
4A

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Annual Reports to the Legislature on the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program, the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program, and an Update for the Commission on the 2023 Diverse Education Leaders Pipeline Initiative Program

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides the annual report for the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program; the annual report for the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program, which was revised and recast as the 2025 Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization and Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant program on July 1, 2025; and an update on the 2023 Diverse Education Leaders Pipeline Initiative (DELPI) Program.

Recommended Action: That the Commission approve the 2026 Annual Report to the Legislature on the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Program and the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program for transmittal to the Legislature by April 1, 2026.

Presenters: Jasmine Nasser and Sarah Solari Colombini, Consultants, Division of Standards, Accreditation, and Workforce Investments

Strategic Plan Goal

Educator Preparation and Advancement

- **Goal 2.** Prospective educators have multiple pathways to explore and access careers in education and advance in the profession.
 - F. Administer grant programs that expand pathways to credentialing
- **Goal 3.** California's educators reflect the diversity of the students they serve.

Annual Reports to the Legislature on the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program, the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program, and an Update for the Commission on the 2023 Diverse Education Leaders Pipeline Initiative Program

Introduction

This agenda item provides the annual report to the Legislature for the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program and the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program. It also provides an update to the Commission on the 2023 Diverse Education Leaders Pipeline Initiative (DELPI).

Background

As part of the California State Legislature's investment in teacher preparation for the purpose of expanding the workforce, the 2021-22 state budget appropriated \$15 million one-time funds, available for five years through June 30, 2026, to provide grants to TK-12 local education agencies (LEAs) to support credentialed teachers in obtaining a supplementary authorization in computer science. In 2022-23, the Legislature approved the sum of \$15 million in one-time funds for the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program. This program was designed to support credentialed teachers in adding a Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) or a Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist (RLLS) credential. In July of 2025, legislation was passed to revise and recast the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant program as the 2025 Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization and Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant program. The revision also increased the amount of the award per participant from \$2500 with a 100% local match requirement to \$6000 per participant with a one-third local match requirement and added the Reading and Literacy supplemental authorization and Mathematics Instructional added authorization to the options supported by these grant funds.

In 2023-24, the state budget appropriated \$10 million to establish the Diverse Education Leaders Pipeline Initiative. Authorizing legislation required the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to allocate these funds to LEAs through a competitive grant process for the purpose of training, placing, and retaining diverse and culturally responsive administrators in TK-12 schools to improve pupil outcomes and meet the needs of California's education workforce.

This agenda item includes two reports to the Legislature, one for the Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Program and another for the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program, and an update for the DELPI program.

Executive Summary for the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program

This report provides an update on the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program (Computer Science Grant) and presents the 2026 Annual Report to the Legislature as required by AB 130 (Chap. 44, Stats. 2021). The report details the progress of the grant program, including updated participant data, grant fund utilization, and key findings from data collected date for the 2024-25 fiscal year.

For the 2021-22 fiscal year, the Legislature allocated \$15 million to the Computer Science Grant to support credentialed teachers in obtaining a supplementary authorization in computer science. As of July 2025, 17 local education agencies (LEAs) have been awarded grants across six rounds of funding, totaling \$2,563,700. With \$12,436,300 remaining, the Commission released an eighth Request for Applications (RFA), with awards announced on November 14, 2025, and released a ninth round of funding on November 21, 2025, with grant award announcements scheduled for February 13, 2026. LEA grantees utilize grant funds to cover tuition, fees, books, and/or release time for participating teachers. A 100 percent match of grant funds is required, and funds cannot be used for administrative purposes.

The full report, found in [Attachment A](#), is structured as follows:

- 2024-25 Annual Data Report on the Computer Science Grant Program
- Institutions of Higher Education Grant Program Collaborator(s)
- Summary of All Computer Science Program Participants
- Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of Participants
- Program Narratives
- Summary and Conclusion

Key findings and updates for the 2024-25 fiscal year are summarized below:

- As of December 2025, \$2,885,450 has been awarded to 20 LEAs across eight rounds of funding, supporting 1,183 participants. Just over \$12 million remains available.
- Grantees have increased enrollment and completion rates in 2024-25. Grantees enrolled 266 participants of the 306 projected participants, representing an 86.9 percent enrollment rate.
- The grant program had its second set of completers in 2024-25, with 153 participants successfully earning a Computer Science Supplementary Authorization. These completers averaged nine years of teaching experience, with nearly 89 percent teaching at schools with high unduplicated pupil counts.
- Thirty-three participants (12.4% of total enrollment) exited the program early, with personal reasons cited as the most common cause.
- Strong partnerships with institutions of higher education (IHEs) have been critical to program success, with many grantees highlighting collaboration with IHEs as a key factor in effective implementation.
- The majority of program funds were used for tuition and fees, reinforcing the importance of financial support for teachers pursuing supplementary authorization.
- Some LEAs reported recruitment difficulties, time constraints for participants, administrative capacity challenges and financial sustainability issues as primary barriers to program implementation.

- The most common instructional model reported by grantees for newly authorized teachers was a standalone computer science course, followed by integrated classroom instruction and after-school programs.

The 2026 annual report highlights the continued growth and impact of the Computer Science Grant. Looking ahead, Round Nine applications are due January 23, 2026, with awards to be announced in February 2026. A two-year liquidation period begins effective July 1, 2026.

Executive Summary for the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program

This report provides an update on the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program and presents the 2026 Annual Report to the Legislature on the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program (Reading and Literacy Grant) as required by AB 121 (Chap. 52, Stats. 2022).

For the 2022-23 fiscal year, the Legislature approved the sum of \$15 million for the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program, and this report addresses the Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program as outlined in legislation prior to July 1, 2025. Prior legislation authorized \$2,500 one-time grant awards per participant, with a local match requirement equal to 100 percent of the grant award, to support credentialed teachers in adding a Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) or a Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist (RLLS) credential. Priority is given to eligible grant applicants for teachers that provide instruction at an [eligible schoolsite](#). Grant funds may be used to cover tuition, fees, books, and/or release time. This report responds to the requirements specified in statute and provides an update to policymakers and others interested in the grant program.

In 2025, with the passage of AB 121, the program has been revised and recast as the 2025 Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization and Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program (Math/Read/Lit Grant) for the purpose of including mathematics authorizations. In addition, the new legislation increases the award amount each participating teacher is eligible to receive while requiring one third match of grant funding and extends the dates that the funds are available to June 30, 2030. It is important to note that the revision to legislation for this grant occurred in the 2025-26 academic and fiscal year, therefore the information in this report reflects the data collected from grantees that was due July 11, 2025 for the 2024-25 academic year for the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Incentive Grant Program as it existed in prior legislation.

The full report, found in [Attachment B](#), is structured as follows:

- 2026 Data Report on the 2022 Reading and Literacy Grant Program
- Summary of all Program Participants
- Program Funding
- Comments From the Field
- Summary and Conclusion

Key Findings and updates are summarized below:

- The Reading and Literacy Grant, which has been revised and recast as the Math/Read/Lit Grant, has completed six rounds of funding since the grant's inception, awarding a total of \$4,540,000 to ten local education agencies (LEAs) of the available \$15 million, with \$10,460,000 remaining.
- The latest Request for Applications (RFA) was released in September 2025, with awards for a sixth round announced in December 2025. Awards issued during the 2025-26 fiscal year will include the new math authorizations which will be reflected in the 2027 Annual Report.
- As of July 2025, when the Commission collects annual data for review, four LEA grantees have begun implementing the program, enrolling 126 participants of the 161 projected participants for the 2024-25 fiscal year and have expended 77 percent of the 2024-25 grant allocation. Remaining grantees are set to launch programs in 2025-26.
- All LEA grantees have prioritized tuition costs, with only two grantees requesting funds for additional expenses such as books or filing fees for authorizations.
- LEA grantees have emphasized the importance of cost-effective university partnerships, proactive participant support, and strong program advertising to ensure successful implementation.

The Commission will continue to offer grant competitions twice a year until the 2029-2030 fiscal year or until all \$15 million has been awarded.

Update on the 2023 Diverse Education Leaders Pipeline Initiative Program

This report provides an update on the 2023 Diverse Education Leaders Pipeline Initiative Program (DELPI Grant). The report details the progress of the grant program, including participant data, grant fund utilization, and key findings from the 2024-25 fiscal year.

The purpose of the program is to increase diversity among public school administrators; cultivate culturally responsive leadership through professional development that centers diversity, equity, and inclusion; mitigate or remove credentialing costs for aspiring administrators; and promote improved academic and school-climate outcomes for all pupils, especially historically underserved subgroups.

In May 2024, the Commission awarded nearly the full \$10 million appropriation to ten LEAs, representing a mix of school districts, county offices of education, and charter school consortia. Collectively, grantees plan to support 367 administrator candidates across three cohorts (2024-25, 2025-26, and 2026-27).

During the 2024-25 fiscal year, the first year of implementation, grantees launched their initial cohorts, established partnerships with institutions of higher education (IHEs) and, where applicable, nonprofit educational service providers (NESPs), and began enrolling candidates. A total of 104 administrator candidates participated in the first cohort, with eight completers earning a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential by June 2025.

Program data show high levels of participation, the establishment of strong partnerships between LEAs and partner organizations, and early progress toward the statutory goals of training, placing, and retaining diverse, culturally responsive educational leaders.

The full report, found in [Attachment C](#), is structured as follows:

- Background
- Award Summary of DELPI Grantees
- Institutions of higher education and nonprofit educational service provider partnerships
- Summary of All DELPI Program Candidates
- Ethnic/Racial Composition, Gender Identification, and First Language of Candidates
- Program Funding
- Program Narratives
- Summary and Conclusion

Key findings and updates are summarized below:

- Following the award of DELPI grants in 2023-24, the 2024-25 fiscal year marked the first year of program implementation.
- A total of 104 administrator candidates enrolled in the 2024-25 cohorts, representing a 97.20 percent enrollment rate, and eight completers earned a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential by the close of the 2024-25 fiscal year.
- Grantees have expended 72% of funds allocated for the 2024-25 cohorts during the 2024-25 fiscal year. Unexpended funds from the 2024-25 fiscal year will roll forward to support Cohort 1 in subsequent years.
- Preliminary data indicate that the DELPI program is meeting its legislative goals of increasing administrator diversity. The 2024-25 cohort includes participants from a variety of racial and ethnic groups, with 79.8 percent of participants identifying as candidates of color (including Hispanic/Latinx, Asian, Black/African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and those identifying as two or more races). In terms of language diversity, nearly one-third of participants reported a first language other than English.
- Grantees have reported that the program is cultivating culturally responsive leadership and strengthening partnerships that build capacity across California's educational system.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend that the Commission approve the 2026 Annual Report to the Legislature for both the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program and for the 2022 Reading Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program for transmittal to the Legislature.

Next Steps

Commission staff will continue to implement the renewed rounds of the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program and the 2025 Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization and Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program and present annual data reports at future Commission meetings. The Commission will submit the 2026 Annual Report of the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program and the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program to the Legislature no later than April 1, 2026.

