



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

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

December 2025

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

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
May Lee State Office Complex
651 Bannan Street, Suite 600
Sacramento, CA 95811

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

State of California
Gavin Newsom, Governor
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

This list reflects the composition of the Commission at the time of adoption of the 2024 Annual Report on the California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program in December 2024. Current membership of the Commission is available on the [Members of the Commission](#) webpage.

Commission Member

Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, Chair
Jose Cardenas, Vice Chair

Danette Brown
Juan Cruz
Christopher Davis
Michael De La Torre
Ruben Mancillas
Ira Lit
David Simmons
Richard Simpson
Mike Torres
Phuong Uzoff

Ex-Officio Representatives

Kathryn Williams Browne
Annamarie Francois
Shireen Pavri
Deborah Erickson

Executive Director

Mary Vixie Sandy

Representing

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

Representing

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

Representing

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Report to the Legislature on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants Program	4
Introduction	4
Background	4
Year 2 Annual Data Report on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program	5
Partnerships Between Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and California Community Colleges	7
Program Implementation Progress	9
Program Completion	12
Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of Candidates and Completers.....	13
Program Funding	15
Program Narratives	17

Executive Summary

This 2025 Annual Report to the Legislature on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants provides an update on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants (Integrated Grants) as required by statute (Education Code §44259.1) that mandates grantees to provide program and outcome data for at least five years after receiving the grant, through the 2027-28 fiscal year.

The 2022-23 Committee on Budget, Education Finance: Education Omnibus Budget Trailer Bill, AB 181, authorized the Commission to allocate \$20 million in one-time grants to regionally accredited institutions of higher education (IHEs) for four-year integrated teacher preparation programs, including student teaching, and/or to adapt an existing Commission-approved five-year integrated teacher preparation program to a four-year program. These grants support the planning for, creation of, or expansion of four-year integrated programs of professional preparation that produce teachers in the designated shortage fields of special education, bilingual education, science, health, computer science, technology, engineering, mathematics, transitional kindergarten, or kindergarten and/or that partner with a California community college to create an integrated program of professional preparation. This 2025 state report includes information on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program and reflects the second year of program data collected for 2024-25 fiscal year.

This report is organized with the following headings:

- Introduction
- Background
- Year 2 Annual Data Report on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program
- Partnerships Between Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and California Community Colleges
- Program Implementation Progress
- Program Completion
- Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of the Participants and Completers
- Program Funding
- Program Narratives
- Summary and Conclusion

Overall findings for the 2024-25 fiscal year are summarized below:

- All grantees reported progress planning and/or implementing grant programs, including 70 percent of grantees developing partnerships with California Community Colleges.
- In the second year, 115 candidates earned their undergraduate degree and preliminary credential in the first year of the grant program to address the teacher shortage.
- Over 81 percent of candidates and completers belong to an underrepresented ethnic/racial group.
- Grantees will continue to plan and/or recruit integrated candidates to complete their undergraduate education and preliminary certification.

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

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

Introduction

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

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

Background

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

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

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

Grantees must provide program and outcome data for at least five years after receiving the grant, through the 2027-28 fiscal year. This 2025 state report includes information on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program and reflects the second year of program data collected for the 2024-25 fiscal year. The report includes information on both Integrated Planning and Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants, and addresses the following topics: grantee information, California Community College partnerships, implementation progress, credentials issued, candidate demographics, program expenditures, and direct narratives from grantees. To support annual data collection, the Commission staff hosted three forums (i.e., office hours) for grant managers, and any additional staff, to ask the Commission and the broader Integrated Grant community questions and to share best practices. All IHEs successfully submitted the annual data reporting requirements.

Year 2 Annual Data Report on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program

In November 2022, the Commission published the first Request for Application (RFA) for the Integrated Grants Program. Following a competitive RFA process, in March 2023, the Commission conditionally funded 20 Integrated Planning Grants and 15 Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants to Institutions of Higher Education. Round One awarded a total of \$12,171,019.40. With \$7,828,980.55 grant funds remaining, the Commission published Round Two of the Integrated Grants RFA in March 2023 and awarded six Integrated Planning Grants and three Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants in May 2023. In total after Round One and Round Two awards, the Commission funded 26 Integrated Planning Grants for a total of \$6,175,077.87 and 18 Integrated Implementation/Expansion grants for a total of \$8,675,848.58, for a combined total of \$14,850,926.45 in one-time grant awards.

