Annual Report Card on California Teacher Preparation Programs for the Academic Year 2021-22

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

December 2023

December 2023

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95811

This handbook is available on the Commission's website.

December 2023

State of California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Mary Vixie Sandy, Executive Director

This list reflects the composition of the Commission at the time of adoption of the Annual Report Card on California Teacher Preparation Programs for the Academic Year 2020-21. Current membership of the Commission is available on the Members of the Commission webpage.

Commission Member	**Representing**
Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, Chair	Public Representative
Danette Brown	Teacher Representative
Jose Cardenas	Non-Administrative Services Credential Representative
Cheryl Cotton	Designee, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Juan Cruz	School Administrator Representative
Christopher Davis	Teacher Representative
Michael de la Torre	Teacher Representative
Megan Gross	Teacher Representative
Johanna Hartwig	Public Representative
Susan Heredia	School Board Member Representative
Bonnie Klatt	Teacher Representative
Ira Lit	Faculty Member Representative
Monica Martinez	Public Representative
David Simmons	Human Resources Administrator Representative

Ex-Officio Representatives	**Representing**
Kathryn Williams Browne	California Community Colleges
Annamarie Francois	University of California
Shireen Pavri	California State University
Kimberly White-Smith	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities

Table of Contents

Annual Report Card on California Teacher Preparation Programs for the Academic Year 2021-22

Introduction

This agenda item presents the Annual Report Card on California Teacher Preparation Programs for the Academic Year 2021-22 as required by Title II of the 2008 Reauthorization of the federal Higher Education Act. It is the twenty-third annual report and includes a description of credentialing requirements to teach in California public schools and qualitative and quantitative information on teacher preparation programs.

Background

In 2008, the Higher Education Opportunities Act reauthorized the 1965 Higher Education Act to provide resources to colleges and universities and financial assistance to their students. The reauthorization also made changes to the Title II data collection and reporting requirements regarding teacher preparation. Section 207 of Title II requires institutions to submit annual reports to state agencies on the quality of their teacher preparation programs, and states are required to collect the information contained in these institutional reports and submit an annual report to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) on the success of teacher preparation programs and efforts to improve teacher quality. These report cards are also intended to inform the public of the status of teacher preparation programs. The reporting requirements for Title II impact (1) the sponsors of all teacher preparation programs; (2) the state agencies that certify new teachers for service in public schools; and (3) the U.S. Secretary of Education.

Institutional and Program Report Cards for 2021-22

USDOE, with the help of the federal contractor, developed a web-based data entry tool called the Institutional and Program Report Card (IPRC). For the 2023 reporting year, all California teacher preparation institutions that have approved preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist credential programs had to submit their institutional and program report cards for the 2021-22 academic year to the federal contractor by May 19, 2023, in compliance with federal reporting deadlines set forth in Title II. Table 1 below lists the sections and contents that are reported in IPRCs. Most of the information from the IPRCs and additional statewide information are presented in the consolidated state report (see Table 2 for sections in the state report).

Table 1: Institutional and Program Report Card's Sections and Content

Section	Content
Section I	Program Information (List of Programs), Program Requirements (Undergraduate requirements, Postgraduate requirements, Supervised Clinical Experience), Enrollment and Program Completers, Teachers Prepared (by Subject Area and Academic Major), and Program Completers
Section II	Program Assurances; Annual Goals for mathematics, science, special education, and Instruction of Limited English Proficient Students
Section III	Assessment Pass Rates and Summary Pass Rates
Section IV	Low-Performing Teacher Preparation Institutions
Section V	Use of Technology
Section VI	Teacher Training (General Education and Special Education)
Section VII	Contextual Information (Optional)

The State Report Card for 2021-22

Sections 205 through 208 of the Title II of the Higher Education Act, as amended in 2008 (PL 110-315), call for increased or different types of accountability for programs that prepare teachers. Section 205 of Title II requires annual reports from each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional initial teacher preparation program or an alternative route program to state certification or that enrolls students receiving federal assistance under the Higher Education Act.

Note: Title II specifically calls out the need for IHEs (and not non-IHE programs) to report through the IPRC in 205(a). However, in the State Report Cards (205(b)), Title II specifically requires states to report on all teacher preparation programs, and specifically mentions alternative routes not based at IHEs (205(b)(1)(E)). So, even though Title II doesn't specifically require an IPRC from non-IHE-based programs, it is still necessary for them to report through the IPRC so the required data are included in the State Report Card.

States are responsible for coordinating the IHE traditional route, IHE-based alternative route, and LEA-based alternative route data collection. There are many common data reporting elements in the IPRC and state Title II data collection. Much of the data that teacher preparation institutions report to the state are included in the state report to the USDOE. States report through a web-based reporting system called the State Report Card (SRC) system. The SRC is an online tool, developed and maintained by the federal contractor, used by all states to meet the annual Title II reporting requirements.

Title II data are intended to inform students and aspiring teachers, the education community, institutions of higher education, Congress, researchers, policymakers, and the public about the quality of teacher preparation in the United States. Title II reporting is intended to encourage transparency and accountability for preparation programs, as well as a national conversation on teacher quality. The Title II report submitted by each state is made available at the federal Title II website. Table 2 below lists the sections and contents that are reported in the SRC and summarized in this agenda item.

Table 2: State Report Card's Sections and Content

Section	Content
Section I	Program Information, Program Requirements (Admissions requirements – Entry/Exit and Grade Point Average by Undergraduate and Postgraduate levels), Supervised Clinical Experience, Enrollment, Teachers Prepared by Subject Area, Teachers Prepared by Academic Major, Program Completers, and Initial teaching credentials issued
Section II	Annual Goals; Assurances
Section III	Credential Requirements
Section IV	Standards and Criteria
Section V	Assessment Information and Pass rate data by routes
Section VI	Alternative Routes
Section VII	Program Performance
Section VIII	Low Performing Teacher Preparation Programs
Section IX	Teacher Shortages
Section X	Use of Technology
Section XI	Statewide Improvement Efforts

Summary tables are provided in the agenda item and detailed information by individual teacher preparation institution are provided via the Title II data dashboards at the Title II web page.

The final version of the report will be available on the Commission website for public access in accordance with federal reporting guidelines. In order to meet the federal reporting deadlines, submission of the report to the USDOE was completed via the web-based Title II Data Collection System on October 12, 2023.

Section I: Program Information

Section I of the state report includes information on the following topics – program information, admission requirements, supervised clinical experience, enrollment by gender and race/ethnicity, teachers prepared by subject area, teachers prepared by academic major, program completers, and number of credentials issued. Every data element collected and reported in the Institution and Program Report Cards (IPRCs) comes directly from the Higher Education Act (HEA) and the specific section of HEA is listed in *italics* with each section requirement.

For the academic year 2021-22, a total of 152 IPRCs were submitted to the USDOE. Teacher preparation programs at institutions of higher education with alternative routes are required to submit two separate reports: one for the Traditional route only and a second report for the Alternative route only. There were 82 Traditional route reports, 56 IHE-based Alternative route (University Intern) reports, and 14 not IHE-based Alternative route (District Intern, LEA) reports. Table 3 below displays the number of institutions and number of reports submitted by the four teacher preparation segments (California State University, University of California, Private/Independent Institutions, and Local Education Agency) and three different routes (Traditional, Alternative IHE-based, and Alternative LEA-based). Note these totals are of institutions sponsoring any combination of Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and/or Education Specialist preliminary programs. The table shows a total of institutions, not educator preparation programs.

Table 3. Distribution of Title II Institutions and Reports, by Route

Name of Higher Education Segment	Number of institutions	Number of Traditional route reports	Number of Alternative, IHE-based route reports	Number of Alternative, LEA-based route reports	Total number of reports
California State University	23	23	22	Not applicable	**45**
University of California	9	9	3	Not applicable	**12**
Private/Independent institutions	49	49	31	Not applicable	**80**
Local Education Agency	15	1	Not applicable	14	**15**
Statewide Total	**96**	**82**	**56**	**14**	**152**

Program Requirements: Admissions

Section I requires programs (institutions) to report the following information about the teacher preparation programs' entry and exit requirements, at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels. (§205(a)(1)(C)(i))

- Are there initial certification programs at the postgraduate level?

If yes, for each element listed below, indicate if it is required for admission into or exit from any of your teacher preparation program(s) at the postgraduate level.
    - Transcript
    - Fingerprint check
    - Background check
    - Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed
    - Minimum GPA
    - Minimum GPA in content area coursework
    - Minimum GPA in professional education coursework
    - Minimum ACT score
    - Minimum SAT score
    - Minimum basic skills test score
    - Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification
    - Recommendation(s)
    - Essay or personal statement
    - Interview
    - Other requirements
- What is the minimum GPA required for admission into the program?
- What is the minimum GPA required for completing the program?

Table 4a below presents the minimum GPA requirements for IHE Traditional, Alternative IHE-based, and Alternative LEA-based routes. The minimum GPA required for admission into the program (Entry) as well as completing the program (Exit) varied slightly by routes.

Table 4a. Grade Point Average Requirements for Postgraduate Program, by Route, 2021-22

Grade Point Average Requirements	IHE Traditional route	Alternative IHE-based route	Alternative LEA-based route
Minimum GPA required for admission into the program (Entry)	2.75	2.75	2.78
Minimum GPA required for completing the program (Exit)	2.97	2.96	2.83

Table 4b below presents GPA for postgraduate candidates by higher education segments. The minimum GPA required for admission into the programs (Entry) ranged from 2.65 for California State University to 3.00 for University of California. The minimum GPA required for completing the program (Exit) also showed slight variation by segments – 2.96 for California State University to 3.00 for University of California.

Table 4b. Grade Point Average Distribution by Higher Education Segment, 2021-22

Grade Point Average Requirements	California State University	University of California	Private/ Independent Institution
Minimum GPA required for admission into the program (Entry)	2.65	3.00	2.78
Minimum GPA required for completing the program (Exit)	2.96	3.00	2.97

Program Requirements: Supervised Clinical Experience

Provide the following information about supervised clinical experience in 2021-22. (§205(a)(1)(C)(iii), §205(a)(1)(C)(iv))

- Number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to student teaching.
- Number of clock hours required for student teaching.
- Number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to teaching as the teacher of record in a classroom.
- Years required for teaching as the teacher of record in a classroom.
- Number of full-time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff).
- Number of adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff).
- Number of cooperating teachers/K-12 staff supervising clinical experience during this academic year.
- Number of students in supervised clinical experience during this academic year.

Table 5a below presents data on supervised clinical experience requirements by routes. At the state level, the supervised clinical experience requirements differed by routes. For the IHE-Traditional route, the average number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to student teaching was 108 hours and the average number of clock hours required for student teaching was 562 hours. The average number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to teaching as the teacher of record was 123 hours for Alternative IHE-based and 70 hours for Alternative LEA-based route. The average number of years required for teaching as the teacher of record ranged from one to two years for alternative routes.

For the IHE-Traditional route, more than 500 full-time equivalent faculty members, 2,700 adjunct faculty, and 15,000 K-12 staff provided supervised clinical experience. For the Alternative IHE-based route, 276 full-time equivalent faculty, 1,520 adjunct faculty, and 6,028 K-12 staff provided supervised clinical experience. For the Alternative LEA-based route, 24 full-time faculty, 156 adjunct faculty, and 333 K-12 provided supervised clinical experience. Statewide, more than 25,000 candidates participated in supervised clinical experience during the 2021-22 academic year.

Table 5a. Supervised Clinical Experience Requirements, by Route, 2021-22

Requirements	IHE Traditional route	Alternative IHE-based route	Alternative LEA-based route
Number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to student teaching (student teaching model)	108 hours	Not applicable	Not applicable
Number of clock hours required for student teaching (student teaching model)	562 hours	Not applicable	Not applicable
Number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to teaching as the teacher of record in a classroom (intern model)	Not applicable	123 hours	70 hours
Years required for teaching as the teacher of record in a classroom (intern model)	Not applicable	1 year	2 years
Number of full-time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff)	572	276	24
Number of adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff)	2,788	1,520	156
Number of cooperating teachers/K-12 staff supervising clinical experience during this academic year	15,295	6,028	333
Number of candidates in supervised clinical experience during this academic year	16,243	7,644	1,629

Note: Data are reported by individual institutions by route and the summary data are provided here. Definitions for Supervised Clinical Experience and questions to collect data for Supervised Clinical Experience come directly from the Title II Higher Education Act.

