
LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Roseville Joint Union High School District
CDS Code: 31-66928
School Year: 2026-27
LEA contact information:
Dr. Tu Carroz
Assistant Superintendent
tcarroz@rjuhsd.us
(916) 782-5979

School districts receive funding from different sources: state funds under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), other state funds, local funds, and federal funds. LCFF funds include a base level of funding for all LEAs and extra funding - called "supplemental and concentration" grants - to LEAs based on the enrollment of high needs students (Foster Youth, English learners, and low-income students).

Budget Overview for the 2026-27 School Year




This chart shows the total general purpose revenue Roseville Joint Union High School District expects to receive in the coming year from all sources.

The text description for the above chart is as follows: The total revenue projected for Roseville Joint Union High School District is $212,406,613, of which $160,360,839 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), $28,134,118 is other state funds, $19,757,201 is local funds, and $4,154,455 is federal funds. Of the $160,360,839 in LCFF Funds, $12,671,080 is generated based on the enrollment of high needs students (Foster Youth, English learner, and low-income students).

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

The LCFF gives school districts more flexibility in deciding how to use state funds. In exchange, school districts must work with parents, educators, students, and the community to develop a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) that shows how they will use these funds to serve students.



This chart provides a quick summary of how much Roseville Joint Union High School District plans to spend for 2026-27. It shows how much of the total is tied to planned actions and services in the LCAP.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: Roseville Joint Union High School District plans to spend $212,958,746 for the 2026-27 school year. Of that amount, $29,072,338 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and $183,886,408 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:


General fund expenditures not included in the LCAP include certificated and classified salaries and benefits, special education costs, facilities and maintenance upkeep, transportation, administrative costs and core education program needs.

Increased or Improved Services for High Needs Students in the LCAP for the 2026-27 School Year

In 2026-27, Roseville Joint Union High School District is projecting it will receive $12,671,080 based on the enrollment of Foster Youth, English learner, and low-income students. Roseville Joint Union High School District must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Roseville Joint Union High School District plans to spend $14,171,080 towards meeting this requirement, as described in the LCAP.

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Update on Increased or Improved Services for High Needs Students in 2025-26



This chart compares what Roseville Joint Union High School District budgeted last year in the LCAP for actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students with what Roseville Joint Union High School District estimates it has spent on actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students in the current year.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: In 2025-26, Roseville Joint Union High School District's LCAP budgeted $12,018,591 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Roseville Joint Union High School District actually spent $10,923,967 for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2025-26.

The difference between the budgeted and actual expenditures of $1,094,624 had the following impact on Roseville Joint Union High School District’s ability to increase or improve services for high needs students:

The difference between the total budgeted expenditures and actual expenditures for actions and services in 2025–26 is primarily due to strategic adjustments in funding sources, timing of expenditures, and conservative placeholder budgeting practices.

In several cases, planned professional development and credit recovery expenditures were ultimately funded through alternative restricted funding sources, including Educator Effectiveness and Learning Recovery funds, in order to meet expenditure deadlines and maximize the use of those one time funds. As a result, these services were still fully implemented, but the associated costs were not reflected under LCFF supplemental expenditures.

Additionally, a portion of the variance is attributed to credit recovery costs that were either lower than projected or shifted to other funding sources. This reflects ongoing efforts to align expenditures with actual student participation and program needs.

Finally, some budgeted amounts, particularly within core content and instructional support (Action 2.1), were intentionally included as placeholders during the planning phase to ensure sufficient allocation of resources. Not all of these funds were ultimately needed or expended, as final program needs and costs were lower than initially anticipated.

Overall, this difference did not negatively impact the implementation of actions and services. RJUHSD was able to fully implement the planned support for high need student groups, and in many cases, leveraged additional funding sources to enhance or sustain services. The district continues to prioritize effective and strategic use of resources to increase or improve services for unduplicated pupils.

Local Control and Accountability Plan

The instructions for completing the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) follow the template.

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Roseville Joint Union High School District	Dr. Tu Carroz Assistant Superintendent	tcarroz@rjuhsd.us (916) 782-5979

Plan Summary [2026-27]

General Information

A description of the LEA, its schools, and its students in grades transitional kindergarten–12, as applicable to the LEA. LEAs may also provide information about their strategic plan, vision, etc.

The Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) serves the educational needs of over 11,000 students from a diverse range of backgrounds (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2025). Geographically, the district encompasses the city of Roseville, the Granite Bay community, and a portion of Antelope. It spans both Placer and Sacramento counties and is situated approximately 35 miles northeast of Sacramento. Roseville has evolved significantly since its incorporation in 1909, transitioning from a railroad-centric town to a vibrant city with a diverse population. The city has earned a reputation for its excellent schools, expanding employment opportunities, and a welcoming environment for families.

RJUHSD operates six comprehensive high schools (Antelope, Granite Bay, Oakmont, Roseville, Woodcreek, and West Park), along with an adult school (Roseville Adult), and alternative education options through Roseville Pathways which include two campuses, Adelante and Independence, serving continuation, independent study, and middle college students. According to data from the fall 2025 California School Dashboard, the RJUHSD student population totaled 11,002 (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2024). Breaking down this population, 42.5% of students are socioeconomically disadvantaged, 6.1% are English Learners, 3.2% are experiencing homelessness and 0.2% are foster youth. Over the past decade, the RJUHSD student body has become more diverse, with the current ethnic breakdown showing 45.9% white students, 3.8% African American, 12.3% Asian, 4.8% Filipino, 22.3% Hispanic, and 6.4% are Two or More Races. The most commonly spoken non-English languages among our families are Spanish, Russian, Ukrainian, Punjabi, Arabic, and Filipino (Pilipino or Tagalog) (Dataquest; California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2025).

Reflections: Annual Performance

A reflection on annual performance based on a review of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) and local data.

Upon reviewing our district's performance on the 2025 California School Dashboard and local data, we have identified both successes and challenges across multiple state indicators. Our reflection highlights the areas in need of targeted support and our ongoing efforts to improve student outcomes across all student groups.

Academic Performance

Our district performed well overall on the ELA indicator, with 63.79% of students meeting or exceeding standard. This exceeds both the state average of 48.2% and the county average of 58.14%. Notable areas of strength include Filipino (82.4%) and Asian students (74.72%). However, challenges persist among English Learners (EL), Long-Term English Learners (LTELs), and students with disabilities (SWD), with only 9.46%, 15.46%, and 18.18% respectively meeting or exceeding standard. LTELs declined by 4.5 points, while ELs remained relatively stable at -0.1 points. SWD increased by 4.2 points. Additionally, students identifying as Two or More Races declined by 16.6 points. Contributing factors include the need to strengthen reclassification systems and support for LTEL students, as well as the continued need for specialized interventions and inclusive instructional practices for SWD.

Math performance increased to 41.61% of students meeting or exceeding standard. While this is above the state average of 37.30%, it remains below the county average of 47.13%. A notable success includes African American students moving from orange to yellow, with an increase of 20.2 points districtwide. LTELs also showed growth, increasing by 4.3 points. Despite these gains, significant challenges remain for students with disabilities, with only 8.20% meeting or exceeding standard, although this subgroup did increase by 3 points. These outcomes indicate a continued need for targeted math interventions, strengthened Tier I instruction, and expanded support structures for historically underserved student groups.

Student movement from the 2023 Dashboard Red Indicators:
Antelope High: ELA: African American students moved to N/A, (not enough student group data) however, they did increase by 47.1 points. Math: African American students moved to N/A, however, they increased by 45.3 points. English learners moved to yellow and increased by 16.7 points.
Independence High: ELA: African American is N/A with fewer than 11 students. Math: All students moved to yellow with an increase by 28.9 points. White students moved yellow back to red and declined by 6.5 points.
Roseville High: Math: SED students moved maintained at yellow with an increase by 10.9 points.
Woodcreek High: ELA: SWD students increased by 29.5 points and moved to N/A. Math: SED moved maintained at yellow and increased by 13.4 points. SWD is N/A, however, they increased by 46.3 points.

We attribute areas of growth to the continued implementation of key district actions, including the use of Building Thinking Classrooms (BTC), development of a systemic math support plan, expansion of targeted intervention programs, integration of interim assessments, increased implementation of co-teaching models, and ongoing professional development for educators. These strategies are designed to address achievement gaps, improve student performance, and ensure equitable access to high-quality instruction for all students across the district.

Graduation Rate

The Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) maintained a strong overall graduation rate of 94%, continuing to exceed the statewide average. This reflects the ongoing commitment of students, educators, and the broader school community. Subgroup performance reflects both areas of progress and areas requiring additional focus. Graduation rates include 76% for English Learners (declined by 3.9%), 91.2% for socioeconomically disadvantaged students (increased by 1.2%), 74.3% for homeless students (increased by 4.8%), and 75% for students with disabilities (declined by 2.6%). The performance level for students with disabilities declined from yellow to orange, while homeless students maintained yellow status. These trends indicate continued progress for some student groups, alongside the need for targeted support for English Learners and students with disabilities.

The following schools moved in performance color from the 2023 dashboard:
Adelante High - All Students moved back to red, with a 59.3% graduation rate. Hispanic students declined significantly to 42.9% (a decrease of 37.1%), and socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students declined to 60.6% (a decrease of 9.2%). White students maintained at -0.8% (68.4% graduation rate).
Antelope High - Students with disabilities improved to green, increasing by 7.4%.
Granite Bay High: Students with Disabilities (SWD) moved to green (increase by 11.8%).
Roseville High: Students with Disabilities (SWD) maintained yellow (increased by 1.5%).
Independence High: Hispanic students were N/A, however, they increased by 20.8%.
Oakmont High: SWD students are N/A, however they declined by 8.1%.

We attribute areas of growth to continued implementation of academic support for all students and expanded access to credit recovery during both the academic year and summer for students deficient in credits. At the same time, the identified declines highlight the need to strengthen targeted interventions, particularly for English Learners and students with disabilities, and to ensure consistent monitoring of student progress toward graduation. Through these continued efforts, RJUHSD aims to close gaps for student groups while sustaining high overall graduation rates.

Suspension Rate

In RJUHSD, suspension rates continue to reflect both successes and ongoing challenges in maintaining a positive school climate. The overall suspension rate decreased by 0.7%, allowing the district to maintain a green performance level.

Despite this overall success, disparities persist among specific student groups. Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) experienced an increase in suspension rates by 1.5%, and English Learners increased by 0.9%. In contrast, foster youth declined significantly by 6.8%. Students with disabilities improved, declining by 2.7% and moving from red to yellow. Additionally, homeless students declined by 6.5% and improved from orange to yellow.

These outcomes reflect both progress in reducing overall suspensions and the need for continued targeted support for specific student groups, particularly LTELs and English Learners.
Contributing factors to the overall decrease in suspension rates include a continued focus on data collection, improved documentation practices, and ongoing data analysis. The district refined the PAUSE protocol to further support administrative teams in increasing the use of “Other Means of Correction” (OMC) in place of suspensions.

Throughout the year, discipline practices, outcomes, and data are regularly reviewed by administrative teams to ensure alignment across the district. This work has included extensive dialogue, reflection, and root cause analysis, with a focus on approaching each situation individually to better understand and address student behavior. As a result, the culture around discipline practices across the district has continued to improve, as evidenced by the sustained reduction in suspension rates. This year, the district expanded alignment efforts through case studies, reflection, norming activities, and increased accountability through peer support and consultation. Additionally, expanded intervention practices have contributed to a more positive overall school climate. While many student groups continue to exhibit relatively lower suspension rates, disparities remain.

The following schools and student groups moved in performance color from the 2023 dashboard:
Foster youth - moved to orange and declined in suspensions by 6.8%.
Students with Disabilities - in yellow and declined by 2.7%.
African American - in yellow and declined by 1.9%.
SED Students - in green and declined by 1%.
Woodcreek High - SWD students moved to orange and increased by 0.7%.
Next Steps - The district will continue to strengthen the use of Other Means of Correction through expanded intervention practices, increased collaboration with site-based resources (including special education staff, counselors, and wellness teams), and additional training for teachers and administrators on behavior intervention strategies such as trauma-informed practices and motivational interviewing. These efforts will be supported by continued access to social-emotional services and a sustained focus on fostering a culture of care across all schools.

College/Career Readiness (CCI)

RJUHSD increased to 58.7% of students being prepared on the College/Career Indicator (CCI), up 3% from the previous school year. Notable areas of strength include Filipino students (72.1%), Asian students (68.6%), White students (60.7%), Hispanic students (50%), socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students (45.9%), and African American students (42.7%). Homeless students maintained a yellow performance level, with an increase of 12.6%. Despite these strengths, challenges persist across certain schools and student groups, as outlined below.