Table 1 shows the summary of grant awards and grant funds, per type of Integrated Grant Program. Appendices A and B provide a complete list of each grantee, the total grant award, 2024-25 expenditures, and the amount of grant funds remaining for the Planning Grant and Implementation/Expansion Grant, respectively. The Integrated Grant funds are one-time awards, and all grantees must expend grant funds by the end of the two-year liquidation period that follows the grant end date of June 30, 2025.

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

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

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

Table 2: Type of IHE Awarded, per grant type

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

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

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

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

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

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

more program focus areas, so the total number of program focus areas in Table 4 is larger than the total number of grantees. Note that Single Subject Science in Table 4 includes Biological Science, Chemistry, Geosciences, and Physics. PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Instruction Credential was the most common program focus area for Integrated Planning Grants (29.41%). For Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants, Education Specialist (Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs) was the most common program focus area (33.33%). For a complete list of program focus area(s) per grantee and the type of program planning and implementation, see [Appendices C](#) and [D](#).

Table 4: Program Focus Area, by Grant Program Area

Program Focus Area	Planning (n=34)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=48)
Multiple Subject	5.88%	14.58%
Multiple Subject with kindergarten and/or transitional kindergarten focus	0%	2.08%
Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization	0%	20.83%
Single Subject: Science	11.76%	12.5%
Single Subject: Mathematics	2.94%	12.5%
Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs	14.7%	33.33%
Education Specialist with Bilingual Authorization	8.82%	0%
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education	26.47%	4.17%
PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Instruction Credential*	29.41%	0%

**There were no Commission approved PK-3 Early Childhood Specialist Instruction Credential programs at the time the implementation and expansion grant RFA was issued.*

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

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

provided in Table 3, which only reflects the number of grantees that are solely focused on planning with CCC partners. Across both program types, close to 70 percent of grantees have at least one CCC partner as of the second year of the grant program. While the percentages in Table 5 remain the same, the number of CCC partners has increased for grantees. Appendices C and D provide a complete list of each grantee and CCC partner(s) across both grant types. A majority of Planning grantees and Implementation/Expansion grantees reported that their partnerships with community colleges focused on transfer pipelines, dual enrollment, and recruitment of teacher candidates. There are some grantees for both grants that reported no community college collaboration at all, indicating uneven engagement across institutions. In particular, the Planning grant recipients place less emphasis on community colleges with most responses centered on school district partnerships. Where the partnerships do exist, they directly support recruitment and transfer pipelines, helping to address teacher shortages by drawing students from community colleges into teacher preparation programs. One grantee with an Implementation/Expansion grant reported *“Partnerships with community colleges increased awareness and created a clearer transfer route, though formal articulation documents are still being drafted.”*

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

Program Implementation Status	Planning (n=26)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=18)
At least one CCC or CCC District Partner	69.23%	72.22%
Total number of CCC Partners	44	63
Total number of CCC District Partners	3	1

Collaboration with community colleges and local education agencies (LEAs) emerged as a hallmark of success. Community college partners contributed to transfer pathways, articulation agreements, and curriculum design. LEAs partnered in program design, clinical placements, and pipeline development from high schools to teacher preparation. The following are direct comments from Planning grantees describing the positive impact of their partnerships:

- *“Our nascent but promising work with high school Career and Technical Education programs in ECE, particularly the exciting prospect of a 2+2 program with the Santa Ana Unified School District, is another testament to our innovative recruitment approach.”*
- *“We have successfully created articulation agreements with three partner community colleges...laying the groundwork for seamless transfer pathways for students.”*

Grantees emphasized the importance of strong pipelines from community colleges and school districts. Multiple campuses developed articulation agreements, dual enrollment opportunities, and collaborative advising with community college partners. Programs also created new agreements with school districts, ensuring clinical placement opportunities and recruitment into teacher preparation with one institution noting: *“We experienced an increase in the*

number of community college transfer students, indicating that our outreach efforts and newly strengthened partnerships...are beginning to pay off.”

Several campuses successfully expanded flexible on-ramps into teaching, allowing students to explore teaching without committing immediately to a credential program. Internships, early coursework, and cross-enrollment at universities offered students multiple opportunities to engage with the profession. Online tutoring, hybrid courses, and targeted internships further increased accessibility.