Table 5b below displays the distribution of teacher preparation institutions by total student teaching clinical experience hours. At the statewide level, all Institutions of Higher Education reported 600 or more clinical experience hours. Specifically, more than two-thirds of the institutions (72 percent) reported total clinical hours in the range of 600 to 699 hours. More than one-fourth (28 percent) of the institutions reported more than 700 hours of total clinical hours.

Table 5b. Distribution of Total Clinical Hours Reported by Higher Education Segment, 2021-22

Total Hours of Clinical Experience	IHE Traditional route	California State University	University of California	Private/ Independent Institution
500 to 599 hours	-	-	-	-
600 to 699 hours	58	20	7	31
700 to 799 hours	16	1	2	13
800 to 899 hours	5	2	-	3
Above 900 hours	2	-	-	2

Note: Total number of clinical experience hours include hours required for prior to student teaching and for student teaching. Total clinical hours are reported for Traditional route only; candidates in the Alternative routes are considered teacher of record so the student teaching hours are not applicable. Governor's Executive Order N-66-20 provided flexibilities to teacher preparation programs regarding supervised clinical hours for 2021-22.

Program Information: Total Enrollment, 2021-22

Provide the total number of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs for an initial teaching credential and the subset of individuals enrolled who also completed the program during the academic year. (§205(a)(1)(C)(ii)(H))

Tables 6a through 6l provide demographic information for total enrollment, including the subset of program completers, by route and higher education segments. In addition, there are tables to show five-year trend of total enrollment by demographic data and by segments. Table 6a displays total enrollment by gender and race/ethnicity for the reporting year 2021-22. Data indicate that more than two-thirds of enrollment in the Traditional and Alternative IHE-based routes consisted of female candidates. The percentage of male candidates enrolled in both Alternative IHE and LEA routes (26.9 percent and 31 percent, respectively) were higher when compared to the Traditional route (24.2 percent). There were variations in the race/ethnicity distribution of total enrollment by route as well. Data indicate that there was more diversity (accounting for about 63% of non-white candidates) amongst the Alternative LEA based route as there were a higher percentage of total American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino of any race, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander candidates as compared to candidates enrolled in the Traditional and Alternative IHE-based routes. The proportion of candidates who identified themselves as White was less than half the total enrollment for all three routes – 35 percent for Traditional route, 39.3 percent for Alternative IHE-based route, and 29.5 percent for Alternative LEA-based route.

Table 6a. Gender, Race/Ethnicity of Total Enrollment (Enrolled Candidates and Program Completers) by Route, 2021-22

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	Traditional route (n=25,580)	Alternative IHE-based route (n=7,152)	Alternative LEA-based route (n=2,144)
Female	74.3%	71.9%	64.8%
Male	24.2%	26.9%	31.0%
Non-binary/Other	0.2%	0.1%	0.6%
Gender not reported	1.4%	1.1%	3.6%

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	Traditional route (n=25,580)	Alternative IHE-based route (n=7,152)	Alternative LEA-based route (n=2,144)
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5%	0.6%	1.6%
Asian	8.3%	6.3%	8.0%
Black or African American	3.5%	6.2%	8.1%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	38.3%	32.4%	39.6%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.5%	0.6%	1.4%
Race/Ethnicity not reported	9.2%	8.8%	7.6%
Two or more races	4.8%	5.7%	4.2%
White	35.0%	39.3%	29.5%

Note: For the purpose of Title II reporting, an enrolled candidate is defined as a candidate who has been admitted to a teacher preparation program, but who has not yet completed the program during the academic year being reported. An individual who completed the program during the academic year being reported is counted as a program completer. Programs must report on the number of candidates by ethnicity and race separately. Individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino will be reported in one of the race categories. The sum of the members of each racial category may not add up to the total number of candidates enrolled due to institutions that may not collect demographic data or Individuals belonging to one or more racial groups.

Table 6b below provides gender and race/ethnicity distribution by higher education segments. Of the total enrollment in all education segments, nearly three-quarters of candidates were female. Of the total enrollment at California State University institutions, more than two-fifths (46 percent) were Hispanic/Latino of any race candidates, and about three-tenths (29.7 percent) were White candidates. Of the total enrollment at University of California institutions, Hispanic/Latino of any race and Asians made up of half of enrolled candidates. Of the total enrollment at Private/Independent Institutions, more than two-fifths (41.4 percent) were White candidates, and three-tenths (30 percent) were Hispanic/Latino of any race candidates. Overall, all three higher education segments reported that half or more than half of their candidates identified themselves as non-White in the academic year 2021-22.

Table 6b. Gender, Race/Ethnicity of Total Enrollment (Enrolled Candidates plus Program Completers) by Higher Education Segment, 2021-22

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	California State University (n=14,331)	University of California (n=970)	Private/Independent Institution (n=17,151)
Female	73.9%	73.9%	73.7%
Male	24.9%	21.4%	24.7%
Non-binary/Other	0.1%	2.7%	0.1%
Gender not reported	1.1%	2.0%	1.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%
Asian	9.5%	20.3%	5.8%
Black or African American	3.3%	2.4%	4.9%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	46.0%	30.5%	30.0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.3%	1.0%	0.6%
Race/Ethnicity not reported	7.0%	3.2%	11.2%

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	California State University (n=14,331)	University of California (n=970)	Private/Independent Institution (n=17,151)
Two or more races	3.9%	12.0%	5.5%
White	29.7%	29.8%	41.4%

Note: For the purpose of Title II reporting, an enrolled candidate is defined as a candidate who has been admitted to a teacher preparation program, but who has not yet completed the program during the academic year being reported. An individual who completed the program during the academic year being reported is counted as a program completer. Programs must report on the number of candidates by ethnicity and race separately. Individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino will be reported in one of the race categories. The sum of the members of each racial category may not add up to the total number of candidates enrolled due to institutions that may not collect demographic data or Individuals belonging to one or more racial groups. Local Education Agency (LEA) refers to the Alternative LEA-based route presented in Table 6a above.

Program Information: Demographic Information Five-Year Trend, by Segment

Table 6c below provides enrolled candidates gender and race/ethnicity data by segments for the past five years. For California State University (CSU), there has been a significant increase of Hispanic/Latino of any race candidates - 36.6 percent in 2017-18 to 46 percent in 2021-22, an increase of 9.4 percentage points. In contrast, the percentage of White candidates had a dramatic decrease in the last five years – 42.9 percent in 2017-18 to 29.7 percent in 2021-22, a decrease of 13.2 percentage points.

Table 6c. Five-year Trend of Enrolled Candidates for California State University

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Female	72.0%	72.7%	72.8%	74.6%	73.9%
Male	28.0%	27.0%	26.9%	25.0%	24.9%
Non-binary/Other		0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Gender not reported		0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	1.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
Asian	10.5%	9.8%	9.2%	9.1%	9.5%
Black or African American	3.8%	3.7%	3.2%	2.9%	3.3%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	36.6%	38.6%	42.1%	41.4%	46.0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%
Race/Ethnicity not reported		8.1%	8.7%	6.5%	7.0%
Two or more races	5.3%	4.3%	3.5%	6.2%	3.9%
White	42.9%	34.6%	32.6%	33.2%	29.7%

Note: For the purpose of Title II reporting, an enrolled candidate is defined as a candidate who has been admitted to a teacher preparation program, but who has not yet completed the program during the academic year being reported. Starting in 2018-19, demographic data were reported for total enrollment (enrolled candidates and program completers). New options "Non-binary/Other", "Gender not reported" and "Race/Ethnicity not reported" became available starting in the 2018-19 reporting year. Programs must report on the number of candidates by ethnicity and race separately. Individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino will be reported in one of the race categories. The sum of the members of each racial

category may not add up to the total number of candidates enrolled due to institutions that may not collect demographic data or Individuals belonging to one or more racial groups.

Table 6d below displays enrolled candidates at University of California (UC) segment by gender and race/ethnicity for the past five years. For the UC segment, the proportion of candidates who were male showed a decrease of 3.8 percentage points between 2017-18 and 2021-22. The non-binary/other candidates increased (by 2.7 percentage points) between 2018-19 and 2021-22. There was an increase in the proportion of Asian, Hispanic/Latino of any race, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander candidates in the past five years (2.7, 0.9, and 1 percentage points, respectively). There was a notable decrease in the percentage of candidates who identified themselves as White (by 5.4 percentage points) between 2017-18 and 2021-22.

Table 6d. Five-year Trend of Enrolled Candidates for University of California

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Female	74.8%	75.3%	48.3%	70.3%	73.9%
Male	25.2%	24.1%	26.2%	25.7%	21.4%
Non-binary/Other		0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	2.7%
Gender not reported		0.6%	25.5%	2.8%	2.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.8%	1.3%	5.8%	0.8%	0.6%
Asian	17.6%	20.9%	15.8%	18.8%	20.3%
Black or African American	3.7%	4.4%	2.9%	2.0%	2.4%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	29.6%	28.5%	30.2%	27.7%	30.5%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.0%
Race/Ethnicity not reported		5.1%	5.8%	5.8%	3.2%
Two or more races	13.1%	7.0%	11.5%	10.4%	12.0%
White	35.2%	32.9%	28.1%	32.7%	29.8%

Note: For the purpose of Title II reporting, an enrolled candidate is defined as a candidate who has been admitted to a teacher preparation program, but who has not yet completed the program during the academic year being reported. Starting in 2018-19, demographic data were reported for total enrollment (enrolled candidates and program completers). New options "Non-binary/Other", "Gender not reported" and "Race/Ethnicity not reported" became available starting in the 2018-19 reporting year. Programs must report on the number of candidates by ethnicity and race separately. Individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino will be reported in one of the race categories. The sum of the members of each racial category may not add up to the total number of candidates enrolled due to institutions that may not collect demographic data or Individuals belonging to one or more racial groups.

Table 6e below displays total enrollment at Private/Independent Institutions by gender and race/ethnicity for the past five years. There has been a steady trend of about 70 percent of female enrollment in the past five years. Hispanic/Latino of any race candidates stayed steady around 30 percent of the total enrollment in the past five years. Candidates who identified themselves as White continued to decline (by 9.8 percentage points) from 2017-18 to 2021-22.

Table 6e. Five-year Trend of Enrolled Candidates for Private/Independent Institutions

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Female	69.7%	69.3%	69.5%	72.7%	73.7%
Male	30.3%	28.3%	26.8%	26.2%	24.7%
Non-binary/Other		0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Gender not reported		2.4%	3.7%	1.0%	1.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%
Asian	6.4%	5.5%	5.4%	5.2%	5.8%
Black or African American	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.7%	4.9%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	30.7%	29.3%	30.6%	29.5%	30.0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%
Race/Ethnicity not reported		9.6%	15.0%	15.1%	11.2%
Two or more races	4.8%	4.5%	3.8%	4.0%	5.5%
White	51.2%	44.6%	38.9%	40.3%	41.4%

Note: For the purpose of Title II reporting, an enrolled candidate is defined as a candidate who has been admitted to a teacher preparation program, but who has not yet completed the program during the academic year being reported. Starting in 2018-19, demographic data were reported for total enrollment (enrolled candidates and program completers). New options "Non-binary/Other", "Gender not reported" and "Race/Ethnicity not reported" became available starting in the 2018-19 reporting year. Programs must report on the number of candidates by ethnicity and race separately. Individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino will be reported in one of the race categories. The sum of the members of each racial category may not add up to the total number of candidates enrolled due to institutions that may not collect demographic data or Individuals belonging to one or more racial groups.

Table 6f below displays total enrollment at teacher preparation programs that are offered by Local Education Agencies for the past five years. There has been a slight decline in the proportion of male candidates, 32.9 percent in 2017-18 down to 31.1 percent in 2021-22. There has been a significant increase (by 15.1 percentage points) in candidates who identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino of any race between 2017-18 and 2021-22. In contrast, the biggest decline (by 27.5 percentage points) in the past five years was in the proportion of candidates who identified themselves as White.

Table 6f. Five-year Trend of Enrolled Candidates for Local Education Agencies

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Female	67.1%	69.2	65.3%	63.1%	64.5%
Male	32.9%	29.9%	32.1%	31.9%	31.1%
Non-binary/Other		0.2%	0.8%	0.5%	0.7%
Gender not reported		0.6%	1.8%	4.5%	3.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.7%	0.9%	1.7%	1.3%	1.6%
Asian	6.2%	4.8%	4.7%	4.4%	8.0%
Black or African American	7.0%	4.9%	5.0%	6.3%	8.0%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	24.6%	32.9%	33.2%	32.0%	39.7%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1.3%	1.5%	1.2%	1.2%	1.4%
Race/Ethnicity not reported		5.2%	6.7%	8.5%	7.5%

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Two or more races	2.1%	2.9%	3.4%	4.1%	4.2%
White	57.1%	46.9%	44.0%	42.3%	29.6%

Note: For the purpose of Title II reporting, an enrolled candidate is defined as a candidate who has been admitted to a teacher preparation program, but who has not yet completed the program during the academic year being reported. Starting in 2018-19, demographic data were reported for total enrollment (enrolled candidates and program completers). New options "Non-binary/Other", "Gender not reported" and "Race/Ethnicity not reported" became available starting in the 2018-19 reporting year. Programs must report on the number of candidates by ethnicity and race separately. Individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino will be reported in one of the race categories. The sum of the members of each racial category may not add up to the total number of candidates enrolled due to institutions that may not collect demographic data or Individuals belonging to one or more racial groups.

