2C

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

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

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an update on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants and presents the 2026 Annual Report to the Legislature on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants.

Recommended Action: That the Commission approve the 2026 Annual Report to the Legislature on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants for transmittal to the Legislature.

Presenters: Sarah Solari Colombini, Interim Administrator, Division of Standards, Accreditation, and Workforce Investment

Strategic Plan Goal

Educator Preparation and Advancement

- Goal 3. California's educators reflect the diversity of the students they serve.
  F. Administer grant programs that expand pathways to credentialing

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

Introduction
This agenda item provides an update on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants (Integrated Grants) and presents the 2026 Annual Report to the Legislature on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants as required by statute (Education Code §44259.1).

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

Executive Summary
This 2026 Annual Report to the Legislature on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants provides an update on the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants (Integrated Grants) as required by statute (Education Code §44259.1) that mandates grantees to provide program and outcome data for at least five years after receiving the grant, through the 2027-28 fiscal year. The 2026 state report reflects the third year of program data collected for 2025-26 fiscal year.

The full report, found in Attachment A, is structured as follows:

- Year 3 Annual Data Report on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program
- Partnerships Between Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and California Community Colleges
- Program Implementation Progress
- Program Completion
- Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of the Participants and Completers
- Program Funding
- Program Narratives
- Summary and Conclusion

The 2026 annual report demonstrates continued progress in implementing the Integrated Teacher Preparation Grant Program, with grantees strengthening partnerships, supporting candidates through integrated preparation pathways, and contributing to efforts to address teacher shortages and increase educator diversity.

Overall findings for the 2025-26 fiscal year are summarized below:

- All grantees reported progress planning and/or implementing grant programs, including over 62 percent of grantees developing partnerships with California Community Colleges.
- In the third year of the grant program, 183 candidates earned their undergraduate degree and preliminary credential to address the teacher shortage.
- Over 75 percent of candidates and completers belong to an underrepresented ethnic/racial group.
- Grantees will continue to plan and/or recruit integrated candidates to complete their undergraduate education and preliminary certification.
- Commission staff will continue to provide technical assistance and host office hour sessions during the 2026-27 fiscal year to support program planning and implementation and annual data collection.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the 2026 report on the Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants Program for transmittal to the Legislature.

Next Steps

Commission staff will continue to support Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program grantees and present annual data reports at future Commission meetings. Grantees are required to submit annual reporting data for five years, through the 2027-28 fiscal year. The Commission will submit the 2026 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grant Program to the Legislature no later than January 1, 2027.

Attachment A

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

Introduction

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

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

Background

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

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

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

Grantees must provide program and outcome data for at least five years after receiving the grant, through the 2027-28 fiscal year. This 2026 state report includes information on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program and reflects the third year of program data collected for the 2025-26 fiscal year. The report includes information on both Integrated Planning and Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants, and addresses the following topics: grantee information, California Community College partnerships, implementation progress, credentials issued, candidate demographics, program expenditures, and direct narratives from grantees. To support annual data collection, the Commission staff hosted three forums (i.e., office hours) for grant managers, and any additional staff, to ask the Commission and the broader Integrated Grant community questions and to share best practices. All IHEs successfully submitted the annual data reporting requirements.

Year 3 Annual Data Report on the 2022 Integrated Grants Program

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

Table 1 shows the summary of grant awards and grant funds, per type of Integrated Grant Program. Appendices A and B provide a complete list of each grantee, the total grant award, 2025-26 expenditures, and the amount of grant funds remaining for the Planning Grant and Implementation/Expansion Grant, respectively. The Integrated Grant funds are one-time awards.

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

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

Eligible regionally accredited institutions awarded include California State Universities, private institutions, and Universities of California. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the type of

institutions of higher education (IHEs) that were awarded for both types of Integrated Grants Programs. The percentage of the type of IHE represented differs between Planning Grants and Implementation/Expansion Grants. Overall, private IHEs were awarded the most Integrated Grants.