Program Implementation Progress

Program implementation and candidate completion data in the state report reflects the second year (2024-25) data that was submitted at the end of June 2025. Table 6 provides an updated implementation status for each Integrated Grant program type as of the end of the 2024-25 academic year across all the program focus areas listed in Table 4. Note that Appendix C reflects the estimated implementation date Planning grantees indicated on the initial planning grant applications, which may have changed for grantees in the first planning year. The majority of IHE Planning grantees plan to enroll candidates in the 2025-26 academic year, while the majority of the Implementation and Expansion grantees have programs in progress (39.58%) or were implemented in the Fall of 2024 (41.67%). Close to 28 percent of Planning grantees will continue planning efforts in the 2025-26 academic year, and only four percent of Implementation/Expansion grantees will continue to plan before enrolling candidates.

In an open-ended narrative response asking about successes of the Integrated Program, grantee responses reflect substantial progress across recruitment, curriculum development, institutionalization, and partnerships. Collectively, these successes demonstrate that the Planning Grants are achieving their purpose of laying the groundwork for integrated teacher preparation pathways in California.

Institutions reported measurable gains in student recruitment and enrollment as a direct result of the Planning Grant. Internal and external recruitment strategies yielded new student cohorts across BA and post-baccalaureate programs. Some institutions exceeded their targets and provided scholarships to attract and retain candidates. One grantee shared: *“Thanks to our enormous effort for recruiting and advertising the teaching preparation program for PK-3 credential we can meet our goal for recruitment for B.A. 2025-2026 and exceed the goal for post-bacc.”*

Another major success of the Planning Grants has been the completion of new course designs, revised sequences, and alignment of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) to coursework. Programs embedded student teaching into undergraduate pathways and developed specialized tracks in bilingual education, STEM, biology, and special education. The following quotes from grant recipients highlight the successes:

- *“Final development of a PK3 Credential Program of Study done in consultation with interdisciplinary university and community college faculty.”*

- *“We completed the design and approval process of five new Liberal Studies courses and nine new Special Education courses for the SPED-ITEP pathway.”*

Responses from the Integrated Implementation and Expansion Grants also indicate successes that led to substantial progress in modernizing curricula, increasing student enrollment, strengthening retention, and building sustainable pipelines into the teaching profession. These successes reflect a strong return on state investment and position the integrated teacher preparation model as a viable and scalable solution to California’s teacher shortage.

A major success across institutions has been the comprehensive redesign of Liberal Studies and related teacher preparation programs. Campuses aligned coursework with current Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and strategically reduced unit counts to accelerate time-to-degree. Several programs now allow students to complete a bachelor’s degree and credential in four years, increasing accessibility and reducing costs. As one program indicated *“We successfully reduced the IBC program’s unit count from 116 to 91 units, enabling students to complete the Integrated Bachelor’s Degree and Teaching Credential within four years.”*

These streamlined pathways ensure that students graduate both degree- and credential-eligible, strengthening California’s teacher workforce.

Recruitment efforts funded by the grant yielded measurable gains. Multiple campuses reported exponential increases in participation, particularly in bilingual and special education pathways. Some programs achieved growth rates of 200–300% compared to the prior year. High school outreach, community college pipelines, and dual enrollment agreements were critical contributors. One grantee shared that *“Since receiving the grant, the number of undergraduates pursuing a BA in Liberal Studies with a bilingual authorization has grown exponentially from zero to nearly 20.”*

Institutions restructured advising systems and deployed financial supports to improve retention and completion. Several campuses disbursed large amounts of grant-funded scholarships, some exceeding \$100,000, to help students persist. Academic supports, including tutoring, exam preparation for RICA and edTPA, and dedicated advising, were implemented to address known barriers. Program sustainability has been strengthened through new faculty hires, expanded advising capacity, and cross-departmental collaboration. Many campuses reported hiring tenure-track faculty and professional staff to oversee outreach, advising, and program logistics. Institutionalization of the integrated pathways in university catalogs and advising systems reflects long-term commitment.

Table 6: Program Implementation Status, by Grant Program Type

Program Implementation Status	Planning (n=36*)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=47*)
Did Not Implement in 2024-25	27.78%	4.17%
Plan to Enroll Candidates 2025-26	41.67%	10.42%

Program Implementation Status	Planning (n=36*)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=47*)
Program In-Progress	13.89%	39.58%
Implemented Fall 2024-25	11.11%	41.67%
Implemented Spring 2024-25	5.56%	4.17%