The following schools and student groups moved in performance color from the 2023 dashboard:
Adelante High: All students remain in red, maintaining at -1.1%. SED students also remain in red at -1.4%. Hispanic students are in red and declined by 2.6%. English Learners, homeless students, LTELs, students with disabilities (SWD), and White students remain at 0% prepared.
Antelope High: Students with disabilities (SWD) maintained yellow, increasing by 8.8%.
Independence High: All students increased by 6.7%.
Oakmont High: English Learners (EL) are N/A and declined by 8.3% and Students with Disabilities (SWD) also are N/A, increasing by 9.1%.
Woodcreek High: English Learners (EL) moved to N/A and increased by 23.3%. SWD maintained yellow and increased by 5.1%.
These outcomes highlight the need to strengthen systems that support college and career readiness, particularly for historically underserved student groups.

Next Steps – To improve College and Career Indicator (CCI) outcomes, the district will continue expanding Career Technical Education (CTE) pathways to increase student access, awareness, and completion of pathway sequences, particularly for unduplicated student groups including students with disabilities (SWD), English Learners (EL), foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. The district will also continue expanding Dual Enrollment opportunities and increase intentional conversations with students regarding the value of completing CTE pathways and participating in one or more Dual Enrollment courses as part of becoming CCI prepared.

Counselors will continue providing individualized academic planning support during the fall semester to ensure students understand available pathways and opportunities connected to CCI readiness. The district also plans to develop clearer communication tools and resources, including CCI flowcharts and awareness materials, to help students and families better understand the multiple pathways available for college and career readiness. While A–G completion rates continue to show progress, the district will maintain a focus on increasing access to rigorous coursework and CTE learning experiences for unduplicated student populations to ensure all students graduate prepared for college, career, and life.

English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)

Progress on the ELPI showed that 50% of our English Learners are making adequate progress toward English proficiency as measured by English Language Proficiency Assessment for California (ELPAC) which has maintained since the 2024 dashboard after a decline from the 2022-2023 dashboard. All students identified as EL maintained at 0.3%. Both EL and LTEL's maintained at 0.3% and -0.3% respectively.

Successes were observed at Oakmont High School as they increased by 6.2%, Woodcreek High School (increasing for the second year in a row) which they attributed in part to the change of the ELPAC testing environment and strengthened partnership between the EL and the English teachers to strengthen English instruction. Although Oakmont High School, and Roseville High School showed a decline in 2023-2024, progress has been made. Oakmont High School increased by 6.2% and Roseville High School maintained at 0.4%.

Next Steps - To improve English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) outcomes, the district will continue strengthening systems focused on the instructional experiences and academic success of English Learners (ELs). A continued focus will be placed on intentional EL shadow walks, classroom walkthroughs centered on EL instructional practices, and ongoing monitoring of EL student performance in core classes. These efforts are designed to increase administrator and teacher awareness of the learning experiences of EL students and strengthen the implementation of high-quality first instruction across all content areas. Five of the six comprehensive high schools participated in EL shadow walks during the 2025–26 school year, providing administrators and teacher leaders with direct insight into the student experience throughout the instructional day. In addition, multiple classroom visits were conducted in designated ELD classrooms to observe the explicit instruction of the California ELD Standards, including instruction focused on how English works, foundational language development, and interacting in meaningful ways. These observations support instructional reflection, professional learning, and increased alignment of designated and integrated ELD practices.

The district will also continue building EL professional development capacity among site administrators and instructional leaders to ensure ongoing attention to EL student achievement, including monitoring grades in core classes and identifying targeted supports and interventions when needed. Through these efforts, the district aims to strengthen instructional practices, improve student engagement and language development, and ultimately improve ELPI outcomes for English Learners.

Learning Recovery and Emergency Block Grant (LREBG)

RJUHSD has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2026-27 school year.

LREBG funded actions may be found in:
Goal 2, Action 2.3, 2.6
Goal 3, Action 3.2

The RJUHSD needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2025 Dashboard related to English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics academic performance, graduation rates, and suspension rates. A review of state and local data continues to indicate disparities in academic performance, graduation, and suspension outcomes among students with disabilities (SWD), English Learners (EL), Long-Term English Learners (LTEL), African American, and socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) student groups.

Based on these findings, Goal 2, Actions 2.3, 2.6, and 3.2 directly address the identified needs by strengthening instructional capacity, expanding access to credit recovery and summer school opportunities, increasing targeted support for unduplicated student groups, and providing professional development and training for staff. These actions are designed to improve student engagement, accelerate learning, and ensure students have access to the academic and intervention supports necessary to be successful.

Specifically, Action 2.3 supports credit recovery, summer school programming, and professional development to ensure students have opportunities to recover credits, stay on track for graduation, and improve academic outcomes. Action 2.6 focuses on building staff capacity through targeted professional development in artificial intelligence to enhance instructional practices and support personalized learning. Action 3.2 supports staff through training opportunities and professional development/growth in order to effectively meet the needs of our students. This includes increasing the number of staff trained to support site-level intervention processes and ensuring consistent use of data to inform student support.

These actions align with allowable uses of Learning Recovery Block Grant funds in the areas of professional development, instructional capacity building, and intervention support systems, ensuring that the district continues to address identified gaps and improve outcomes for unduplicated student groups.

The RJUHSD needs assessment did not identify Chronic Absenteeism as a primary area of need for Learning Recovery Block Grant funding, as it is not a California Dashboard indicator at the high school level. However, the district continues to monitor attendance trends and implement site-based supports as needed to ensure student engagement and access to instruction.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

As applicable, a summary of the work underway as part of technical assistance.

The Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) continues to engage in Differentiated Assistance as part of the second year of the support cycle, with a focus on monitoring progress, refining systems, and strengthening implementation of actions aligned to identified needs for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Long-Term English Learners (LTEL). While the district did not requalify for Differentiated Assistance

based on the 2025 California Dashboard, ongoing collaboration with the Placer County Office of Education (PCOE) has supported continued progress monitoring and system improvement efforts.

Throughout the 2025–26 school year, RJUHSD and PCOE engaged in consultative meetings to review Dashboard data, assess progress on identified action items, and determine next steps for strengthening academic and behavioral supports. These meetings focused on reviewing outcomes related to academic performance, graduation rates, and suspension data for SWD, LTEL, and other unduplicated student groups. The district shared data updates and engaged in collaborative discussions to identify areas of progress and opportunities for continued growth.

A key area of focus this year has been strengthening system coherence and fidelity of implementation across sites. Professional learning cycles for English Language Development (ELD) were reviewed and refined to ensure stronger alignment and clarity across district initiatives. Additionally, the district continued to implement and refine the Proceed with Analysis: Understanding Student Experience (PAUSE) protocol, with an increased emphasis on Tier 2 interventions and a shift toward more proactive and preventative approaches to student behavior. Administrative teams engaged in reflection on the use of the protocol, identifying opportunities to strengthen intervention strategies and ensure more consistent application across sites.

The district also engaged in ongoing work related to Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), including analysis of Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) data. This work identified variability across sites in readiness for full PBIS implementation, particularly at Tier 2, and highlighted the need for more consistent systems of support, including common analytics and data-informed decision-making processes. As a result, the district has prioritized strengthening data systems, documentation practices, and alignment between Educational Services and Student Services to support more effective intervention planning and monitoring.

Strengths of the district's work this year include an increased focus on system alignment, improved collaboration across departments, and a stronger emphasis on data-informed decision-making. The district has demonstrated a commitment to refining existing practices, building leadership capacity, and ensuring that support for SWD and LTEL students are embedded within broader instructional and intervention systems. Additionally, ongoing collaboration with PCOE has supported continuous reflection and adjustment of strategies to better meet student needs.

Opportunities for continued growth include strengthening the fidelity and consistency of Tier 2 intervention practices across all sites, expanding administrator and staff capacity to implement PBIS and PAUSE protocols effectively, and further developing data systems to support real-time monitoring and evaluation of student supports. Continued focus on supporting SWD and LTEL students through aligned instructional practices, targeted interventions, and systemwide coherence will remain a priority moving forward.

Through the Differentiated Assistance process, RJUHSD has shifted from initial identification and root cause analysis to a more focused approach on implementation, monitoring, and continuous improvement. This work ensures that district systems remain responsive, aligned, and effective in supporting improved outcomes for all students, particularly those identified through the Differentiated Assistance process.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

An LEA with a school or schools eligible for comprehensive support and improvement must respond to the following prompts.

Schools Identified

A list of the schools in the LEA that are eligible for comprehensive support and improvement.

Adelante High School

Support for Identified Schools

A description of how the LEA has or will support its eligible schools in developing comprehensive support and improvement plans.

RJUHSD (Roseville Joint Union High School District) continues to support the implementation of the Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) plan for Adelante High School (AHS) through a strong commitment to continuous improvement, data analysis, and collaborative planning. The district's approach is grounded in the Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) continuous improvement cycle, emphasizing ongoing monitoring, reflection, and refinement of instructional and intervention practices to improve student outcomes.

District support focuses on addressing identified root causes related to attendance, credit attainment, student engagement, and access to rigorous instruction. A significant portion of resources and support are directed toward strengthening systems that improve graduation outcomes and increase student connection to school. RJUHSD works collaboratively with site leadership, staff, students, parents, and educational partners to analyze data, identify barriers, and develop targeted strategies aligned to the needs of Adelante High School students.

The district continues to provide ongoing support through Educational Services leadership meetings, regular data conversations, and one-on-one collaboration with site administration and Educational Services staff. These meetings focus on reviewing student outcome data, monitoring progress toward identified goals, and refining intervention strategies to ensure responsive support for students.

RJUHSD also supports student learning by working with Adelante High School to strengthen instructional planning, data review, and academic intervention practices aligned to identified school improvement priorities. District and site teams will continue to review local data, including credit attainment, attendance, graduation progress, course completion, and educational partner feedback, to identify student needs and adjust supports accordingly. Through this collaborative and data-informed approach, the district remains committed to supporting Adelante High School in improving student achievement, increasing graduation rates, and strengthening long-term student success.

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

A description of how the LEA will monitor and evaluate the plan to support student and school improvement.

The Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) has developed a comprehensive process to monitor and evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) plan for Adelante High School (AHS), ensuring ongoing reflection, continuous improvement, and responsiveness to student needs. RJUHSD and Adelante High School will continue to work collaboratively to strengthen graduation outcomes, improve student engagement, and increase access to academic and career readiness opportunities.

A key component of this work is maintaining consistent communication among all educational partners to ensure a shared understanding of school goals, expectations, available supports, and student opportunities. This includes continued outreach to students and families regarding college coursework, Career Technical Education (CTE) pathways, credit recovery opportunities, and intervention support available within the Adelante High School community.

The district will continue to monitor the CSI process through ongoing Educational Services meetings, one-on-one collaboration with site administration, and regular review of student outcome data. School Site Council (SSC) meetings will continue to review progress toward identified goals and monitor the use of CSI funds to ensure alignment with school improvement priorities. In addition, staff leadership teams will engage in frequent data discussions focused on academic performance, graduation progress, attendance, engagement, and resource allocation.

Various data sources, including academic performance, credit attainment, attendance, graduation rates, student demographics, and educational partner feedback, will be analyzed regularly to assess implementation effectiveness and identify areas requiring additional support. Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) will continue to support this work through collaborative analysis of student data, identification of instructional strategies, and development of targeted interventions designed to improve student outcomes.

RJUHSD will also continue to review staffing, instructional materials, intervention systems, and support programs to ensure resources remain aligned to the needs identified through the CSI process. Adjustments to implementation strategies and support structures will be made based on ongoing data analysis and educational partner input.

In partnership with Adelante High School, RJUHSD will continue to communicate progress, challenges, and next steps with educational partners, reinforcing a culture of shared responsibility and continuous improvement focused on increasing student success and graduation outcomes.

Engaging Educational Partners

A summary of the process used to engage educational partners in the development of the LCAP.

School districts and county offices of education must, at a minimum, consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units, parents, and students in the development of the LCAP.

Charter schools must, at a minimum, consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, parents, and students in the development of the LCAP.

An LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also consult with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for each applicable school.

