging our own and our school’s other credential programs, since the majority of our credential candidates must use PELL funds to be successful.”
- “The loss of the Golden State Grant to offset college costs poses a challenge and may affect enrollment.”

In the summary narratives, grantees also shared valuable lessons learned that may benefit future Integrated Program grantees. In addition to the importance of accounting for the timing of approval processes that was highlighted in the “Program Implementation Progress” section of this report, two additional key insights emerged:

1. *Grantees emphasized the critical role of establishing strong partnerships:* fifty-four percent of Planning grantees and 44 percent of Implementation/Expansion grantees shared that strong partnerships, both internal within their institutions and external with Community Colleges and LEA partners, proved instrumental in setting up programs for success. Collaborating with LEAs helped grantees gather data on local teacher shortages to help tailor their programs to specific community needs, aided in the recruitment of potential candidates for Integrated programs, and provided placement opportunities for student teaching.
2. *Grantees underscored the significance of marketing and recruitment strategies:* 31 percent of Planning grantees and 50 percent of Implementation and Expansion grantees shared insights regarding the importance of developing robust pipelines of participants to ensure program success.

Summary and Conclusion

The 2024 annual state report reflects the first year of the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants Program planning and implementation through the 2023-24 academic year. All grantees reported progress planning and/or implementing grant programs, including 70 percent of grantees developing partnerships with California Community Colleges. In the first year, 64 candidates earned their undergraduate degree and preliminary credential in the first year of the grant program to address the teacher shortage, for a total of 69 credentials. Over 67 percent of candidates and completers belong to an underrepresented ethnic/racial group. Grantees will continue to plan and/or recruit integrated candidates to complete their undergraduate education and preliminary certification. Commission staff will continue to provide technical assistance and host office hour sessions in 2024-25 to support program planning and implementation and annual data collection.

Appendix A

Planning Grant: Total Grant Award, 2022-23 Expenditures, and Remaining Funds

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Total Grant Award	2023-24 Expenditures	% Expended	Remaining Grant Funds
Azusa Pacific University	\$249,948.00	\$79,667.47	31.87%	\$183,439.67
Biola University	\$250,000.00	\$42,452.16	16.98%	\$207,547.84
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	\$250,000.00	\$33,344.97	13.34%	\$216,655.03
California Baptist University	\$249,999.00	\$119,686.29	47.87%	\$130,312.71
Chapman University	\$249,106.00	\$96,473.90	38.73%	\$152,632.10
CSU Channel Islands	\$249,942.00	\$143,719.99	57.50%	\$106,222.01
CSU Fresno	\$249,950.00	\$45,464.14	18.19%	\$204,485.86
CSU Long Beach	\$250,000.00	\$92,443.40	36.98%	\$157,556.60
CSU Long Beach	\$250,000.00	\$120,950.45	48.38%	\$129,049.55
CSU Monterey Bay	\$250,000.00	\$48,202.07	19.28%	\$201,797.93
EDvance College	\$250,000.00	\$94,247.00	37.70%	\$155,753.00
Fresno Pacific University	\$249,995.00	\$131,559.00	52.62%	\$118,436.00
Humphreys University	\$131,392.00	\$81,577.00	62.09%	\$49,815.00
Humphreys University	\$104,536.00	\$68,021.00	65.07%	\$36,515.00
Jessup University	\$244,900.00	\$91,887.00	37.52%	\$153,013.00
Loyola Marymount University	\$250,000.00	\$72,335.93	28.93%	\$177,664.07
Mount Saint Mary's University	\$249,910.87	\$96,637.00	38.67%	\$153,273.87
San Francisco State University	\$240,240.00	\$10,254.66	4.27%	\$229,985.34
San Jose State University	\$250,000.00	\$109,399.45	43.76%	\$140,600.55
Simpson University	\$233,570.00	\$117,009.04	50.10%	\$116,560.96
Sonoma State University	\$249,629.00	\$84,700.00	33.93%	\$164,929.00
University of San Diego	\$240,795.00	\$125,294.00	52.03%	\$115,501.00
University of San Diego	\$250,000.00	\$76,342.23	30.54%	\$173,657.77
University of Southern California	\$249,864.00	\$18,263.00	7.31%	\$231,601.00
Vanguard University	\$233,099.00	\$154,997.02	66.49%	\$78,101.98
Vanguard University	\$248,202.00	\$119,255.99	48.05%	\$128,946.01