Table 2: Type of IHE Awarded, per grant type

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

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

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

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

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

Table 4 below provides a breakdown, per Integrated Grant type, of the program focus areas that grantees explored in the second year of the grant program. Grantees applied to one or more program focus areas, so the total number of program focus areas in Table 4 is larger than the total number of grantees. Note that Single Subject Science in Table 4 includes Biological

Science, Chemistry, Geosciences, and Physics. PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Instruction Credential was the most common program focus area for Integrated Planning Grants (29.41%). For Integrated Implementation/Expansion Grants, Education Specialist (Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs) was the most common program focus area (33.33%). For a complete list of program focus area(s) per grantee and the type of program planning and implementation, see Appendices C and D.

Table 4: Program Focus Area, by Grant Program Area

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

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

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

Authorizing Legislation for the Integrated Grants Program supports IHEs that are interested in creating an integrated program of professional preparation with California Community College (CCC) and/or California Community College District partners. Integrated Grant Planning and Implementation/Expansion grantees using grant funds to implement integrated pathways with CCC partners are required to submit signed partnership agreements confirming planning and implementation timelines, and budgets included in the application. Grantees submitted partnership agreements with the initial grant application. Grantees may continue to submit partnership agreements through the reporting period ending June 30, 2028. Table 5 provides a breakdown, by program type, showing the percentage of grantees that have at least one CCC or CCC District partner, followed by the total number of CCC and CCC District partners. Table 5 includes all grantees that are collaborating with CCCs, and expands on the information provided in Table 3, which only reflects the number of grantees that are solely focused on planning with CCC partners. Across both program types, over 60 percent of grantees have at least one CCC

partner as of the third year of the grant program. Appendices C and D provide a complete list of each grantee and CCC partner(s) across both grant types.

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

Program Implementation Status	Planning (n=26)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=18)
At least one CCC or CCC District Partner	61.54%	72.22%
Total number of CCC Partners	33	38
Total number of CCC District Partners	4	1

Partnerships with California Community Colleges continued to support recruitment, transfer, and program access across both Planning and Implementation/Expansion grants. Grantees described collaboration with community college faculty, counselors, transfer centers, and administrators to clarify pathways into integrated teacher preparation programs, align coursework, and reduce barriers for transfer students. Some partnerships also supported recruitment events, advising, cross-enrollment, and development of new articulation or transfer agreements.

Several grantees reported concrete progress in formalizing these pathways. One Implementation/Expansion grantee finalized Transfer Admission Guarantee agreements with three community college partners, while another described developing stackable certificates and associate degree pathways aligned with its Education Specialist program.

The following are direct quotes from grantees:

- *"We successfully finalized Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) agreements with each of our three community college partners."*
- *"Our partnerships with community colleges have broadened our perspectives and deepened our understanding of how to best support community college students."*
- *"Our team believes our success is due in large part to the partnerships we have with our CA Community Colleges."*

Planning grantees similarly continued to use community college partnerships to build and refine transfer pathways. Reported activities included articulation work, recruitment at community college campuses, development of clearer degree maps, and coordination with counselors to help students enter integrated programs with fewer excess units or missing requirements.

Program Implementation Progress

Program implementation and candidate completion data in the state report reflects the third year (2025-26) data that was submitted in July 2026. Table 6 provides an updated implementation status for each Integrated Grant program type as of the end of the 2025-26 fiscal year across all the program focus areas listed in Table 4. Note that Appendix C reflects the estimated implementation date Planning grantees indicated on the initial planning grant applications, which may have changed for grantees in the first planning year. The majority of IHE Planning grantees plan to enroll candidates in the 2026-27 academic year (44.44%), while

most of the Implementation and Expansion grantees have programs in progress (87.76%). Close to 22 percent of Planning grantees will continue planning efforts in the 2026-27 academic year, and only four percent of Implementation/Expansion grantees will continue to plan before enrolling candidates.

Table 6: Program Implementation Status, by Grant Program Type

Program Implementation Status	Planning (n=36*)	Implementation/ Expansion (n=49*)
Did Not Implement in 2025-26	22.22%	4.08%
Plan to Enroll Candidates 2026-27	44.44%	2.04%
Program In-Progress	30.56%	87.76%
Implemented Fall 2025-26	2.78%	6.12%

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

In 2025-26, grantees continued to make progress developing, implementing, and expanding integrated teacher preparation pathways. Reported successes included completing curriculum and program approvals, launching new credential pathways, revising course sequences to shorten time to completion, expanding recruitment and enrollment, and strengthening advising and transfer processes. Several grantees also reported growth in bilingual, special education, and PK-3 pathways.