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

Grantees were also asked about the challenges they faced with the implementation of the grant. Both Planning and Implementation/Expansion grantees faced systemic barriers: slow and complex approval processes, curriculum integration challenges, financial aid inequities, recruitment and retention difficulties, and administrative/staffing shortages. Grantees emphasized the difficulty of creating and revising curricula to embed Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) throughout program design. The process was described as time-intensive, iterative, and resource-heavy, requiring extensive faculty coordination and repeated adjustments in response to CTC feedback. Grantees across both programs faced bureaucratic bottlenecks in approval processes, including delays with CTC Initial Program Review, CSU Chancellor’s Office approvals, and federal Title IV authorization. These delays slowed the ability to launch programs and restricted students’ access to financial aid. In addition, both groups identified retention as a concern, particularly for first-generation students, who often needed additional advising and financial support to persist. A majority of the grant recipients shared that a challenge was the ineligibility of integrated students for Pell Grants and other federal aid. This restriction reduced enrollment, especially among low-income and transfer students, and made programs at private institutions less accessible. Both sets of grantees reported staffing instability, including turnover in key positions and limited faculty capacity to manage added workload. Some external challenges reported by both groups included statewide enrollment declines, budget instability, and inconsistent K–12 hiring capacity.

In addition to the shared challenges, each respective grant program experienced unique challenges. The Planning Grant recipients shared challenges that come with being at the front end of development, and their primary struggles were tied to initial program design and approval. Several institutions faced faculty resistance or disagreements over program rigor and structure, delaying curricular approvals. Some campuses reported limited faculty expertise in Special Education or PK-3 credentialing, which slowed pathway development. Because many programs were not yet fully launched, Planning grantees highlighted concerns over whether sufficient student interest and institutional support existed to sustain programs once implemented.

The challenges that were unique to Implementation/ Expansion grantees included those tied to the rigor and accelerated pace of integrated pathways. Candidates balancing part-time work with heavy course loads often fell behind or missed credential application deadlines. While Planning grantees focused on early partnership-building, Implementation/ Expansion grantees confronted the day-to-day challenges of advising transfer students through complex

articulation agreements and program requirements. Several Implementation/ Expansion grantees reported that as enrollment expanded, challenges emerged around placement capacity, faculty load, and maintaining program quality at scale.

While Planning Grantees and Implementation/Expansion Grantees faced similar systemic challenges, their unique contexts shaped the specific obstacles they encountered. Planning grantees struggled primarily with early-stage approvals, faculty alignment, and program viability, while Implementation & Expansion grantees contended with student retention, transfer pathways, and scaling pressures.

Program Completion

Completion data in the state report reflects candidates in Implementation/Expansion Grant programs, and the total credentials earned during the second year of the Planning grant. Table 7 provides a summary of candidates' progress, by credential area, indicating the number of integrated candidates with junior class standing (minimum of 60 semester units), senior class standing (minimum 90 semester units), other candidates, candidates that dropped out or left the program, and candidates that earned their undergraduate degree and credential. Note that the percentages in Table 7 are calculated by credential area and the completer data percentages are calculated using the total number of completers, not the total number of candidates across each credential area. Some of the reported "other" candidate standing circumstances include enrolling candidates with freshman and sophomore standing, community college students supported by the grant, and candidates that have earned their undergraduate degree, but are still working on completing credential assessments (i.e., TPA, RICA). While Single Subject Science (Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geoscience, and Physics combined, 49.81%) and Single Subject Mathematics (29.26%) were the two largest groups of candidates, Multiple Subject without Bilingual Authorization and Mild to Moderate Support Needs preliminary credentials were the two largest groups of credentials earned (30.43% and 21.74%, respectively).

Table 7: Candidate Progress, by Credential Area

Credential Area	Total Candidates (n=1193)	Junior Class Standing (n=699)	Senior Class Standing (n=320)	Other Candidates (n=163)	Dropped or Left Program (n=11)	Credentials Earned (n=115)
Multiple Subject	90 (7.54%)	35 (5.01%)	46 (14.38%)	5 (3.07%)	4 (36.36%)	19 (16.52%)
Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization	182 (6.31%)	89 (12.73%)	88 (27.50%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (45.45%)	35 (30.43%)
Single Subject- Mathematics	246 (29.26%)	162 (23.18%)	48 (15.0%)	36 (22.09%)	0 (0.00%)	20 (17.39%)
Single Subject- Science	462 (49.81%)	299 (42.78%)	74 (23.13%)	88 (53.99%)	1 (9.09%)	9 (7.83%)