Appendix B

Implementation/Expansion Grant: Total Grant Award, 2022-23 Expenditures, and Remaining Funds

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Total Grant Award	2023-24 Expenditures	% Expended	Remaining Grant Funds
Azusa Pacific University	\$499,938.00	\$121,844.78	24.37%	\$378,093.22
Biola University	\$500,000.00	\$183,312.97	36.66%	\$316,687.03
Cal Poly Pomona	\$500,000.00	\$164,602.20	32.92%	\$335,397.80
Cal State LA	\$500,000.00	\$114,615.65	22.92%	\$385,384.35
California Lutheran University	\$500,000.00	\$243,656.13	48.73%	\$256,343.87
CSU Dominguez Hills	\$499,999.00	\$80,732.79	16.15%	\$419,266.21
CSU Long Beach	\$500,000.00	\$160,436.07	32.09%	\$339,563.93
CSU Northridge	\$500,000.00	\$91,436.67	18.29%	\$408,563.33
CSU Northridge	\$330,000.00	\$85,603.82	25.94%	\$244,396.18
CSU San Bernardino	\$499,996.58	\$36,286.42	7.26%	\$463,710.16
Fresno Pacific University	\$499,055.00	\$89,804.65	17.99%	\$409,250.35
Fresno State University	\$499,864.00	\$73,832.86	14.77%	\$426,031.14
Loyola Marymount University	\$500,000.00	\$117,972.78	23.59%	\$382,027.22
Saint Mary's College	\$491,478.00	\$171,772.67	34.95%	\$319,705.33
San Diego State University	\$499,975.00	\$202,484.00	40.50%	\$297,491.00
UC Berkeley	\$499,888.00	\$127,160.45	25.44%	\$372,727.55
UC Irvine	\$487,358.00	\$131,426.93	26.97%	\$355,931.07
University of Redlands	\$368,297.00	\$81,208.00	22.05%	\$287,089.00

Appendix C

Planning Grant: Program Focus Area(s), Community College Partner(s), and Estimated Implementation Year

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, E, I, N) *	Community College Partner(s)	Estimated Implementation Year
Azusa Pacific University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barstow Community College • Victor Valley College 	Fall 2024-25
Biola University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner 	Fall 2023-24
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner 	Fall 2026-27
California Baptist University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilingual Education Specialist-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner 	Fall 2024-25
Chapman University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-N • Extensive Support Needs-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner 	Fall 2025-26
CSU Channel Islands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ventura County Community College District 	Fall 2025-26
CSU Fresno	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-A • Extensive Support Needs-A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College of the Sequoias 	Fall 2025-26
CSU Long Beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject-A • Early Childhood Education Specialist-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner 	Fall 2025-26
CSU Long Beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-A • Extensive Support Needs-A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cerritos College • Golden West College 	Fall 2024-25
CSU Monterey Bay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Subject- Biological Sciences- A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabrillo College • Hartnell College • Monterey Peninsula College 	Fall 2024-25
EDvance College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilingual Education Specialist-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Berkeley City College, 	Fall 2024-25