Grantees also reported ongoing implementation challenges. These included lengthy university and Commission approval processes, limited staffing and faculty capacity, coordination across departments, transfer students arriving with missing or misaligned coursework, and financial aid limitations for integrated programs. Some institutions also noted that the accelerated structure of integrated pathways can be difficult for students balancing coursework, employment, and other responsibilities.

The following are direct quotes from grantees speaking about implementation successes and challenges:

- *"We successfully created articulation agreements with the three partner community colleges… laying the groundwork for seamless transfer pathways for students."*
- *"Our ITEP program requires collaboration across three departments and our credential services office… This poses challenges with communication, cross-collaboration, student advising, policies and procedures."*

Program Completion

Completion data in the state report reflects candidates in Implementation/Expansion Grant programs, and the total credentials earned during the second year of the Planning grant. Table 7 provides a summary of candidates' progress, by credential area, indicating the number of integrated candidates with junior class standing (minimum of 60 semester units), senior class standing (minimum 90 semester units), other candidates, candidates that dropped out or left

the program, and candidates that earned their undergraduate degree and credential. Note that the percentages in Table 7 are calculated by credential area, and the completer data percentages are calculated using the total number of completers, not the total number of candidates across each credential area. Some of the reported "other" candidate standing circumstances include enrolling candidates with freshman and sophomore standing, community college students supported by the grant, and candidates that have earned their undergraduate degree, but are still working on completing credential assessments (i.e., TPA, RICA). While Single Subject Science (Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geoscience, and Physics combined, 29.33%) was the largest groups of candidates, Multiple Subject and Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization preliminary credentials were the two largest groups of credentials earned (31.69% and 32.24%, respectively).

Table 7: Candidate Progress, by Credential Area

Credential Area	**Total Candidates (n=1497)**	**Junior Class Standing (n=925)**	**Senior Class Standing (n= 389)**	**Other Candidates (n=181)**	**Dropped or Left Program (n=43)**	**Credentials Earned (n=183)**
Multiple Subject	311 (20.77%)	173 (18.70%)	80 (20.57%)	20 (11.05%)	14 (32.56%)	58 (31.69%)
Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization	205 (13.69%)	62 (6.70%)	84 (21.59%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (27.91%)	59 (32.24%)
Single Subject- Mathematics	252 (16.83%)	185 (20.00%)	42 (10.80%)	41 (22.65%)	1 (2.33%)	25 (13.66%)
Single Subject- Science	439 (29.33%)	350 (37.84%)	71 (18.25%)	97 (53.59%)	0 (0.00%)	18 (9.84%)
Mild to Moderate Support Needs	177 (11.82%)	80 (8.65%)	82 (21.08%)	0 (0.00%)	10 (23.26%)	15 (8.20%)
Extensive Support Needs	29 (1.94%)	19 (2.05%)	7 (1.80%)	3 (1.66%)	3 (6.98%)	3 (1.64%)
PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction	84 (5.61%)	56 (6.05%)	23 (5.91%)	20 (11.05%)	3 (6.98%)	5 (2.73%)

Ethnic/Racial Composition and Gender Identification of Candidates and Completers

Integrated grantees reported candidates' self-identified ethnic/racial composition and gender identity. The data in Tables 8 and 9 break down the demographics of the total Integrated Grantee candidates and program completers. Note that the total numbers reported are less than those reported in Table 7, as some candidates and completers are working on or have earned more than one credential. Additionally, note that the Asian ethnic/racial category

includes Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Asian Indian, Laotian, Cambodian, Filipino, and Hmong. The Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ethnic/racial category also includes Guamanian, Samoan, and Tahitian.