Attachment A

Report to the Legislature on the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program February 2026

Introduction

Assembly Bill 130 requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to submit an annual report by April 1 to the Legislature regarding the 2021 Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive (Computer Science) Grant Program. The requirements of the report are specified in statute and must include, but not limited to, the following:

- The number of participating local educational agencies.
- The number of grants issued.
- The number of computer science supplementary authorizations issued.
- The number of new computer science courses reported by grant recipients.

Background

For the 2021-22 fiscal year, the Legislature approved the sum of \$15 million for the Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program. This grant program provides one-time grant awards up to \$2,500 per participant, with a required 100 percent match of grant funding, to support credentialed teachers to obtain a supplementary authorization in computer science and provide instruction in computer science coursework in settings authorized by the underlying credential. Any local education agency (LEA) that successfully applies to the competitive grant may use these funds to support tuition, fees, books, and/or release time. Priority is given to eligible grant applicants for teachers that provide instruction at either of the following: (a) a school operating within a rural district and/or (b) a school with a higher share than other applicants of unduplicated pupils, as defined in Section 42238.02 of the Education Code. This funding is available for encumbrance until June 30, 2026.

Annual participant data is collected by fiscal year and submitted in July. Per legislation, annual reports are due the first of April.

2024-25 Annual Data Report on the 2021 Computer Science Grant Program

The Commission continues to award grant funds through a competitive Request for Application (RFA) process. As of December 2025, 20 local education agencies (LEAs) have been awarded grants across eight rounds of funding, totaling \$2,885,450. Following the initial award of \$955,000 to four LEAs in Round One (June 2022), \$152,500 to three LEAs in Round Two (December 2022), and \$787,500 to three LEAs in Round Three (May 2023), the Commission has awarded four additional rounds. Round Four, awarded in December 2023, provided \$337,500 to one LEA. Round Five, awarded in April 2023, allocated \$102,900 to two LEAs, Round Six, awarded in December 2024, provided \$187,500 to three LEAs, and Round 7, awarded in March 2025 provided \$40,800 to one LEA. Round 8, awarded in November 2025, allocated \$321,750 to three LEAs. With \$12,114,550 in grant funds remaining, the Commission published the RFA for

Round Nine in November 2025, with awards to be announced February 2026. Table 1 below shows the summary of grant awards and remaining grant funds, per Round.

Table 1: Award Summary of Computer Science Grants, per Round

Rounds	Date	Total Grantees	Total Funding	Remaining Funds
Round 1	June 20, 2022	4	\$955,000	\$14,050,000
Round 2	December 6, 2022	3	\$152,500	\$13,892,500
Round 3	May 12, 2023	3	\$787,500	\$13,105,000
Round 4	December 15, 2023	1	\$337,500	\$12,767,500
Round 5	April 5, 2024	2	\$102,900	\$12,664,600
Round 6	December 6, 2024	3	\$187,500	\$12,447,100
Round 7	March 21, 2025	1	\$40,800	\$12,436,300
Round 8	November 3, 2025	3	\$321,750	\$12,114,550
	Totals	20	\$2,885,450	\$12,114,550

Table 2 below provides a summary, per RFA round, of each LEA grantee, of the total number of projected participants awarded across the life of the grant through June 2026. Legislation allocates grant funds for at least 6,000 participants, assuming all participants are funded at the maximum \$2,500 in one-time grant funds. A total of 1,183 participants from the available 6,000 potential participants have been awarded (19.7%).

Table 2: Computer Science Grant Recipients, Number of Total Projected Participant Awarded, and Total Grant Award, By Round

Local Education Agency (LEA)	Round	# of Total Projected Participants Awarded	Total Grant Award
Fontana Unified School District	1	120	\$300,000
Kern County Superintendent of Schools	1	140	\$350,000
Los Angeles Unified School District	1	120	\$300,000
Potter Valley Community Unified	1	2	\$5,000
Hawthorne School District	2	30	\$75,000
Pajaro Valley Unified School District	2	11	\$27,500
Redondo Beach Unified School District	2	20	\$50,000
Alvord Unified School District	3	180	\$450,000
Los Angeles Unified School District	3	60	\$150,000
Ventura County Office of Education	3	75	\$187,500
Marysville Joint Unified School District	4*	135	\$337,500
Los Angeles County Office of Education	5	33	\$46,200**

Local Education Agency (LEA)	Round	# of Total Projected Participants Awarded	Total Grant Award
San Francisco Unified School District	5	28	\$56,700**
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	6	20	\$50,000
San Diego County Office of Education	6	35	\$87,500
Santa Clara County Office of Education	6	20	\$50,000
Riverside County Office of Education	7	24	\$40,800
Monterey County Office of Education	8	30	\$75,000
Pajaro Valley Unified School District	8	50	\$125,000
Ventura County Office of Education	8	50	\$121,750
Totals		1183	\$2,885,450

* Note that one grantee from Round 4 withdrew from the grant program after being awarded, resulting in a final total of one grantee for this round.

**Note that Los Angeles County Office of Education and San Francisco Unified School District requested funding below the \$2500 maximum per participant, \$1400 and \$2025 respectively.

Institutions of Higher Education Grant Program Collaborator(s)

To earn a Computer Science Supplementary Authorization, participants must complete twenty semester units or ten upper division semester units, or the equivalent quarter units, of non-remedial coursework within a specific subject category (introductory subjects or specific subjects). Participants do not have to complete a specific Commission-approved program or complete all coursework at one specific institution. LEAs are encouraged to collaborate with institutions of higher education (IHEs) to support participants in the grant program. To support applicants and grantees, a list of [IHEs](#) that offer the required computer science coursework is published on the Computer Science Grant webpage. Note that this list only includes IHEs that submitted program information to the Commission.

Table 3 below lists the institution of higher education (IHE) collaborators that offer the coursework needed to earn the Computer Science Supplementary Authorization.

Table 3: Computer Science Grantees and IHE Collaborator(s)

Local Education Agency (LEA)	IHE Collaborator(s)
Alvord Unified School District	University of California, Davis University of California, Riverside
Fontana Unified School District	University of California, Davis
Hawthorne School District	California State University, Dominguez Hills
Kern County Superintendent of Schools	California State University, Bakersfield

Local Education Agency (LEA)	IHE Collaborator(s)
Los Angeles County Office of Education	California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Los Angeles Unified School District	University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles Unified School District	California State University, Los Angeles
Marysville Joint Unified School District	University of California, Davis University of California, Riverside
Monterey County Office of Education	University of California, Davis University of California, Riverside
Pajaro Valley Unified School District	University of California, Irvine University of California, Riverside
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	University of California, Riverside
Potter Valley Community Unified	University of California, San Diego
Redondo Beach Unified School District	California State University, Dominguez Hills
Riverside County Office of Education	University of California, San Diego
San Diego County Office of Education	University of California, San Diego
San Francisco Unified School District	San Francisco State University
Santa Clara County Office of Education	San Jose State University
Ventura County Office of Education	California State University, Channel Islands

Summary of All Computer Science Program Participants

The following summarizes participant enrollment, completion progress, and program early exits for the 2024-25 fiscal year. The data in the state report reflects the annual data submitted from grantees in Rounds One (June 2022) through Seven (March 2025) regarding enrolled participants.

In 2024-25, grantees are maintaining strong enrollment rates. Round One and Round Two grantees maintained or decreased their enrollment rates in the third year, suggesting that recruitment is posing a challenge in subsequent years. Round Three and Four grantees continue to demonstrate strong enrollment rates, ranging from 40 percent to 100 percent in their second year of implementation.

On average, participants in 2024-25 have been teaching for nine years, slightly lower than both the 11.03-year average reported in 2023-24 and the 9.65-year average reported in 2022-23. Approximately six percent of participants in the grant program teach at a rural school, and 89 percent are teaching at a LEA with a high unduplicated pupil count (above 50%). The majority of participants continue to hold Multiple Subject credentials (61%), followed by Single Subject Mathematics (13%) and English (6%) credentials.

The Computer Science grant program saw more completers in 2024-25 with 153 participants successfully earning their Computer Science Supplementary Authorizations. These completers averaged nine years of teaching experience, with nearly 89 percent teaching at schools with high unduplicated pupil counts. The majority of completers held Multiple Subject credentials (69%), followed by Single Subject Mathematics (17%).

Table 4: Participant Awarded Slots and Enrollment, by Round

Local Education Agency (LEA)	Round	# of Annual Projected Participants Awarded in 2024-25	# of Participants Enrolled, 2022-23	# of Participants Enrolled, 2023-24	# of Participants Enrolled, 2024-25
Fontana Unified School District	1	30	21 (70.00%)	22 (73.33%)	0 (0%)
Kern County Superintendent of Schools	1	35	30 (85.71%)	32 (91.43%)	21 (70%)
Los Angeles Unified School District	1	30	10 (33.33%)	29 (96.67%)	22 (73.33%)
Potter Valley Community Unified	1	0*	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Hawthorne School District	2	10	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	6 (60%)
Pajaro Valley Unified School District	2	4	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (125%)
Redondo Beach Unified School District	2	2	0 (0%)	8 (80.00%)	0 (0%)
Alvord Unified School District	3	60	N/A	51 (85.00%)	80 (133.33%)
Los Angeles Unified School District	3	20	N/A	13 (65.00%)	19 (95%)
Ventura County Office of Education	3	25	N/A	19 (76.00%)	10 (40%)
Marysville Joint Unified School District	4	45	N/A	37 (82.22%)	42 (93.33%)
Los Angeles County Office of Education	5	33	N/A	N/A	27 (81.82%)
San Francisco Unified School District	5	14	N/A	N/A	15 (107%)
Placentia Yorba Linda Unified School District	6	0**	N/A	N/A	N/A
San Diego County Office of Education	6	10	N/A	N/A	4 (40%)
Santa Clara County Office of Education	6	20	N/A	N/A	15 (75%)
Riverside County Office of Education	7	24	N/A	N/A	0 (0%)
Totals		362	62 (52.99%)	222 (83.15%)	266 (73.48%)

Note: enrollment numbers between fiscal years may not represent unique participants, as participants remain enrolled until they earn their supplementary authorization.

*Potter Valley Community Unified only requested two total participant slots over the four-year grant period.

