



Report to the Legislature on the 2018 Teacher Residency Grant 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

State of California
Gavin Newson, Governor
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

This list reflects the composition of the Commission at the time of adoption of the Report to the Legislature on the Local Solutions to the Shortage of Special Education Teachers Grant Program in December 2023. Current membership of the Commission is available on the [Members of the Commission Webpage](#).

Commission Member

Marquita Grenot-Scheyer
Danette Brown
Jose Cardenas

Cheryl Cotton

Juan Cruz
Christopher Davis
Michael de la Torre
Megan Gross
Johanna Hartwig
Susan Heredia
Bonnie Klatt
Ira Lit
Monica Martinez
David Simmons

Representing

Public 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
Teacher Representative
Faculty Member Representative
Public Representative
Human Resources Administrator
Representative

Ex-Officio Representatives

Kathryn Williams Browne

Annamarie Francois
Shireen Pavri
Kimberly White-Smith

Representing

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

Executive Director

Mary Vixie Sandy

Representing

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	5
Introduction	6
Background	6
Teacher Residency Capacity Grant Program	6
Teacher Residency and Teacher Residency Expansion Grant Program	8
Teacher Residency Program Enrollment	8
Teacher Residency Program Completers	10
Summary and Conclusion	15
Attachment A	17
Attachment B	20
Attachment C	21

Executive Summary: Report to the Legislature on the Teacher Residency Grant Program Authorized by 2018 Funds

This report fulfills the legislative requirement set forth in Education Code §44417, requiring the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to provide a report to the Department of Finance and the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the legislature on the effectiveness of the Teacher Residency Grant Program by December 1, 2023.

The Legislature approved a total of \$75 million for the Teacher Residency Grant Program in the 2018-19 state budget. This grant program provided up to \$20,000 per resident for eligible local education agencies (LEAs) to work in partnership with institutions of higher education (IHEs) with Commission-approved teacher preparation programs to offer a teacher residency pathway wherein residents earn a teaching credential in special education, STEM, or bilingual education. Of this total allocation, \$1.5 million was appropriated specifically for capacity grants for eligible LEAs to partner with IHEs to expand or create teacher residency programs that lead to more credentialed special education, and bilingual education, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teachers.

This report is organized with the following headings:

- Introduction
- Background
- Teacher Residency Capacity Grant Program
- Teacher Residency and Teacher Residency Expansion Grant Program
- Teacher Residency Program Enrollment
- Teacher Residency Program Completers
- Summary and Conclusion

Overall findings for the project period are summarized below:

- Data compiled from annual reports indicate that grant funds were most commonly used to support residents with a salary or stipend, to address the teacher shortage.
- Grant funds supported 1,081 candidates through Commission-approved teacher preparation programs in which residents worked toward a teaching credential in special education, STEM, or bilingual education.
- The majority of teacher residents are being hired as teachers of record in traditionally hard-to-staff schools and in schools where 50% or more of the students enrolled are eligible for free or reduced-price meals.
- Grantee LEAs report that teacher residency program completers are more diverse than teachers statewide and better match the diversity of California students.

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

Introduction

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

Background

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

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

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

Teacher Residency Capacity Grant Program

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

Grantees were funded to collectively develop their partnership capacity with IHEs to design and be prepared to implement 51 residency programs. Of the 22 grant recipients, 17 report that all planning activities outlined in their proposals have been complete, four grantees are still

completing planning activities, and one did not submit their report by the October 2023 due date and after multiple reminders.

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

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

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

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

Teacher Residency Capacity Grant – Program Implementation

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

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

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

Teacher Residency and Teacher Residency Expansion Grant Program

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

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

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

Teacher Residency Program Enrollment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Teacher Residency Program Completers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Teacher Residency Employment and Retention Data

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Teacher Residency Program Costs

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

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

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

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

Summary and Conclusion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attachment A

Teacher Residency Capacity Grants Round 1, October 2018

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

LEA	Partner IHE(s)	Award Amount	Residency Focus
Westside Union School District	Brandman University, California State University, Bakersfield	\$23,875	Special Education

Teacher Residency Capacity Grants Round 2, November 2018

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

Attachment B

Teacher Residency Expansion Grants, December 2018

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

Attachment C

Teacher Residency Grants, March 2019

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

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

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