Table 6g below displays total enrollment in the teacher preparation programs for the past five years. Data include both enrolled candidates, as well as, program completers in the same academic year to provide a full picture of total enrollment in teacher preparation programs. There has been an increase of total enrollment in the Alternative LEA-based route at 43.1 percent in the past five years. There was a decrease of total enrollment in the Traditional and Alternative, IHE-based routes (by 10.6 percent and 4 percent, respectively) between 2017-18 and 2021-22. Overall, there was a decrease of total enrollment by 7.1 percent between 2017-18 and 2021-22.

Table 6g. Total Enrollment (Enrolled Candidates and Program Completers) 5-year Trend by Route, 2017-18 to 2021-22

Route	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Percent Change in 5 years
Traditional route	28,606	26,761	27,766	30,115	25,580	-10.6
Alternative IHE-based route	7,453	6,312	6,588	7,646	7,152	-4.0
Alternative LEA-based route	1,498	1,395	1,729	1,855	2,144	43.1
Total enrollment	37,557	34,468	36,083	39,616	34,876	-7.1

Table 6h below displays total enrollment (enrolled candidates and program completers) by higher education segments for the past five years. California State University showed a small increase of less than one percent between 2017-18 and 2021-22. University of California and Private/Independent Institution showed a 5-year percent change decrease by 14.1 percent and 16 percent, respectively.

Table 6h. Total Enrollment (Enrolled Candidates plus Program Completers) 5-year Trend by Higher Education Segment, 2017-18 to 2021-22

IHE Segment	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Percent Change in 5 years
California State University	14,212	13,496	14,120	15,475	14,331	0.8
University of California	1,130	911	945	955	970	-14.1
Private/Independent Institution	20,717	18,649	19,270	21,300	17,401	-16.0

Local Education Agency (LEA) refers to the Alternative LEA-based route presented in Table 6g above.

Program Information: Program Completers (subset of Total Enrollment), 2021-22

Enrolled candidates who complete a preliminary teaching program within the same reporting year will be reported as program completers. Table 6i below presents data on gender and race/ethnicity distribution for program completers by route. More than one-fourth of program completers in the Alternative program routes were male. The proportion of program completers who identified themselves as White was less than half of total program completers for all three routes – 37.8 percent for Traditional route, 38.7 percent for Alternative IHE-based route, and 38.1 percent for Alternative LEA-based route.

Table 6i. Demographic Information of Program Completers by Route, 2021-22

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	Traditional route (n=10,028)	Alternative IHE-based route (n=2,602)	Alternative LEA-based route (n=648)
Female	74.5%	72.7%	66.0%
Male	23.9%	25.8%	30.2%
Non-binary/Other	0.2%	0.0%	0.6%
Gender not reported	1.4%	1.5%	3.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5%	0.7%	1.7%
Asian	9.8%	6.9%	7.3%
Black or African American	2.5%	5.8%	6.9%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	37.3%	34.6%	32.4%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.4%	0.7%	0.9%
Race/Ethnicity not reported	6.7%	7.3%	7.7%
Two or more races	5.0%	5.2%	4.9%
White	37.8%	38.7%	38.1%

Table 6j below presents data on gender and race/ethnicity distribution for program completers by higher education segment. The proportion of program completers who identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino of any race was more than one-fourth for all three higher education segments – 41.4 percent for California State University, 32.7 percent for University of California, and 32.1 percent for Private/Independent Institution. All higher education segments had less than half of their program completers who identified themselves as White – 33.6

percent for California State University, 29.4 percent for University of California, 44.2 percent for Private/Independent Institution.

Table 6j. Demographic Information of Program Completers by Higher Education Segment, 2021-22

Gender and Race/Ethnicity	California State University (n=6,212)	University of California (n=784)	Private/Independent Institution (n=5,610)
Female	73.1%	76.5%	75.1%
Male	24.7%	21.2%	24.1%
Non-binary/Other	0.1%	0.9%	0.1%
Gender not reported	2.1%	1.4%	0.7%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%
Asian	9.6%	21.2%	7.1%
Black or African American	2.8%	1.8%	3.8%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	41.4%	32.7%	32.1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.3%	0.9%	0.7%
Race/Ethnicity not reported	7.7%	2.7%	6.4%
Two or more races	4.2%	10.7%	5.1%
White	33.6%	29.4%	44.2%

Local Education Agency (LEA) refers to the Alternative LEA-based route presented in Table 6i above.

Table 6k below provides data for program completers by route for five years. There has been a steady upward trend of program completers in the Traditional and Alternative LEA-based routes in the past four years. Despite the decrease of program completers in 2021-22, there was a five-year percent change increase between 2017-18 and 2021-22 in both the Traditional and Alternative LEA-based routes (11. 5 percent and 46.6 percent, respectively). For the Alternative IHE-based route, there was a five-year percent change decrease of 17.8 percent between 2017-18 and 2021-22. Overall, the number of program completers increased by 5.4 percent between 2017-18 and 2021-22.

Table 6k. Trend of Program Completers by Route, 2017-18 to 2021-22

Route	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Percent Change in 5 years
Traditional route	8,996	9,054	9,980	11,424	10,028	11.5%
Alternative IHE-based route	3,165	3,069	3,719	3,144	2,602	-17.8%
Alternative LEA-based route	442	591	601	677	648	46.6%
Total Program Completers	12,603	12,714	14,300	15,245	13,278	5.4%

Table 6l presents the number of program completers for the past five years by higher education segment. Both University of California and Private/Independent institution showed an increase

(3.7 percent and 8.9 percent, respectively) while California State University showed a slight decline of 0.6 percent between 2017-18 and 2021-22.

Table 6l. Trend of Program Completers by Higher Education Segment, 2017-18 to 2021-22

IHE Segment	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Percent Change in 5 years
California State University	6,252	5,972	6,370	6,980	6,212	-0.6%
University of California	756	753	800	811	784	3.7%
Private/Independent Institution	5,153	5,382	6,520	6,750	5,610	8.9%

Local Education Agency (LEA) refers to the Alternative LEA-based route presented in Table 6k above.

Program Information: Teachers Prepared by Subject Area

Provide the number of teachers prepared by subject area. "Subject area" refers to the subject area category in which the program completer is prepared to teach. An individual can be counted in more than one subject area. (§205(a)(1)(C)(v))

Table 7a below presents the percentage of program completers (prepared teachers) by subject area and route. For the IHE-Traditional route, more than two-fifths (46.6 percent) of program completers were prepared in elementary education. Program completers prepared in Mathematics and Science subject areas constituted more than one-tenth (12.8 percent), followed by another one-tenth (11.1 percent) in special education. For the Alternative IHE-based route, more than two-fifths (43.6 percent) of program completers were prepared in special education, followed by about one-fifth (22.6 percent) in elementary education. For the Alternative LEA-based route, more than half (51.9 percent) of program completers were prepared in special education and about one-fifth (22.3 percent) in elementary education. Program completers' subject area in Mathematics and Science accounted for more than one-tenth across all three routes.

Table 7a. Teachers Prepared by Subject Area by Route, 2021-22

Subject Area	IHE Traditional route	Alternative IHE-based route	Alternative LEA-based route
Multiple Subject (Elementary education)	46.6%	22.6%	22.3%
Special Education	11.1%	43.6%	51.9%
Single Subject (SS)-Mathematics and Science	12.8%	11.6%	11.4%
SS-Social Sciences	10.1%	4.5%	4.0%
SS-English and World Languages	11.0%	9.4%	6.4%
SS-Agriculture, Art, Business, ITE, Music, PE	8.5%	8.4%	3.9%

Table 7b below presents teachers prepared by subject area data by higher education segments. California State University prepared more than two-fifths (44.2 percent) in elementary education followed by more than one-tenth (14.6 percent) in special education. University of California prepared more than one-third (34.9 percent) in elementary education followed by another one-third (31.4 percent) in the Mathematics and Science subject areas. Private/Independent Institutions prepared more than one-third (39.3 percent) in elementary education followed by more than one-fifth (23.6 percent) in special education. Overall, the proportion of program completers by subject area differed by higher education segments. University of California prepared more than three-fifths (62.2 percent) candidates in single subject credential areas while both California State University and Private/Independent Institutions prepared more than half (58.8 percent and 62.9 percent, respectively) in elementary education and special education combined.

Table 7b. Teachers Prepared by Subject Area by Higher Education Segment, 2021-22

Subject Area	California State University	University of California	Private/ Independent Institution
Multiple Subject (Elementary education)	44.2%	34.9%	39.3%
Special Education	14.6%	3.0%	23.6%
Single Subject (SS)-Mathematics and Science	10.9%	31.4%	11.8%
SS-Social Sciences	8.8%	13.5%	8.5%
SS-English and World Languages	10.2%	15.8%	10.5%
SS-Agriculture, Art, Business, ITE, Music, PE	11.3%	1.5%	6.3%

Local Education Agency (LEA) refers to the Alternative LEA-based route presented in Table 7a above.

Program Information: Teachers Prepared by Academic Major

Provide the number of teachers prepared by academic major. "Academic major" refers to the actual major(s) declared by the program completer. An individual can be counted in more than one academic major. (§205(b)(1)(H)(ii))

Table 7c below presents teachers prepared by their academic major. This section asks for teacher preparation programs who offered an undergraduate degree, so this section is not applicable to the Alternative LEA-based route. Only a few teacher preparation programs offer a degree at the end of the programs, most of them offer credentials. There was a variation of degrees earned by program completers in IHE Traditional and Alternative IHE-based routes. More than half of the teachers prepared had an academic major in Social Sciences – 51.7 percent for the IHE Traditional route and 61.7 percent for the Alternative IHE-based route. More than one-tenth had "Other" academic majors – 16 percent for Traditional route and 13 percent for Alternative IHE-based route.

Table 7c. Teachers Prepared by Academic Major by Route, 2021-22

Academic Major	IHE Traditional route	Alternative IHE-based route
Social Sciences	51.7%	61.7%
Other	16.0%	13.0%

Academic Major	IHE Traditional route	Alternative IHE-based route
Mathematics and Science	10.8%	6.4%
English and World Languages	8.9%	6.1%
Liberal Arts	8.0%	8.2%
Agriculture, Art, Business, ITE, Music, PE	4.3%	4.5%
Career Technical Education	0.3%	0.1%

Note: Local Education Agencies do not offer undergraduate degrees; no academic major data to report. Academic Major identified as "Other" includes non-teaching majors, combined majors, non-subject specific majors, and advanced degrees.

Table 7d below displays teachers prepared by academic major by higher education segments. More than half (50.7 percent) of California State University's teachers prepared had an academic major in Social Sciences followed by 17.9 percent in Liberal Arts. For the University of California, more than two-fifth (41.8 percent) of teachers had an academic major in Social Sciences and more than one-fourth (26.9 percent) had an academic major in "Other". Private/Independent Institutions reported more than half (57.3 percent) in Social Sciences followed by more than one-tenth (17 percent) in "Other" academic majors.

Table 7d. Teachers Prepared by Academic Major by Higher Education Segment, 2021-22

Academic Major	California State University	University of California	Private/ Independent Institution
Social Sciences	50.7%	41.8%	57.3%
Liberal Arts	17.9%	2.1%	3.3%
Other	9.2%	26.9%	17.0%
English and World Languages	9.1%	10.6	7.6%
Mathematics and Science	7.1%	15.6%	10.7%
Agriculture, Art, Business, ITE, Music, PE	6.0%	1.9%	4.0%
Career Technical Education	0.0%	1.2%	0.3%

Note: Academic Major identified as "Other" includes non-teaching majors, combined majors, non-subject specific majors, and advanced degrees.

Program Information: Teaching Credentials Issued for 2021-22

The federal regulations mandate that the states report on the total number of initial credentials issued in 2021-22 as part of the state report. For Title II purposes, only initial teaching credentials are reported; secondary authorizations or additional credentials earned are not included. The Commission's annual *Teacher Supply Report* has detailed data on credentials issued for the 2021-22 academic year.