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
Teachers	Teacher Meetings Targeted discussions in district department leader meetings to align LCAP goals with curriculum needs. [October 2025 - April 2026] Bargaining Units Involvement Conducted LCAP discussions that included representatives from the Roseville Secondary Education Association (RSEA) leadership team to ensure teacher representation and input in the planning process. [November 2025 - April 2026] Survey Data and Feedback Administered surveys within focus groups to collect detailed insights on specific LCAP components and strategies. [February 2026] Collaborative Workshops Integrated LCAP-related workshops with Department Coordinators with the curriculum and Instruction team to foster teacher, administrator, and staff understanding and engagement. [October 2025 - April 2026]
Parents	Parent Surveys and Feedback Forms Distributed online surveys to gather parent opinions, concerns, and suggestions regarding LCAP priorities and initiatives. [February 2026] Advisory Committees or Focus Groups

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Formed advisory committees that included parents. The committee met regularly and discussed LCAP elements, ensuring their perspectives were included in decision-making. [November 2025 - April 2026] The Superintendent of the LEA responded, in writing, to any comments submitted by the parent advisory committee and the English learner parent advisory committee. [May 2026] Multilingual Engagement Conducted LCAP discussions and feedback sessions with the District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) which included languages spoken by diverse parent communities, ensuring inclusivity. [April 2026] Offered translated LCAP documents and information to facilitate understanding and engagement among non-English speaking parents. [September 2024 - April 2025]. DELAC reviewed the LCAP and provided comments on the proposed LCAP. [May 2026] The Superintendent of the LEA responded, in writing, to any comments submitted by the parent advisory committee and the English learner parent advisory committee. [May 2026] School Site Council Engagement Engaged parents in School Site Council meetings where LCAP priorities and strategies were discussed and reviewed. [October 2025 - January 2026] Encouraged parent representation on the School Site Council to ensure their perspectives are considered in decision-making. [August - September 2025]
Students	Student Surveys and Feedback Platforms Distributed online surveys along with the California Healthy Kids Survey tailored for different age groups to gather student perspectives on various LCAP priorities and initiatives. [October 2025 - November 2026]

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Distributed online surveys to gather student opinions, concerns, and suggestions regarding LCAP priorities and initiatives. [February 2026] Focus Groups and Advisory Committees Organized student forums at each school site to delve deeper into specific LCAP elements and gather more detailed feedback. [November 2025 - February 2026] Formed advisory committees that included students. The committee met regularly and discussed LCAP elements, ensuring their perspectives were included in decision-making. [November 2025 - April 2026] Student Council Involvement Engaged student council members to discuss LCAP priorities, gather insights, and represent student perspectives in decision-making. [November 2025 - April 2026]
Administrators	Meetings and Workshops Held regular meetings with school administrators to discuss LCAP goals, review progress, and gather their insights. [October 2025 - April 2026] Data Review and Analysis Collaborated with administrators to review academic, attendance, and other pertinent data to identify areas of improvement aligned with LCAP goals. [January - April 2026] Hosted workshops focusing on data interpretation and analysis to understand how different metrics align with the LCAP priorities. [November 2025 - February 2026] Feedback Forums and Committees Facilitated focused group discussions for administrators to share their perspectives, challenges, and recommendations related to LCAP initiatives.

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Invited site principals to LCAP advisory committee discussion responsible for various aspects to offer targeted insights and solutions. [November 2025 - April 2026] Training and Professional Development Offered training sessions on LCAP reporting requirements and methodologies for administrators involved in data collection and reporting. [January - March 2026]
SELPA	The SELPA Program Specialist was invited to Advisory Committee meetings to review and provide input on the actions for Students with disabilities (SWD). [April 2026] The SELPA Program Specialist was consulted with to discuss areas of growth and need. [April 2026] The district Special Education team was regularly consulted to determine that specific actions for students with disabilities (SWDs) are included in the LCAP. [October 2025 - April 2026]
Other School Personnel	Survey Data and Feedback Proctored surveys to gather opinions, suggestions, and areas of concern from counselors and support staff members regarding LCAP priorities and implementation. [February 2026] Meetings and Workshops The LCAP leadership team held meetings every two weeks to prepare for Parent Advisory Committee engagement. [September 2025 - April 2026]
Community Partners	Posted the LCAP for public comment before the public hearing. [May 2026] Held a public hearing to solicit the recommendations and comments of members of the public regarding the specific actions and expenditures proposed to be included in the LCAP. [May 2026] Adopted the LCAP and Budget at the board meeting and reported local indicator data as a non-consent item. [June 2026]

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Posted the adopted LCAP prominently on our district web page. [July 2026]

A description of how the adopted LCAP was influenced by the feedback provided by educational partners.

RJUHSD believes that cultivating strong relationships with educational partners and providing intentional opportunities for feedback throughout the development of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) results in a plan that reflects the shared values and priorities of our diverse school community. Our collaborative approach centers on the belief that incorporating multiple perspectives—students, families, staff, and community educational partners—enhances the quality of the plan and contributes to improved outcomes for all students.

RJUHSD actively seeks input from students, parents/guardians, teachers, classified staff, site and district administrators, bargaining units, and community educational partners. Feedback is gathered through a variety of means including annual surveys, Student Focus Groups, Advisory meetings, Educational Services Leadership meetings, ELAC/DELAC, and districtwide LCAP Advisory Committee meetings. This collective input is reviewed and analyzed to shape goals and actions that promote academic achievement, student well-being, and inclusive access to learning opportunities.

Feedback from educational partners was collected, analyzed, and influenced the LCAP in the following ways:

Students:
Goal 1, Action 1.2, Action 1.3, Action 1.4, and Action 1.5 reflects feedback from students indicating a need for stronger connections to college and career pathways. This influenced expanded outreach and improved student awareness of AP, IB, Dual Enrollment, Seal of Biliteracy, and CTE opportunities.

Goal 2, Action 2.4 and Action 2.8 were shaped by feedback from student focus groups who expressed a desire for more personalized support, Credit Recovery, and access to resources. As a result, expanded tutoring and targeted academic support in courses have been prioritized.

Parents and Families:
Goal 3, Action 3.1 and Action 3.5 were influenced by parent feedback collected through the annual districtwide LCAP survey and DELAC meetings, which emphasized the need for improved communication and access to resources in multiple languages. In response, RJUHSD will implement a Chief Officer of Strategic Communication and Engagement and increase multilingual outreach materials to better connect with families. Additionally, parents and families through annual surveys highlighted the importance of student safety and well-being. As a result, tools such as Catapult/WeTip, and CoVitality will be utilized to ensure the effective collection of data and implementation of targeted interventions to foster safer, more supportive school environments.

Goal 2, Action 2.6, and Action 2.7, and Goal 3, Action 3.4, address feedback from families of chronically absent students, including EL, FY, and homeless youth, who voiced the need for more proactive outreach. This resulted in the creation of family engagement strategies specifically focused on attendance, academic support, counseling, and student support.

Staff (Teachers, Classified, and Certificated):
Goal 2, Action 2.3 was shaped by PLT and staff survey feedback calling for increased support in implementing common assessments and using data to inform instruction. As a result, the district is expanding support for PLTs and CAASPP-aligned training.

Goal 2, Action 2.2 and Action 2.5 reflect staff input regarding the importance of professional learning around inclusive instructional strategies. Coaching on explicit language instruction and support for co-teaching models will be expanded in response.

Administrators:
Goal 3, Action 3.2 and Action 3.3 were informed by site leaders through Educational Services meetings and 1:1 check-ins, who identified a need for more effective interventions and alternative discipline options. The district will now provide additional Restorative Practices training and resources for schoolwide behavior support systems.

Goal 2, Action 2.1 was supported by site leadership as part of a continued effort to improve access in a systematic way to rigorous curriculum, including strategies to increase enrollment in higher-level math and science courses among underrepresented student groups.

Goal 1, Action 1.1 and Goal 3, Action 3.6 were influenced by feedback gathered through DELAC meetings and site leadership input emphasizing the need for more intentional and responsive support for English Learners and their families. In response, the EL Director of Multilingual Education will provide leadership in strengthening both integrated and designated ELD programs across the district. Administrators and families also identified a need for better communication tools; therefore, translation headsets and real-time communication devices will be implemented to support engagement during various events.

Through this ongoing partnership with our educational partners, RJUHSD ensures that its LCAP remains responsive, inclusive, and focused on student academic, behavioral, and emotional success and wellbeing.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	RJUHSD students will be college, career, and life-ready.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The Roseville Joint Union High School District crafted this LCAP goal in response to significant educational challenges. A decline in students meeting academic standards signaled a pressing issue in achieving educational benchmarks. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated learning gaps, underscoring the need for targeted interventions to address disparities in academic achievement. The influx of newcomers in the English Learner (EL) population added complexities in meeting diverse linguistic needs.

Supporting the academic achievement of English Learners (ELs) is a critical focus in educational research. Effective strategies are vital to assist ELs in mastering English and excelling academically across all subjects. Barriers to success in English Language Development (ELD) include challenges such as poor attendance, which hinders consistent language learning. Additionally, the lack of Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) poses a hurdle. SDAIE refers to instructional strategies that are specifically designed for ELs to access grade-level content while learning English. Insufficient teacher training in ELD methods can also impede progress, and various factors can impact scores on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), which evaluate ELs' language proficiency levels. The ELPAC is a state-required test that measures the English language proficiency of EL students. Addressing these challenges through targeted interventions and professional development is crucial for the success of ELs in the educational system. To address these issues and improve the low ELPAC summative proficiency score of 21.43%, targeted interventions are necessary (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Long Term English Learners (LTELs) are students who have been designated as an English Learner (EL) for seven years or more without being reclassified as fluent English proficient. According to the California Department of Education (CDE) and research on EL education, students often become LTELs due to insufficient academic progress, inadequate support, or inconsistent language development programs (LTEL COP - Resources (CA Dept of Education), n.d.). To be reclassified from EL to fluent English proficient, a student must meet criteria set by the state or school district, which typically includes achieving a specified level on English language proficiency assessments, demonstrating mastery of basic skills on state tests, and receiving teacher evaluations and parent opinions supporting the reclassification. Challenges in language learning, proficiency testing, and barriers to AP and IB participation indicated a need for addressing cultural, socioeconomic, and self-belief factors to staff, parent, and student partner groups.

Dual enrollment can significantly impact college enrollment and completion rates. A study conducted by Karp et al. (2007) noted that dual enrollment participants were more likely to go to college and complete their degrees. This is especially true for underrepresented student populations, as dual enrollment programs help demystify the college experience and make higher education appear more attainable. Statistical data and discussions with both parent and student groups indicated success in dual enrollment programs (DE) but highlighted additional needs to support the program. Challenges in dual enrollment (DE) arose from a shortage of instructors meeting the minimum qualifications required to teach these courses. Educational partners recognized the need to establish scaffolding and support structures to tackle achievement gaps in college-level courses and to address concerns regarding inconsistent teaching styles in both college and career courses.

Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs in high schools have received strong support from various research studies highlighting their benefits for students, educators, and the broader economy. Graduates of CTE programs often experience higher employment rates. Research by Alfeld et al. (2007) indicated that high school CTE students were more likely to be employed, and those who continued into postsecondary CTE programs had even higher rates of employment. Challenges in RJUHSD's Career and Technical Education (CTE) program involve unduplicated student participation, barriers to that participation, and specific course challenges identified by student partners and the data revealing 16.9% of graduating students completing a CTE pathway in 2023. Although this is an increase from the 14.0% of students completing a pathway in 2022, there is more work to be done in some areas to increase this percentage (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