**Placentia Yorba Linda Unified did not request a cohort for 2024-25. Their first cohort will be in 2025-26.

Table 5: Participant Program Teaching Information and Credential Area

Participant Teaching Information	Participants* 2024-25 (n=266)	All Participants* (n=550)	Completers* 2024-25 (n=153)	All Completers (n=242)
Average Teacher Tenure	10 Years	10.4 Years	12.33 Years	10.70 Years
Teaches at a Rural School	15 (10.46%)	39 (17.57%)	16 (10.46%)	23 (9.50%)
Teaches at a School with a High Unduplicated Pupil Count	238 (89.47%)	490 (89.09%)	136 (88.89%)	214 (88.43%)
Multiple Subject	163 (61.28%)	344 (62.55%)	105 (68.63%)	168 (69.42%)
Single Subject, Science**	23 (8.65%)	47 (8.55%)	7 (4.58%)	21 (8.68%)
Single Subject, English	17 (6.39%)	28 (5.09%)	5 (3.27%)	10 (4.13%)
Single Subject, Mathematics	35 (13.16%)	81 (14.73%)	26 (16.99%)	39 (16.12%)
Single Subject, Other	20 (7.52%)	30 (5.45%)	7 (4.58%)	7 (2.89%)
Single Subject, Social Science	7 (2.63%)	19 (3.45%)	3 (1.96%)	7 (2.89%)
Education Specialist, Mild to Moderate Support Needs	1 (0.00%)	1 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

*Note: The table reflects multiple data points from different categories, therefore the percentages will not add up to a hundred percent.

**Note: The category Single Subject Science includes Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geosciences, and Physics.

Table 6 provides a summary of the early exit reasons reported by participants. Thirty-three participants exited the program early during the 2024-25 fiscal year, representing approximately twelve percent of total enrollment. The majority of early exits (55%) were due to personal reasons, while 15 percent changed plans to add the authorization. Other reasons for early exits included not passing coursework, financial constraints, and relocation, with the percentage represented shown in the table below.

Table 6: Early Exit Reason

Early Exit Reason	Participants, 2024-25 (n=33)
Changed plans to add authorization	5

Early Exit Reason	Participants, 2024-25 (n=33)
	(15.15%)
Did not pass coursework	4 (12.12%)
Moved	1 (3.03%)
No Longer Employed by LEA	2 (6.06%)
Personal	15 (45.45%)
Other	6 (18.18%)

Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of the Participants

Programs reported the participants’ self-identified ethnic/racial composition and gender identity. The data in Tables 7 and 8 break down the demographics of program participants. 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.

For the 2024-25 data reports, approximately 91.4 percent of participants reported their race/ethnicity. In 2024-25, Hispanic/Latinx participants were the largest report racial/ethnic group (34.6%), followed by White participants (33.5%). Among completers, approximately 37 percent identify as Hispanic/Latinx, followed by 32 percent who identify as White. Ninety-seven percent of participants reported their gender identity; reporting this information to the Commission is voluntary for participants in the program. In 2024-25, reported gender identify remained fairly consistent compared to prior years with female participants being the largest group (72.6%), followed by male participants (24.8%). The gender identity of completers and participants who exited the program early closely mirrors that of the general participants.

Table 7: Ethnic/Racial Composition of Participants

Race/Ethnicity	Participants, 2022-23 (n=62)	Participants, 2023-24 (n=222)	Participants, 2024-25 (n=266)	Completers, 2024-25 (n=153)	Early Exit, 2024-25 (n=33)
American Indian or Alaska Native	1 (1.61%)	1 (0.45%)	1 (.38%)	1 (.65%)	0 (0.00%)
Asian	6 (9.68%)	18 (8.11%)	38 (14.3%)	21 (13.73%)	3 (9.09%)
Black or African American	1 (1.61%)	7 (3.15%)	14 (5.26%)	5 (3.27%)	2 (6.06%)
Hispanic/Latinx (of any race)	15 (24.19%)	75 (33.78%)	92 (34.59%)	57 (37.25%)	15 (45.45%)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0 (0.00%)	2 (0.90%)	2 (.75%)	2 (1.31%)	0 (0.00%)

Race/Ethnicity	Participants, 2022-23 (n=62)	Participants, 2023-24 (n=222)	Participants, 2024-25 (n=266)	Completers, 2024-25 (n=153)	Early Exit, 2024-25 (n=33)
White	12 (19.35%)	78 (35.14%)	89 (33.46%)	49 (32.03%)	9 (27.27%)
Two or more races	4 (6.45%)	5 (2.25%)	7 (2.63%)	6 (3.92%)	0 (0.00%)
Decline to state Race/Ethnicity	23 (37.10%)	36 (16.22%)	23 (8.65%)	12 (7.84%)	4 (12.12%)

Table 8: Gender Identity of Participants

Gender Identity*	Participants, 2022-23 (n=62)	Participants, 2023-24 (n=222)	Participants, 2024-25 (n=266)	Completers, 2024-25 (n=153)	Early Exit, 2023-24 (n=33)
Female	42 (67.74%)	159 (71.62%)	193 (72.56%)	113 (73.86%)	23 (69.7%)
Male	20 (32.26%)	63 (28.38%)	66 (24.81%)	39 (25.5%)	9 (27.27%)
Decline to State	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (2.63%)	1 (.654%)	1 (3.03%)

**Note: No participant selected Nonbinary and as such it has been excluded from these tables*

Program Funding

Round One, in its third year of implementation, expended 38 percent of the awarded grant funds, showing decreased utilization compared to its second year’s implementation which was an 87 percent expenditure rate. Round Two achieved nearly 58 percent utilization of their grant award funds in 2024-25. Round Three expended 58 percent of awarded funds. Round Four utilized 53 percent of their annual grant allocation. Round Five, in its first year of implementation, used nearly 82% of the funds awarded. Round Six which was awarded to grantees in the Spring of 2025 utilized 8.4% of awarded funds and Round 7 started at the end of the fiscal year and will start to utilize funds at the beginning of the 2025-26 fiscal year. In total, grantees expended \$393,026 (47%) of the \$842,850 in awarded funds for the 2024-25 fiscal year.

Programs may request grant funds from any of the following budget categories:

- Teacher preparation costs (tuition and/or IHE fees)
- Teacher preparation costs (books and/or supplies)
- Release time and/or substitute teacher costs
- Supplemental authorization filing fee

All grantees requested funds from the teacher preparation costs (tuition and/or IHE fees) budget category, which remained the primary expenditure category. While six grantees requested funds from additional budget categories, actual spending outside of tuition was minimal, with approximately \$1,900 used for supplemental authorization filing fees. The

consistent focus on tuition support suggests this remains the most critical funding need for participating teachers.

Table 9: Grant Award Expenditure, per Round

Round	Annual Amount Awarded 2022-23	Total Expended, 2022-23	Annual Amount Awarded 2023-24	Total Expended, 2023-24	Annual Amount Awarded 2024-25	Total Expended, 2024-25
One	\$240,000	\$152,500 (63.54%)	\$240,000	\$207,500 (86.46%)	\$237,500	\$90,000 (37.90%)
Two	\$52,000	\$0 (0.00%)	\$47,500	\$45,000 (94.74%)	\$40,000	\$23,125 (57.81%)
Three	N/A	N/A	\$262,500	\$126,631 (48.24%)	\$262,500	\$152,862 (58.23%)
Four	N/A	N/A	\$112,500	\$26,000 (23.11%)	\$112,500	\$59,635 (53.01%)
Five	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$74,550	\$61,105 (81.97%)
Six	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$75,000	\$6,300 (8.40%)
Seven	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$40,800	\$0 (0.00%)
Totals	\$292,500	\$155,000 (52.99%*)	\$662,500	\$405,131 (61.15%*)	\$842,850	\$393,027 (46.63%*)

Note: "N/A" indicates that a grant round was awarded after the specified year and, as a result, did not have expenditure data available for reporting.

*Note: Percent expended is calculated based on the total grant funds awarded each fiscal year; annual totals vary.

Program Narratives

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

- the matching funds source(s),
- the number of new computer science courses taught by teachers that have earned the supplementary authorization and how these courses are offered (e.g., standalone course, integrated in an elementary classroom, after school program, etc.),
- the extent to which the newly authorized computer science teachers have helped address the unmet needs for computer science instruction within the LEA, especially among rural schools or schools with a high share of unduplicated pupils,
- the best practices found to be effective in implementing the grant program,
- factors hindering program implementation, and
- any lessons learned to inform potential future investments in this type of grant program.

Grantees continued to use a wide range of sources to meet the 1:1 matching requirement. Consistent with prior years, state-funded programs such as the Educator Effectiveness Block

Grant, Career Technical Education Incentive Grant, and ESSER funds were frequently cited. Several university partners provided direct support through the Math and Science Teacher Initiative (MSTI) grants, covering tuition, books, and materials. In some cases, corporate and philanthropic partners such as Salesforce and Schools Federal Credit Union also contributed to the match.

However, concerns over the sustainability of these funds emerged more prominently in this reporting cycle. Multiple grantees noted that matching funds are other grant-based or one-time allocations, raising long-term viability concerns. One grantee summarized the issue succinctly *“We are relying on unguaranteed money to support this CTC CSSA grant.”*

With respect to new computer science course offerings, there was notable progress in the number and variety of computer science (CS) learning opportunities offered by participating teachers, though most grantees noted that implementation was still underway or only recently completed.

While adding stand-alone computer science (CS) courses remain the most visible outcome, particularly at the middle and high school level, many grantees emphasized integrated models at the elementary level and a strong presence in after-school settings. For instance:

- One district implemented six new sections of computer programming at the middle school level.
- Another reported 13 afterschool CS clubs and seven elementary classrooms offering integrated CS instruction.
- Several grantees indicated that teachers had started by infusing computational thinking into existing curriculum, even before formal CS courses were added to master schedules.

While some grantees had no new courses to report yet, many highlighted that their first cohorts had only recently completed coursework and were now poised to impact classrooms in the 2025–26 school year.

Grantees largely affirmed that the CS Supplementary Authorization program has begun addressing long-standing gaps in access to computer science, especially in rural areas and schools serving high numbers of unduplicated pupils.

Several grantees noted that:

- New courses were added at schools with high percentages of English learners and students in poverty.
- Teachers became advocates and leaders for CS education on campus, even before formally launching new courses.
- The authorization process itself increased teacher efficacy, confidence, and enthusiasm, particularly among multiple-subject teachers in elementary and rural settings.

As one grantee reflected *“This program is directly contributing to the expansion of computer science education in high-need, under-resourced communities by building a sustainable and regionally responsive pipeline of qualified CS teachers.”*

Grantees identified a number of best practices that supported successful program implementation:

- **Strong IHE Partnerships**
Echoing findings from the previous year, the most commonly cited best practice was deep collaboration with university partners. Grantees highlighted IHE support in recruitment, tuition coverage, instructional alignment, and data reporting. Notably, the Mathematics and Science Teacher Initiative (MSTI) partnership at CSU campuses was a recurring enabler.
- **Cohort-Based Models**
Many grantees found success in building cohort communities, which fostered peer learning, accountability, and ongoing engagement. These cohorts were often cross-school or cross-grade level, building broader districtwide networks of CS educators.
- **Flexible and Equitable Course Design**
Several grantees praised asynchronous or hybrid course models, which allowed rural teachers to participate despite geographic or time constraints. Teachers appreciated hands-on kits and the opportunity to try tools they could later implement in their classrooms.
- **Targeted Supports and Mentoring**
Ongoing mentoring, sometimes funded externally, proved especially valuable for teachers with little prior experience in computer science. Multiple grantees noted that this support was crucial for retention and success, especially for educators new to the subject matter.