Table 8 below provides summary data on the total number of initial credentials earned in the state and outside of California during the 2021-22 academic year. Out of the 16,491 new teaching credentials issued in 2021-22 (by completion of a California-prepared and out-of-state/county prepared programs), nearly four-fifths of the teaching credentials were issued to candidates who were prepared in-state while about one-fifth of the teaching credentials were issued to teachers who were trained out-of-state/out-of-country. Fifty-six percent of the new

credential holders came through the IHE Traditional route, about 17 percent through the Alternative IHE-based route, 5 percent via the Alternative LEA-based route, and the remaining 22 percent were issued to teachers who were prepared out-of-state/out-of-country. When analyzed by the type of teaching credentials, 41 percent were issued in Multiple Subject (elementary education), another 37 percent were issued in Single Subject and the remaining 22 percent were issued in Education Specialist (special education) credentials.

Table 8. Number of Initial Teaching Credentials Issued, by Route, 2021-22

Credential Type	IHE Traditional route	Alternative IHE-based route	Alternative LEA-based route	Out-of-state/Out-of-country Prepared	Total credentials
Multiple Subject	4,315	768	134	1,472	6,689
Single Subject	3,773	833	110	1,443	6,159
Education Specialist	1,145	1,241	566	691	3,643
Total	9,233	2,842	810	3,606	16,491

Teacher Supply Report, 2021-22

Section II: Assurances

Please certify that your institution is in compliance with the following assurances. (§205(a)(1)(A)(iii)), (§206(b)) Note: Be prepared to provide documentation and evidence for your responses, when requested, to support the following assurances.

- Preparation responds to the identified needs of the local educational agencies or states where the program completers are likely to teach, based on past hiring and recruitment trends.
- Preparation is closely linked with the needs of schools and the instructional decisions new teachers face in the classroom.
- Prospective special education teachers are prepared in core academic subjects and to instruct in core academic subjects.
- Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to students with disabilities.
- Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to limited English proficient students.
- Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to students from low-income families.
- Prospective teachers are prepared to effectively teach in urban and rural schools, if applicable.
- Describe your institution's most successful strategies in meeting the assurances listed above.

Detailed responses by each teacher preparation program to Section II: Assurances are presented via the Title II data dashboards at Title II web page.

Section II: Annual Goals

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route to the state credential program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students. (§205(a)(1)(A) (i), (§205(a)(1)(A) (ii), (§206(a))

Provide information about your program's goals to increase the number of prospective teachers in mathematics, science, and special education:

- Did your institution offer a program in this subject?
- Describe your goals.
- Did your program meet the annual goal set for this subject?
- Description of strategies used to achieve goal.
- Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal.

All teacher preparation programs were asked to answer the questions listed above for mathematics, science, special education, and limited English proficient students (LEP). Data for LEP is not included here because all Commission-approved teacher preparation programs embed English learner (EL) authorization preparation in their initial teaching credential programs. Hence all current program completers and future program completers will be authorized to teach English learners. In other words, for LEP, one hundred percent of the annual goals will be met for all institutions.

Tables 9a and 9b below summarize the annual goals data from the individual IPRC reports for all three subjects (mathematics, science, and special education) by route and by higher education segment. The annual goals section requires that institutions offering teaching credentials in mathematics, science, and special education indicate whether or not goals to increase prospective teachers in shortage areas are set, if goals are met, and which strategies were used to meet annual goals.

When data were analyzed by route, the Traditional route programs indicated that 70 percent of the programs met their goals in mathematics, 73 percent for science, and 83 percent for special education programs. For Alternative IHE-based programs, 61 percent of the programs met their goals for mathematics, 77 percent for science, and 75 percent for special education. For the Alternative LEA-based route, 88 percent of the programs met goals for mathematics, 75 percent for science, and 77 percent for special education. Overall, more than three-fifths of all program routes met their goals for mathematics, science, and special education.

Table 9a. Annual Goals to Increase Number of Prospective Teachers in Mathematics, Science, Special Education, by route, 2021-22

Program	Subject Area	Traditional route	Alternative IHE-based route	Alternative LEA-based route
Number of current programs	Mathematics	70	46	8
Number met goals	Mathematics	49	28	7
Percent met goals	Mathematics	70%	61%	88%
Number of current programs	Science	73	47	8
Number met goals	Science	53	36	6
Percent met goals	Science	73%	77%	75%
Number of current programs	Special Education	53	47	13
Number met goals	Special Education	44	35	10
Percent met goals	Special Education	83%	75%	77%

When data were analyzed by higher education segments, California State University indicated that 56 percent of the programs met goals for mathematics, 72 percent for science, and 81 percent for special education. For University of California, 83 percent met goals for mathematics, 75 percent for science, and 67 percent for special education. For Private/Independent Institutions, 70 percent met goals for mathematics, 77 percent for science, and 78 percent for special education. Science showed a consistency of more than 70 percent of annual goals met across all IHE segments.

Table 9b. Annual Goals to Increase Number of Prospective Teachers in Mathematics, Science, Special Education, by Higher Education Segment, 2021-22

Program	Subject Area	California State University	University of California	Private/ Independent Institution
Number of current programs[\1]	Mathematics	39	12	64
Number met goals	Mathematics	22	10	45
Percent met goals	Mathematics	56%	83%	70%
Number of current programs	Science	39	12	68
Number met goals	Science	28	9	52
Percent met goals	Science	72%	75%	77%
Number of current programs	Special Education	42	3	55
Number met goals	Special Education	34	2	43
Percent met goals	Special Education	81%	67%	78%

[\1] *an IHE is identified as having 2 programs when both a traditional and alternative (Intern) are offered.*

Detailed responses by each teacher preparation program to annual goals for shortage areas such as mathematics, science, and special education are presented via the Title II data dashboards at Title II webpage.

Section III: Credential Requirements

List each teaching credential (certificate, license or other) currently issued by the state and answer the questions about each. Include all teaching credentials including initial, emergency, temporary, provisional, permanent, professional, and master teacher licenses as well as any credentials given specifically to those participating in or completing alternative routes to certification or licensure. Do not include credentials for principals, administrators, social workers, guidance counselors, speech/language pathologists, or any other school support personnel. (§205(b)(1)(A))

In order to be employed in a California public school district, teachers must hold a credential issued by the Commission. California's credential structure is organized by subject matter and classroom setting. Within this structure, the state has established certification requirements that ensure candidates are prepared for their initial teaching credential and that each candidate must satisfy additional requirements, complete Teacher Induction, before advancing to the second level or Clear teaching credential.

There are four basic credentials that authorize individuals to teach in TK-12 public school settings: the Multiple Subject teaching credential, the Single Subject teaching credential, the Education Specialist Instruction credential, and the Designated Subjects teaching credential. The Commission also issues credentials for other educational service occupations requiring state certification, such as school counselors, psychologists, nurses, librarians, and administrators. But the Title II legislation does not require reporting of data related to Designated Subjects credentials, child development permits, or the services credentials. In addition, for general education (Multiple Subject and Single Subject) and special education (Education Specialist Instruction), the Title II report requires reporting only the initial teaching credential.

Subject Matter and Classroom Setting

California's teaching credential structure emphasizes both content knowledge, pedagogical competence, and the TK-12 students' developmental status. Candidates earning a Multiple Subject, Single Subject, or Education Specialist credential must hold a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited college or university. Candidates must also acquire knowledge and demonstrate preparation to teach by completing a Commission-approved teacher preparation program. A formal recommendation to the Commission from the Commission-approved college, university, or local educational agency where candidates completed the teacher preparation program is made. The State offers multiple routes to teaching certification, including traditional one-year post baccalaureate programs at institutions of higher education, district or university sponsored intern programs, and four-to five-year "integrated undergraduate" programs that allow for the concurrent completion of a baccalaureate degree (including subject matter requirements) and professional preparation. All credential programs, ***no matter the delivery mode,*** are held to the same standards of quality and effectiveness, and all programs include instruction in pedagogy, as well as a supervised teaching experience.

The credential most often held by those teaching in an elementary school classroom is the Multiple Subject teaching credential. This credential authorizes individuals to teach all subjects in a self-contained classroom in kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, and classes organized primarily for adults.

The appropriate credential to teach a specific subject such as mathematics or English in a departmentalized (single subject) classroom at the middle or high school level is the Single Subject teaching credential. This credential authorizes public school teaching in a departmentalized classroom in kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, and classes organized primarily for adults. A Single Subject teaching credential authorizes an individual to teach in one of the specific content areas listed on Table 10.

Table 10: List of Subject Content Areas for Single Subject teaching credential

Agriculture	Art
Business	Chemistry
Dance	Earth and Space Sciences
English	General Science - Foundational Level
Health Science	Home Economics
Industrial and Technology Education	Life Sciences
Mathematics	Mathematics – Foundational Level
Music	Physical Education
Physics	Social Science
Theatre	World Languages*

* *World Languages include American Sign Language, Arabic, Armenian, Cantonese, ELD, Farsi, Filipino, French, German, Hebrew, Hmong, Italian, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Latin, Mandarin, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese*.

The Education Specialist Instruction credential authorizes individuals to teach students with disabilities. This credential is currently organized in five distinct authorizations: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Extensive Support Needs, Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Education. Individuals seeking the Education Specialist Instruction credential complete a special education preparation program that includes student teaching in the area of their chosen specialization plus verification of subject matter competency.

Requirements for Initial Certification

Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist Instruction initial credentials, known as Preliminary credentials in California, are issued to beginning teachers for a maximum of five years and are non-renewable. Candidates are expected to complete Teacher Induction to earn the Clear credential within the five-year period of the initial credential.

Teaching Permits and Waivers

In addition to the teaching credentials (Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist), there are teaching permits and waivers that allow individuals to teach in California's

TK-12 classrooms. The requirements are different for permits and waivers. Detailed information on teaching permits and waivers are displayed in Teacher Supply data dashboards.

Short-Term Staff Permit

A Short-Term Staff Permit (STSPs) may be requested by an employing agency when there is an acute staffing need. An "acute staffing need" exists when an employer needs to fill a classroom immediately based on an unforeseen need. STSPs are restricted to service in the employing agency that requests issuance of the permit, are valid for one school year and are not renewable. In 2021-22, more than 2,700 STSPs were issued. Detailed information on the requirements is available in credential information leaflet CL-858: STSP leaflet.

Provisional Internship Permit

Provisional Internship Permits (PIPs) may be requested by an employing agency when there is an anticipated need. An "anticipated staffing need" exists when a district is aware that an opening is going to occur and conducts a diligent search for a credentialed teacher but is unable to recruit one. PIPs are restricted to service within the employing agency that requests issuance of the permit and are issued for one calendar year. In 2021-22, more than 1,300 PIPs were issued. Detailed information on the requirements is available in credential information leaflet CL-856: PIP leaflet.

Limited Assignment Teaching Permit

Limited Assignment Teaching Permits are designed to allow fully credentialed teachers to teach outside their authorized areas while completing the requirements to earn an added authorization, supplementary authorization, or subject matter authorization. Limited Assignment Teaching Permits are issued at the request of, and are restricted to service with, a California public school employer to fill vacancies. These permits allow employing agencies flexibility, especially in rural and remote areas of the state, to assign individuals to teach in more than one subject area. The Commission issues General Education Limited Assignment Teaching Permits (GELAPs) in any statutory subject area available on a Single Subject or Multiple Subject teaching credential. The Special Education Limited Assignment Teaching Permit (SELAP) was added to Title 5 Regulations effective July 3, 2009. A SELAP may be issued in any of the five Education Specialist Instruction Credential specialty areas while the holder completes the requirements for an added authorization in special education or a full education specialist authorization. In 2021-22, more than 1,400 GELAPs and 370 SELAPs were issued. Detailed information on the requirements of GELAP is available in credential information leaflet CL-828: GELAP leaflet and requirements of SELAP is available in credential information leaflet CL-889: SELAP leaflet.

Variable Term Waivers

Waivers are the final option for public school employers within the hiring priority. Waivers give the employer the ability to meet the staffing needs when a suitable fully qualified credentialed employee cannot be found. Employing agencies must complete a diligent search for a suitable credentialed teacher or qualified intern teacher before requesting a credential waiver. In 2021-22, more than 850 new waivers were issued.