The College/Career Indicator (CCI) aims to measure the extent to which students are prepared for postsecondary options, whether that involves attending a college or starting a career. The CCI combines various measures to provide a more holistic view of student preparedness, including completion of college-preparatory coursework, performance on standardized tests, and completion of career technical education sequences. Gaps in the College and Career Indicator (CCI) Action Plans, including disparities among EL and homeless students, persistent math challenges, and gaps in college and career guidance, prompted the identification of barriers and the need for enhanced teacher training. Strengths identified in increased CTE completions, as previously mentioned, a rise in Seal of Biliteracy numbers, and steady CCI performance were acknowledged by educational partners; however, challenges persisted in certain student groups completing CTE pathways, the Seal of Biliteracy, and lower A-G completion rates with 15.9% of English Learners, 38.8% of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and 33.3% of foster youth students meeting the status of Prepared for CCI (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	Percent of Total Student Enrollment Identified as Long-Term English Learners. Data Source: Dataquest	10% of our students are Long Term EL students.	8.2% of our students are Long Term EL students.	8.6% of our students are Long Term EL students.	4% of our students are Long Term EL students.	Overall: -1.4%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.2	Percentage of Students Earning the Seal of Biliteracy upon Graduation Data Source: Dataquest	Overall: 26% EL: 12% FY: 25% Homeless: 0% SED: 23% SWD: 8% African American: 25% American Indian: 0% Asian: 35% Filipino: 31% Hispanic: 33% Two or More Races: 25% Pacific Islander: 13% White: 22%	Overall: 30% EL: 24% FY: N/A Homeless: 30% SED: 26% SWD: 9% African American: 22% American Indian: 0% Asian: 34% Filipino: 30% Hispanic: 45% Two or More Races: 18% Pacific Islander: 27% White: 27%	Overall: 32% EL: 22% FY: N/A Homeless: 20% SED: 29% SWD: 12% African American: 22% American Indian: 44% Asian: 32% Filipino: 40% Hispanic: 43% Two or More Races: 21% Pacific Islander: 36% White: 28%	Overall 29% EL: 18% FY: 31% Homeless: 6% SED: 29% SWD: 14% African American: 31% American Indian: 6% Asian: 41% Filipino: 37% Hispanic: 39% Two or More Races: 31% Pacific Islander: 19% White: 28%	Overall: +6% EL: +10% FY: N/A Homeless: +20% SED: +6% SWD: +4% African American: -3% American Indian: +44% Asian: -3% Filipino: +9% Hispanic: +10% Two or More Races: -4% Pacific Islander: +23% White: +6%
1.3	Percent of Students taking IB Courses *At GBHS and OHS, students can take International Baccalaureate (IB) classes without being IB diploma candidates. Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	Overall: 16% (only counting GBHS & OHS) EL: 1% FY: 0% Homeless: 5% (only 20 students) SED: 12% SWD: 2% African American: 11% American Indian: 10% Asian: 27% Filipino: 25% Hispanic: 12% Two or More Races: 18%	Overall: 19% (only counting GBHS & OHS) EL: 6% FY: 25% (only 4 students) Homeless: 12% (only 16 students) SED: 15% SWD: 2% African American: 12% American Indian: 9% (only 23 students)	Overall: 25% (only counting GBHS & OHS) EL: 1% FY: 67% (only 3 FY) Homeless: 6% SED: 18% SWD: 4% African American: 20% American Indian: 25% (only 24 students) Asian: 36%	Overall: 19% EL: 4% FY: 3% Homeless: 8% SED: 15% SWD: 5% African American: 14% American Indian: 13% Asian: 30% Filipino: 28% Hispanic: 15% Two or More Races: 21%	Overall: +9% EL: 0% FY: N/A Homeless: +1% SED: +6% SWD: +2% African American: +9% American Indian: +15% Asian: +9% Filipino: -5% Hispanic: +10%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Pacific Islander: 16% (only 25 students) White: 14%	Asian: 26% Filipino: 17% Hispanic: 18% Two or More Races: 16% Pacific Islander: 10% (only 21 students) White: 18%	Filipino: 20% Hispanic: 22% Two or More Races: 17% Pacific Islander: 35% (only 7 students) White: 26%	Pacific Islander: 19% White: 17%	Two or More Races: -1% Pacific Islander: N/A White: +12%
1.4	Percentage of students earning a C or better in IB Courses Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	Overall: 96% EL: 100% FY: N/A Homeless: 100% SED: 94% SWD: 100% African American: 100% American Indian: 100% Asian: 97% Filipino: 94% Hispanic: 94% Two or More Races: 95% Pacific Islander: 100% White: 96%	Overall: 96% EL: 82% FY: N/A Homeless: N/A SED: 94% SWD: N/A African American: 95% American Indian: N/A Asian: 98%, Filipino: 97% Hispanic: 94% Two or More Races: 96% Pacific Islander: N/A White: 96%	Overall: 96% EL: 100% (only 2 grades) FY: 100% (only 3 grades) Homeless: 100% (only 2 grades) SED: 92% SWD: 88% (17 grades) African American: 84% American Indian: 100% (only 10 grades) Asian: 99% Filipino: 100% Hispanic: 93% Two or More Races: 96% Pacific Islander: 93% (only 15 grades) White: 96%	Overall: 99% EL: 100% FY: TBD% Homeless: 100% SED: 100% SWD: 100% African American: 100% American Indian: 100% Asian: 100% Filipino: 100% Hispanic: 100% Two or More Races: 100% Pacific Islander: 100% White: 100%	Overall: 0% EL: 0% FY: N/A Homeless: 0% SED: -2% SWD: -12% African American: -16% American Indian: 0% Asian: +2% Filipino: +6% Hispanic: -1% Two or More Races: +1% Pacific Islander: -7% White: 0%
1.5	Percent of Students taking AP Courses	Overall: 33%	Overall: 34%	Overall: 35%	Overall: 36%	Overall: +2%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	EL: 3% FY: 12% Homeless: 5% SED: 22% SWD: 4% African American: 24% American Indian: 22% Asian: 44% Filipino: 39% Hispanic: 24% Two or More Races: 41% Pacific Islander: 19% White: 34%	EL: 5% FY: 0% Homeless: 14% SED: 27% SWD: 5% African American: 29% American Indian: 24% Asian: 45% Filipino: 41% Hispanic: 26% Two or More Races: 40% Pacific Islander: 28% White: 35%	EL: 6% FY: 24% Homeless: 28% SED: 29% SWD: 5% African American: 33% American Indian: 37% Asian: 48% Filipino: 44% Hispanic: 29% Two or More Races: 30% Pacific Islander: 40% White: 36%	EL: 6% FY: 15% Homeless: 8% SED: 25% SWD: 7% African American: 27% American Indian: 25% Asian: 47% Filipino: 42% Hispanic: 27% Two or More Races: 44% Pacific Islander: 22% White: 37%	EL: +3% FY: +12% Homeless: +23% SED: +7% SWD: +1% African American: +9 American Indian: +15% Asian: +4% Filipino: +5% Hispanic: +5% Two or More Races: -11% Pacific Islander: +21% White: +2%
1.6	Percentage of students earning a C or better in AP Courses Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	Overall: 95% EL: 86% FY: 67% Homeless: 100% SED: 91% SWD: 91% African American: 89% American Indian: 79% Asian: 97% Filipino: 96% Hispanic: 91% Two or More Races: 93% Pacific Islander: 80% White: 96%	Overall: 95% EL: 75% FY: N/A Homeless: 92% SED: 91% SWD: 93% African American: 93% American Indian: 95% Asian: 96% Filipino: 96% Hispanic: 92% Two or More Races: 95% Pacific Islander: 79%	Overall: 95% EL: 80% FY: 40% (only 5 grades) Homeless: 88% SED: 92% SWD: 82% African American: 92% American Indian: 95% Asian: 97% Filipino: 93% Hispanic: 91% Two or More Races: 95%	Overall: 98% EL: 92% FY: 73% Homeless: 100% SED: 97% SWD: 97% African American: 95% American Indian: 85% Asian: 100% Filipino: 100% Hispanic: 97% Two or More Races: 99% Pacific Islander: 86%	Overall: 0% EL: -6% FY: -27% Homeless: -12% SED: 1% SWD: -9% African American: +3% American Indian: +16% Asian: 0% Filipino: -3% Hispanic: 0% Two or More Races: +2% Pacific Islander: 5%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			White: 95%	Pacific Islander: 85% White: 96%	White: 100%	White: 0%
1.7	Percent of Students taking DE Courses Data Source: Dataquest; Internal Aeries report	Overall: 8% EL: 3% FY: 0% Homeless: 5% SED: 10% SWD: 3% African American: 6% American Indian: 4% Asian: 8% Filipino: 7% Hispanic: 9% Two or More Races: 11% Pacific Islander: 7% White: 8%	Overall: 10% EL: 2% FY: 0% Homeless: 2% SED: 10% SWD: 3% African American: 9% American Indian: 6% Asian: 11% Filipino: 9% Hispanic: 10% Two or More Races: 12% Pacific Islander: 11% White: 11%	Overall: 20% EL: 3% FY: 14% Homeless: 11% SED: 18% SWD: 4% African American: 22% American Indian: 19% Asian: 19% Filipino: 20% Hispanic: 19% Two or More Races: 17% Pacific Islander: 21% White: 21%	Overall: 11% EL: 9% FY: 6% Homeless: 13% SED: 16% SWD: 9% African American: 12% American Indian: 10% Asian: 14% Filipino: 13% Hispanic: 15% Two or More Races: 17% Pacific Islander: 13% White: 14%	Overall: +12% EL: 0% FY: 14% Homeless: +6% SED: 8% SWD: +1% African American: +16% American Indian: +15% Asian: +11% Filipino: +13% Hispanic: +10% Two or More Races: +6% Pacific Islander: +14% White: +13%
1.8	Percentage of students earning a C or better in dual enrollment courses Data Source: Internal Aeries report	Overall: 94% EL: 74% FY: N/A Homeless: 100% SED: 90% SWD: 75% African American: 85% American Indian: 75% Asian: 97% Filipino: 96% Hispanic: 92%	Overall: 95% EL: 87% FY: N/A Homeless: N/A SED: 93% SWD: 84% African American: 96% American Indian: N/A Asian: 97% Filipino: 98%	Overall: 93% EL: 79% (only 24 grades) FY: 67% (only 3 grades) Homeless: 84% SED: 91% SWD: 85% African American: 93%	Overall: 97% EL: 80% FY: 100% Homeless: 100% SED: 96% SWD: 81% African American: 91% American Indian: 81% Asian: 100% Filipino: 100%	Overall: -1% EL: +5% FY: N/A Homeless: -16% SED: +1% SWD: +10% African American: +8% American Indian: +5% Asian: -2% Filipino: +1%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Two or More Races: 93% Pacific Islander: 91% White: 95%	Hispanic: 93% Two or More Races: 100% Pacific Islander: 92% White: 96%	American Indian: 80% (only 20 grades) Asian: 95% Filipino: 97% Hispanic: 91% Two or More Races: 93% Pacific Islander: 83% (only 24 grades) White: 94%	Hispanic: 98% Two or More Races: 99% Pacific Islander: 97% White: 100%	Hispanic: -1% Two or More Races: 0% Pacific Islander: -8% White: -1%
1.9	Percentage of Graduates Who Successfully Completed CTE Pathways Data Source: Dashboard Additional reports	Overall: 17% EL: 8% FY: 23% Homeless: 3% SED: 15% SWD: 6% African American: 13% American Indian: 10% Asian: 21% Filipino: 29% Hispanic: 14% Two or More Races: 12% Pacific Islander: 18% White: 17%	Overall: 22% EL: 7% FY: N/A Homeless: 1% SED: 17% SWD: 13% African American: 10% American Indian: 18% Asian: 26% Filipino: 25% Hispanic: 18% Two or More Races: 18% Pacific Islander: 32% White: 23%	Overall: 25% EL: 8% FY: N/A Homeless: 9% SED: 23% SWD: 14% African American: 23% American Indian: 29% Asian: 24% Filipino: 37% Hispanic: 20% Two or More Races: 19% Pacific Islander: 20% White: 26%	Overall: 25% EL: 31% FY: 56% Homeless: 6% SED: 31% SWD: 21% African American: 20% American Indian: 6% Asian: 29% Filipino: 36% Hispanic: 26% Two or More Races: 28% Pacific Islander: 31% White: 27%	Overall: +8% EL: 0% FY: N/A Homeless: +6% SED: +8% SWD: +8% African American: +10% American Indian: +19% Asian: +3% Filipino: +8% Hispanic: +6% Two or More Races: +7% Pacific Islander: +2% White: +9%
1.10	Percentage of Students Who Enrolled in a CTE Course But Did Not Complete the Pathway	Overall: 80% EL: 84% FY: 67% Homeless: 92%	Overall: 79% EL: 91% FY: N/A Homeless: 100%	Overall: 76% EL: 99% FY: 67% Homeless: 83%	Overall: 77% EL: 81% FY: 64% Homeless: 89%	Overall: -4% EL: +15% FY: N/A Homeless: -9%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Data Source: Dashboard Additional reports	SED: 82% SWD: 92% African American: 82% American Indian: 88% Asian: 73% Filipino: 65% Hispanic: 82% Two or More Races: 81% Pacific Islander: 67% White: 81%	SED: 85% SWD: 91% African American: 89% American Indian: 86% Asian: 69% Filipino: 74% Hispanic: 80% Two or More Races: 81% Pacific Islander: 74% White: 79%	SED: 77% SWD: 95% African American: 78% American Indian: 67% Asian: 74% Filipino: 61% Hispanic: 79% Two or More Races: 79% Pacific Islander: 70% White: 76%	SED: 79% SWD: 89% African American: 79% American Indian: 85% Asian: 70% Filipino: 71% Hispanic: 62% Two or More Races: 78% Pacific Islander: 64% White: 78%	SED: -5% SWD: +3% African American: -4% American Indian: -21% Asian: +1% Filipino: -4% Hispanic: -3% Two or More Races: -2% Pacific Islander: +3% White: -5%
1.11	Percentage of Students with Successful Course Completion of A-G courses Data Source: Dashboard Additional reports	Overall: 61% EL: 23% FY: 39% Homeless: 14% SED: 44% SWD: 15% African American: 54% American Indian: 52% Asian: 76% Filipino: 78% Hispanic: 47% Two or More Races: 46% Pacific Islander: 50% White: 64%	Overall: 61% EL: 25% FY: N/A Homeless: 16% SED: 46% SWD: 18% African American: 44% American Indian: 35% Asian: 71% Filipino: 77% Hispanic: 50% Two or More Races: 58% Pacific Islander: 56% White: 64%	Overall: 60% EL: 26% FY: N/A Homeless: 28% SED: 49% SWD: 17% African American: 46% American Indian: 57% Asian: 66% Filipino: 75% Hispanic: 53% Two or More Races: 55% Pacific Islander: 40% White: 63%	Overall: 64% EL: 29% FY: 45% Homeless: 20% SED: 50% SWD: 21% African American: 60% American Indian: 58% Asian: 82% Filipino: 84% Hispanic: 53% Two or More Races: 52% Pacific Islander: 56% White: 70%	Overall: -1% EL: +3% FY: N/A Homeless: +14% SED: +5% SWD: +2% African American: -8% American Indian: +5% Asian: -10% Filipino: -3% Hispanic: +6% Two or More Races: +9% Pacific Islander: -10% White: -1%
1.12	Percentage of Students with Readiness on	Overall: 57%	Overall: 57%	Overall: 59%	Overall: 60%	Overall: +2%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	College and Career Indicator Data Source: Dashboard Additional reports	EL: 16% FY: 33% Homeless: 9% SED: 39% SWD: 12% African American: 41% American Indian: 38% Asian: 75% Filipino: 79% Hispanic: 41% Two or More Races: 46% Pacific Islander: 38% White: 60%	EL: 16% LTEL: 19% FY: N/A Homeless: 11% SED: 41% SWD: 13% African American: 36% American Indian: 29% Asian: 68% Filipino: 74% Hispanic: 44% Two or More Races: 53% Pacific Islander: 44% White: 60%	EL: 21% LTEL: 20% FY: N/A Homeless: 24% SED: 46% SWD: 16% African American: 43% American Indian: 59% Asian: 69% Filipino: 72% Hispanic: 50% Two or More Races: 53% Pacific Islander: 37% White: 61%	EL: 22% FY: 39% Homeless: 15% SED: 45% SWD: 18% African American: 47% American Indian: 44% Asian: 81% Filipino: 85% Hispanic: 47% Two or More Races: 52% Pacific Islander: 44% White: 66%	EL: +5% LTEL: +20% FY: N/A Homeless: +15% SED: +7% SWD: +4% African American: +2% American Indian: +21% Asian: -6% Filipino: -7% Hispanic: +9% Two or More Races: +7% Pacific Islander: -1% White: +1%
1.13	Number of IB courses offered at GBHS and OHS Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	IB Courses offered at each of the IB High Schools Site: GBHS Course #: 24 Enrollment: 716 Site: OHS Course #: 37 Enrollment: 742	IB Courses offered at each of the IB High Schools Site: GBHS Course #: 22 Enrollment: 671 Site: OHS Course #: 39 Enrollment: 666	IB Courses offered at each of the IB High Schools Site: GBHS Course #: 26 Enrollment: 1157 Site: OHS Course #: 35 Enrollment: 507	IB Courses offered at each of the IB High Schools Site: GBHS Course #: 21+ Enrollment: TBD Site: OHS Course #: 10+ Enrollment: TBD	GBHS: Courses Offered: +2 Enrollment: +441 OHS: Courses Offered: -2 Enrollment: -235
1.14	Number of AP Courses Offered at all High Schools Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	AP Courses offered at each of the High Schools Site: AnHS Course #: 15	AP Courses offered at each of the High Schools Site: AnHS Course #: 17	AP Courses offered at each of the High Schools Site: ANHS Course #: 18	Overall: Maintain or Increase Site: AnHS Course #: 15+ Enrollment: TBD	ANHS: Courses Offered: +3