Despite progress, grantees reported a number of persistent and emerging barriers:

- **Time Constraints**
Balancing full-time teaching responsibilities with coursework remained the most widely reported challenge. Teachers, especially in smaller schools, often lacked release time or compensation to engage meaningfully with the program.
- **Recruitment Difficulties**
Some grantees struggled to fill available slots, even with low-cost or subsidized programs. This was attributed to post-COVID burnout, professional development fatigue, or misalignment with credentialing needs (e.g., CTE vs. CSSA requirements).
- **Administrative Complexity**
Many LEAs faced challenges in coordinating with IHEs on billing, tuition splits, and reporting deadlines. Small districts cited a lack of dedicated staff to manage grant activities.
- **Matching Funds Requirement**
As in previous years, the 1:1 match continued to be a barrier to participation. Some LEAs withdrew or declined to apply due to uncertainty about their ability to secure matching contributions, particularly during times of fiscal constraint.

Grantees surfaced several key takeaways to inform the design of future CS educator preparation efforts:

- **Sustain Multi-Year Cohort Models**
Multi-year funding allows LEAs and IHEs to build momentum and scale impact. With each cohort, systems become more efficient and teacher communities deepen.

- **Prioritize Flexibility and Support**
Courses that are asynchronous, online, and teacher-friendly (with on-demand office hours and mentoring) saw higher engagement, particularly among rural and veteran educators.
- **Expand to Specific Supplementary Authorization**
Several grantees requested the ability to fund an additional course, enabling teachers to earn the specific (rather than introductory) CS authorization, critical for expanding offerings at the secondary level.
- **Remove or Adjust the Matching Funds Requirement**
Many LEAs recommended removing or significantly reducing the matching funds mandate, or allowing COEs to coordinate regional applications, alleviating the administrative burden from individual districts.
- **Fund Central Coordination Roles**
Larger districts emphasized the value of having a dedicated CS coordinator or administrator to provide systems-level support. This position was seen as crucial for growing programs, building partnerships, and aligning CS with broader district initiatives.

Summary and Conclusion

The 2024–25 program year revealed strong momentum and emerging impact from the Computer Science Supplementary Authorization Grant Program, with many LEAs now implementing or preparing to launch new computer science learning opportunities. The continued success of this initiative will rely on sustained support, reduced barriers to participation, and flexible models that reflect the realities of educators' lives and district capacities. Grantees remain enthusiastic about the potential of the program and are eager to build upon early successes to ensure that all students, especially those in underserved communities, have access to high-quality computer science education.

Attachment B

Report to the Legislature on the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program February 2026

Introduction

Statute (181 SEC. 126, Stats 2022) requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to annually report to the Legislature regarding the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program. The requirements of the report are specified in statute and must include, but not limited to, the following:

- The number of participating local education agencies.
- The number of grants issued.
- The number of mathematics instructional added authorizations and reading and literacy supplementary authorizations issued.

Background

For the 2022-23 fiscal year, the Legislature approved the sum of \$15 million for the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program and this report addresses the program as outlined in legislation prior to July 1, 2025. Prior legislation awarded \$2,500 one-time grant awards per participant, with a local match requirement equal to 100 percent of the grant award, to support credentialed teachers in adding a Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) or a Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist (RLLS) Credential. Priority is given to eligible grant applicants for teachers that provide instruction at an [eligible schoolsite](#). Grant funds may be used to cover tuition, fees, books, and/or release time. This report responds to the requirements specified in statute and provides an update to policymakers and others interested in the grant program.

In 2025, with the passage of Assembly Bill 121, the program has been revised and recast as the 2025 Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization and Reading and Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program (Math/Read/Lit Grant) for the purpose of including mathematics authorizations. In addition, the new legislation increases the award amount each participating teacher is eligible to receive up to \$6,000 and extends the dates that the funds are available to June 30, 2030. It is important to note that the revision to legislation for this grant occurred in the 2025-26 academic and fiscal year, therefore the information in this report reflects the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program as it existed in prior legislation.

The program has completed six rounds of Request for Applications (RFAs) with the most recent round awarded in December 2025. A seventh RFA was released December 2025, with applications due on February 13, 2026. This 2026 state report includes summary information regarding grant awards and initial program enrollment and program spending data collected in July of 2025 for the 2024-25 fiscal year.

2026 Data Report on the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program

The Commission continues to award grant funds through a competitive Request for Application (RFA) process. As of December 2025, ten local education agencies (LEAs) have been awarded grants across five rounds of funding, totaling \$4,540,000. The Commission has awarded the following amount in each round: \$455,000 to one LEA in Round One, \$187,500 to one LEA in Round Two, \$750,000 to two LEAs in Round Three, \$2,500 to one LEA in Round Four, and \$565,000 to two LEAs in Round Five. With \$10,460,000 in grant funds remaining, the Commission published the RFA for Round Six in September 2025, with awards announced December 15, 2025. Grant competitions will continue to be offered twice a year through the end of the 2029-30 fiscal year or until the full \$15 million has been awarded. Table 1 below shows the summary of grant awards and remaining grant funds, per Round.

Table 1: Award Summary of Reading and Literacy Grants, per Round

Rounds	Award Date	Total Grantees	Total Funding	Remaining Funds
One	July 14, 2023	1	\$455,000	\$14,545,000
Two	December 15, 2023	1	\$187,500	\$14,375,500
Three	April 5, 2024	2	\$750,000	\$13,607,500
Four	December 6, 2024	1	\$2,500	\$13,605,000
Five	March 21, 2025	2	\$565,000	\$13,040,000
Six	December 15, 2025	3	\$2,580,000	\$10,460,000
Totals		10	\$4,540,000	\$10,460,000

Table 2 below provides a summary, per round through the 2024-25 reporting year of each LEA grantee, the total number of participant slots awarded across the life of the grant, and the total grant award. Note that over the life of the grant, LEAs may have requested a different number of participant slots per fiscal year provided the number does not exceed the total number of participants projected in the grant application.

Table 2: Reading and Literacy Grant Recipients, Number of Total Projected Participants Awarded, and Total Grant Award, By Round

Local Education Agency (LEA)	Round	# of Projected Participants Awarded Over Life of Grant	Total Grant Award
William S. Hart Union High School District	1	182	\$455,000.00
Santa Barbara County Office of Education	2	75	\$187,500.00
Ontario-Montclair School District	3	150	\$375,000.00
Rialto Unified School District	3	150	\$375,000.00
Beardsley School District	4	1	\$2,500.00
Oakley Union Elementary School District	5	16	\$40,000
Los Angeles Unified School District	5	210	\$525,000
Los Angeles Unified School District*	6**	210	\$1,260,000

Local Education Agency (LEA)	Round	# of Projected Participants Awarded Over Life of Grant	Total Grant Award
Rialto Unified School District	6**	125	\$750,000
Santa Barbara County Office of Education	6**	100	\$570,000
Totals		1219	\$4,540,000.00

*Note: While Los Angeles Unified School District was awarded during the 2024-25 fiscal year, their grant award agreement was not signed until the 2025-26 fiscal year and the participant and funding information for the LEA is not included in tables 4-9.

**Note: Round 6 was the first round awarded under the new legislation which increased the amount each participating teacher is eligible to receive up to \$6,000.

Table 3 reflects the program as it existed prior to the adoption of AB 121 which added math authorizations. Table 3 below provides a summary of each LEA grantee, the institution of higher education (IHE) collaborator, and the added authorization area(s) the grant program will support: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) and/or Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist (RLLS) credential. LEAs may add additional collaborators that offer Commission-approved programs. To support applicants and grantees, a list of [IHEs](#) that offer Commission-approved programs is published on the Reading and Literacy Grant webpage.

Table 3: Reading and Literacy Grant Recipients, IHE Collaborator(s), and Added Authorization Type(s)

Local Education Agency (LEA)	IHE Collaborator(s)	Added Authorization (RLAA, RLLS)
William S. Hart Union High School District	California State University, Bakersfield	RLAA
Santa Barbara County Office of Education	California State University, Bakersfield California State University, Fullerton University of California, San Diego	RLAA
Ontario-Montclair School District	University of Southern California	RLAA
Rialto Unified School District	University of Southern California	RLAA
Beardsley School District	University of California, San Diego	RLAA
Oakley Union Elementary School District	California State University, Fullerton University of California, San Diego	RLAA, RLLS*
Los Angeles Unified School District	Los Angeles Unified School District	RLAA

*Note: CSU Fullerton is the only IHE approved to offer both the RLAA and RLLS.

Summary of All Program Participants

The following summarizes participant enrollment, completion progress, and program early exits for the 2024-25 fiscal year. The data in the state report reflects the annual data submitted July 2025 from grantees in Rounds One through Five regarding enrolled participants. Rounds One through Five enrollment reflects participants who are pursuing the two areas of added authorization that were authorized by legislation during the 2024-25 fiscal year: Reading and

Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) and/or Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist (RLLS) Credential.

In the 2024-25 fiscal year, five of the six LEAs implemented their programs for the first time and reported strong enrollment data. Table 4 summarizes the number of participants compared to the projected number of participants awarded in the 2024-25 fiscal year by LEA. Out of the 161 projected participants that were awarded for the 2024-25 fiscal year, 126 were filled, resulting in nearly a 79 percent enrollment rate overall.

Table 5 presents teaching information and credential area information for participants and completers. The grant program saw its first completers in 2024-25, with 138 participants successfully earning the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA). Note: 16 participants who received grant funds in 2023-24 earned the RLAA in 2024-25 which is why the number of completers is greater than the number of participants. On average, participants and completers in 2024-25 have been teaching for 13 years. Approximately two percent of participants in the grant program teach at an eligible school site. The majority of participants and completers hold Multiple Subject credentials (55% and 53%, respectively).

LEAs also reported on the number of participants who exited early or who left the grant program before earning a supplementary authorization. During the 2024-25 fiscal year, only two participants exited early, citing personal reasons.