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

Race/Ethnicity	**Total Candidates (n=1497)**	**Completers (n=183)**
American Indian or Alaska Native	5 (0.33%)	0 (0%)
Asian	223 (14.90%)	14 (7.65%)
Black or African American	40 (2.67%)	4 (2.19%)
Hispanic/Latinx (of any race)	847 (56.58%)	107 (58.47%)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	8 (0.53%)	2 (1.09%)
White	223 (14.90%)	42 (22.95%)
Two or more races	77 (5.14%)	13 (7.10%)
Decline to state Race/Ethnicity	74 (4.94%)	1 (0.55%)

Table 9: Gender Identity of Candidates and Program Completers

Gender Identity	**Total Candidates (n=1497)**	**Completers (n=183)**
Female	1076 (71.88%)	150 (81.97%)
Male	385 (25.72%)	32 (17.49%)
Nonbinary	14 (0.94%)	0 (0.00%)
Decline to state	22 (1.47%)	1 (0.55%)

In 2025-26 narrative responses, grantees described a range of strategies to recruit and retain a diverse candidate pool. These included outreach through community colleges, high schools, and local education agencies; targeted recruitment of bilingual candidates, first-generation college students, paraprofessionals, and other historically underrepresented groups; and individualized advising and financial support. Several grantees also emphasized the importance of making integrated pathways easier to understand and navigate for students who may be unfamiliar with teacher preparation requirements.

The following are direct quotes from grantees:

- *"As a Hispanic-Serving (HSI) and Minority-Serving Institution (MSI), we are deeply dedicated to diversifying the teacher pipeline to reflect California's student population, with a purposeful focus on marketing our program to male students of color, veterans, and military-serving families."*
- *"Recruitment efforts emphasized outreach to local community colleges, school districts, paraprofessionals, long-term substitutes, first-generation college students, and bilingual Spanish-speaking candidates interested in serving Inland Empire schools."*

Program Funding

Both Integrated Grant program types were funded as one-time grant awards in the 2022-23 fiscal year. Table 10 provides the total grant award, the total amount expended in the 2025-26 fiscal year, the percentage expended, and the total amount of remaining funds. After the first year of expenditures (2023-24), close to 27 percent of planning grantees expended half or more of awarded funds, while none of the implementation/expansion grantees expended half or more of awarded funds. During the second fiscal year (2024-25) 77 percent of grant funds have been expended. After the most recent year of expenditures (2025-26), close to 88 percent of grant funds have been expended. As part of the 2025-26 reporting process, grantees with remaining grant funds reported whether there was a need to continue expending grant funds during the following fiscal year. Grantees who reported a need to continue utilizing grant funds can do so during the 2026-27 fiscal year. Grantees will continue to report annual implementation, candidate progress, and grant fund utilization (if applicable) through the 2027-28 academic year.

Table 10: 2025-26 Grant Award Expenditure, per grant type

Type	Grant Award	Total Expended	% Expended	Remaining Funds
Planning	$6,175,077.87	$5,247,398.99	84.98%	$927,678.88
Implementation/Expansion	$8,675,848.58	$7,802,615.25	89.93%	$873,233.33
Total	$14,850,926.45	$13,050,014.24	87.87%	$1,800,912.21

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

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

- Integrated program consultant
- Other costs

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

Table 11: Planning Grant Award Expenditures by Budget Categories

Budget Categories	Total Grant Amount	% of Total Grant Award	Expended	% Expended, from Total Expenditures	% Expended, from Total Category Budget
Administration Costs	$957,313.00	15.50%	$883,709.77	16.11%	38.63%
Coordination with CCC(s): Salaries	$266,348.00	4.31%	$214,388.29	4.40%	37.87%
Recruitment Strategies	$283,037.00	4.58%	$253,633.48	1.01%	8.16%
Release Time	$1,411,376.35	22.86%	$1,181,894.89	27.15%	44.15%
Faculty/Personnel Salaries	$897,944.00	14.54%	$929,463.77	19.11%	48.84%
Faculty/Personnel Stipends	$784,056.00	12.70%	$634,820.71	14.92%	43.66%
Program Coordinator Stipends	$157,698.00	2.55%	$121,683.06	3.77%	54.88%
Travel	$75,693.00	1.23%	$38,020.62	0.46%	13.82%
Integrated Program Consultant	$245,500.00	3.98%	$225,125.30	1.97%	18.41%
Other	$1,068,826.52	17.31%	$715,133.98	11.11%	23.85%