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Enrollment: 852 Site: GBHS Course #: 21 Enrollment: 2066 Site: OHS Course #: 10 Enrollment: 668 Site: RHS Course #: 21 Enrollment: 879 Site: AdHS/ IHS Course #: 0 Enrollment: 0 Site: WPHS Course #: 16 Enrollment: 824 Site: WHS Course #: 17 Enrollment: 1372	Enrollment: 902 Site: GBHS Course #: 21 Enrollment: 2190 Site: OHS Course #: 9 Enrollment: 580 Site: RHS Course #: 24 Enrollment: 1029 Site: AdHS/ IHS Course #: 0 Enrollment: 0 Site: WPHS Course #: 17 Enrollment: 1196 Site: WHS Course #: 17 Enrollment: 1612	Enrollment: 1068 Site: GBHS Course #: 22 Enrollment: 2377 Site: OHS Course #: 10 Enrollment: 716 Site: RHS Course #: 24 Enrollment: 983 Site: AdHS/ IHS Course #: 0 Enrollment: 0 Site: WPHS Course #: 19 Enrollment: 1386 Site: WHS Course #: 17 Enrollment: 1602	Site: GBHS Course #: 21+ Enrollment: TBD Site: OHS Course #: 10+ Enrollment: TBD Site: RHS Course #: 21+ Enrollment: TBD Site: AdHS/ IHS Course #: 0+ Enrollment: TBD Site: WPHS Course #: 16+ Enrollment: TBD Site: WHS Course #: 17+ Enrollment: TBD	Enrollment: +216 GBHS: Courses Offered: +1 Enrollment: +311 OHS: Courses Offered: 0 Enrollment: +48 RHS: Courses Offered: +3 Enrollment: +104 AdHS/IHS: Courses Offered: 0 Enrollment: 0 WPHS: Courses Offered: +3 Enrollment: +562 WHS: Courses Offered: 0 Enrollment: +230
1.15	Number Of DE Courses Offered At All High Schools Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	DE Courses offered at each of the High Schools Site: AnHS Course #: 7 Enrollment: 416	DE Classes offered at each high school 2024-2025 Site: AnHS Course #: 10 Enrollment: 584	DE Classes offered at each high school 2025-2026 Site: ANHS Course #: 11 Enrollment: 852	DE Classes offered at each high school 2026-2027 Site: AnHS Course #: 7+ Enrollment: TBD	ANHS: Courses Offered: +4 Enrollment: +436

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Site: GBHS Course #: 3 Enrollment: 159 Site: OHS Course #: 1 Enrollment: 13 Site: RHS Course #: 6 Enrollment: 170 Site: AdHS/ IHS Course #: 10 Enrollment: 72/45 Site: WPHS Course #: 0 Enrollment: 0 Site: WHS Course #: 9 Enrollment: 198	Site: GBHS Course #: 8 Enrollment: 425 Site: OHS Course #: 4 Enrollment: 136 Site: RHS Course #: 8 Enrollment: 364 Site: AdHS/IHS Course #: 10 Enrollment: 83/230 Site: WPHS Course #: 8 Enrollment: 523 Site: WHS Course #: 11 Enrollment: 349	Site: GBHS Cousre #: 13 Enrollment: 966 Site: OHS Course #: 5 Enrollment: 136 Site: RHS Course #: 7 Enrollment: 360 Site: AdHS/IHS Course #: 3/9 Enrollment: 168/262 Site: WPHS Course #: 12 Enrollment: 874 Site: WHS Course #: 14 Enrollment: 397	Site: GBHS Course #: 3+ Enrollment: TBD Site: OHS Course #: 1+ Enrollment: TBD Site: RHS Course #: 6+ Enrollment: TBD Site: AdHS/ IHS Course #: 10+ Enrollment: TBD Site: WPHS Course #: + Enrollment: + Site: WHS Course #: 9+ Enrollment: TBD	GBHS: Courses Offered: +10 Enrollment: +807 OHS: Courses Offered: +4 Enrollment: +123 RHS: Courses Offered: +1 Enrollment: +190 AdHS/IHS: Courses Offered: +2 Enrollment: +96/+217 WPHS: Courses Offered: +12 Enrollment: +874 WHS: Courses Offered: +5 Enrollment: +199
1.16	Percentage of Students Who Accessed CTE Internships Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	Overall: 6% EL: 0% FY: 0% Homeless: 0% SED: 21% SWD: 1%	Overall: 9% EL: 1% FY: 0% Homeless: 0% SED: 30% SWD: 0%	Overall: 10% EL: 0% FY: 0% Homeless: 1% SED: 41% SWD: 0%	Overall: 12% EL: 6% FY: 6% Homeless: 6% SED: 27% SWD: 7%	Overall: +4% EL: 0% FY: 0% Homeless: +1% SED: +20% SWD: -1%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		African American: 4% American Indian: 0% Asian: 24% Filipino: 4% Hispanic: 16% Two or More Races: 5% Pacific Islander: 0% White: 45%	African American: 4% American Indian: 3% Asian: 24% Filipino: 0% Hispanic: 11% Two or More Races: 4% Pacific Islander: 1% White: 49%	African American: 3% American Indian: 0% Asian: 20% Filipino: 12% Hispanic: 19% Two or More Races: 4% Pacific Islander: 0% White: 39%	African American: 10% American Indian: 6% Asian: 30% Filipino: 10% Hispanic: 22% Two or More Races: 11% Pacific Islander: 6% White: 51%	African American: -1% American Indian: 0% Asian: -4% Filipino: +8% Hispanic: +3% Two or More Races: -1% Pacific Islander: 0% White: -6%

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.

A description of overall implementation, including any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions, and any relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.

Successful Implementation (Fully Implemented)

Action 1.1 Multilingual Education and English Learner Support - The district initiated the adoption process for a new English Language Development (ELD) curriculum, with full implementation anticipated in the 2026–27 school year. In support of improved reclassification outcomes, updated Reclassification Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) criteria were approved, providing students with expanded and more flexible pathways to reclassify. To strengthen monitoring and compliance, a revised Ellevation process was implemented to improve documentation of RFEP determinations and ongoing RFEP monitoring. Additionally, the district launched a comprehensive professional learning plan focused on Integrated ELD, introducing research-based language routines developed through partnerships with the Sacramento Valley Mathematics Initiative (SVMI) and the California Reading and Literature Project (CRLP). These routines are grounded in the California ELD Standards and support consistent, high-quality language instruction across content areas. A critical phase of support for English Learners was also established through the allocation of a dedicated release period for site EL Coordinators throughout the school year. Their role has expanded beyond compliance to include instructional leadership for both designated and integrated ELD, supported by ongoing guidance to strengthen site-level implementation and collaboration.

Action 1.2 Seal of Biliteracy Program Improvements - Seal of Biliteracy committees met consistently throughout the 2024–25 school year and reconvened in August 2025 to finalize districtwide communication plans and tracking tools. During this process, roles and responsibilities were clearly defined, and site-based teams were identified to ensure consistent implementation across all schools. In addition, the district revised the approved language assessment schedule to improve accessibility and provide more timely opportunities for students to

demonstrate proficiency. These efforts strengthened the overall system for identifying, supporting, and recognizing students working toward the Seal of Biliteracy.

Action 1.3 Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs - During the 2025–26 school year, the district continued to expand access, support, and success in advanced coursework, including AP, IB, Dual Enrollment (DE), and CTE pathways, with a focus on increasing participation among unduplicated student groups. Schools implemented targeted outreach and recruitment strategies, including counselor guidance, course selection support, and enhanced communication with students and families to promote enrollment in advanced courses. While the annual student survey for AP/IB/DE/CTE courses was not administered this year, the district gathered input through site-level feedback, counselor insights, and ongoing program monitoring to inform program improvements. Supports for students enrolled in advanced coursework were maintained and expanded, including access to tutoring centers, teacher office hours, and academic interventions. AP Coordinators at all comprehensive sites, along with IB program coordinators at Granite Bay High School and Oakmont High School, continued to oversee program implementation, including exam preparation and student support systems. Efforts were also made to increase AP course offerings and sections where feasible, while AVID programs continued to play a critical role in preparing students for rigorous coursework and college readiness. Communication with families was provided through multiple platforms, with ongoing efforts to improve accessibility and outreach. Overall, the district sustained its commitment to expanding equitable access to advanced coursework while identifying opportunities to strengthen data collection and program evaluation.

Action 1.4 Support for Dual Enrollment (DE) Program - Board policy was revised to allow Dual Enrollment courses approved for IGETC/Cal-GETC to receive weighted grading, with full implementation beginning in the 2025–26 school year. Structures were established to support site-level development of Dual Enrollment pathways aligned to Cal-GETC requirements, strengthening program coherence and access. To improve communication and family understanding, parent webinars were offered to provide additional clarity regarding Dual Enrollment opportunities. Additionally, the district course catalog was revised to more clearly communicate available Dual Enrollment options. These efforts enhanced transparency, expanded access, and supported increased student participation in college-level coursework while in high school.

Partially Implemented

Action 1.5 Support for Career Technical Education (CTE) Program - Initial efforts to strengthen alignment between Career Technical Education (CTE) and Special Education departments have resulted in increased understanding of CTE pathway opportunities for students with disabilities. Sites have been directed to engage in collaborative meetings to expand access and ensure inclusive participation across all programs; however, full implementation will occur once these practices are consistently established at all sites. Additionally, we will have more intentional discussions to plan the process.

Draft materials have been developed to improve communication with students and families, supporting exploration of career pathways and the educational steps required to pursue them. The next phase of implementation includes refining and standardizing these materials across all CTE pathways and translating them to increase accessibility for multilingual families.