Table 4: Participant Awarded Slots and Enrollment, by Round

Local Education Agency (LEA)	Round	# of Projected Participants 2024-25	# of Participants Enrolled, 2024-25
William S. Hart Union High School District	1	35	23 (65.71%)
Santa Barbara County Education Office	2	25	18 (72%)
Ontario-Montclair School District	3	50	35 (70%)
Rialto Unified School District	3	50	50 (100%)
Beardsley School District	4	1	0 (0%)
Oakley Union Elementary School District	5	0	N/A
Totals		161	126 (78.26%)

Table 5: Participant Program Teaching Information and Credential Area

Participant Teaching Information	Participants* 2024-25 (n=126)	Completers* 2024-25 (n=138**)
Average Teacher Tenure	13 Years	13 Years
Teaches at an Eligible Schoolsite	3	3

Participant Teaching Information	Participants* 2024-25 (n=126)	Completers* 2024-25 (n=138**)
	(2.38%)	(2.17%)
Multiple Subject	76 (55.07%)	73 (52.90%)
Single Subject, Science	2 (1.45%)	2 (1.45%)
Single Subject, English	18 (13.04%)	30 (21.74%)
Single Subject, Mathematics	2 (1.45%)	2 (1.45%)
Single Subject, Other	2 (1.45%)	2 (1.45%)
Single Subject, Social Science	4 (2.90%)	4 (2.90%)
Special Education	21 (15.22%)	24 (17.39%)
Special Secondary Credentials	1 (0.72%)	1 (0.72%)

**Note: The table reflects multiple data points from different categories, therefore the percentages will not add up to a hundred percent.*

***Note: Sixteen teachers who received grant funds in 2023-24 earned the RLAA in 2024-25 which is why the number of completers is greater than the number of participants.*

LEAs also reported on the number of participants who exited early or who left the grant program before earning a supplementary authorization. When a participant exits the program, the grantee is required to select an option that best identifies the reason for the early exit from the following selections: changed plans to add authorization, did not pass coursework, financial, moved, or personal. During the 2024-25 fiscal year, only two participants exited early, citing personal reasons.

Table 6: Early Exit Reason

Early Exit Reason*	Participants, 2024-25 (n=2)
Personal	2 (100%)

Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of the Participants

Programs reported the participants’ self-identified ethnic/racial composition and gender identity. The data in Tables 7 and 8 break down the demographics of program participants, completers, and participants who left the grant program before earning a supplementary authorization (early exited). 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.

For the 2024-25 data reports, approximately 98 percent of participants reported their race/ethnicity. In 2024-25, White participants were the largest report racial/ethnic group (39%), followed by Hispanic/Latinx participants (37%). Among Completers, approximately 45 percent identify as White, followed by 34 percent who identify as Hispanic/Latinx. A hundred percent of participants reported their gender identity. In 2024-25, female participants were the largest group (88%), followed by male participants (12%). The gender identity of completers and participants who exited the program early closely mirrors that of the general participants.

Table 7: Ethnic/Racial Composition of Participants and Completers

Race/Ethnicity*	Participants (n=126)	Completers (n=138)	Early Exit (n=2)
Asian	6 (4.76%)	5 (3.97%)	0 (0.00%)
Black or African American	6 (4.76%)	6 (4.35%)	0 (0.00%)
Hispanic/Latinx (of any race)	46 (36.51%)	47 (34.06%)	0 (0.00%)
White	49 (38.89%)	62 (44.93%)	0 (0.00%)
Two or more races	16 (12.70%)	16 (11.59%)	1 (50.00%)
Decline to state Race/Ethnicity	3 (2.38%)	2 (1.45%)	1 (50.00%)

**Note that no one selected American Indian or Alaska Native or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and as such they have been excluded from these tables.*

Table 8: Gender Identity of Participants

Gender Identity*	Participants (n=126)	Completers (n=138)	Early Exit (n=2)
Female	111 (88.09%)	120 (86.95%)	2 (100%)
Male	15 (11.90%)	18 (13.04%)	0 (0.00%)

**Note that no one selected Nonbinary or Decline to State, and as such they have been excluded from these tables*

Program Funding

Programs may request grant funds from any of the following budget categories:

- Teacher preparation costs (tuition and/or IHE fees)
- Teacher preparation costs (books and/or supplies)
- Release time and/or substitute teacher costs
- Supplemental authorization filing fee

All grantees requested funds from the teacher preparation costs (tuition and/or IHE fees) budget category. Only two grantees requested funds in an additional budget category: either

for the supplemental authorization filing fee or for books and/or supplies. The consistent focus on tuition support suggests that grantees anticipate this cost to be the most critical funding need for participating teachers.

During the 2024-25 fiscal year, all rounds utilized 77 percent of their grant award for that year. Note that, during program implementation, grantees can move grant funds across approved budget categories to meet the needs of participants if the total of individual changes across all participants remains under 10 percent of the total grant budget; changes exceeding 10 percent require formal budget change requests.

Table 9: Grant Award Expenditure, Round One through Five

Budget Category	Annual Budget	Total Expended, 2024-25
Teacher Prep Costs (tuition, and/or IHE fees)	\$382,500	\$288,184
Teacher Prep Costs (books and/or supplies)	\$20,000	\$23,000
TOTAL	\$402,500	\$311,184

Comments from the Field

The following comments from the field were collected both formally and informally by the Commission’s grants team and may provide additional insight into the continued implementation of the Math/Read/Lit Grant Program now expanded as a result of AB 121 to include math authorizations effective the start of the 2025-26 fiscal year. The information gathered provides a snapshot of field-level implementation experiences and highlights both promising practices and ongoing challenges across a diverse range of local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in the Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program as it existed under prior legislation.

Grantees consistently emphasized the importance of strong partnerships with institutions of higher education (IHEs), especially those offering cost-effective, high-quality programs. These partnerships were cited as foundational to program success, particularly when institutions provided regular progress updates and were responsive to the needs of participating educators. Several grantees reported that this level of engagement supported high program completion rates and helped troubleshoot challenges in real time.

In terms of program design and implementation, grantees shared that aligning the coursework with the Science of Reading principles improved buy-in among both educators and district leadership. Teachers noted that the content felt timely, practical, and immediately applicable to their classrooms. Grantees also highlighted the value of targeted communication and outreach strategies to generate awareness and participation, especially among educators in rural or under-resourced schools. With respect to funding, grantees use the following sources to meet the matching requirement: release time provided by LEA; Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant; Educator Effectiveness Block Grant; Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund; Title 1 funds; and, the Local Control Funding Formula.

Many programs implemented ongoing teacher support systems, such as monthly check-ins, structured collaboration time, and online discussion sessions. Grantees reported that these supports not only helped teachers persist through the demands of coursework but also

fostered meaningful professional learning communities. One grantee held an end-of-year celebration recognizing teacher participants, a gesture that educators found highly motivating and affirming.

Although the majority of participants had not yet had the opportunity to create new standalone reading or literacy courses, due to the timing of course completion and pre-established school schedules, grantees noted that the impact on student literacy outcomes was evident. Teachers utilized their new skills to deliver more targeted, differentiated instruction and reported meaningful gains in student fluency, reading comprehension, and overall engagement. In one case, a participating teacher documented a student's growth from reading one word per minute at the start of the year to 62 words per minute by year's end.

Despite these successes, grantees identified a few recurring implementation challenges. Chief among them were the time demands of coursework and the lack of administrative funding to manage the program locally. Several grantees noted that while the grant provides critical tuition and textbook support for teachers, the administrative workload to coordinate recruitment, track progress, and meet reporting requirements remains unfunded. Additionally, some teachers found the academic workload difficult to balance alongside full-time teaching duties, leading to attrition in a few cases.

Looking ahead, grantees offered lessons learned that may inform future investments. These included providing early and ongoing communication around expectations, building opportunities for local collaboration and peer mentorship, and ensuring administrative leaders are fully aligned with the goals and logistics of the grant program from the outset. Some grantees recommended a phased or pilot-based approach, allowing districts to develop a proof of concept before scaling participation more broadly.

Summary and Conclusion

The 2026 annual report represents the third year of implementation of the 2022 Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program, recast by authorizing legislation in 2025-26 to include mathematics. To date, the Commission has awarded \$4,54,000 of the \$15 million available for distribution through this program, leaving \$10,460,000 remaining for future grant rounds.

This year's grantee cohort reporting program data includes a mix of LEAs implementing new and ongoing programs. The majority of participants in this reporting cycle (2024-25) completed their coursework between August 2024 and May 2025, with some still finalizing requirements for authorization at the time data was reported in July 2025. While most programs have not yet resulted in the creation of new standalone courses, grantees reported significant improvements in teachers' capacity to provide targeted reading support and interventions, particularly within elementary and self-contained classroom settings.

Key strengths across grantees include the development of strong partnerships with IHEs, effective recruitment strategies, structured teacher support systems, and an emphasis on evidence-based literacy instruction. Grantees also reported emerging best practices such as monthly check-ins, collaborative learning communities, and local recognition events to sustain teacher motivation and commitment.

Challenges related to administrative capacity and time constraints for working educators persist, though most grantees have identified strategies to mitigate these barriers. As the program continues, a clearer picture of participant completion and student outcomes will emerge, particularly as more teachers complete their authorizations and districts plan for long-term sustainability of their literacy programs.

The Commission will continue to offer competitive grant opportunities on a biannual basis through the 2029-30 fiscal year or until the full \$15 million has been awarded. Lessons learned from grantees will continue to shape the program's evolution and provide valuable insight into how targeted investment in educator preparation can drive improvements in math and reading instruction across the state.

Update on the 2023 Diverse Education Leaders Pipeline Initiative Program

February 2026

Introduction

Section 112 of Senate Bill 141 (Chap. 48, Stats. 2023) requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) on or before June 30, 2027, to provide a report on the Diverse Education Leaders Pipeline Initiative Program (DELPI Grant) to the Department of Finance and the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of both houses of the Legislature. The report shall include an evaluation of the program, including, but not limited to, all of the following information:

- (1) The number of local educational agencies awarded a grant and the number of institutions of higher education and nonprofit educational service providers that were included in grantee partnerships.
- (2) The number of administrator candidates supported by the grant award and the number of individuals who obtained an administrative services credential and employment as an administrator as a result of the program.
- (3) Any relevant demographic data for each participating local educational agency, including the racial, ethnic, and gender demographics and first language of each administrator candidate supported by the grant award.
- (4) The types of culturally relevant support provided to administrator candidates and administrators to improve retention and the education, engagement, and retention of diverse pupils, families, and educators.
- (5) Where applicable, the impact of the program on pupil academic and school climate outcomes in participating local educational agencies.

An update has been prepared for the Commission providing information in advance of the required report that is due to the Legislature on or before June 30, 2027.

Background

The 2023-24 state budget appropriated \$10 million to establish the Diverse Education Leaders Pipeline Initiative (DELPI Grant). The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) was required to allocate these funds to local educational agencies (LEAs) through a competitive grant process for the purpose of training, placing, and retaining diverse and culturally responsive administrators in TK-12 public schools, inclusive, to improve pupil outcomes and meet the needs of California's education workforce.

The Commission developed criteria for awarding grants and selected recipients based on demonstrated understanding of how diverse and culturally competent school leadership affects pupil academic success, social-emotional well-being, family engagement, and the retention of a diverse educator workforce.