Teaching Permit for Statutory Leave

In spring 2016, the Commission developed the Teaching Permit for Statutory Leave (TPSL) to address the teacher shortage. The TPSL allows an employing agency to fill a position where the teacher of record is unable to teach due to a statutory leave (medical or otherwise) with a temporary teacher of record for the duration of the leave. TPSL may be issued with one or more authorizations in the areas of Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Special Education, depending on an individual's qualifications. The permit is renewable upon verification from the employing agency that specific requirements have been completed. In 2021-22, more than 400 TPSLs were issued. Detailed information on the requirements is available in credential information leaflet CL-902: TPSL Leaflet.

Detailed data on interns, permits, and waivers are available at the following dashboard Intern Permit Waivers Dashboard.

Specific Assessment Requirements

California uses a variety of examinations to assess candidates' competencies in basic skills, subject matter proficiency, and professional knowledge. California law requires candidates to demonstrate subject matter knowledge by passage of a Commission-approved subject-matter assessment, by completing a Commission-approved subject-matter program of coursework in the field in which they will be teaching, by verifying and accepting specific academic degree, by evaluating coursework aligned with the domains of the Subject Matter Requirements, or by completing a combination of coursework and subject matter assessment. For initial teacher certification or licensure, California uses the following written tests or performance assessments:

- Assessment of Basic Skills (CBEST, other options; *see Basic Skills Requirement*)
- Assessment of Subject Matter Knowledge (CSET)
- Assessment of the Methods for Teaching Reading (RICA)
- Assessment of Teaching Performance (TPA)

Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist teacher candidates are required to satisfy the basic skills requirement in order to obtain an initial teaching credential. The California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) provides an assessment of a candidate's basic knowledge and skills in reading, writing, and mathematics. While California Education Code §44252(f) requires candidates to take CBEST prior to admission to a program of professional preparation for diagnostic purposes, if the candidate has not yet met the basic skills requirement, programs are required to assure that candidates demonstrate proficiency in basic skills before advancing them to daily student teaching responsibilities. Candidates admitted to university or district intern programs are required to satisfy the basic skills requirement prior to assuming their teaching responsibilities. All candidates must pass the CBEST, or the equivalent, before recommended for teaching credentials.

Since the Ryan Act of 1970, California has required candidates to demonstrate competency in the content area they will teach. Historically, candidates have had two options to demonstrate subject matter competence – passage of a subject matter examination or completion of a Commission-approved subject matter preparation program. The passage of Assembly Bill 130

(Chap. 44, Stats. 2021) in July 2021 created three additional options for candidates to demonstrate subject matter competency – completion of a specific academic major, completion of coursework in the subjects related to the content area of the credential, or a combination of coursework and examination(s). Because Assembly Bill 130 was a budget trailer bill, it went into effect immediately upon signing by the Governor in July 2021.

Candidates are required to demonstrate subject matter competency in the specific content area(s) they plan to teach. Content knowledge is assessed prior to a candidate's entry into a program of professional preparation, and verification of subject matter competency is required prior to the commencement of daily class instruction either as part of a student teaching program or an intern program. Multiple Subject candidates can fulfill the subject matter requirement either by passing CSET Multiple Subjects exams (Exam route), completing a Commission-approved elementary subject matter program (Program route), verifying a baccalaureate or higher degree in liberal studies or other major that includes coursework in language studies, literature, mathematics, science, social studies, history, the arts, physical education, and human development, completing coursework in the aforementioned subjects, or by a combination of coursework and passage of the appropriate subtest(s) of the CSET Multiple Subjects examination. Of note: the exam route was the only option available from 2004-2017 for Multiple Subject credential candidates to fulfill the subject matter requirement before obtaining a Multiple Subject credential. In April 2017, under the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015, amendments to Title 5 regulations were approved to reauthorize the option of the elementary subject matter program to meet the subject matter requirement for the Multiple Subject and Education Specialist credentials. Commission action to approve institutions to offer elementary subject matter programs provides candidates the option of fulfilling subject matter requirement through a Commission-approved program.

Educational Specialist candidates have the option of passing the CSET Multiple Subject examination or a core content area in the CSET Single Subject exam, completing an elementary subject matter program or a core area in the Single Subject subject matter program, completion of a baccalaureate or higher degree with a major in one of the subject areas in which the Commission credentials candidates or a liberal studies or other major that includes coursework in language studies, literature, mathematics, science, social studies, history, the arts, physical education, and human development, completion of coursework in the aforementioned subjects, or by a combination of coursework and passage of the appropriate subtest(s) of the CSET examinations.

Single Subject candidates have the option of passing the CSET examination in the content area of the authorization to be listed in their credential, completing a subject matter program in the content area of the authorization to be listed in their credential, completing a baccalaureate or higher degree with a major in the subject area to be listed on their credential or other equivalent major as specified in Title 5 California Code of Regulations section 80096, or by a combination of coursework and passage of the appropriate subtest(s) of the CSET examinations.

In 2021-22, 60 percent of Single Subject credential candidates and 65 percent of Multiple Subject credential candidates used the CSET examination option to demonstrate subject matter requirement. All other candidates satisfied this requirement by completion of a Commission-approved subject matter program, verification of degree major, coursework evaluation, or a combination of coursework and CSET exam. All teacher candidates satisfying subject matter requirements for California certification by examination are required to take the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET).

The Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) is designed specifically for testing professional knowledge in the area of teaching reading. This knowledge is typically acquired by candidates through a program of professional preparation. All Multiple Subject and Education Specialist preparation programs are required to include instruction in the teaching of reading in their methodology courses. Their candidates must pass the RICA to obtain certification. These candidates must pass the RICA before they can be recommended for an initial credential, but passage is not required for candidates to complete a teacher preparation program. The Title II reports require institutions to provide pass rate information on all program completers. An individual may be a 'program completer' but may not yet have passed the RICA examination. California Education Code section 44283 requires that candidates for an initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and candidates for the initial Education Specialist Instruction Credential must pass the RICA prior to receiving their credential. Passage of this assessment is not a requirement for the Single Subject teaching credential.

Pursuant to SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006), Multiple Subject and Single Subject preparation programs were required to embed a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in their preparation program by July 1, 2008. Candidates enrolled in the program on or after July 1, 2008 are required to satisfy this requirement. This law requires that the initial Multiple Subject and Single Subject teacher preparation programs include a performance assessment of each credential candidate's teaching ability. The Education Code allows for multiple models of a TPA to be used, including both the Commission-developed TPA and other TPA models that meet the Commission's Assessment Design Standards. Preparation for the TPA, regardless of TPA model selected by the program, must be embedded into the teacher preparation program. All TPA models include both formative assessment as well as summative assessment for each credential candidate.

There are three Commission-approved models used by the teacher preparation programs. They are listed below:

- California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) originally developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) and owned by the Commission, revised by a Design Team with a contractor (Evaluation Systems group of Pearson)
- edTPA is a national model owned by Stanford University, with a contractor (Evaluation Systems group of Pearson)
- Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST), owned and operated by California State University, Fresno

Table 11 below displays the distribution of teacher preparation institutions by credential type and TPA models. About three-fifths of teacher preparation institutions use CalTPA and more than one-third use edTPA. California State University, Fresno uses its own model called FAST.

Table 11. Distribution of Institution by Credential Type and TPA models

Credential Type	TPA Model	CSU	UC	Private/ Independent Institution	LEA	Total	Percent of Credential Type
Multiple Subject	CalTPA	13	2	33	9	57	62%
Multiple Subject	edTPA	9	7	15	3	34	37%
Multiple Subject	FAST	1	-	-	-	1	1%
Single Subject	CalTPA	11	3	30	7	51	60%
Single Subject	edTPA	10	6	15	2	33	39%
Single Subject	FAST	1	-	-	-	1	1%

Note: a few institutions use more than one TPA model.

The Commission's model, **CalTPA,** was redeveloped based on the work of the CalTPA Design Team between 2015-18. The newly redeveloped CalTPA has a task-based structure with two cycles of instruction.

Cycle 1: Learning about Students and Planning Instruction
Cycle 1 focuses on getting to know students' assets and needs and using this information for instructional planning. Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of student and instructional strategies including developing academic language, monitoring student learning, and making appropriate accommodations and/or modifications during the teaching of a lesson to meet individual student needs. They establish a positive learning environment and provide social and emotional supports through interactions with students. Candidates reflect on their teaching and on what students learned and apply insights to future instructional planning.

Cycle 2: Assessment-Driven Instruction
Cycle 2 focuses on assessing student learning during instruction using outcomes from multiple assessments to plan for and promote learning for all students. Candidates use what they know about students and the learning context to enact the plan, teach and assess sequence based on California content standards for students. They must also demonstrate how their students use educational technology to enhance their learning. Candidates provide feedback to students about their performance from both informal and formal assessments. Based on what the candidate learns about their students' skills and

competencies and/or content knowledge, candidates either reteach or develop a connecting, extension activity to build on the instruction provided.

The field test for the redeveloped CalTPA was conducted in the spring of 2018. A standard setting panel concluded its work by recommending a passing score at the June 2019 Commission meeting: Passing Score Standards for the Redeveloped California Teaching Performance Assessment.

edTPA's common architecture consists of three interconnected tasks embedded in clinical practice – Planning, Instruction, and Assessment. Each task has five rubrics, and there are three different types of handbooks used (15-rubric, 13-rubric and 18-rubric).

A majority of the content fields use the 15-rubric handbooks. The 13-rubric handbooks are used by World Language and Classical language as they do not have the two academic language rubrics. The 18-rubric handbooks are used by Elementary education and have one additional task for either Mathematics or Literacy so that the candidate is assessed in both Mathematics and Literacy on the assessment. A candidate completes all tasks for the edTPA in one submission and can then retake by task(s) or as a whole.

Detailed information on edTPA for California including passing scores can be found at: edTPA webpage.

General information on edTPA is available at: Why edTPA and Using edTPA.

FAST assesses the pedagogical competence of teacher candidates, including interns, with respect to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). FAST consists of two projects:

- *Site Visitation Project*: This task assesses teacher candidates' ability to plan, implement, and evaluate instruction. The three parts of the project include:
    - (1) Planning: planning documentation for a single lesson incorporating state-adopted content standards and English language development,
    - (2) implementation: an in-person observation and videotaping of the teaching of the lesson, and
    - (3) Reflection: a review of the entire video, selection of a 3- to 5-minute video segment, and a written evaluation of the lesson. Single Subject and Multiple Subject candidates complete the Site Visitation Sample Project during their initial student teaching placements.
- *Teaching Sample Project*: This task assesses teacher candidates' ability to:
    - (a) identify the context of the classroom,
    - (b) plan and teach a series of at least five cohesive lessons with a focus on content knowledge and literacy,
    - (c) assess students' learning related to the unit, and
    - (d) document their teaching and their students' learning and reflect on the effectiveness of their teaching.

Candidates and interns complete the Teaching Sample Project during final student teaching (including internship).

Each assessment evaluates multiple TPEs using a task-specific rubric for each section of the task. The tasks are scored by trained faculty and supervisors using a task-specific four-point rubric. Candidates must earn a minimum score of "2" on each of the three sections evaluated in the Site Visitation project and the seven sections evaluated in the Teaching Sample Project. Detailed information about FAST can be found at FAST webpage

Detailed information about TPA models is available on the Commission's TPA web page.

Section IV: Standards and Criteria

Provide a brief background of California's recent teacher preparation reform efforts including a description of state standards for programs and teachers. (§205(b)(1)(B), §205(b)(1)(C))

Standards and Criteria for General Education Teacher Certification
After extensive input from California educators, administrators, and policymakers, the Commission adopted three sets of standards[1] consistent with the provisions of SB 2042. These sets of standards are the:

- *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Teacher Preparation Programs*, adopted December 2015, TPEs adopted June 2016, Handbook revised June 2017
- *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Teacher Induction Programs*, adopted October 2016, Handbook revised June 2017
- *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs*, adopted October 2016

Through its accreditation review process the Commission holds institutions accountable for ensuring that programs meet standards of quality and effectiveness and for ensuring that candidates meet prescribed competence standards. In addition to the requirements identified in the *Teacher Certification in California* section of this report, the Commission established Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) that described what beginning teachers should know and be able to do regardless of pupil level or content area. These expectations defined the levels of pedagogical competence and performance the Commission expects all candidates to attain as a condition of earning an initial teaching credential. The Commission expects institutions preparing prospective teachers to verify individual attainment of the performance expectations prior to recommending a candidate for a teaching credential. In June 2016, the Commission adopted updated TPEs.

Addition of New Literacy Program Standard and Literacy Teaching Performance Expectation
Senate Bill 488 (2021) revised the definition of "study of effective means of teaching literacy" in Education Code 44259 (b)(4)(A) and (B) and required the Commission to complete a series of actions related to literacy instruction. These sections of statute apply to the Multiple Subject (MS), Single Subject (SS) English Language Arts (ELA), Education Specialist credentials, and the new PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Instruction.