Additionally, mentorship opportunities are being supported through the districtwide internship program, providing students with real-world exposure and guidance. Professional development in August focused on supporting teachers in the development of career exploration plans

aligned to each industry sector. While meaningful progress has been made in building systems and awareness, continued work is needed to ensure consistent implementation across sites and expand equitable access to CTE pathways.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

Action 1.4 - Difference due to DE funds being held for the final year of spending in FY26/27. Additional sections and timing of master's degree stipends being postponed.

A description of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal.

Based on our analysis of metrics and outcomes, the implementation of actions showed strong overall effectiveness in achieving Goal 1, as demonstrated by both quantitative data and qualitative indicators, with some areas of emerging effectiveness requiring continued focus.

Actions Demonstrating Strong Effectiveness

Action 1.1 Multilingual Education and English Learner Support - This action demonstrated strong effectiveness through both improved systems and targeted student outcomes. The allocation of release time for EL Coordinators allowed for the organization of site-based professional development, strengthening both instructional capacity and leadership at each site. As a result of improved systems, including updated RFEP criteria and strengthened monitoring processes, 75 out of 76 eligible students were successfully reclassified, demonstrating effective identification and support structures. Additionally, the percentage of Long-Term English Learners declined from 10% to 8.6%, indicating continued progress in reducing long-term EL status. While the overall reclassification rate declined, this is likely influenced by an increase in newcomer students, and the district continues to see positive trends in student progress and system coherence.

Action 1.2 Seal of Biliteracy Program Improvements - This action demonstrated strong effectiveness through improved systems of tracking, communication, and implementation. The development of clearer tracking tools and communication structures resulted in greater clarity for both staff and students, strengthening the overall process for identifying and supporting students working toward the Seal of Biliteracy. As a result, the overall percentage of students earning the Seal increased from 26% to 32%, with notable gains across multiple student groups, including English Learners (+10%) and Hispanic students (+10%). These outcomes reflect the effectiveness of improved coordination and consistent site-level implementation.

Action 1.3 Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs - This action demonstrated moderate to strong effectiveness in increasing access to and success in advanced coursework. The district expanded AP and IB course offerings across sites and increased IB participation, while maintaining high levels of student success, with 95% of students in AP courses and 96% of students in IB courses earning a C or better. AP participation increased from 33% to 35%, and IB participation increased overall, reflecting the impact of expanded access and targeted outreach efforts. Additionally, College and Career Indicator (CCI) readiness improved from 57% to 59%, and A–G completion showed relative stability, indicating continued progress toward college readiness outcomes. These results demonstrate that systems of support, including tutoring, counseling, and program coordination, are effectively supporting student success in rigorous coursework.

Actions Demonstrating Emerging Effectiveness or Somewhat Effective

Action 1.4 Support for Dual Enrollment (DE) Program - This action demonstrated emerging effectiveness in expanding access to and awareness of Dual Enrollment opportunities. Participation in DE courses increased significantly from 8% to 20%, and the number of course offerings expanded across multiple sites, reflecting strong system-level growth. Parent webinars were implemented to increase awareness and support family understanding of Dual Enrollment pathways.

While progress has been made in expanding opportunities, continued efforts are needed to improve proportional participation among certain student groups, particularly Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (SED) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) students. Additional focus will be placed on strengthening communication, increasing family outreach and resources, and implementing targeted strategies to increase enrollment and access for underrepresented student groups.

Action 1.5 Support for Career Technical Education (CTE) Program – This action demonstrated emerging effectiveness as foundational systems and materials were developed to support CTE pathway awareness and access. Initial progress was made in creating templates and building an inventory of materials to support communication with students and families. However, the process of developing and organizing these resources proved more time intensive than originally anticipated, and the lack of planned intern support limited the pace of implementation. While early steps have been taken to strengthen systems and support structures, additional time and resources will be necessary to fully implement and scale these efforts across all sites.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, target outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

Metric 1.1 has been revised because the metric description was inaccurate. The metric has been revised from “Percent of EL students who are Long-Term English Learners” to “Percent of Total Student Enrollment Identified as Long-Term English Learners.”

Metric 1.3 has been revised because the baseline, Year 1, and target Year 3 data previously reported for Percent of students taking IB Courses was inaccurate.

Metric 1.5 has been revised because the baseline, Year 1, and target Year 3 data previously reported for Percent of students taking AP Courses was inaccurate.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year’s actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year’s actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.1	Multilingual Education and	The EL Director of Multilingual Education and English Learner Support will provide leadership and directions by implementing and supporting multilingual integrated and designated English Learner programs to	$798,504.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
	English Learner Support	support student achievement and rigorous, innovative learning aligned to the district and school goals. Embed test-taking and organizational (study skills) in ELD Seminar. Continue the use of Ellevation to support the identification of students. Purchase and implement translation headsets/devices that allow us to correspond with our EL parents in real-time, during DELAC meetings, etc. Funds provided to site for EL support.		
1.2	Seal of Biliteracy Program Improvements	Implementation of New Seal of Biliteracy Standards and Inclusive Language Testing Strategy at RJUHSD. Communicate new Seal of Biliteracy requirements to staff and families. Build a comprehensive promotional plan specifically targeting unduplicated students and families, including information on testing for languages not currently offered at RJUHSD.	$0.00	No
1.3	Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs	Implement comprehensive strategies to enhance access, support, and success for students in advanced coursework. Develop an annual student survey for AP/IB/DE/CTE courses to gather input for program outreach with an emphasis on unduplicated students. Provide information in languages accessible to all RJUHSD families across print, digital, and other platforms. Enhance outreach and recruitment efforts targeting unduplicated groups. Increase the number of unduplicated students completing AP coursework. Increase the number of AP courses and sections. Assess and enhance the effectiveness of the tutoring center to maintain and improve the academic support system. Provide supports for students in AP and IB courses. AP Coordinators. Operational expenses of the IB programs at GBHS and OHS. Preparation of students for AP exams. Enhance AVID programs to support student academic success and college readiness.	$996,964.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.4	Support for Dual Enrollment (DE) Program	Enhance access and support for students in Dual Enrollment (DE). Implement English language development strategies to support EL students to access DE. Simplify and clarify the application and onboarding process for students and families. Increase access and opportunity of our unduplicated students in DE courses. Effectively communicate diverse course options to unduplicated student groups and families. Create tools for counselors and registrars to enhance parent communication about DE options.	$1,022,509.00	No
1.5	Support for Career Technical Education (CTE) Program	Implement personalized support initiatives for students. Offer targeted support for unduplicated students. Enhance communication with unduplicated students and families to provide additional support. Develop individualized learning plans for students that align with their career interests and academic needs. Create structured mentorship programs where students are paired with mentors from industries relevant to their CTE track. Offer specialized career services and a comprehensive inventory of career options to help students explore career opportunities, understand the educational requirements for these careers, and learn about pathways for advancement.	$1,236,835.00	No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Significantly reduce and ultimately eliminate the achievement gap among specific student groups, promoting educational opportunities for all students.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

RJUHSD formulated this LCAP goal with the primary objective of significantly reducing and ultimately eliminating the achievement gap among unduplicated student groups. The goal is rooted in a commitment to fostering educational opportunities for all students, ensuring that each individual has equitable access to quality education. The decision to develop this goal is supported by a comprehensive examination of various data points, shedding light on the disparities among student subgroups in different academic and non-academic aspects.

Academic Performance

The CAASPP (California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress) is the statewide educational assessment program in California. It measures student knowledge and skills in English language arts, mathematics, and science, providing key data on student performance for grades three through eight and grade eleven. For California's Local Education Agencies (LEAs), CAASPP results are crucial as they help evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and curricula, identify areas needing improvement, and ensure compliance with state and federal educational standards, contributing to accountability and educational improvement strategies.

In English Language Arts (ELA), the overall percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards is 67%, as measured by the 2023 California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP). The student groups listed in the LCAP (Local Control and Accountability Plan) are dashboard groups for which we are held accountable, representing specific demographic categories whose academic progress and outcomes are monitored and evaluated and notable disparities exist among these groups. With 8% of English Learners (EL) meeting or exceeding the proficiency standard in ELA, there is a clear need for targeted interventions to address learning gaps (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Similarly, in Mathematics, the overall percentage of 11th-grade students meeting or exceeding standards is 36%, with significant variations among subgroups. For instance, EL students have a lower percentage at 3%, highlighting the need to focus on specific support mechanisms for this group. Providing specialized training sessions and workshops in mathematics instruction focusing on research-proven strategies is a

clear need. Additionally, supporting and guiding math instructors in data analysis to effectively evaluate student performance and inform instructional decisions can help identify the root cause of achievement gaps. Educational partners identified a need for workshops, lesson modeling, coaching, and collaboration sessions with math teachers and site leaders as a need to facilitate continuous professional development and implementation of effective instructional practices in mathematics. Additionally, there is a need to contribute to the development of instructional materials that cater to diverse student needs and align with math standards, ensuring accessibility and relevance for all learners. Finally, aligning assessments in math to measure progress and identify areas for improvement is crucial for enabling targeted interventions and differentiated instruction, ultimately fostering student success. Based on math trends, RJUHSD has established a proficiency goal of 39% of students meeting or exceeding the standard of proficiency on the CAASPP by 2027, incorporating a growth goal of 1% annually for the system as a whole. This goal is informed by the historical data trends, including proficiency rates of 36% in 2022-23, 33% in 2021-22, 34% in 2020-21, 40% in 2018-19, and 39% in 2017-18 (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Both parents and teachers acknowledged the difficulty of making the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) relevant to both teachers and students. Educational partners also recognized that these barriers extended to insufficient training for test formats, inadequate support for students with disabilities, resistance to CAASPP as an accurate measure of student performance, and a general lack of success consciousness among students, highlighting multifaceted challenges. When educational partners reviewed the data related to the CAASPP test, they noted fewer students meeting standards, increased learning gaps due to the pandemic, and the need to provide additional scaffolds and supports due to the increase in English learners emphasizing significant hurdles in achieving educational goals. Barriers, such as a lack of buy-in for CAASPP, changes in the EL population, and pandemic-related disruptions, underscored the complexity of addressing issues in student performance and educational access.

The percentage of students within our 2023 graduating cohort taking higher-level math courses upon graduation was 78%, demonstrating a commitment to providing advanced educational opportunities. However, further analysis based on student subgroups is required to ensure equitable access to these courses. Over the past five years, there has been a fluctuation in the percentage of the graduating cohort taking higher-level math courses upon graduation. Baseline data collected in 2023 included all courses above Common Core Integrated Math II (CCIM2) including CCIM3, College Algebra, Precalculus, AP Statistics, AP Calculus, dual enrollment (DE) Math courses, or IB Math courses completed by the student’s senior year. This is an increase compared to the previous two years (36.5% in 2022 and 35.9% in 2021); however, the data collected during these years only considered year 3 or year 4 A-G or dual enrollment (DE) math courses into consideration. These trends across the last three years, including the incorporation of a more comprehensive definition of “high-level” math courses and pathways, suggest that a goal of a 1% increase annually is an appropriate target for the district (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023). These trends also suggest a need for targeted services to enhance academic performance and support student progression in mathematics. Prioritizing communication of CAASPP resources to district staff and alignment with Interim Assessment Benchmarks (IABs), with a particular focus on providing PLT training for math and English departments, is a clear need. Improving communication and support for counselors and math teachers is also essential to encourage increased math enrollment and facilitate student progression in math courses.

The California Science Test (CAST) is an assessment part of the CAASPP system, designed to evaluate students' understanding of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) for California public schools. For California's Local Education Agencies (LEAs), CAST is important as it provides critical data on student achievement in science, aiding in curriculum improvement, helping to ensure that educational practices align with the NGSS, and contributing to the overall assessment of school and district performance. Science proficiency, as measured by the

percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards, reveals an overall rate of 45%. Again, disparities among student subgroups emphasize the additional need for targeted interventions in this area (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023). High-leverage strategies suggested by educational partners to improve science achievement involve integrating technology and hands-on experiments to make learning more interactive and engaging, thereby enhancing students' understanding and retention of scientific concepts. Another suggested approach was the implementation of professional development (PD) programs for teachers, focusing on the latest science education practices and curricula, which can equip educators with the tools and knowledge to better address diverse learning needs and improve instructional quality.