The program is guided by several goals, as outlined in authorizing legislation:

- Increase diversity among public school administrators to promote school environments that better represent and reflect the diversity of the pupils served.
- Cultivate culturally responsive administrators through professional development that centers diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Mitigate or remove credentialing costs for aspiring administrators and for administrator preparation and induction programs.
- Promote improved academic and school-climate outcomes for all pupils, especially historically underserved pupil subgroups.
- Track and report recruitment, retention, and demographic data for educators supported by the program.
- Build capacity and partnerships between local educational agencies, nonprofit educational service providers, and institutions of higher education to strengthen the administrator pipeline.
- Increase the quality of school administrators statewide by incorporating culturally diverse practices that have proven effective in improving outcomes for pupils and strengthening the educator workforce.

Each grantee LEA receives funding of up to \$30,000 per administrator candidate for permissible uses such as tuition, coaching, training, mentoring, and other credentialing costs. Grant recipients may not use more than five percent of funds for program administration.

The 2024–25 fiscal year represented the first year of program implementation. During this period, grantees began enrolling candidates, forming partnerships, and launching support systems consistent with the authorizing legislation.

Award Summary of DELPI Grantees

In May 2024, the Commission awarded nearly the full \$10 million appropriated for the DELPI grant through a highly competitive Request for Applications (RFA) process. The RFA process generated strong interest from LEAs across the state, reflecting broad recognition of the need to build and sustain a diverse, culturally responsive administrator workforce.

Following extensive review, ten LEAs were selected for funding, representing a mix of county offices of education, unified school districts, and charter school consortiums. Grantees demonstrated a clear commitment to advancing diversity in educational leadership and strong capacity to provide comprehensive support to administrator candidates. Collectively, the awarded LEAs plan to support 367 administrator candidates with \$9,996,669 of the \$10 million total grant funding encumbered.

Award amounts were determined based on the number of candidate slots proposed in each LEA's application and allowable funding levels under statute, up to \$30,000 per administrator candidate. Table 1 summarizes the DELPI grantees, total projected candidates awarded, and

corresponding grant award amounts. A full list of consortium partners is provided in [Appendix A](#).

Table 1: Award Summary of DELPI Grantees

Local Education Agency	Total Projected Candidates Awarded	Total Grant Award Amount
Aspire Firestone Academy (Southern California Consortium)	62	\$1,860,000
Aspire Lionel Wilson College Preparatory Academy (Northern California Consortium)	69	\$2,070,000
Los Angeles County Office of Education	44	\$1,320,000
Los Angeles Unified School District	44	\$982,872
Oakland Unified School District	16	\$480,000
Riverside County Office of Education	34	\$1,020,000
San Francisco Unified School District	60	\$1,123,797
Santa Maria-Bonita School District	22	\$660,000
Tracy Joint Unified School District	5	\$150,000
West Contra Costa Unified School District	11	\$330,000
TOTAL	367	\$9,996,669

Institutions of Higher Education and Nonprofit Educational Service Provider Partnerships

Authorizing legislation for the DELPI grant encourages grant recipients to partner with institutions of higher education (IHEs) and nonprofit educational service providers (NESPs) to meet the goals of the program. All ten of the DELPI grantees established formal partnerships with one or more IHEs and four grantees elected to partner with NESPs as part of their implementation model.

The ten grantees collectively partnered with twelve IHEs across California, including campuses within the University of California, California State University, and private university systems. Table 2 summarizes all IHE partnerships by LEA. Early implementation data show that of the 104 candidates enrolled in the 2024-25 cohort, 73.08 percent are enrolled in private university programs, 19.23 percent in California State University programs, and 7.69 percent in University of California programs (Table 3).

Table 2: DELPI Grantees and IHE Partner(s)

Local Education Agency	IHE Partner(s)
Aspire Firestone Academy	Loyola Marymount University
Aspire Lionel Wilson College Preparatory Academy	Loyola Marymount University
Los Angeles County Office of Education	UMASS Global
Los Angeles Unified School District	University of Southern California
Oakland Unified School District	UC Berkeley
Riverside County Office of Education	University of California, Los Angeles
San Francisco Unified School District	San Francisco State University University of California, Berkeley
Santa Maria-Bonita School District	California Lutheran University

Local Education Agency	IHE Partner(s)
Tracy Joint Unified School District	Teachers College of San Joaquin
West Contra Costa Unified School District	University of California, Berkeley

Table 3: Type of IHE Candidates Enrolled in, 2024-25 Cohort

Type of Institution	# of Candidates (n=104)	% of Candidates (n=104)
California State University (CSU)	20	19.23%
University of California (UC)	8	7.69%
Private	76	73.08%

Across grantee narratives submitted in the 2024-25 annual reports, LEAs consistently reported that strong IHE partnerships have been essential to ensuring both program compliance and high-quality learning experiences. Several LEAs highlighted the benefits of integrated oversight for the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) and close coordination on credentialing requirements. As one grantee described, *“Our collaboration with [IHE] has been essential to the success of our DELPI Fellowship Program. [IHE] provides oversight for the CalAPA and supports compliance with CTC credentialing requirements, ensuring alignment with state standards. This partnership has allowed us to embed CalAPA preparation seamlessly into the program.”*

Other grantees emphasized how these partnerships strengthened communication between universities and local educational agencies: *“The relationship between [IHE partners] and [LEA] was already strong, but the grant required us to engage in more frequent, focused communication. This collaboration kept both the IHEs and LEAs informed about deadlines, policies, and procedures and allowed us to determine the best ways to support our candidates.”*

Participation in NESP partnerships was optional under authorizing legislation. During the 2024-25 fiscal year, four of the ten DELPI grantees partnered with NESPs. The NESPs currently partnering with DELPI grantees include the Diversity in Leadership Institute (DLI), and California Association of Latino Superintendents and Administrators (CALSA), and the Coalition for Educational Partnerships (Table 4). Of the 104 administrator candidates enrolled in the 2024-25 cohort, 67 candidates (64.42%) are supported by an NESP, while 37 candidates (35.58%) are not. Table 5 provides a summary of how many candidates are supported by the NESP partners.

Table 4: DELPI Grantees and NESP Partner(s)

Local Education Agency	NESP Partner(s)
Aspire Firestone Academy	Diversity in Leadership Institute
Aspire Lionel Wilson College Preparatory Academy	Diversity in Leadership Institute
Los Angeles County Office of Education	Diversity in Leadership Institute
Los Angeles Unified School District	N/A
Oakland Unified School District	N/A
Riverside County Office of Education	California Association of Latino Superintendents and Administrators, Coalition for Educational Partnerships
San Francisco Unified School District	N/A

Local Education Agency	NESP Partner(s)
Santa Maria-Bonita School District	N/A
Tracy Joint Unified School District	N/A
West Contra Costa Unified School District	N/A

Table 5: NESP Support, 2024-25 Cohort

NESP Partner(s)	# of Candidates Supported (n=67)	% of Candidates (n=67)
California Association of Latino Superintendents and Administrators, Coalition for Educational Partnerships	34	50.75%
Diversity in Leadership Institute	33	49.45%

In grantee narratives submitted in the 2024-25 annual reports, LEAs reported that NESP partnerships have added value through tailored professional learning, leadership coaching, and a focus on culturally responsive practices. The following are direct quotes from LEAs:

- *“Our NESP partner [...] plays an integral role in developing the curricular focus on diversity and culturally responsive school leadership. They collaborate closely with the IHE partner and LEA to ensure alignment across all aspects of the program.”*
- *“The collaboration with our nonprofit partners has been instrumental in ensuring that our candidates not only complete their credentialing requirements but also develop a deep understanding of equity, access, and community leadership.”*

Collectively, the early experiences across IHE and NESP partnerships underscore the collaborative nature of the DELPI program. Grantees reported that regular communication, shared accountability, and clearly defined roles among partners have been key factors in successful implementation during the program’s first year.

Summary of All DELPI Candidates

The 2024-25 fiscal year marked the launch of the first DELPI cohorts across nine of the ten grantee LEAs. Grantees reported strong implementation progress, with nearly all requested slots filled. As of June 2025, 104 administrator candidates were enrolled across nine of the ten awarded LEAs, representing a 97.20 percent enrollment rate (Table 6). Enrollment data indicates full participation among grantees, with most LEAs achieving 100 percent enrollment in their awarded candidate slots. Note: Los Angeles Unified School District did not request candidate slots for the 2024-25 fiscal year and will begin enrollment in the 2025-26 fiscal year.

Table 6: Participant Awarded Slots and Enrollment, by Round

Local Education Agency (LEA)	# of Projected Candidates Awarded, 2024-25	# of Candidates Enrolled, 2024-25	% of Candidates Enrolled, 2024-25
Aspire Firestone Academy	10	10	100%
Aspire Lionel Wilson College Preparatory	12	12	100%
Los Angeles County Office of Education	14	11	78.57%
Los Angeles Unified School District*	0	N/A	N/A

Local Education Agency (LEA)	# of Projected Candidates Awarded, 2024-25	# of Candidates Enrolled, 2024-25	% of Candidates Enrolled, 2024-25
Oakland Unified School District	4	4	100%
Riverside County Office of Education	34	34	100%
San Francisco Unified School District	22	22	100%
Santa Maria-Bonita School District	6	6	100%
Tracy Joint Unified School District	3	3	100%
West Contra Costa Unified School District	2	2	100%
Totals	107	104	97.20%

**Note: Los Angeles Unified School District did not project candidates for a 2024-25 cohort.*

A total of eight candidates completed the DELPI program during the 2024-25 fiscal year, earning their preliminary administrative services credential. Because many of the participating credential programs span more than one fiscal year, the number of candidates who completed during the 2024-25 fiscal year reflects a snapshot of early program progress rather than the full cohort’s eventual completion. Additionally, at the time the annual reports were submitted (July 2025) all eight of the completers were in the process of applying and interviewing for administrator positions. As a result, placement data was not yet available for inclusion in this report but will be collected in subsequent years as part of ongoing placement tracking. Under program requirements, completers have four years to fulfill a two-year service commitment as a site-level administrator in a California public school, as outlined in authorizing legislation.

Candidates in the 2024-25 cohorts entered the program from a wide range of professional roles, with teachers representing the largest group of participants. Table 7 provides a breakdown of positions held at program start for all candidates in the 2024-25 cohorts as well as the completers who earned their administrative services credential during the 2024-25 fiscal year.

As shown in Table 7, 58.66 percent of candidates entered the DELPI program from classroom teaching positions (TK-12), while 18.27 percent were district office staff, and 8.65 percent were current school administrators. Additional participants include county office staff (4.81%) and those serving in pupil personnel or clinical service roles (4.81%). Completers primarily came from classroom teaching and pupil personnel backgrounds, with teachers in TK-5 positions comprising 50 percent of 2024-25 completers and pupil personnel services staff representing 37.5 percent.