Credential Area	Total Candidates (n=1193)	Junior Class Standing (n=699)	Senior Class Standing (n=320)	Other Candidates (n=163)	Dropped or Left Program (n=11)	Credentials Earned (n=115)
Mild to Moderate Support Needs	190 (15.93%)	102 (14.59%)	53 (16.56%)	3 (1.84%)	1 (9.09%)	26 (22.61%)
Extensive Support Needs	23 (2.52%)	12 (1.72%)	11 (3.44%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (5.22%)

Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of Candidates and Completers

Integrated grantees reported candidates' self-identified ethnic/racial composition and gender identity. The data in Tables 8 and 9 break down the demographics of the total Integrated Grantee candidates and program completers. Note that the total numbers reported are less than those reported in Table 7, as some candidates and completers are working on or have earned more than one credential. Additionally, note that the Asian ethnic/racial category includes Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Asian Indian, Laotian, Cambodian, Filipino, and Hmong. The Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ethnic/racial category also includes Guamanian, Samoan, and Tahitian.

In narrative responses describing how the Integrated program is meeting local teacher shortages, planning grantees report that the new pathways directly target regional shortages, especially early childhood, bilingual, and hard to staff PK3 roles. Many are forging LEA MOUs and building flexible, online hybrid options to reach working paraprofessionals. While most are early in the pipeline build-out, they emphasize strong alignment with district needs and equitable access for place bound candidates. Responses from institutions that received the Implementation /Expansion grant reported redesigning curricula to shorten time to credential or added authorizations to respond to district demand. Both Planning and Implementation/Expansion grantees report widespread, layered recruitment paired with high-touch retention have resulted in an increase in enrollment. In the 2024-25 year, there were 1218 candidates and 115 completers across the two grants. Combined the programs experienced a 55% increase in enrollment and an 80% increase in the number of completers.

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

Race/Ethnicity	Total Candidates (n= 1218)	Completers (n= 115)
American Indian or Alaska Native	3 (0.25%)	0 (0%)
Asian	208 (17.08%)	12 (10.43%)
Black or African American	40 (3.28%)	3 (2.61%)
Hispanic/Latinx (of any race)	654 (53.69%)	74 (64.35%)

Race/Ethnicity	Total Candidates (n= 1218)	Completers (n= 115)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2 (0.16%)	1 (.87%)
White	170 (13.96%)	18 (15.65%)
Two or more races	57 (4.68%)	3 (2.61%)
Decline to state Race/Ethnicity	84 (6.9%)	4 (3.48%)

Overall, 93 percent of candidates reported their gender identity; reporting this information to the Commission is voluntary for candidates in the program. Female candidates were the largest group (72.17%), followed by male candidates (23.81%).

Table 9: Gender Identity of Candidates and Program Completers

Gender Identity	Total Candidates (n=1218)	Completers (n=115)
Female	879 (72.17%)	98 (85.22%)
Male	290 (23.81%)	13 (11.3%)
Nonbinary	9 (0.74%)	1 (0.87%)
Decline to state	40 (3.28%)	3 (2.61%)

In narrative responses, Integrated grantees detailed their progress and strategies implemented to recruit and retain a candidate pool. Among the various approaches described, grantees emphasized the critical role of leveraging partnerships with community colleges in their marketing materials. The following are direct narratives from grantees:

- *“A key focus of our recruitment has been community colleges across the region, hosting information sessions, creating tailored advising guides, and building clear transfer maps so candidates can complete credentialing and contribute to the local educational workforce.”*
- *“We actively participated in Early Childhood conferences, met individually with prospective candidates, and developed program overviews and FAQs to help potential applicants, especially working paraprofessionals, plan their pathway this academic year.”*

- *“Recruitment development efforts included coordinated outreach with our partner colleges, dedicated web pages, and a credential flyer to promote the 2+2 pathway for future students.”*

Program Funding

Both Integrated Grant program types were funded as one-time grant awards in the 2022-23 fiscal year. Grantees have a two-year liquidation period to expend grant funds through June 30, 2025. Grantees will continue to report annual implementation and candidate progress after grant funds have been expended through the 2027-28 academic year. Table 10 provides the total grant award, the total amount expended in the 2024-25 fiscal year, the percentage expended, and the total amount of remaining funds. After the first year of expenditures, close to 27 percent of planning grantees expended half or more of awarded funds, while none of the implementation/expansion grantees expended half or more of awarded funds. During the second fiscal year (2024-25) 77 percent of grant funds have been expended.