Graduation Rates

Research consistently shows that individuals with high school diplomas earn significantly more than those without. According to data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, high school graduates earn approximately 30% more than those who have not completed high school and are more likely to be employed than those without a diploma (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, (n.d.). A commendable 92% overall graduation rate is observed in RJUHSD; however, disparities persist among various student subgroups, emphasizing the importance of addressing equity in educational outcomes (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

English Learner Progress

Reclassifying English learners (ELs) refers to the process of transitioning students from an English learner status to a proficient English status based on specified criteria, which often includes assessment scores, teacher evaluations, and parent input. Reclassified students often experience significant improvements in academic performance. Research by Ilana Umansky and Sean Reardon, for example, suggests that reclassified ELs frequently perform at par with or better than their native English-speaking peers in academic assessments (Umansky & Reardon, 2014). This implies that reclassification, when accurately aligned with true language proficiency, can lead to enhanced educational outcomes. Notable progress is seen in the reclassification of EL students, with 73% achieving this milestone; however, a detailed analysis of The English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) levels, which shows the percentage of current English learners making progress towards English language proficiency or maintaining the highest performance level, indicates areas where additional support may be necessary (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Teaching Staff

A significant body of research indicates that teacher quality is one of the most important factors affecting student achievement. For example, a study by Aaronson, Barrow, and Sander (2007) found that the quality of the teacher was the most important factor influencing student performance in math, surpassing class size and the socioeconomic status of students. Teachers with strong content knowledge and pedagogical skills are better equipped to deliver effective instruction and engage students. The high percentage of appropriately assigned teachers in RJUHSD (92%) is indicative of a commitment to ensuring students have access to qualified educators (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

In summary, the LCAP goal is a response to the nuanced data collected, aiming to address disparities in academic achievement, college and career readiness, graduation rates, attendance, and discipline among specific student groups. The goal reflects a commitment to promoting equitable educational opportunities for all students within the RJUHSD community.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard: ELA (SBAC/CAASPP) Data Source: Dashboard ELA Indicator	Overall: 67% EL: 8% FY: N/A (4 enrolled; 0 tested) Homeless: N/A (5 enrolled; 4 tested) SED: 53% SWD: 18% African American: 49% American Indian: 50% Asian: 74% Filipino: 86% Hispanic: 56% Two or More Races: 61% Pacific Islander: 57% White: 72%	Overall: 61% EL: 8% FY: N/A Homeless: 39% SED: 50% SWD: 7% African American: 43% American Indian: 54% Asian: 71% Filipino: 83% Hispanic: 49% Two or More Races: 55% Pacific Islander: 38% White: 63% LTEL: 4%	Overall: 64% EL: 9% FY: N/A Homeless: 30% SED: 52% SWD: 18% African American: 41% American Indian: 54% Asian: 75% Filipino: 82% Hispanic: 54% Two or More Races: 53% Pacific Islander: 43% White: 68%	Overall: 70% EL: 14% FY: 2% annual increase from baseline %* Homeless: 2% annual increase from baseline %* SED: 59% SWD: 24% African American: 55% American Indian: 56% Asian: 80% Filipino: 92% Hispanic: 62% Two or More Races: 67% Pacific Islander: 63% White: 78%	Overall: -3% EL: +1% FY: N/A Homeless: N/A SED: -1% SWD: 0% African American: -8% American Indian: +4% Asian: +1% Filipino: -4% Hispanic: -2% Two or More Races: -8% Pacific Islander: -14% White: -4%
2.2	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard: MATH (SBAC/CAASPP) Data Source: Dashboard Math Indicator	Overall: 36% EL: 3% FY: N/A (4 students enrolled; 0 tested) Homeless: N/A (4 students enrolled; 0 tested) SED: 20% SWD: 5%	Overall: 36% EL: 8% FY: N/A Homeless: 8% SED: 24% SWD: 3% African American: 22%	Overall: 42% EL: 7% FY: N/A Homeless: 19% SED: 31% SWD: 8% African American: 25%	Overall: 39% EL: 9% FY: 2% annual increase from baseline %* Homeless: 2% annual increase from baseline %* SED: 26%	Overall: +6% EL: +4% FY: N/A Homeless: N/A SED: +11% SWD: +3% African American: +10%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		African American: 15% American Indian: 23% Asian: 55% Filipino: 57% Hispanic: 22% Two or More Races: 32% Pacific Islander: 35% White: 39%	American Indian: 43% Asian: 51% Filipino: 47% Hispanic: 23% Two or More Races: 31% Pacific Islander: 17% White: 39% LTEL:0%	American Indian: 30% Asian: 60% Filipino: 57% Hispanic: 26% Two or More Races: 32% Pacific Islander: 30% White: 45%	SWD: 11% African American: 21% American Indian: 29% Asian: 61% Filipino: 63% Hispanic: 28% Two or More Races: 38% Pacific Islander: 41% White: 45%	American Indian: +7% Asian: +5% Filipino: 0% Hispanic: +4% Two or More Races: 0% Pacific Islander: -5% White: +6%
2.3	Percentage of students who took a higher level (above IM2) math course upon graduation (CCIM3, College Algebra, Precalculus, AP Statistics, AP Calculus (AB or BC), DE Math, IB Math) Data Source: SIS	Overall: 78% (of the 2023 graduating cohort) EL: 26% FY: N/A (2 students that were in the 2023 cohort that graduated, took a higher level math course - N/A given the low number)* Homeless: 28.6% SED: 67% SWD: 15% African American: 54% American Indian: 77% Asian: 86% Filipino: 96% Hispanic: 68% Two or More Races: 78% Pacific Islander: 90% White: 80%	Overall: 74% (of the 2024 graduating cohort) EL: 48% FY: N/A Homeless: 70% SED: 72% SWD: 64% African American: 70% American Indian: 81% Asian: 76% Filipino: 81% Hispanic: 72% Two or More Races: 76% Pacific Islander: 87% White: 76%	Overall: 74% (of the 2025 graduating cohort) EL: 72% FY: N/A Homeless: 64% SED: 75% SWD: 67% African American: 71% American Indian: 88% Asian: 78% Filipino: 83% Hispanic: 78% Two or More Races: 71% Pacific Islander: 62% White: 75%	Overall: 81% (of the 2026 graduating cohort) EL: 32% FY: TBD Homeless: 34% SED: 73% SWD: 21% African American: 60% American Indian: 82% Asian: 92% Filipino: 100% Hispanic: 74% Two or More Races: 84% Pacific Islander: 96% White: 86%	Overall: -4% EL: +46% FY: N/A Homeless: +35.4% SED: +8% SWD: +52% African American: +17% American Indian: +11% Asian: -8% Filipino: -13% Hispanic: +10% Two or More Races: -7% Pacific Islander: -28% White: -5%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.4	High School Graduation Rate Data Source: Dashboard	Overall: 92% EL: 74% FY: 70% Homeless: 67% SED: 85% SWD: 66% African American: 89% American Indian: 86% Asian: 96% Filipino: 97% Hispanic: 85% Two or More Races: 88% Pacific Islander: 100% White: 94%	Overall: 94% EL: 80% FY: NA Homeless: 70% SED: 90% SWD: 78% African American: 91% American Indian: 71% Asian: 96% Filipino: 98% Hispanic: 91% Two or More Races: 93% Pacific Islander: 92% White: 95% LTEL: 84%	Overall: 94% EL: 76% FY: N/A Homeless: 74% SED: 91% SWD: 75% African American: 98% American Indian: 89% Asian: 95% Filipino: 98% Hispanic: 89% Two or More Races: 96% Pacific Islander: 90% White: 95%	Overall: 95% EL: 80% FY: 76% Homeless: 73% SED: 91% SWD: 72% African American: 95% American Indian: 92% Asian: 100% Filipino: 100% Hispanic: 91% Two or More Races: 94% Pacific Islander: 100% White: 100%	Overall: +2% EL: +2% FY: N/A Homeless: +7% SED: +6% SWD: +9% African American: +9% American Indian: +3% Asian: -1% Filipino: +1% Hispanic: +4% Two or More Races: +8% Pacific Islander: -10% White: +1%
2.5	Percent of EL students who are reclassified Data Source: Internal / CALPADS	23% of EL students were reclassified during the 22-23 school year.	22% of EL students were reclassificated during the 23-24 school year.	16% of EL students were reclassificated during the 24-25 school year.	24% of EL students reclassified	Overall: -7%
2.6	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard: SCIENCE Data Source: Dataquest (CAST)	Overall: 45% EL: 1% FY: N/A (0 enrolled)* Homeless: N/A (6 enrolled; 4 tested)* SED: 28% SWD: 9% African American: 27% American Indian: 31%	Overall: 43% EL: 3% FY: N/A Homeless: 14% SED: 28% SWD: 4% African American: 27%	Overall: 46% EL: 3% FY: N/A Homeless: 23% SED: 34% SWD: 8% African American: 25%	Overall: 48% EL: 7% FY: 2% Homeless: 2% SED: 34% SWD: 15% African American: 33%	Overall: +1% EL: +2% FY: N/A Homeless: N/A SED: +6% SWD: -1% African American: -2%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Asian: 58% Filipino: 72% Hispanic: 31% Two or More Races: 43% Pacific Islander: 44% White: 48%	American Indian: 41% Asian: 53% Filipino: 67% Hispanic: 31% Two or More Races: 37% Pacific Islander: 40% White: 46% LTEL: 0%	American Indian: 46% Asian: 58% Filipino: 63% Hispanic: 33% Two or More Races: 42% Pacific Islander: 29% White: 49%	American Indian: 37% Asian: 64% Filipino: 78% Hispanic: 37% Two or More Races: 49% Pacific Islander: 50% White: 54%	American Indian: +15% Asian: 0% Filipino: -9% Hispanic: +2% Two or More Races: -1% Pacific Islander: -15% White: +1%
2.7	Number/Percentage of Appropriately Assigned Teachers Data Source: Dashboard	Appropriately Assigned Teachers: 92%	Appropriately Assigned Teachers: 91%	Appropriately Assigned Teachers: 93%	Appropriately Assigned Teachers: 91%	Overall: +1%

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.

A description of overall implementation, including any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions, and any relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.

Successful Implementation (Fully Implemented)

Action 2.1 Instructional Capacity Building - During the 2025–26 school year, the district made significant progress in strengthening instructional capacity in mathematics through a comprehensive system of professional learning, coaching, and leadership development aligned to district priorities. Targeted professional development was delivered through structured learning cycles focused on high-quality Tier I instruction, including math language routines, Building Thinking Classrooms (BTC), and strategies to support English Learners and Multilingual Learners. These cycles included full-day trainings followed by coaching support, enabling teachers to implement research-based practices in their classrooms. The district expanded support for educators through professional learning specialists and partnerships with external providers, ensuring access to high-quality instructional materials, modeling, and data-informed instructional strategies. Teachers engaged in workshops, collaborative planning, and coaching cycles designed to strengthen lesson design, increase student engagement, and support differentiated instruction for unduplicated students. Additionally, administrators participated in aligned training and walkthrough calibration to strengthen their role as instructional leaders, with a focus on identifying and supporting high-level math instruction. Ongoing progress monitoring through professional learning implementation, classroom practices, and student data contributed to increased alignment, consistency, and instructional coherence across sites.

Action 2.2 Explicit Language Strategies - District efforts focused on strengthening support for English Learners through aligned professional learning and site-based leadership development. Professional development was designed and implemented to support Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) in general education classrooms through integrated ELD strategies. Site-based EL Leadership Teams participated in two full release days and two half days to develop and refine their site-level programs, with an emphasis on EL shadowing, student goal setting, expanded use of accessibility resources for state testing, and coordinated participation in professional learning. These teams were supported by TOSAs to develop site-specific professional development or leverage districtwide offerings. District leadership also participated in Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL) training, with the TOSA team scheduled to attend in Summer 2026 to further expand district capacity. Additional partnerships with PCOE provided foundational ELD support, while collaborations with CRLP and SVMI introduced language routines aligned to the California ELD Standards. These efforts strengthened instructional practices and increased consistency in supporting EL students across content areas.

Action 2.3 Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science) - During the 2025–26 school year, the district expanded professional development and support systems across core content areas to ensure equitable access to high-quality instruction and improved academic outcomes for all students, with a focus on unduplicated student groups. Teachers participated in targeted professional learning designed to strengthen learner-centered instruction, deepen student thinking, and reduce D and F rates, particularly in mathematics. These efforts were supported through partnerships with external providers and facilitated by professional learning specialists, who provided training, modeling, and coaching aligned to district instructional priorities. The district also strengthened data-informed instructional practices by providing training on CAASPP interim assessments and formative data use, supporting teachers in analyzing student performance, adjusting instruction, and implementing targeted interventions. To support students with significant skill gaps, professional learning and collaborative planning opportunities focused on scaffolding strategies, explicit language instruction, and Integrated ELD practices across math, English, and science classrooms. These coordinated efforts strengthened instructional practices, increased the use of data to inform teaching, and improved system coherence across sites.

Action 2.5 Co-Taught Learning Support - As of Spring 2026, all comprehensive schools have fully implemented co-teaching in IM1, IM2, English 9, English 10, and NGSS Biology to support students with disabilities as identified in their IEPs. The program includes 37 co-teaching teams across 6 sites, providing 153 co-taught sections that expand access to grade-level curriculum within the least restrictive environment. These structures have strengthened inclusive instructional practices and increased access to rigorous coursework for students with disabilities. Moving forward, the district will continue implementing co-teaching across these content areas at all comprehensive schools to ensure sustained support and continued progress in student outcomes.