Pursuant to SB 488, a new program standard and its associated TPE was approved by the Commission and will be fully implemented by July 1, 2024. Program Standard 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students and TPE 7 were designed to significantly strengthen the preparation new general education teachers receive in the areas of reading and literacy instruction.

The TPEs are organized in two sections, as outlined below. The first includes seven broad areas, aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), and the second section relates to subject specific pedagogy.

The Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) 2016
TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning
TPE 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning
TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning
TPE 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students
TPE 5: Assessing Student Learning
TPE 6: Developing as a Professional Educator
TPE 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students *(Approved in October 2022)*

In addition to the seven TPEs, there are additional sections of the TPEs that apply to all teachers but are viewed through the lens of the teacher's content area:

- Content Specific Pedagogy
- Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations (will be replaced by TPE 7 in 2024)
    - All Candidates
    - Multiple Subject and Education Specialist Candidates
    - Single Subject English Candidates
- Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy
- English Language Development in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy
- Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills for Multiple Subject Teaching Assignments
- Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills for Single Subject Teaching Assignments

Standards and Criteria for Special Education Teacher Certification
A Standards Design Team was appointed by the Executive Director of the Commission in 2016 to review the credential requirements and program standards for preparing special education teachers. Draft program standards, TPEs, and a revised credential structure were developed by the Design Team and were adopted by the Commission in June 2018 and August 2018. These standards may be found at the following link: Preliminary Education Specialist Teaching Credential Preconditions, Program Standards, and Teaching Performance Expectations.

As with Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs, SB 488 resulted in the adoption of a new program standard and associated TPE to strengthen the preparation of new Education Specialists in the area of reading and literacy instruction. This new standard and associated TPE will be fully implemented by July 1, 2024 and is available here: Program Standard 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for Students with Disabilities.

Standards and Criteria for Subject Matter Preparation Programs
The *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential* includes standards related to the substance of subject matter program curriculum, qualities of the subject matter program curriculum, leadership and implementation of the subject matter programs, and content specifications for the Subject Matter Requirement (SMR) for the Multiple Subject teaching credential. Completion of this

(SMR) prepares Multiple Subject candidates for the CSET: Multiple Subject examination and effective April 2017 completing a Commission-approved subject matter program waives candidates from the requirement to pass the examination.

In June 2002, the Commission adopted new SMRs for mathematics, science, social science, and English. In January 2004, the Commission adopted new SMRs and standards in four additional subject areas: art, languages other than English (now called World Languages), music, and physical education. The requirements for these eight subject matter areas were aligned with the state student content standards and consistent with standards established by national teacher associations in each subject area (i.e., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Council for the Social Sciences, National Art Education Association, and American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language). In addition, the Commission developed new SMRs and standards in five additional subject areas: agriculture, business, health science, home economics, and industrial and technology education. Subsequently, based on legislation, SMRs were developed for six additional world languages, and following that, for American Sign Language (ASL).

In 2013, SMRs were updated to align with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in Multiple Subjects, Mathematics, and English. In 2017, the SMRs for prospective elementary teachers and science teachers were revised to ensure alignment with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). Subject matter standards are updated as needed.

In 2020, the Commission adopted SMRs and TPEs for Theater and Dance and in 2021, the Commission updated the SMRs for Art, Music, and Multiple Subject credentials to align with the 2019 California Art Standards for Public Schools. In 2022, the Commission adopted SMRs for Theater and Dance.

Alignment of Teacher Credential Standards with California Student Content Standards
Pursuant to subdivision (a) of California Education Code §60605, California requires that each candidate recommended for a credential demonstrates satisfactory ability to assist students to meet or exceed state content and performance standards for pupils. The standards-based credential system is intended to hold programs and candidates accountable for teaching and learning and reflect congruence with California's TK-12 academic content standards. Each of the various pathways for earning an initial credential (integrated programs of subject matter preparation and professional preparation, post baccalaureate programs of professional preparation, and intern programs of professional preparation) reflect this requirement. Induction programs continue to support candidates as they work with their mentors to refine practice with respect to teaching the TK-12 student content standards.

Section V: Assessment Information

This section of the report provides statewide information about the number of individuals who completed programs of professional preparation in the 2021-22 academic year along with information about the performance of those candidates who took any assessments required for initial certification in California. The performance data are based on the institutional report card data submitted by more than 90 postsecondary institutions and school districts approved by the Commission to offer Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and/or Education Specialist teacher preparation programs in California for the 2021-22 academic year.

Statewide Assessments Used for Certification

In accordance with the federal reporting guidelines of the Higher Education Act, this report provides pass rates for the basic skills, subject matter content examinations, Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA), and the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). Table 12 below indicates the specific California examinations used in the reporting of the assessment categories and a description of the state requirements for those examinations.

Table 12: Description of the Assessments Used

Assessment Categories	Description of the Examination	Who takes the Examination?	When is passage of the Examination required?
Basic Skills*	Assessment of basic skills in reading, writing, and math	Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist credential candidates	Before recommendation for the credential or prior to teacher placement for intern positions
Content Knowledge*	Assessment of subject matter content knowledge for subject area taught in grades K-12	Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialist credential candidates who choose the examination option in the specified content areas to fulfill the subject matter requirement for teachers	Before advancement to the supervised classroom teaching portion of the teacher preparation program or teacher placement for intern positions
Professional Knowledge/ Pedagogy**	RICA: The assessment of the skills and knowledge necessary for the effective teaching of K-8 reading	Multiple Subject and Education Specialist credential candidates	Before recommendation for the credential

Assessment Categories	Description of the Examination	Who takes the Examination?	When is passage of the Examination required?
Pedagogical Knowledge***	TPA: assessment of the pedagogical performance of prospective teachers	Multiple and Single Subject credential candidates	Before recommendation for the credential

**The knowledge assessed by the basic skills and subject matter examinations is not typically acquired through the teacher preparation program. Verification of basic skills is required prior to beginning supervised teaching for the credential while subject matter knowledge is required before advancement to the supervised classroom-teaching portion of a teacher preparation program.*

***RICA is required for certification and is designed to test a portion of the professional knowledge acquired through a program of professional preparation. Since passage of this exam is not a requirement for the Single Subject Teaching Credential, the RICA performance data in this report are specific to candidates completing Multiple Subject or Education Specialist credential programs only.*

****TPA is a program completion and a credential requirement.*

Institutional Pass-Rate Data for Academic Year 2021-22

For purposes of Title II reporting, the federal law makes a distinction between candidates who completed programs of teacher preparation and those recommended for credentials. Program completers are defined as candidates who completed all the academic requirements of a Commission-approved teacher preparation program. These program requirements do not include any of the following legislated California credential requirements:

- Possession of a baccalaureate degree or higher degree from a regionally-accredited institution of postsecondary education;
- Completion of a basic skills requirement before student teaching;
- Completion of subject matter requirement either by passing a subject matter examination or completing an approved program, as applicable to the particular credential;
- Completion of a course or passage of an examination in the principles and provisions of the United States Constitution;
- A criminal background clearance as specified by the Commission; and
- Passage of the RICA as a state requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and the Education Specialist Instruction Credential.

Pass rate information represents aggregate data for candidates who have completed a teacher preparation program in California and have taken any examination to fulfill any of their credential requirements. Although California considers California's University and District intern programs to be equivalent to Traditional programs associated with institutions of higher education, Title II reporting requirements mandate that pass rate data for Alternative (Intern) routes to certification be reported separately from those of Traditional routes. Pass rate information for programs and subject areas with fewer than ten program completers is not reported. Pass rates are calculated for each subtest in CSET, CalTPA, edTPA, and RICA.

Table 13. Assessments Used and Reported for 2021-22

Assessment Name	State Passing Score Standard	Score Range
Basic Skills - CBEST • Reading • Mathematics • Writing	A scaled score of 41 in each of the three sections (a score as low as 37 on any section is acceptable if the minimum total score is 123)	20 – 80 for each section
Basic Skills - CSET: Multiple Subjects plus Writing	220 on the CSET Multiple Subjects examination and 220 on the Writing Skills examination	100 - 300
Content Knowledge – CSET for all Single Subjects	220	100 - 300
Professional Knowledge - RICA • Written Exam (3 subtests) • Video Performance Assessment (VPA)	220 on each of the Written Exam subtest or 220 on the VPA	100 - 300
California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)	Cycle One includes 8 rubrics Cycle Two includes 9 rubrics	Minimum score of 2 across all rubrics and no more than one rubric with a score of 1 on each cycle
edTPA	Multiple Subject has 18 rubrics Single Subject has 15 rubrics	Multiple Subject - overall score of 49 across 18 rubrics Single Subject - overall score of 41 across 15 rubrics

Table 14a below displays the overall summary pass rate for all assessments by route. The pass rates for program completers for the 2021-22 academic year varied slightly by routes. For the Traditional route, the pass rate ranged from 88 percent for the RICA, 94 percent for the TPA, 96 percent for the CSET, to 97 percent for the CBEST. For Alternative IHE-based route, the pass rate ranged from 84 percent for the RICA, 92 percent for the TPA, 96 percent for the CSET, to 99 percent for the CBEST. For Alternative LEA-based route, the pass rate ranged from 94 percent for the RICA and TPA, 97 percent for the CSET, to 100 percent for the CBEST.

CBEST is one of the options to fulfill basic skills requirement (BSR). Nearly 90 percent of the candidates fulfill BSR by taking CBEST, and the Title II contractor matches the exam data for CBEST along with other exams (CSET, TPA, RICA). For candidates who fulfill BSR by using other options, the teacher preparation programs maintain that information. When providing

individual-level information for the contractor to match for all exams, teacher preparation programs provide the non-CBEST option data to the contractor. Therefore, pass rate data for non-CBEST option is not available. It is assumed that for the candidates who used the non-CBEST options that the pass rate would be 100 percent.

Table 14a. Summary Pass Rate for Program Completers, by Route, 2021-22

Assessment	Traditional route	Alternative IHE-based route	Alternative LEA-based route
CBEST	97%	99%	100%
CSET	96%	96%	97%
RICA	88%	84%	94%
TPA	94%	92%	94%

Note: CBEST is the main option to fulfill basic skills requirement and pass rate is provided here. Non-CBEST option pass rate data is not available. TPA pass rate includes data from two models (CalTPA and edTPA). RICA pass rate includes both RICA Written subtests and RICA Video data. RICA is not a program completion requirement; it is a licensure or credential requirement. Due to COVID-19 flexibilities offered in 2020-21, CBEST and CSET requirements were deferred for program completers and candidates must complete those requirements prior to obtaining their preliminary credentials. TPA and RICA requirements were deferred from Preliminary credential requirements to Clear credential.

Table 14b below displays the average pass rate for all assessments by higher education segment. The pass rate for all assessments by the higher education segments had a minimum of 90 percent and higher. For California State University, the pass rate ranged from 90 percent for the RICA, 95 percent for the TPA, to 97 percent for the CBEST and CSET. For University of California, the pass rate ranged from 94 percent for the RICA, 98 percent for the CSET and TPA, to 99 percent for the CBEST. For Private/Independent Institution, the pass rate ranged from 91 percent for the RICA, 92 percent for the TPA, 96 percent for the CSET, to 97 percent for the CBEST.

Table 14b. Average Pass Rate for Program Completers, by Higher Education Segment, 2021-22

Assessment	California State University	University of California	Private/ Independent Institution
CBEST	97%	99%	97%
CSET	97%	98%	96%
RICA	90%	94%	91%
TPA	95%	98%	92%

Note: Local Education Agency (LEA) refers to the Alternative LEA-based route presented in Table 14a above. CSET, RICA and TPA assessment pass rates were by subtest.

Detailed information on all other Commission-approved assessments, the structure, cut score, total volume, and examinees demographic data are presented in the annual exams pass rate report at Annual Passing Rate Report.

Detailed pass rate data are published via the Title II data dashboards: Title web page.

Section VI: Alternative Routes

For all state-approved Alternative routes, list each Alternative route and answer the questions about each route. (§205(b)(1)(E))

Within the California context, it is critical to distinguish between alternative certification and Alternative routes to certification. While California has *Alternative routes* to the teaching credential, it does not have *alternative credentials*. As previously discussed, there are four types of teaching credentials in California: (1) Multiple Subject (2) Single Subject (3) Education Specialist and (4) Designated Subjects credentials. The Commission is in the process of also developing a PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Instruction credential, but it is not yet operational. Title II reports information for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist credentials only and candidates may obtain one of these teaching credentials through an alternative (intern) route. Regardless of whether an individual has met all the necessary requirements for one of the four types of teaching credentials through Traditional means, such as a one-year post-baccalaureate program at an institution of higher education, or a four- to five-year "integrated undergraduate" program that allows for the concurrent completion of subject matter and professional preparation, or through alternative means such as a district- or university sponsored intern program, the resulting credentials issued are the same. Further, all programs, including intern programs, are required to meet uniform standards of program quality and effectiveness established by the Commission. All programs include instruction in pedagogy and supervised teaching experiences. All programs are required to ensure that prospective teachers meet the *Teaching Performance Expectations* prior to completing the program.