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

Type	Grant Award	Total Expended	% Expended	Remaining Funds
Planning	\$6,175,077.87	\$4,800,726.89	77.74%	\$1,374,350.98
Implementation/Expansion	\$8,675,848.58	\$6,677,617.00	76.97%	\$1,998,231.58
Total	\$14,850,926.45	\$11,478,343.89	77.29%	\$3,372,582.56

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

- Administration costs
- Coordination with California Community College(s) IHE personnel: Salaries
- Developing recruitment strategies for the integrated program
- IHE faculty/personnel: Release time for course redesign and/or creating summer courses for students in a four-year integrated program
- IHE faculty/personnel: Salaries
- IHE faculty/personnel: Stipends
- IHE faculty/personnel: Stipends for program coordinators to assist in collaboration with subject matter professors and pedagogy professors
- IHE faculty/personnel: Travel
- Integrated program consultant
- Other costs

Tables 11 and 12 further break down the total annual expenditures by approved budget categories across each Integrated Grant program type, Planning Grants and Implementation/Expansion Grants, respectively. For each budget category, the total grant award amount is listed and the percentage each budget category represents from the total grant award amount. Tables 11 and 12 also shows the amount expended per budget category, the percentage expended from the total grant award, and the percentage expended within each budget category. The column, “% Expended, from Total Category Budget,” reflects the

percentage of funds that were expended from the total amount budgeted across each category. Note that Integrated grantees must expend funds from budget categories approved in the grant application for the specific program approved. Grantees must receive Commission approval for any budget changes that exceed 10 percent of the total grant award.

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

For Planning Grants, release time for IHE faculty and/or personnel to support integrated course redesign and/or creating summer courses for students in a four-year integrated program (22.86% of total grant funds) and other costs (17.31% of total grant funds) were the two largest budget categories. However, for year 2, release time (22.86%) and IHE faculty/personnel stipends (14.74%) were the two categories with the highest total expenditures for the second year of planning. While expenditures for Planning Grants generally mirrored expenditures across each budget category ($\pm 7\%$), the percentage expended within each budget category differed more, with recruitment strategies expending the least amount of the total budgeted at eight percent, and stipends for program coordinators to assist in collaboration with subject matter professors and pedagogy professors expending close to 55 percent of what was budgeted. For Implementation/Expansion Grants, expenditures did not mirror budgets as closely as Planning Grants ($\pm 17\%$). Other costs (26.3%) and developing recruitment strategies (19.24%) were the two largest budget categories, however salaries for faculty and personnel (32.88%) and release time for course redesign and/or creating integrated summer courses (16.92%) were the largest expenditures in year 1. Lastly, salaries (54.21%) and stipends (44.29%) for program coordinators were the two categories that expended the most funds from what was initially budgeted.

Table 11: Planning Grant Award Expenditures by Budget Categories

Budget Categories	Total Grant Amount	% of Total Grant Award	Expended	% Expended, from Total Expenditures	% Expended, from Total Category Budget
Administration Costs	\$969,813.00	15.71%	\$857,625.83	16.16%	38.27%
Coordination with CCC(s): Salaries	\$281,134.00	4.55%	\$227,265.98	4.39%	35.88%
Recruitment Strategies	\$283,037.00	4.58%	\$99,365.12	1.01%	8.16%
Release Time	\$1,411,376.35	22.86%	\$1,160,728.60	27.13%	44.15%
Faculty/Personnel Salaries	\$897,944.00	14.54%	\$881,106.81	19.03%	48.69%
Faculty/Personnel Stipends	\$784,056.00	12.70%	\$626,266.77	14.96%	43.83%

Budget Categories	Total Grant Amount	% of Total Grant Award	Expended	% Expended, from Total Expenditures	% Expended, from Total Category Budget
Program Coordinator Stipends	\$157,698.00	2.55%	\$111,949.86	3.77%	54.88%
Travel	\$75,693.00	1.23%	\$35,669.18	0.46%	13.82%
Integrated Program Consultant	\$245,500.00	3.98%	\$151,674.81	1.85%	17.30%
Other	\$1,068,826.52	17.31%	\$649,173.88	11.26%	24.19%