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, E, I, N) *	Community College Partner(s)	Estimated Implementation Year
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Los Medanos College 	
Fresno Pacific University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College of the Sequoias • Fresno City College • Reedley College 	Spring 2025-26
Humphreys University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner 	Spring 2024-25
Humphreys University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner 	Spring 2023-24
Jessup University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sierra Joint Community College District • Yuba College 	Fall 2024-25
Loyola Marymount University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Los Angeles Mission College 	Fall 2025-26
Mount Saint Mary's University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Los Angeles Southwest College 	Fall 2024-25
San Francisco State University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City College of San Francisco • Los Medanos College • Skyline College 	Fall 2024-25
San Jose State University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Valley College 	Fall 2025-26
Simpson University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shasta College 	Fall 2024-25
Sonoma State University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Santa Rosa Junior College 	Fall 2025-26
University of San Diego	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Diego City College • San Diego Mesa College • San Diego Miramar College 	Fall 2024-25
University of San Diego	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Specialist with Bilingual Authorization-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Diego City College 	Fall 2024-25

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, E, I, N) *	Community College Partner(s)	Estimated Implementation Year
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject-E • Single Subject-Biological Science-E • Single Subject-Chemistry-E • Single Subject-Mathematics-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Diego Mesa College • San Diego Miramar College 	
University of Southern California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-N • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N • Single Subject Science (Biological Science, Chemistry, Geosciences, Physics)-N • Single Subject-Mathematics • Single Subject- Music • Single Subject- Dance • Single Subject- Theater 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner 	Fall 2025-26
Vanguard University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fullerton College • Irvine Valley College • Orange Coast College • Saddleback College • Santa Ana College 	Fall 2024-25
Vanguard University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild to Moderate support Needs-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fullerton College • Coastline Community College 	Fall 2025-26

*A= Adapt from a 5-year to 4-year program, E= Expansion, I= Implementation, N= New program

Appendix D

Implementation/Expansion Grants: Program Focus Area(s) and Type of Planning, Community College Partner(s)*

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, E, I, N) *	Community College Partner(s)
Azusa Pacific University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject (TK/K)-N • Single Subject Science-E • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E • Extensive Support Needs-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner
Biola University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject (TK/K)-A • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner
Cal Poly Pomona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-I • Extensive Support Needs-I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chaffey College • Citrus College • Mt. San Antonio College
Cal State LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Los Angeles College • Los Angeles City College • Pasadena City College • Rio Hondo College
California Lutheran University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-N • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E • Early Childhood Education Specialist with Bilingual Authorization-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner
CSU Dominguez Hills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-I • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-I • Extensive Support Needs-N • Early Childhood Education Specialist-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cerritos College • East Los Angeles College • El Camino College • Long Beach City College • Los Angeles Harbor College
CSU Long Beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E • Extensive Support Needs-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cerritos College • Golden West College
CSU Northridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E • Extensive Support Needs-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, E, I, N) *	Community College Partner(s)
CSU Northridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner
CSU San Bernardino	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Bernardino Community College District
Fresno Pacific University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject (TK/K)-N • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-N • Single Subject Science-N • Single Subject Mathematics-N • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-N • Extensive Support Needs-N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clovis Community College • College of the Sequoias • Fresno City College • Reedley College
Fresno State University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CCC Partner
Loyola Marymount University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject (TK/K)-I • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Camino College • Pasadena City College • Santa Monica College
Saint Mary's College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E • Single Subject Science-A • Single Subject Mathematics-A • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diablo Valley College • Merritt College • Los Medanos College
San Diego State University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E • Extensive Support Needs-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southwestern College
UC Berkeley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Subject Science-E • Single Subject Mathematics-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Berkeley City College • College of Marin • Diablo Valley College • Laney College
UC Irvine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Subject Science-E • Single Subject Mathematics-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irvine Valley College • Mt. San Antonio College • Orange Coast College • Santa Ana College • Santiago Canyon College

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, E, I, N) *	Community College Partner(s)
University of Redlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Subject Science-E • Single Subject Mathematics-E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crafton Hills College

*A= Adapt from a 5-year to 4-year program, E= Expansion, I= Implementation, N= New program