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

Budget Categories	Total Grant Amount	% of Total Grant Award	Expended	% Expended, from Total Expenditures	% Expended, from Total Category Budget
Administration Costs	$998,293.18	11.51%	$931,908.33	11.90%	25.70%
Coordination with CCC(s): Salaries	$296,821.23	3.42%	$295,490.14	4.21%	30.62%
Recruitment Strategies	$1,658,244.90	19.11%	$1,418,607.95	9.94%	12.93%
Release Time	$1,521,992.24	17.54%	$1,047,798.12	17.92%	25.38%
Faculty/Personnel Salaries	$1,385,123.06	15.97%	$1,661,944.78	34.82%	54.21%
Faculty/Personnel Stipends	$304,644.31	3.51%	$256,698.39	3.38%	23.94%
Program Coordinator Stipends	$109,691.53	1.26%	$106,630.41	2.39%	47.03%
Travel	$70,753.42	0.82%	$64,397.64	0.06%	1.88%
Integrated Program Consultant	$47,941.00	0.55%	$55,685.41	0.37%	16.51%
Other	$2,282,343.23	26.31%	$1,963,454.08	15.01%	14.18%

Across both grant programs, expenditures were concentrated primarily in personnel-related costs and faculty release time. For Planning Grants, release time accounted for the largest share of expenditures at 27 percent, followed by faculty/personnel salaries at 19 percent and administration costs at 16 percent. For Implementation/Expansion Grants, faculty/personnel salaries represented the largest share of expenditures at 35 percent, followed by release time at 18 percent and other costs at 15 percent. Recruitment, travel, and consultant expenditures represented smaller shares of total spending across both grant programs.

Program Narratives

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

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

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

Grantees frequently emphasized the importance of building clear and sustainable systems around integrated programs. This included involving advisors and other campus offices early, establishing consistent communication across departments, and creating processes that do not depend on a single staff member. Grantees also noted that curriculum and program approval processes often took longer than anticipated and that realistic timelines and early coordination with credential, financial aid, and curriculum staff were important to implementation.

Another common lesson was the need for flexibility in program design and candidate support. Grantees described the value of multiple entry points, clear advising from the beginning of the pathway, and structures that account for the needs of transfer students and candidates balancing school, employment, and other responsibilities. Several also identified improved student tracking and continued follow-up as important for understanding candidate progress over time.

The following are direct quotes from grantees:

- *"The key to success is clear advisement and successfully guiding candidates through the completion of both their undergraduate degree and credential requirements—particularly for transfer students."*
- *"All collaborators must be on board to support the program."*
- *"We continue to learn that there is a lot of outreach and education needed to both internal and external audiences about integrated pathways."*

Summary and Conclusion

The 2026 annual state report reflects the third year of the 2022 Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Grants Program planning and implementation through the 2025-26 academic year. All grantees reported progress planning and/or implementing grant programs, including over 62 percent of grantees developing partnerships with California Community Colleges. In this third year of the grant program, 183 candidates earned their undergraduate degree and preliminary credential to address the teacher shortage. Over 75 percent of candidates and completers belong to an underrepresented ethnic/racial group. Grantees will continue to plan and/or recruit integrated candidates to complete their undergraduate education and preliminary certification. Commission staff will continue to provide technical assistance and host office hour sessions in 2026-27 to support program planning and implementation and annual data collection.

Appendix A

Planning Grant: Total Grant Award, Total Expenditures as of EOY 2025-26, and Remaining Funds