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

Budget Categories	Total Grant Amount	% of Total Grant Award	Expended	% Expended, from Total Expenditures	% Expended, from Total Category Budget
Administration Costs	\$942,637.00	10.87%	\$753,741.52	11.24%	27.22%
Coordination with CCC(s): Salaries	\$307,321.23	3.54%	\$263,340.42	3.98%	29.58%
Recruitment Strategies	\$1,669,309.00	19.24%	\$1,343,890.15	15.09%	20.64%
Release Time	\$1,533,464.79	17.68%	\$964,143.08	16.92%	25.19%
Faculty/Personnel Salaries	\$1,385,122.80	15.97%	\$1,476,800.13	32.88%	54.21%
Faculty/Personnel Stipends	\$319,250.00	3.68%	\$146,797.67	3.19%	22.85%
Program Coordinator Stipends	\$109,691.53	1.26%	\$105,880.13	2.16%	44.293%
Travel	\$77,268.00	0.89%	\$42,746.66	0.06%	1.72%
Integrated Program Consultant	\$49,441.00	0.57%	\$32,799.04	0.35%	16.01%
Other	\$2,282,343.23	26.31%	\$1,548,678.00	14.13%	14.14%

Program Narratives

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

- the program's candidate recruitment progress,
- program successes and challenges,
- the degree to which the program is meeting the local teacher shortage needs,
- the impact of LEA's collaboration with CCC partner(s) and any partnerships supporting the creation, impletion, or expansion of integrated programs,

- efforts to coordinate with existing sources of candidate support, such as the Golden State Teacher Grant Program and other forms of financial aid, and
- any lessons learned.

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

Across both the Planning and the Implementation/ Expansion grantees, internal collaboration paired with community college and LEA partnerships drove design, recruitment and placements. Many build or deepened MOUs, shared advising, and fieldwork pipelines. The programs intentionally targeted bilingual/dual language, special education and STEM (math/science), adding authorizations, dual pathways, or multi-subject science coverage. Many institutions simplified requirements or reduced the number of units and time, while aligning coursework to the TPEs and new literacy standards. Both programs offered cohort models, success coaches, peer mentors, targeted workshops, and funds to provide a high level of candidate support. Recruitment efforts focused on meeting potential candidates where they are with campus visits and cross- enrollment pilots at universities followed up with consistent counselor outreach. While Planning grantees experienced success with building infrastructure, implementation and expansion grantees scaled what was working experiencing enrollment growth in priority pathways such as bilingual and special education.

Challenges experienced by both include Pell ineligibility for some integrated pathways; volatility/limits in state grants such as the Golden State Teacher Grant; and confusion when stacking BA + credential + bilingual/dual pathways. Other challenges included slow curriculum approvals; multi-unit coordination; credential application timing, while sustained support is still needed for CALTPA/RICA/CSET. There is still a shortage of bilingual/SPED supervisors and mentor teachers. Many of the candidates who are working, parenting, or are transfer students need flexible, paid experiences to persist.

The successes and challenges are captured in the direct narratives from grantees:

- *“We reduced the integrated program from 116 to 91 units, enabling four-year completion of the bachelor’s plus credential.”*
- *“A change in financial aid eligibility for integrated pathways reduced the pool of candidates who could continue without additional funding.”*
- *“A major success has been our cross-department collaboration to align coursework and clinical experiences with the ECE-TPEs; this foundational work is strengthening quality and coherence.”*
- *“We formalized an MOU with a county office and local districts to create a seamless route from AA to BA to credential, with evening/online coursework to retain educators in their communities.”*

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

1. *Grantees emphasized the importance of starting articulation early, building advising guides with concrete milestones; designing flexible course scheduling for working adults; and planning for administrative capacity (approvals, communications, and data-sharing).*
2. *Grantees underscored the significance of providing multiple on-ramps and flexibility to increase recruitment and retention. Cross-unit coordination for advising, curriculum, and financial aid must be built early and maintained. In addition, high-touch support improves persistence of candidates accompanied with early outreach to community college and LEA partners.*

Summary and Conclusion

The 2025 annual state report reflects the second year of the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants Program planning and implementation through the 2024-25 academic year. All grantees reported progress planning and/or implementing grant programs, including 72 percent of grantees developing partnerships with California Community Colleges. In the first year, 115 candidates earned their undergraduate degree and preliminary credential in the second year of the grant program to address the teacher shortage, of which 35 were Multiple Subject with Bilingual authorizations and 30 were an Education Specialist credential for either a Mild to Moderate Support Needs or Extensive Support Needs. Over 75 percent of candidates and completers belong to an underrepresented ethnic/racial group. Grantees will continue to plan and/or recruit integrated candidates to complete their undergraduate education and preliminary certification. Commission staff will continue to provide technical assistance and host office hour sessions in 2025-26 to support program planning and implementation and annual data collection.