Table 7: Position at Program Start, 2024-25 Cohorts

Position at Program Start	# of Candidates (n=104)	% of Candidates (n=104)	# of Completers (n=8)	% of Completers (n=8)
Teacher, TK-5th	30	28.85%	4	50.00%
Teacher, 6th-8th	10	9.62%	0	0%
Teacher, 9th-12th	21	20.19%	0	0%
Administrator, TK-5th	9	8.65%	0	0%

Position at Program Start	# of Candidates (n=104)	% of Candidates (n=104)	# of Completers (n=8)	% of Completers (n=8)
Administrator, 6th-8th	1	0.96%	0	0%
Administrator, 9th-12th	4	3.85%	0	0%
District Office Staff	19	18.27%	1	12.50%
County Office of Education Staff	5	4.81%	0	0%
Pupil Personnel Work	4	3.85%	3	37.50%
Clinical or Rehabilitative Services	1	0.96%	0	0%

Candidates also entered the DELPI program with diverse credential backgrounds. Table 8 summarizes the credential at program start for all candidates in the 2024-25 cohorts as well as the completers who earned their administrative services credential during the 2024-25 fiscal year. The largest proportion of candidates held Multiple Subject credentials (39.42%) followed by Special Education: Mild to Moderate Support Needs (15.38%) and Pupil Personnel Services (9.62%). Smaller percentages of candidates held credentials in Single Subject areas such as English, Mathematics, Science, and Social Science.

Among the eight completers who earned their credential during the 2024-25 fiscal year, candidates with Pupil Personnel Services and Special Education: Mild to Moderate Support Needs credentials each represented 37.5 percent of completers.

Table 8: Credential at Program Start, 2024-25 Cohorts

Credential at Program Start	# of Candidates (n=104)	% of Candidates (n=104)	# of Completers (n=8)	% of Completers (n=8)
Multiple Subject	41	39.42%	2	25.00%
Pupil Personnel Services	10	9.62%	3	37.50%
School Nurse Services	1	0.96%	0	0%
Single Subject, English	9	8.65%	0	0%
Single Subject, Mathematics	10	9.62%	0	0%
Single Subject, Science	4	3.85%	0	0%
Single Subject, Social Science	3	2.88%	0	0%
Single Subject, Other	5	4.81%	0	0%
Special Education: Deaf and Hard of Hearing	1	0.96%	0	0%
Special Education: Extensive Support Needs	2	1.92%	0	0%
Special Education: Mild to Moderate Support Needs	16	15.38%	3	37.50%
Designated Subjects	2	1.92%	0	0%

Table 9 provides a summary of the education level at program start for all candidates in the 2024-25 cohorts as well as the completers who earned their administrative services credential during the 2024-25 fiscal year. As shown in Table 9, 79.81 percent of candidates held a master’s degree (MA/MS), while 17.31 percent held a bachelor’s degree (BA/BS) and 2.88 percent held a

doctoral degree (PhD/EdD). Of the eight completers, 87.5 percent held master’s degrees at the time of program entry and 12.5 percent held bachelor’s degrees.

Table 9: Education Level at Program Start, 2024-25 Cohorts

Position at Program Start	# of Candidates (n=104)	% of Candidates (n=104)	# of Completers (n=8)	% of Completers (n=8)
BA/BS	18	17.31%	1	12.50%
MA/MS	83	79.81%	7	87.50%
PhD/EdD	3	2.88%	0	0%

LEAs also reported on the number of participants who exited early or who left the grant program before earning a preliminary administrative services credential. During the 2024-25 fiscal year, only one candidate exited early, citing personal and professional setbacks that would not let them continue with the program.

Overall, the 2024-25 participant data illustrate a strong first year of implementation for the DELPI grant. Nearly all available candidate slots were filled, and eight completers successfully earned their preliminary administrative services credential within the first program year. The first cohort of DELPI candidates represents a diverse and experienced educator population, including teachers, district and county office staff, and pupil personnel services professionals.

Ethnic/Racial Composition, Gender Identification, and First Language of Candidates

The DELPI grant was established to train, place, and retain diverse and culturally responsive administrators in California’s public schools. A central goal of the grant program is to increase diversity among school leaders to promote environments that better represent and reflect the diversity of the pupils they serve. Data from the first year of program implementation show that DELPI candidates represent a broad range of racial, ethnic, gender, and linguistic backgrounds, consistent with this legislative intent.

As shown in Table 10, the 2024-25 cohort includes participants from a variety of racial and ethnic groups. Hispanic/Latinx candidates comprise the largest group (37.5%), followed by White candidates (20.19%), Black or African American candidates (17.31%), and Asian candidates (16.35%). Candidates identifying as two or more races represented 7.69 percent and smaller percentages identified as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0.96%).

Among the eight completers who earned their credentials during the 2024-25 fiscal year, half identified as White, while 25 percent identified as Hispanic/Latinx and 12.5 percent as Black or African American. These proportions are expected to shift as additional candidates complete the program in subsequent years.

Table 10: Ethnic/Racial Composition of 2024-25 Cohorts

Race/Ethnicity	# of Candidates (n=104)	% of Candidates (n=104)	# of Completers (n=8)	% of Completers (n=8)
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0%	0	0%
Asian	17	16.35%	0	0%

Race/Ethnicity	# of Candidates (n=104)	% of Candidates (n=104)	# of Completers (n=8)	% of Completers (n=8)
Black or African American	18	17.31%	1	12.50%
Hispanic/Latinx (of any race)	39	37.50%	2	25.00%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	0.96%	0	0%
White	21	20.19%	4	50.00%
Two or more races	8	7.69%	1	12.50%

Grantee narratives highlighted how the program’s design intentionally recruits and supports candidates from historically underrepresented backgrounds and how DELPI’s focus on representation has already had a visible impact. The following are direct quotes from grantees’ narrative responses in the 2024-25 annual reports:

- *“The DELPI Fellowship has demonstrated strong success in recruiting candidates who reflect the linguistic and cultural diversity of the students they serve. Our cohort includes educators who bring a deep understanding of their communities and a commitment to equity-driven leadership.”*
- *“Through the DELPI grant, we have expanded our leadership pipeline to include emerging leaders from racially and linguistically diverse backgrounds. These administrators are modeling inclusive, culturally responsive practices that directly improve student and family engagement.”*

Table 11 provides a summary of candidates’ gender identification. Candidates who identify as female comprise the majority of the first cohort (74.04%), followed by candidates who identify as male candidates (25.00%) and nonbinary candidates (0.96%). Among completers, 87.5 percent identify as female and 12.5 percent identify as male.

Table 11: Gender Identity of 2024-25 Cohorts

Gender Identity	# of Candidates (n=104)	% of Candidates (n=104)	# of Completers (n=8)	% of Completers (n=8)
Female	77	74.04%	7	87.50%
Male	26	25.00%	1	12.50%
Nonbinary	1	0.96%	0	0%

Language diversity is also a key strength of the DELPI program. As shown in Table 12, nearly one-third of participants reported a first language other than English. Twenty-three percent identified Spanish as their first language, followed by small groups who reported Cantonese, Korean, Arabic, Hindi, Mandarin, or Vietnamese. Among completers, 87.5 percent reported English as their first language, and 12.5 percent reported Spanish.

Table 12: First Language of 2024-25 Cohorts

Race/Ethnicity	# of Candidates (n=104)	% of Candidates (n=104)	# of Completers (n=8)	% of Completers (n=8)
Arabic	1	0.96%	0	0%

Race/Ethnicity	# of Candidates (n=104)	% of Candidates (n=104)	# of Completers (n=8)	% of Completers (n=8)
Cantonese	2	1.92%	0	0%
English	70	67.31%	7	87.50%
Hindi	1	0.96%	0	0%
Korean	2	1.92%	0	0%
Mandarin (Putonghua)	1	0.96%	0	0%
Spanish	24	23.08%	1	12.50%
Vietnamese	1	0.96%	0	0%
Other non-English	2	1.92%	0	0%

This linguistic diversity enriches the program’s collaborative learning environment and reflects the multilingual realities of California’s schools. In narrative responses submitted in the 2024-25 annual reports, several grantees emphasized that multilingualism among candidates enhances their ability to engage families and lead inclusively. One grantee wrote, *“Our DELPI candidates are linguistically and culturally diverse, which has strengthened communication with students and families and reinforced the importance of bilingual leadership in our schools.”*

Program Funding

Pursuant to authorizing legislation, DELPI grant funds may be used to support a range of activities designed to recruit, train, and retain diverse and culturally responsive school administrators. Permissible uses of funding include, but are not limited to, all of the following:

- Coaching, training, and mentoring activities for current administrators and administrator candidates to serve and educate diverse pupil populations, engage diverse families, and support and retain a diverse educator workforce.
- Developing support systems for a diverse administrator workforce that reflects a local educational agency community’s diversity.
- Paying for or reimbursing administrator program costs.
- Paying for or reimbursing administrator credentialing costs, including administrative services credential clear induction programs.

Table 13 provides a breakdown of the budget by category for all cohorts across the ten awarded grantees. As shown in Table 13, the total program budget for all grantees is \$9,996,669. The largest portion of funding (57.38%) was allocated to cover participant program costs such as tuition, books, and examination fees. Additional major budget categories include nonprofit educational service provider costs (20.96%) and coaching/mentoring/training activities for candidates (9.9%).

Table 13: Budget by Category for all Cohorts

	Budget for all cohorts	% of total budget
Candidate: Administrator program costs (tuition, books, exams, and/or fees)	\$5,735,879.75	57.38%
Candidate: Administrative Services Credential application fees	\$28,176.25	0.28%

	Budget for all cohorts	% of total budget
Candidate: Coaching, mentoring, and training costs	\$989,600.00	9.90%
Candidate: Administrative Services Credential induction costs	\$476,730.00	4.77%
Candidate: Release time	\$163,450.00	1.64%
Nonprofit educational service provider costs	\$2,095,064.00	20.96%
Other	\$89,640.00	0.90%
Program Administration	\$418,129.00	4.18%
TOTAL	\$9,996,669	

Table 14 provides a summary of budget versus actual expenditures by budget category for the first cohort of DELPI candidates during the 2024-25 fiscal year. Under the terms of the DELPI Grant, unexpended funds from the 2024-25 fiscal year will roll over to future fiscal years within the project period, allowing grantees to continue supporting Cohort 1 candidates. As shown in Table 14, grantees collectively expended \$2,902,635 during the 2024-25 fiscal year. This represents 72.02 percent of funds that the grantees allocated to their 2024-25 cohorts. The majority of expenditures were for participant program costs, followed by nonprofit educational service provider costs and candidate coaching/mentoring/training. Lower expenditures were reported for Administrative Services Credential induction costs. This is consistent with program timelines, as candidates complete induction only after earning the preliminary administrative services credential. With only eight completers during the 2024-25 fiscal year, most induction-related costs are expected to occur in future fiscal years as additional candidates complete credentialing requirements. A table summarizing 2024-25 expenditures by LEA is provided in [Appendix B](#).