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Total Grant Award	Total Expenditures	% Expended	Remaining Grant Funds
Azusa Pacific University	$249,948.00	$233,747.00	93.52%	$16,201.00
Biola University	$250,000.00	$150,517.48	60.21%	$99,482.52
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	$250,000.00	$110,693.88	44.28%	$139,306.12
California Baptist University	$249,999.00	$217,483.14	86.99%	$32,515.86
Chapman University	$249,106.00	$246,890.55	99.11%	$2,215.45
CSU Channel Islands	$249,942.00	$249,942.00	100.00%	$0.00
CSU Fresno	$249,950.00	$210,924.58	84.39%	$39,025.42
CSU Long Beach	$250,000.00	$112,184.57	44.87%	$137,815.43
CSU Long Beach	$250,000.00	$245,881.32	98.35%	$4,118.68
CSU Monterey Bay	$250,000.00	$174,217.46	69.69%	$75,782.54
EDvance College	$250,000.00	$250,000.00	100.00%	$0.00
Fresno Pacific University	$249,995.00	$196,664.68	78.67%	$53,330.32
Humphreys University	$131,392.00	$92,992.00	70.77%	$38,400.00
Humphreys University	$104,536.00	$76,336.00	73.02%	$28,200.00
Jessup University	$244,900.00	$244,900.00	100.00%	$0.00
Loyola Marymount University	$250,000.00	$239,441.47	95.78%	$10,558.53
Mount Saint Mary's University	$249,910.87	$249,293.07	99.75%	$617.80
San Francisco State University	$240,240.00	$240,240.00	100.00%	$0.00
San Jose State University	$250,000.00	$246,439.34	98.58%	$3,560.66
Simpson University	$233,570.00	$200,728.12	85.94%	$32,841.88
Sonoma State University	$249,629.00	$245,941.35	98.52%	$3,687.65
University of San Diego	$240,795.00	$240,795.00	100.00%	$0.00
University of San Diego	$250,000.00	$227,910.98	91.16%	$22,089.02
University of Southern California	$249,864.00	$61,934.00	24.79%	$187,930.00
Vanguard University	$233,099.00	$233,099.00	100.00%	$0.00
Vanguard University	$248,202.00	$248,202.00	100.00%	$0.00

Appendix B

Implementation/Expansion Grant: Total Grant Award, Total Expenditures as of EOY 2025-26, and Remaining Funds

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Total Grant Award	Total Expenditures	% Expended	Remaining Grant Funds
Azusa Pacific University	$499,938.00	$335,115.00	67.03%	$164,823.00
Biola University	$500,000.00	$451,115.48	90.22%	$48,884.52
Cal Poly Pomona	$500,000.00	$465,602.89	93.12%	$34,397.11
Cal State LA	$500,000.00	$498,990.47	99.80%	$1,009.53
California Lutheran University	$500,000.00	$500,000.09	100.00%	$0.00
CSU Dominguez Hills	$499,999.00	$277,430.96	55.49%	$222,568.04
CSU Long Beach	$500,000.00	$479,081.90	95.82%	$20,918.10
CSU Northridge	$500,000.00	$430,977.31	86.20%	$69,022.69
CSU Northridge	$330,000.00	$328,378.71	99.51%	$1,621.29
CSU San Bernardino	$499,996.58	$499,184.32	99.84%	$812.26
Fresno Pacific University	$499,055.00	$499,055.00	100.00%	$0.00
Fresno State University	$499,864.00	$340,799.75	68.18%	$159,064.25
Loyola Marymount University	$500,000.00	$499,999.52	100.00%	$0.48
Saint Mary's College	$491,478.00	$447,486.55	91.05%	$43,991.45
San Diego State University	$499,975.00	$499,975.00	100.00%	$0.00
UC Berkeley	$499,888.00	$492,434.13	98.51%	$7,453.87
UC Irvine	$487,358.00	$487,358.00	100.00%	$0.00
University of Redlands	$368,297.00	$269,630.17	73.21%	$98,666.83

Appendix C

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

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	**Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, E, I, N) ***	**Community College Partner(s)**
Azusa Pacific University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• Barstow Community College • Victor Valley College
Biola University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• No CCC Partner
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• No CCC Partner
California Baptist University	• Bilingual Education Specialist-N	• No CCC Partner
Chapman University	• Mild to Moderate Support Needs-N • Extensive Support Needs-N	• No CCC Partner
CSU Channel Islands	• Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• Ventura County Community College District
CSU Fresno	• Mild to Moderate Support Needs-A • Extensive Support Needs-A	• College of the Sequoias
CSU Long Beach	• Multiple Subject-A • Early Childhood Education Specialist-N	• No CCC Partner
CSU Long Beach	• Mild to Moderate Support Needs-A • Extensive Support Needs-A	• Cerritos College • Golden West College
CSU Monterey Bay	• Single Subject- Biological Sciences- A	• Cabrillo College • Hartnell College • Monterey Peninsula College
EDvance College	• Bilingual Education Specialist-N • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• Berkeley City College, • Los Medanos College
Fresno Pacific University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• College of the Sequoias • Fresno City College • Reedley College
Humphreys University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• No CCC Partner