The alternative route to teaching in California is enrollment in an intern preparation program. Intern programs are designed to provide formal teacher preparation to qualifying individuals who concurrently serve as the teacher of record and are paid a salary by the district. Intern programs may be up to three years in length. Interns benefit from a close linkage between their teacher preparation and classroom experience, as they apply newly acquired skills and knowledge into practice in the classroom immediately. California allows two types of intern programs, those offered by universities and those offered by local education agencies.

University intern programs provide one- or two-year internships leading to basic teaching credentials, specialist teaching credentials, and/or service credentials. University intern programs must meet the same standards of program quality and effectiveness as traditional university teacher preparation programs. School districts and county offices of education collaborate with local universities in the planning and implementation of professional instruction, support, supervision, and assessment of interns.

District intern programs are two or three-year programs operated by local school districts, schools, or county offices of education in consultation with accredited colleges and universities.

District intern programs must meet the same standards of program quality and effectiveness as university sponsored intern programs. All intern programs are required to provide each intern with the support and assistance of a mentor teacher or other experienced educator, and to create and fulfill a professional development plan for the interns in the program.

In December 2007, the Commission took action to require confirmation that Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist interns completed 120 clock hours (or the semester and quarter unit equivalent) of initial teacher preparation prior to issuance of an Intern credential. This pre-service component must include foundational preparation in pedagogy, including classroom management and planning, reading/language arts, content- specific pedagogy, human development, and teaching English learners.

At its April 2013 meeting, the Commission took action to identify the range of content that is required to be included in the preservice portion of the Intern program related to the teaching of English learners. The content is a subset of the Commission's program standard addressing the teaching of English learners, which must be addressed comprehensively in the full Intern program.

In addition, the Commission acted in 2014 to enhance the support and supervision provided to interns. Regulations took effect April 1, 2014, mandating that all interns be provided with an annual minimum of 144 hours of general support and supervision and 45 hours of support and supervision specific to teaching English learners (California Code of Regulations §80033).

California statues allow qualified individuals to become Multiple and Single Subject teachers through an Early Completion Option (ECO). Within this option, candidates who successfully complete a Commission-approved teaching foundations exam in their field, which includes teaching methods, learning development, diagnosis and intervention, classroom management and reading instruction (currently the National Evaluation Series (NES) Assessment of Professional Knowledge) and pass the Teaching Performance Assessment in their first attempt within the academic year may be granted an initial credential. Under SB 57, credential candidates still need to meet the existing legislated requirements of a bachelor's degree, subject matter competence, U.S. Constitution, computer technology, basic skills, and character fitness to qualify for a credential. Those seeking the Multiple Subjects credential through the Early Completion Option also need to pass the RICA.

Section VII: Program Performance

Criteria for assessing the performance of teacher preparation programs in the state. (§205(b)(1)(F), §207(a))

Since the Ryan Act of 1970, the Commission has been responsible for oversight of programs that prepare future educators. The Commission's accreditation system holds all educator preparation programs to its standards of quality and effectiveness. Since the adoption of the first *Accreditation Framework* in 1993, the Commission has maintained, with the exception of two temporary suspensions due to lean budget years, a comprehensive accreditation system that includes regular, rigorous reviews of the colleges and universities, school districts, county offices of education, and other entities that prepare educators for California's public schools. The Commission spent 2014-15 reviewing its accreditation system and adopted a revised *Accreditation Framework* in 2015. The revised system increases the focus on program outcomes, including performance assessment data, more streamlined accreditation processes, enhanced clinical experiences for most candidates, clearer expectations for mentors and master teachers, and requires all programs to submit data annually. Accreditation site visits resumed in 2017-18. Other new and revised aspects of the accreditation system were also implemented in 2017-18 such as annual data submission, program review, Common Standards review, and preconditions review. In addition, the Commission modified its process to review and approve institutions not previously approved to sponsor educator preparation programs in California. The revised process has five (5) stages that an entity must complete including a two or three-year Provisional Approval stage prior to full approval and inclusion in the Commission's seven-year accreditation cycle.

The Commission adopted additional refinements to the Accreditation Framework in 2020. Although minor changes were made to the Framework, the major aspects of the system created in 2014-16 remains largely intact.

Procedures for Assessing the Performance of Educator Preparation Programs
Under the Commission's accreditation system, institutions are required to meet Common Standards that apply to all educator preparation programs, as well as specific program standards of quality and effectiveness that apply to each educator preparation program offered by the institution.

In order to determine the quality of educator preparation programs, several different activities provide insight into the accreditation decision. These include annual data submission, the collection and use of survey data, Program Review, Common Standards review, and a site visit. Each of the activities is explained below.

Annual Data Submission

For a number of years, programs have been required to collect, analyze, and use data for program improvement purposes as part of the accreditation system. Data must have included both candidate assessment and program effectiveness data. This expectation continues in the current system. The Commission is seeking to provide transparency, to enhance the use of data in accreditation decisions, and to make the types of data collected be more consistent across programs. In 2016-17, the Commission established the infrastructure for the Accreditation Data System (ADS). In addition, staff worked with representatives from educator preparation programs to identify some of the data elements that will be submitted on an annual basis. In fall 2017, the Commission began implementation of this system with institutions submitting some limited data such as enrollment and completion data, number and types of pathways offered by the institution, admissions requirements, and candidate demographic information. The Commission has built upon this system with examination pass rates and survey data results as well as the inclusion of data visualizations that are used by accreditation teams and institutions. The Commission has been continuously augmenting this system to collect relevant and up-to-date information that can be used to understand the complexity of programs and their candidates.

Survey Data

As part of the effort to obtain more outcomes data about program quality, the Commission has significantly enhanced its survey information with input from stakeholders for the teaching and services credential programs. In addition, there are a couple of surveys – Mentor Teacher survey and Employer survey – used to gather feedback from mentor teachers and employers who worked with new teachers. After several years of piloting the surveys, the response rates were in the 90 percent range for the program completer surveys. The response rate is calculated by the number of program completers who had accessed the survey during the survey year, and how many responded to at least one non-demographic question. As a result, not all program completers may have been included in the survey results. Nonetheless, due to the continued high response rate, the Commission provides survey information to institutions for program improvement purposes and to accreditation review teams to inform their work. This data was used for the first time in a significant manner starting with the 2017-18 accreditation site visits and has continued to be used by accreditation teams to inform accreditation decisions ever since.

Use by Review Teams

The Commission's current accreditation system is intended to include a significant focus on outcomes data that indicate that the program is effectively preparing competent and effective educators. Data submitted by programs are used by both program review teams as well as site visit teams to provide them with a more comprehensive representation of the institution's activities over time. Reports are used by these review teams as another source of information upon which standards findings and accreditation recommendations are based.

Program Review

Program Review takes place in year five of the accreditation cycle and examines each approved educator preparation program individually. The purpose of this activity is to evaluate whether

an institution's approved program meets the standards, either the approved California program standards, experimental program standards, or national or professional program standards. The Commission's new accreditation system is focused on specific types of evidence, including syllabi, advising materials, and assessments. Program Review informs the Site Visit, which takes place in year six of the accreditation cycle. All programs, regardless of credential area, must provide specified documentation, including course syllabi and course matrices that identify where specific required competencies are introduced, practiced, and assessed. These matrices must be linked to course syllabi and assessments to ensure that the program is providing candidates with the opportunity to learn, practice, and be assessed on the required competencies.

Review Process

Teams of two trained content area experts read each Program Review document to determine whether the program appears to be preliminarily aligned to the standards prior to collecting additional evidence at the Site Visit. To ensure alignment with credential program standards, the evidence submitted by the program is reviewed by trained educators who have expertise in the specific program area. In addition, the reviewers have access to the annual data submitted by the program, as well program completer survey data for programs with 10 or more respondents. Programs receive feedback on the review and, if the standard has not been deemed to be preliminarily aligned, the program must submit additional information for the Site Visit. If reviewers identify issues that warrant further review or if questions remain unanswered at the conclusion of the Program Review, the sixth year Site Visit may include a more detailed review of such programs.

Common Standards Review

The Commission's Common Standards ensure that institutions have the capacity and resources to effectively operate their educator preparation programs. The Common Standards address the institutional Infrastructure of the educator preparation unit, the implementation and monitoring of the candidate recruitment and support mechanisms, the course of study and its integration with clinical practice, the continuous improvement process at the program and institution level, and the program impact the institution is having on TK-12 education.

Review Process

The review of Common Standards mirrors the Program Review process with teams of trained experts reviewing materials such as organizational charts, faculty vitae, documents demonstrating the type of resources devoted to support the credential program and determine whether the Common Standards are preliminarily aligned or whether the institution must submit additional information prior to the Site Visit.

Site Visits

An accreditation team visits each institution in the sixth year of the accreditation cycle. The results of the Program Review process and Common Standards review, annual data, survey data from program completers, employers and mentor teachers, and any available evidence are made available to the Site Review team. Site Visit teams make a determination as to whether a program standard is met, met with concerns, or not met. The Site Visit results in an

accreditation recommendation for consideration and action by the Committee on Accreditation (COA).

Review Process

The accreditation Site Visit team is composed of three to seven Board of Institutional (BIR) members, responsible for reviewing all programs at an institution. The site team examines all available evidence to determine whether that evidence substantiates and confirms, or contradicts, the initial findings of Program Review regarding alignment with program standards. The team also reviews evidence to determine if the educational unit meets the Common Standards. Evidence comes from a variety of sources representing the full range of stakeholders, including written documents and interviews with representative samples of significant stakeholders. Each program in operation participates fully in the interview schedule. Additional team members with expertise in specific program areas(s) may be added for programs identified as needing additional study during the Site Visit. The Site Visit team makes a determination about each Common Standard and credential program standard. The Site Visit Team then makes an accreditation recommendation to the COA, which has the responsibility for making the accreditation decision, as described below.

Procedures for Determining Educator Preparation Program Accreditation

After reviewing the recommendation of a Site Visit team that includes information from all the accreditation activities, the COA makes a decision about the accreditation of educator preparation programs at an institution. The *Accreditation Framework*, which guides the accreditation process, calls for three categories of accreditation decisions: Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, and Denial of Accreditation. Within that rubric, the COA makes one of five decisions pertaining to each institution:

- *Accreditation* – The institution has demonstrated that, when judged as a whole, it meets or exceeds the Common and Program Standards. The institution is judged to be effective in preparing educators and demonstrates overall quality in its programs and general operations.
- *Accreditation with Stipulations* – The institution has been found to have some Common Standards or Program Standards not met or not fully met. The deficiencies are primarily technical in nature and generally relate to operational, administrative, or procedural concerns. The institution is judged to be effective overall in preparing educators and general operations.
- *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* – The institution has been found to have significant deficiencies in Common Standards or Program Standards. Areas of concern are tied to matters of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence. The institution demonstrates quality and effectiveness in some of its credential programs and general operations, but effectiveness is reduced by the identified areas of concern.
- *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* – The institution has been found to have serious deficiencies in Common Standards or Program Standards. Significant areas of concern have been identified and tied to matters of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence in one or more programs. A probationary stipulation may require that severely deficient programs be discontinued. The

institution may demonstrate quality and effectiveness in some of its credential programs and general operations, but the effectiveness is overshadowed by the identified areas of concern.

- *Denial of Accreditation* – The COA can deny accreditation upon either an initial visit or a revisit to an institution. Although a recommendation of Denial of Accreditation typically comes after a finding of probationary status at an initial visit and after the institution has been provided with an opportunity to institute improvements a review team can recommend Denial of Accreditation at any time if the situation warrants the finding in accordance with this section of the Accreditation Framework.

a) Initial Visits

A COA decision of Denial of Accreditation upon an accreditation site visit means that extremely serious and pervasive issues exist at an institution. In these instances, the COA has determined that it is highly unlikely that the issues and concerns identified by a review team and COA can be successfully addressed and rectified in a timely manner. The particular facts, the leadership and/or the infrastructure indicate that a significant amount of time and work must be devoted should the institution choose to address the identified issues, during which time it is not prudent to have candidates enrolled in the credential program.

b) Revisits

If an accreditation team, upon conducting a revisit to an institution that received major or probationary stipulations, finds that the stipulations have not been adequately addressed or remediated, or determines that significant and sufficient progress has not been made towards addressing the stipulations, a revisit would be required. If an accreditation team finds that: (a) sufficient progress has been made, and/or (b) special circumstances described by the institution justify a delay, the COA may, if requested by the institution, permit an additional period of time for the institution to remedy its severe deficiencies. If the COA votes to deny accreditation, all credential programs must close at the end of the semester or quarter in which the decision has taken place. In addition, the institution's institutional approval ceases to be valid at that time and the institution will no longer be a CTC approved credential program sponsor.