Appendix A

Planning Grant: Total Grant Award, 2024-25 Expenditures, and Remaining Funds

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Total Grant Award	2024-25 Expenditures	% Expended	Remaining Grant Funds
Azusa Pacific University	\$249,948.00	\$126,182.80	50.48%	\$44,097.73
Biola University	\$250,000.00	\$57,965.50	23.19%	\$149,582.34
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	\$250,000.00	\$71,349.51	28.54%	\$151,587.28
California Baptist University	\$249,999.00	\$43,262.29	17.30%	\$87,050.42
Chapman University	\$249,106.00	\$140,325.85	56.33%	\$12,306.25
CSU Channel Islands	\$249,942.00	\$86,713.75	34.69%	\$19,508.26
CSU Fresno	\$249,950.00	\$115,178.27	46.08%	\$89,307.59
CSU Long Beach	\$250,000.00	\$14,685.00	5.87%	\$142,318.96
CSU Long Beach	\$250,000.00	\$83,152.10	33.26%	\$46,475.99
CSU Monterey Bay	\$250,000.00	\$97,908.20	39.16%	\$98,256.63
EDvance College	\$250,000.00	\$155,753.00	62.30%	\$0.00
Fresno Pacific University	\$249,995.00	\$55,951.00	22.38%	\$62,485.00
Humphreys University	\$131,392.00	\$11,415.00	8.69%	\$38,400.00
Humphreys University	\$104,536.00	\$8,315.00	7.95%	\$28,200.00
Jessup University	\$244,900.00	\$153,013.00	62.48%	\$0.00
Loyola Marymount University	\$250,000.00	\$164,572.32	65.83%	\$13,091.75
Mount Saint Mary's University	\$249,910.87	\$150,227.08	60.11%	\$3,046.79
San Francisco State University	\$240,240.00	\$176,990.06	73.67%	\$49,846.81
San Jose State University	\$250,000.00	\$111,807.77	44.72%	\$28,792.78
Simpson University	\$233,570.00	\$74,039.16	31.70%	\$42,521.80
Sonoma State University	\$249,629.00	\$126,455.72	50.66%	\$17,840.43
University of San Diego	\$240,795.00	\$115,501.00	47.97%	\$0.00
University of San Diego	\$250,000.00	\$134,361.55	53.74%	\$39,296.22
University of Southern California	\$249,864.00	\$21,263.00	8.51%	\$210,338.00
Vanguard University	\$233,099.00	\$78,101.98	33.51%	\$0.00
Vanguard University	\$248,202.00	\$128,946.01	51.95%	\$0.00

Appendix B

Implementation/Expansion Grant: Total Grant Award, 2024-25 Expenditures, and Remaining Funds

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Total Grant Award	2024-25 Expenditures	% Expended	Remaining Grant Funds
Azusa Pacific University	\$499,938.00	\$165,030.14	33.01%	\$213,063.08
Biola University	\$500,000.00	\$301,035.00	60.21%	\$19,652.03
Cal Poly Pomona	\$500,000.00	\$231,798.29	46.36%	\$103,599.51
Cal State LA	\$500,000.00	\$382,674.82	76.53%	\$2,709.53
California Lutheran University	\$500,000.00	\$239,145.68	47.83%	\$17,198.19
CSU Dominguez Hills	\$499,999.00	\$122,822.02	24.56%	\$296,444.19
CSU Long Beach	\$500,000.00	\$245,786.12	49.16%	\$93,777.81
CSU Northridge	\$500,000.00	\$302,333.00	60.47%	\$106,230.33
CSU Northridge	\$330,000.00	\$209,007.00	63.34%	\$35,389.18
CSU San Bernardino	\$499,996.58	\$330,908.23	66.18%	\$132,801.93
Fresno Pacific University	\$499,055.00	\$284,947.82	57.10%	\$115,296.51
Fresno State University	\$499,864.00	\$212,738.18	42.56%	\$213,292.96
Loyola Marymount University	\$500,000.00	\$249,282.57	49.86%	\$132,744.65
Saint Mary's College	\$491,478.00	\$214,560.88	43.66%	\$105,144.45
San Diego State University	\$499,975.00	\$180,219.00	36.05%	\$117,272.00
UC Berkeley	\$499,888.00	\$353,164.13	70.65%	\$19,563.42
UC Irvine	\$487,358.00	\$258,894.69	53.12%	\$97,036.38
University of Redlands	\$368,297.00	\$110,073.57	29.89%	\$177,015.43

Appendix C

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix D

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

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

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

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

*A= Adapt from a 5-year to 4-year program, C= Adding Community College Partners, E= Expansion, I= Implementation, N= New program