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, E, I, N) *	Community College Partner(s)
Humphreys University	• Multiple Subject-N	• No CCC Partner
Jessup University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• Sierra Joint Community College District • Yuba College
Loyola Marymount University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• Los Angeles Mission College
Mount Saint Mary's University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• Los Angeles Southwest College
San Francisco State University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• City College of San Francisco • Los Medanos College • Skyline College • Diablo Valley College
San Jose State University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• West Valley College
Simpson University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• Shasta College
Sonoma State University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• Santa Rosa Junior College
University of San Diego	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• San Diego City College • San Diego Mesa College • San Diego Miramar College
University of San Diego	• Education Specialist with Bilingual Authorization-E • Multiple Subject-E • Single Subject-Biological Science-E • Single Subject-Chemistry-E • Single Subject-Mathematics-E	• San Diego City College • San Diego Mesa College • San Diego Miramar College
University of Southern California	• Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-N • PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N • Single Subject Science (Biological Science, Chemistry, Geosciences, Physics)-N • Single Subject-Mathematics • Single Subject- Music	• No CCC Partner

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, E, I, N) *	Community College Partner(s)
	• Single Subject- Dance • Single Subject- Theater	
Vanguard University	• PK-3 Early Childhood Education-N	• Fullerton College • Irvine Valley College • Orange Coast College • Saddleback College • Santa Ana College
Vanguard University	• Mild to Moderate support Needs-N	• Fullerton College • Coastline Community College

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

Appendix D

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

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	**Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, C, E, I, N) ***	**Community College Partner(s)**
Azusa Pacific University	• Multiple Subject (TK/K)-N • Single Subject Science-E • Single Subject Math-E • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E • Extensive Support Needs-E	• No CCC Partner
Biola University	• Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-A	• No CCC Partner
Cal Poly Pomona	• Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E • Extensive Support Needs-E	• Chaffey College • Citrus College • Mt. San Antonio College
Cal State LA	• • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E	• East Los Angeles College • Los Angeles City College • Pasadena City College • Rio Hondo College
California Lutheran University	• Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E • Early Childhood Education Specialist with Bilingual Authorization-E	• No CCC Partner
CSU Dominguez Hills	• Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-C • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-I • Early Childhood Education Specialist-E	• Cerritos College • East Los Angeles College • El Camino College • Long Beach City College • Los Angeles Harbor College
CSU Long Beach	• Mild to Moderate Support Needs-N • Extensive Support Needs-N	• Cerritos College • Golden West College
CSU Northridge	• Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E • Extensive Support Needs-E	• No CCC Partner

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, C, E, I, N) *	Community College Partner(s)
CSU Northridge	• Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E	• No CCC Partner
CSU San Bernardino	• Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-C	• San Bernardino Community College District
Fresno Pacific University	• Multiple Subject (TK/K)-A • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-A • Single Subject Science-A • Single Subject Mathematics-A • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-A • Extensive Support Needs-A	• Clovis Community College • College of the Sequoias • Fresno City College • Reedley College
Fresno State University	• Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E	• Fresno City College • Clovis Community College
Loyola Marymount University	• Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E	• El Camino College • Pasadena City College • Santa Monica College
Saint Mary's College	• Multiple Subject (TK/K)-C • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-C • Single Subject Science-A • Single Subject Mathematics-A • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-C	• Diablo Valley College • Merritt College • Los Medanos College
San Diego State University	• Multiple Subject (TK/K)-E • Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization-E • Mild to Moderate Support Needs-E • Extensive Support Needs-E	• Southwestern College
UC Berkeley	• Single Subject Science-E • Single Subject Mathematics-E	• Berkeley City College • College of Marin • Diablo Valley College • Laney College
UC Irvine	• Single Subject Science-E • Single Subject Mathematics-E	• Irvine Valley College • Mt. San Antonio College • Orange Coast College • Santa Ana College • Santiago Canyon College

Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Program Focus Area(s)- Type of Planning (A, C, E, I, N) *	Community College Partner(s)
University of Redlands	• Single Subject Science-A • Single Subject Mathematics-A	• Crafton Hills College

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