Table 14: Cohort 1 – Budget v Actuals in 2024-25

	2024-25 Cohort Budget	Actuals, 2024-25	% Expended, 2024-25
Candidate: Administrator program costs (tuition, books, exams, and/or fees)	\$1,415,537.05	\$1,366,857.34	96.56%
Candidate: Administrative Services Credential application fees	\$10,050.95	\$1,358.30	13.51%
Candidate: Coaching, mentoring, and training costs	\$257,000.00	\$164,788.51	64.12%
Candidate: Administrative Services Credential induction costs	\$322,638.00	\$0	0.00%
Candidate: Release time	\$95,580.00	\$5,500.00	5.75%
Nonprofit educational service provider costs	\$580,234.00	\$474,149.85	81.72%
Other	\$86,760.00	\$0	0.00%
Program Administration	\$134,835.00	\$77,905.47	57.78%
TOTAL	\$ 2,902,635.00	\$ 2,090,559.47	72.02%

Authorizing legislation for the DELPI Grant authorizes the use of grant funds for coaching, training, and mentoring activities for current administrators, in addition to administrator candidates.

In their applications, four grantees – Aspire Firestone Academy, Aspire Lionel Wilson College Preparatory Academy, Riverside County Office of Education, and Santa Maria-Bonita School District – requested funds to support culturally responsive professional learning and mentoring for current administrators. However, no expenditures were made for this purpose during the 2024-25 fiscal year. Grantees reported that these activities are scheduled for implementation in future fiscal years (2025-26 and 2026-27).

Program Narratives

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

- Program successes and challenges
- The types of culturally relevant support provided to administrator candidates and administrators to improve retention and the education, engagement, and retention of diverse pupils, families, and educators
- The degree to which the program is improving the academic and school climate outcomes for all pupils, especially historically underserved pupil subgroups.
- Any lessons learned to inform potential future investments in this type of grant program

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

Across all grantees, the 2024-25 fiscal year was described as highly successful in establishing structures to recruit and support aspiring school administrators. Common successes included:

- Fostering belonging, confidence, and purpose among administrator candidates
- Building new or strengthened partnerships with IHEs and NESPs
- Recruiting diverse cohorts that reflect the communities served by the LEA
- Developing strong mentoring and coaching systems focused on culturally responsive leadership
- Increasing local and regional interest in DELPI participation, positioning the program as a statewide model for inclusive leadership preparation

The following are direct narratives from grantees about program successes:

- *“The DELPI Fellowship has demonstrated strong success in recruiting candidates who reflect the diversity of the students they serve. Our cohort includes educators who bring a deep understanding of their communities and a commitment to equity-driven leadership.”*
- *“We had highly motivated candidates who are already emerging as leaders in their schools. DELPI provided a sense of belonging and professional purpose that many had not experienced before.”*
- *“The DELPI program experienced a strong and successful launch, with high levels of interest from educators across the region. We received inquiries from individuals outside our original consortium, which demonstrates the demand for this type of equity-centered administrator preparation.”*
- *“Thanks to the support of the DELPI grant, our partnership has drawn attention from other districts interested in replicating our approach. The program’s design and*

emphasis on culturally responsive leadership have become a reference point for similar initiatives.”

While implementation was largely successful, several grantees identified challenges typical of the first year of a new program. Key challenges included:

- Coordinating across multiple agencies and partners with varying fiscal and administrative processes
- Managing candidates’ workload as they balanced full-time employment with rigorous academic and leadership requirements.

The following are direct narratives from grantees about program challenges:

- *“One of the key challenges we faced during Year 1 was navigating the layered processes between LEAs, IHEs, and fiscal systems. Establishing communication and workflow protocols took time but improved as partnerships strengthened.”*
- *“Candidates faced the dual challenge of completing rigorous coursework while continuing their full-time teaching or leadership roles. Despite these demands, they remained committed to completing all program milestones.”*
- *“The most challenging aspect of this program is ensuring consistent coordination between district, university, and nonprofit partners. However, the relationships built through this work have made those systems much stronger.”*

All grantees described embedding culturally responsive and equity-centered approaches throughout their DELPI programming. Reported practices included:

- Coaching and affinity-based mentoring
- Culturally relevant coursework and seminars designed to strengthen administrators’ understanding of equity, identity, and systemic change
- Collaboration with NESPs to provide specialized equity-focused professional learning and mentoring

The following are direct narratives from grantees that speak to the culturally responsive and equity-centered approaches of their programs:

- *“DELPI instruction, facilitation, and mentoring emphasize cultural humility, bias awareness, and community-based leadership. Candidates are guided to understand their own identities and how those shape their leadership practices.”*
- *“Our partnership with the [NESP] provided the foundation for equity-centered coaching. Administrators-in-training learned to lead with inclusion, empathy, and accountability to their school communities.”*
- *“Through the DELPI grant, we have expanded our leadership pipeline to include emerging leaders from racially and linguistically diverse backgrounds. These administrators are modeling inclusive, culturally responsive practices that directly improve student and family engagement.”*

In their narrative responses, grantees also shared valuable insights and recommendations for future program cycles and for any future statewide initiatives with similar goals. Key lessons included:

- The importance of establishing clear communication protocols among LEAs, IHEs, and NESPs early in implementation

- The need for flexible timelines to accommodate candidates balancing work, family, and coursework obligations
- Ensuring consistent funding and administrative support to sustain long-term partnerships and mentoring systems
- Continuing to prioritize equity-focused professional learning as a cornerstone of leadership development

Summary and Conclusion

Following the award of DELPI grants in 2023-24, the 2024-25 fiscal year marked the first year of program implementation. This update highlights the successful launch of the DELPI Grant program for grantees. Grantees initiated activities aligned with the statutory purposes of the program: recruiting diverse administrator candidates, partnering with institutions of higher education and nonprofit educational service providers, and providing coaching, mentoring, and financial support for administrator candidates. A total of 104 administrator candidates enrolled in the 2024-25 cohorts, and eight completers earned a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential by the close of the 2024-25 fiscal year. Grantees have already expended 72% of funds allocated for the 2024-25 cohorts during the 2024-25 fiscal year. Unexpended funds from the 2024-25 fiscal year will roll forward to support Cohort 1 in subsequent years, particularly for credential applications fees and induction costs incurred after candidates earn their preliminary credentials.

Preliminary data indicate that the DELPI program is meeting its legislative goals of increasing administrator diversity, cultivating culturally responsive leadership, and strengthening partnerships that build capacity across California's educational system. In future years, the Commission will continue to track candidate completion, placement, retention, and impact on pupil outcomes to inform ongoing policy, legislation, and practice.

Appendix A

Table 1: LEAs and Consortium LEAs

Local Education Agency	Consortium LEAs (If applicable)
Aspire Firestone Academy (Southern California Consortium)	Aspire Antonio Maria Lugo Academy, Aspire Inskeep Academy, Aspire Ollin University Preparatory Academy, Aspire Pacific Academy, Aspire Tate Academy, Aspire Titan Academy, Aspire Slauson Academy, Aspire Centennial College Preparatory Academy, Aspire Junior Collegiate Academy, Aspire Gateway Academy, Rise Kohyang Elementary School, Rise Kohyang High School, Rise Kohayang Middle School, Stella Elementary Charter Academy, Stella High Charter Academy, Stella Middle Charter Academy, Valor Academy Elementary School, Valor Academy Middle School, Valor Academy High School, ICEF Vista Middle Academy, ICEF Vista Elementary Academy, ICEF Innovation Los Angeles Charter, ICEF Inglewood Elementary Charter Academy, ICEF View Park Preparatory Elementary, ICEF View Park Preparatory Middle, ICEF View Park Preparatory High, New Los Angeles Charter School, New Los Angeles Charter Elementary, City Language Immersion Charter, Perris Elementary School District
Aspire Lionel Wilson College Preparatory Academy (Northern California Consortium)	Aspire Berkeley Maynard Academy, Aspire College Academy, Aspire East Palo Alto Charter, Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy, Aspire Monarch Academy, Aspire Richmond California College Preparatory Academy, Aspire Richmond Technology Academy, Aspire Triumph Technology Academy, Aspire Alexander Twilight College Preparatory Academy, Aspire Alexander Twilight Secondary Academy, Aspire APEX Academy, Aspire Arts and Sciences Academy, Aspire Benjamin Holt College Preparatory Academy, Aspire Benjamin Holt Middle, Aspire Capitol Heights Academy, Aspire Langston Hughes Academy, Aspire Port City Academy, Aspire River Oaks Charter School, Aspire Rosa Parks Academy, Aspire Stockton Secondary Academy, Aspire Summit Charter Academy, Aspire University Charter School, Aspire Vanguard College Preparatory Academy, Aspire Vincent Shalvey Academy, City Arts & Leadership Academy, Envision Academy, Impact Academy, Rocketship Mateo Sheedy Elementary, Rocketship Si Se Puede Academy, Rocketship Los Suenos Academy, Rocketship Mosaic Elementary, Rocketship Discovery Prep, Rocketship Academy Brilliant Minds, Rocketship Alma Academy, Rocketship Spark Elementary, Rocketship Fuerza Community Prep, Rocketship Rising Stars, Rocketship Redwood City, Rocketship Futuro Academy, Rocketship Delta Prep, Voices College-Bound Language Academy, Voices College-Bound Language Academy at Morgan Hill, Voices College-Bound Language Academy at Mt.

Local Education Agency	Consortium LEAs (If applicable)
	Pleasant, Voices College-Bound Language Academy at Stockton, Voices College-Bound Language Academy at West Contra Costa, Sequoia Union High School District
Los Angeles County Office of Education	Centinela Valley Union High School District, Compton Unified School District, Culver City Unified School District, Lynwood Unified School District, Redondo Beach Unified School District, Wiseburn School District
Los Angeles Unified School District	Not a consortium
Oakland Unified School District	Not a consortium
Riverside County Office of Education	Coachella Valley Unified School District, Hemet Unified School District, San Bernardino City Unified School District, San Jacinto Unified School District Val Verde Unified School District, Victor Valley Union High School District
San Francisco Unified School District	Not a consortium
Santa Maria-Bonita School District	Not a consortium
Tracy Joint Unified School District	Not a consortium
West Contra Costa Unified School District	Not a consortium

Appendix B

Table 2: Cohort 1 – Budget v Actuals in 2024-25 by LEA

Local Education Agency	Budget	Actual Expenditures	% of Funds Expended
Aspire Firestone Academy	\$300,000	\$300,000	100%
Aspire Lionel Wilson College Preparatory Academy	\$360,000	\$360,000	100%
Los Angeles County Office of Education	\$420,000	\$288,068	68.59%
Los Angeles Unified School District*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oakland Unified School District	\$120,000	\$88,284	73.57%
Riverside County Office of Education	\$1,020,000.00	\$481,588	47.21%
San Francisco Unified School District	\$352,635.00	\$340,324	96.51%
Santa Maria-Bonita School District	\$180,000	\$144,868	80.48%
Tracy Joint Unified School District	\$90,000	\$40,428	44.92%
West Contra Costa Unified School District	\$60,000	\$47,000	78.33%

Note: Los Angeles Unified School District did not request any candidate slots for a 2024-25 cohort.