Institutions accredited with stipulations are required to address the stipulations within one calendar year. Institutions are required to prepare a written report with appropriate documentation that they have taken action to address the stipulations. In the case of major or probationary stipulations, institutions are also required to prepare for a revisit that focuses on the areas of concern noted by the accreditation team during the original visit and progress reports are often required within months, sometimes weeks, from when the COA has taken action. Throughout this process, institutions receive technical assistance from Commission staff in developing responses and preparing for revisits.

An institution receiving Denial of Accreditation is required to take immediate steps to close all credential programs at the end of the semester or quarter in which the COA decision took

place. The institution is prohibited from re-applying for accreditation for two years. Denial of Accreditation is an option for accreditation teams and the COA upon an initial visit or after a revisit.

Commission Review

Summary information about each of the accreditation activities is included in the COA Annual Report on Accreditation submitted by the COA to the Commission. The accreditation reports can be found at Accreditation Reports for Commission Approved Institutions.

Section VIII: Low Performing

Please provide the following information about low performing teacher preparation programs in your state. (§207(a))

Criteria Used to Classify Low Performing Preparation Programs
The Commission monitors the quality of educator preparation programs through its accreditation system. Accreditation is granted to those institutions that meet the Commission's standards of quality and effectiveness. Institutions that do not meet Commission standards are precluded from offering educator preparation programs in California.

The Commission uses its accreditation procedures to identify and assist low-performing institutions and those at risk of becoming low performing programs of teacher preparation. California revised its definitions of Low Performing and At Risk of Becoming Low Performing in 2011. For the purpose of meeting the requirements of Title II, section 208(a) of the Higher Education Act, California uses the following procedures and criteria concerning low-performing institutions:

Low Performing Institutions
An institution that is determined by an Accreditation Review team and the COA to have failed to meet a significant number of the Commission's standards of quality and effectiveness and receives an accreditation decision of ***Probationary Stipulations*** would be designated as low performing. Such an institution would be required to respond to the stipulations and provide evidence within one calendar year that the concerns noted by the review team have been addressed. Institutions receiving Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations are required to have a revisit that focuses on the areas of concern noted by the Accreditation team during the original visit. If the institution does not address the stipulations, the COA would deny accreditation.

At Risk of Becoming Low Performing
An institution that is determined by an accreditation team and the COA to receive ***Accreditation with Major Stipulations*** is at risk of becoming a low-performing institution. Such an institution is required to respond to the stipulations and provide evidence within one calendar year that the concerns noted by the review team have been addressed. Institutions receiving Accreditation with Major Stipulations are required to have a revisit that focuses on the areas of concern noted by the accreditation team during the original visit.

For 2022-23, there were no institutions designated as "at risk of becoming low performing institution."

For detailed information about the accreditation status including most recent accreditation reports, next Site Visit, etc. please see the following link: Accreditation Reports

Section IX: Teacher Shortage

The reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 2008 included new provisions addressing teacher shortage.

The 2008 Reauthorized Higher Education Act states the following:
Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route to state credential program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students. (§205(a)(1)(A)(ii)),(§206(a)).

Tables 9a and 9b on page 22 provides data of annual goals to increase the number of prospective teachers in mathematics, science, and special education by teacher preparation programs for 2021-22. Detailed responses by each program sponsor to annual goals for shortage areas such as mathematics, science, and special education are presented via the Title II data dashboards at Title II web page.

State Grants to Recruit New Teachers
The Commission administers nine state-funded grant programs, four of which focus solely on recruiting and retaining the teacher workforce: the Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program, the Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grant Program, Local Solutions to the Shortage of Special Education Teachers Grant Program, and the Teacher Residency Grant Program. Together, these grant programs—and all of the grant programs administered by the Commission--help to recruit, prepare, support, and retain more individuals into the teaching profession, provide expanded and streamlined options for earning a California teaching credential, support induction of teachers into the profession, and support the continued professional learning of teachers and other school professionals.

The 2022-23 state budget earmarked and additional $285 million dollars to the Commission to continue to administer grants to address teacher shortages. An additional $250 million dollars in grant funds was provided to support the development and implementation of school counselor residencies and to continue to support teacher residency programs for teachers in designated shortage fields which includes special education, bilingual education, science, computer science, technology, engineering, mathematics, transitional kindergarten, and any other fields identified by the Commission. Furthermore, $20 million dollars was appropriated for the Statewide Residency Technical Assistance Center, which would provide leadership, expertise, and professional development for current and prospective teacher and school counselor residency programs. Last, the state budget included $15 million to support

credentialed teachers to add a Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) or a Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist (RLLS) credential through a Commission-approved program.

Information on the state-funded grant programs administered by the Commission is available at: Grant Funded Programs webpage.

Section X: Use of Technology

The reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 2008 included new provisions addressing the use of technology. Beginning with the 2008-09 reporting year, all preparation programs and each state are required to respond to these new provisions. This section addresses these new requirements. *(§205(b)(1)(K))*

Provide the following information about the use of technology in your teacher preparation program. Please note that choosing "yes" indicates that your teacher preparation program would be able to provide evidence upon request.

Does your program prepare teachers to:

- Integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction?
- Use technology effectively to collect data to improve teaching and learning?
- Use technology effectively to manage data to improve teaching and learning?
- Use technology effectively to analyze data to improve teaching and learning?

Provide a description of the evidence that your program uses to show that it prepares teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction, and to use technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data in order to improve teaching and learning for the purpose of increasing student academic achievement. Include a description of the evidence your program uses to show that it prepares teachers to use the principles of universal design for learning, as applicable. Include planning activities and a timeline if any of the four elements listed above are not currently in place.

The Commission's standards require all programs to address the use of technology to support instruction. In addition, the Commission's adopted Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) provide clear expectations for candidates to be able to effectively use instructional technology in their classrooms.

Detailed responses to the Technology questions by each teacher preparation program are available at the data dashboards: Title II web page.

Section XI: Statewide Improvement Efforts

List and describe any steps taken by the state during the past year to improve the quality of the current and future teaching force. (§205(d)(2)(A)).

Development of a PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Credential
In recent years, California has made a commitment to providing universal Transitional Kindergarten and have expanded opportunities for state preschools for the young learners. In working toward that important statewide goal, a Pre-Kindergarten-3 (PK-3) Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Credential is currently being developed by the Commission to help meet the unprecedented need for qualified teachers representing a diverse workforce that reflects the children and families/guardians they serve in PK-grade 3. This PK-3 ECE Specialist Credential will provide accelerated pathways for current Multiple Subject Credential as well as Child Development Teacher Permit (CDP) holders with a bachelor's degree to earn the credential and begin serving as quickly as possible in Universal PreK/TK settings.

In October 2022, the Commission adopted program standards and associated Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for the PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) credential. These standards and TPEs may be found at the following link: PK-3 ECE Program Standards and TPEs. The Commission is currently in the process of promulgating regulations and reviewing program proposals for this credential.

Improving Teacher Preparation in Special Education
In 2018, the Commission adopted a new credential structure for special education as part of an larger reform effort in the state to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this effort, the Commission focused on revamping standards, accreditation processes, and teacher preparation. As part of that adoption, the Commission reduced the number of preliminary Education Specialist credentials it issues from seven to five.

- Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs
- Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs
- Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education
- Education Specialist: Visual Impairments

New program standards for Education Specialist educator preparation programs were adopted as well as a set of Teaching Performance Expectations for each of the preliminary credentials to be issued. All educator preparation programs have transitioned to the 2018 Education Specialist program in July 2022. The Teaching Performance Assessment for teachers seeking an Education Specialist credential was implemented in October 2022.

Improving Teacher Preparation in Bilingual Education
In 2020, the Commission convened a panel to review and update the Bilingual Authorization program standards and adopt new Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations.

After extensive consultation with the field and an expert panel, the Commission adopted new Bilingual Authorization Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations. All existing Commission approved bilingual programs transitioned to the new standards on or before July 1, 2023.

Reading and Literacy Instruction Standards Adopted
In October 2022, the Commission adopted new Reading and Literacy Instructions Standards and teaching performance expectations (TPEs) for Multiple Subject, Single Subject English, and Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs credential programs. In February 2023, the Commission adopted new Reading and Literacy Instructions Standards and TPEs for Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Early Childhood Special Education, and Visual Impairment credential programs. All programs must align to these new standards and TPEs by July 1, 2024.

Recent Legislation Impacting Teacher Preparation
In the period of July 1, 2022 – June 31, 2023, the legislature passed, and the governor signed into law, the following bills impacting teacher preparation.

- SB 114 (Budget) of 2023, Section 35 - Alters the Teacher Residency Grant Program to require a residency candidate to agree to serve in any public school in California for at least 4 school years. Increases the amount of the grants to be up to $40,000 per residency candidate. Requires grant recipients receiving an award during and after the 2023–24 fiscal year to provide residency candidates with a minimum compensation package of no less than $20,000.
- SB 114 (Budget) of 2023, Section 89 & 90 - Expands the Golden State Teachers Grant eligibility to California students who are enrolled in a teacher preparation program only offered on-line by IHEs that meet the criteria in state statute.

Annual Data Collection System
The Commission developed an annual data system, the Accreditation Data System (ADS) in spring 2017. The purpose of the ADS is to collect detailed data from all Commission-approved program sponsors each year and to make that information available for program improvement purposes as well as to inform the accreditation team. This annual data collection system helps to collect and analyze data in a timely manner. ADS was piloted in the 2017-18 academic year with full implementation in the 2018-19 year. Commission staff made revisions of the data elements collected as well as made the definitions clearer. Commission staff continue to provide technical assistance to all approved programs via assigned office hours specifically designated to answer questions related to ADS. The goal is to ensure that the ADS is user-friendly based on the feedback from the approved programs. Staff analyze the data collected and data elements collected via ADS are displayed in the form of data dashboards. Commission staff developed a comprehensive set of data dashboards that were tested during the 2019-20

accreditation site visits and have continued with all accreditation visits going forward. An annual update on ADS was presented to the Commission in April 2021. More details about the ADS are available at ADS webpage.

Data Dashboards
Commission staff continue to develop and publish data in the form of dashboards to make the data transparent and easily accessible to the general public. The 2021-22 Title II dashboards are available on the Commission's Title II web page.

Statewide Data Collaboration
Commission staff continue to collaborate with staff from other state agencies to provide data for various statewide data projects. California Statewide Assignment Accountability System (CalSASS) is a new system of assignment monitoring allowing annual monitoring of all certificated educator assignments. CalSASS works through the comparison of the California Department of Education's California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) assignment data and the Commission's Credential authorization data by educator's California Statewide Educator Identifier (SEID). Through this comparison the system identifies questionable assignments, referred to as "exceptions", and provides Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and County Offices of Education (COE) with an opportunity to address anomalies and correct misassignments. The initial report related to the Educator Monitoring pursuant to Assembly Bill 1219 was presented at the October 2022 Commission Meeting.

Commission's Executive Director, Chair, Division Directors, and data staff were actively involved in the statewide data system (Cradle-to-Career) that started development in 2020. Cradle-to-Career Data System: Final Report to the Legislature was submitted in June 2021. The System had its first successful upload of data from providers in October 2023, and it anticipates having its first teacher dashboards available in summer 2024.

Commission's Response to COVID-19
Like the rest of the nation, educator preparation in California was significantly impacted by the pandemic and educator preparation is still addressing some of the significant impacts. During the pandemic, the Commission staff developed a specific COVID-19 web page to provide assistance to all stakeholder groups. The web page provided information related to Commission, legislative, and gubernatorial actions taken in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Most recently, the Legislature and the Governor passed SB 114 (Chap. 48, Statutes of 2023) which exempted certain candidates who were impacted during the pandemic from taking and passing a teaching performance assessment (TPA). The Commission continues to monitor the number of candidates and program completers who were enrolled in preparation programs during the pandemic who have not yet completed all program or state requirements as well as other workforce shortage issues exacerbated by the pandemic.