Action 2.6 Academic Support for Unduplicated Student Groups - This action was fully implemented and resulted in strengthened systems of support for socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED), foster, and homeless students. Attendance teams continued to closely monitor these student groups to ensure consistent engagement and timely intervention. Family and Community Engagement (FACE) liaisons conducted ongoing home visits and connected families to essential resources to address barriers to attendance and learning. Transportation services were maintained and expanded through a variety of options to support student access to school. These coordinated efforts ensured that students had increased access to necessary supports, contributing to improved engagement and stability for unduplicated student populations.

Action 2.7 Enhance Guidance Services - This action was fully implemented and resulted in increased academic and wraparound support for unduplicated student groups. School counselors provided increased one-on-one support for foster youth (FY), homeless, and socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students, addressing their academic, college and career, and social-emotional needs. Counselors assisted students and their families in accessing essential resources such as food, clothing, and shelter to ensure stability and support academic success. These coordinated efforts strengthened systems of support, improved student access to resources, and reinforced the district's commitment to addressing barriers to learning for unduplicated student populations.

Action 2.8 Senior Credit Recovery Program - Roseville Adult School plays a vital role in supporting RJUHSD students who are at risk of not graduating, particularly those in their senior year who require additional pathways to complete their high school requirements. As a fully accredited adult education institution within the district, Roseville Adult School offers a wide range of academic programs designed to serve students beyond the traditional high school setting, including credit recovery.

To strengthen support for students at risk of not graduating, RJUHSD facilitates the concurrent enrollment of twelfth grade students into credit recovery programs offered through Roseville Adult School. This partnership allows eligible seniors to remain enrolled at their high school while simultaneously taking credit recovery courses through the Adult School, providing them with an additional avenue to recover lost credits and stay on track for graduation. The flexible scheduling and individualized pace offered through Roseville Adult School make it especially well suited for students who benefit from a different learning environment or who need to recover credits beyond what their home school can accommodate.

By leveraging the resources and programs available through Roseville Adult School, RJUHSD is able to provide a more robust safety net for students who might otherwise fall short of graduation. This collaborative approach reflects the district's commitment to ensuring that every senior has access to multiple pathways toward earning a diploma.

Partial Implementation

Action 2.4 Targeted Intervention and Academic Support - During the 2025–26 school year, all RJUHSD sites offered academic tutoring to their students. Most schools provided focused academic support through teacher and peer-led tutoring sessions after school, while several sites supplemented these offerings with additional forms of targeted tutoring tailored to their student populations.

In the Spring of 2026, RJUHSD launched a credit recovery pilot program during Quarters 3 and 4. Rather than offering credit recovery in a fully virtual format at the district level, schools delivered a hybrid model directly at their sites. Under this approach, students enrolled in credit recovery received targeted academic support for one hour, three days a week, from content related teachers, allowing them to work through their coursework with consistent, in-person guidance from staff. The results were encouraging: during Quarter 3, RJUHSD saw a 10% increase in the number of students who successfully passed their credit recovery courses compared to Quarter 3 of the previous year.

To better identify and support students in need of targeted academic intervention, RJUHSD also began administering district common assessments alongside interim assessments to monitor student progress in Math, Science, and ELA. These pre- and post-assessments are providing valuable data on subgroup performance and helping schools direct resources where they are most needed.

Overall, RJUHSD made significant progress this school year in expanding tutoring access, reimagining credit recovery, and strengthening the use of formative data to drive instruction. Building on this momentum, the district plans to broaden its assessment program during the 2026–27 school year to further support student achievement across all sites. This school year was dedicated to building out the Performance Matters assessment platform and piloting it in the spring. The Math Design Team spent a majority of the year developing district common assessments (DCAs) within the platform, while many other teachers are currently piloting the platform as well. The formal release of Performance Matters will occur during the 2026–27 school year, providing teachers with more robust assessment data to determine how well learning is progressing for students and whether instructional adjustments are needed to meet the learning needs of all students.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

2.1 - difference mostly due to additional supplemental funds not needing to be spent due to other data systems already in place.
2.3 - difference due to the Learning Recovery grant being fully budgeted at adopted and at estimated actuals bringing the balance down since the funds to not need to be spent until FY 27/28.
2.4 - anticipated costs of credit recovery and related software platforms were not as high as originally planned.

A description of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal.

Based on our analysis of metrics and outcomes, the implementation of actions showed varying levels of effectiveness in achieving Goal 2, as demonstrated by both quantitative data and qualitative indicators.

Actions Demonstrating Strong Effectiveness

Action 2.1 Instructional Capacity Building - This action demonstrated emerging effectiveness in strengthening instructional capacity in mathematics. The district saw measurable gains in graduation rates, which increased from 92% to 94%, as well as improvements in College and Career Indicator (CCI) readiness and access to higher-level coursework. Mathematics performance increased from 36% to 42%, indicating positive movement in student outcomes. However, English Language Arts (ELA) performance declined slightly from 67% to 64%, and science performance showed only modest gains. These mixed results suggest that while professional development, coaching, and instructional alignment efforts are positively impacting outcomes, continued focus is needed to deepen implementation and ensure consistent impact across all content areas and student groups.

Action 2.2 Explicit Language Strategies - This action demonstrated strong effectiveness in strengthening support for English Learners through targeted professional development and increased focus on integrated ELD practices. Site-based leadership structures, including EL Leadership Teams and TOSA support, contributed to improved instructional practices and increased awareness of language development strategies across content areas. These efforts supported improvements in College and Career Indicator (CCI) readiness, which increased from 57% to 59%, and contributed to gains in A–G completion for several student groups. While overall reclassification rates declined, this is likely influenced by changes in student demographics and an increase in newcomer students. Overall, this action strengthened system coherence and instructional capacity, with continued opportunities to improve outcomes for EL students.

Action 2.3 Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science) - This action demonstrated emerging effectiveness in improving instruction and student outcomes across core content areas. Mathematics performance showed measurable

improvement, and access to higher-level math courses increased significantly for several unduplicated student groups, including English Learners and students with disabilities. Science achievement remained relatively stable, indicating consistent instructional support. While these results reflect progress, variability across content areas and student groups indicates a need for continued targeted support and refinement of instructional strategies to ensure sustained growth.

Action 2.5 Co-Taught Learning Support - This action demonstrated strong effectiveness in increasing access to grade-level curriculum and improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The co-teaching model effectively supports students' IEPs by embedding Specialized Academic Instruction directly within general education classrooms. Students are not only receiving the support they need, but are doing so alongside their peers while engaging in grade-level content on a daily basis. This approach has strengthened access, increased time in general education settings within the least restrictive environment, and reinforced a clear pathway toward diploma attainment. The expansion of co-taught sections across all comprehensive sites reflects a systemwide commitment to inclusive practices and has contributed to improved student engagement and access to rigorous coursework.

Action 2.6 Academic Support for Unduplicated Student Groups - This action demonstrated strong effectiveness in providing coordinated systems of support for socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED), foster, and homeless students. Attendance teams continued to closely monitor student engagement, while Family and Community Engagement (FACE) liaisons conducted home visits and connected families to critical resources. Transportation services were expanded through multiple options to ensure access to school. These coordinated efforts contributed to a reduction in chronic absenteeism from 15% to 13% and improved overall student engagement. The continued integration of wraparound services has strengthened the district's ability to support unduplicated students and address barriers to attendance.

Action 2.7 Enhance Guidance Services - This action demonstrated strong effectiveness in increasing targeted academic and wraparound supports for unduplicated student groups. A more focused, individualized approach was implemented, with counselors providing one-on-one support and intentionally recruiting students into pathways and programs such as Dual Enrollment and Career Technical Education (CTE). Students identified as foster youth (FY), homeless (HL), and socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) were placed on targeted lists, ensuring counselors were able to proactively connect with students and address their specific academic, college and career, and social-emotional needs.

As a result of these efforts, graduation rates increased by 7% for homeless students and 6% for socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students, reflecting the impact of strengthened guidance services and targeted interventions. Additionally, access to higher-level math courses increased significantly for homeless students by 41.4% and for SED students by 5%, indicating expanded access to rigorous coursework aligned to graduation and college readiness goals.

Counselors supported students through individualized planning, including submitting requests for reduced credit requirements for students who qualified, and connecting students to Care Solace and Wellness Centers for needs assessments and access to essential resources such as clothing, food, and community services. These coordinated efforts strengthened student stability, improved engagement, and increased access to both academic and support services. Overall, the intentional, student-centered approach to guidance services has been a key driver in improving outcomes for unduplicated student groups.

Action 2.8 Senior Credit Recovery Program - For the past several years, RJUHSD has fully implemented the concurrent enrollment of twelfth grade students at risk of not graduating into credit recovery programs offered through Roseville Adult School. Because this model has been

in place and refined over multiple school years, both school site staff and Adult School personnel have developed strong systems for identifying eligible students, coordinating enrollment, and monitoring student progress to ensure timely completion of coursework.

Actions Demonstrating Emerging Effectiveness or Somewhat Effective

Action 2.4 Targeted Intervention and Academic Support - Significant strides have been made in implementing targeted tutoring, the pilot credit recovery program, and the rollout of district common and interim assessments. However, sustained effort is needed to build momentum across all core departments to ensure consistent administration of either district common assessments or interim assessments throughout the school year. Expanding participation in this manner will provide a more comprehensive understanding of student academic progress across all core subject areas, enabling staff to evaluate growth with greater accuracy and consistency.

This broader assessment data during the 2026-27 school year will be instrumental in informing instructional decision-making, allowing teachers and administrators to identify trends, address learning gaps, and make timely adjustments to instruction. Ultimately, these refinements will strengthen RJUHSD's capacity to support all students in meeting course expectations and achieving academic success.

Action 2.6 Academic Support for Unduplicated Student Groups - This action demonstrated emerging effectiveness in strengthening supports for socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED), foster, and homeless students. Graduation rates increased to 74% for homeless students and remained stable for SED students; however, these rates continue to be lower than the overall district rate. Strengthened support systems, including expanded transportation services and the continued work of Family and Community Engagement (FACE) liaisons, have been critical in addressing barriers and improving student stability. These wraparound supports contributed to improved engagement and access to school for unduplicated student groups.

However, attendance monitoring and intervention efforts showed mixed results, in part due to inconsistent follow-through in supporting students' regular attendance. Persistent barriers, including housing instability and inconsistent transportation, continued to impact school engagement. While letters, home visits, and transportation partnerships were implemented, further refinement of attendance strategies and transportation systems is needed to ensure consistent school attendance and sustained improvement in outcomes for these student groups.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, target outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

Added to Action 2.1 - Site Based Instructional Coaches

To directly address the achievement gap, the district will assign dedicated Instructional Coaches to support the academic success of unduplicated students with the sites having the highest need.. These coaches will work in close collaboration with administration and teachers to build long-term instructional capacity through job-embedded support, such as classroom observations, non-evaluative feedback, and active participation in Professional Learning Communities to analyze student data. By designing site-specific professional development focused on differentiated instruction and inclusive practices, these coaches will serve as a vital bridge between district goals and classroom implementation, ensuring that instructional shifts result in measurable improvements and a learning environment tailored to the diverse needs of our most vulnerable student populations.

Added to Action 2.5 - Co-Taught Learning Support

Action 2.5 has been revised from a non-contributing action to a contributing action based on identified needs and outcome data demonstrating that unduplicated student groups, including students with disabilities, English Learners, foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students, require increased access to inclusive instructional settings, targeted academic supports, and rigorous grade-level coursework to improve academic outcomes and graduation readiness. To increase access to grade-level curriculum and improve outcomes for unduplicated student groups, the district will continue to expand and refine the co-teaching model across all comprehensive sites. This action embeds Specialized Academic Instruction within general education classrooms, allowing students to receive targeted support while engaging in rigorous, grade-level content alongside their peers.

The district will focus on strengthening collaboration between general education and special education teachers through ongoing professional development, co-planning time, and instructional coaching to ensure consistent and effective implementation. Additionally, this action will support increased access to A–G aligned coursework and promote greater support within the least restrictive environment. By scaling and refining this model, the district aims to improve academic achievement, increase graduation rates, and expand college and career readiness opportunities for unduplicated student populations.

Added to Action 2.6 - Capacity Building for Instructional Leadership and Classroom Support for Unduplicated Students

The district will implement professional development opportunities to strengthen the support system for unduplicated students by building the capacity of both site administrators and classroom teachers. This initiative provides administrators with targeted training to enhance their ability to coach and lead teachers in the implementation of high-leverage instructional strategies. Simultaneously, teachers will engage in professional learning designed to expand their toolkit of evidence-based practices, allowing them to better differentiate instruction and remove learning barriers for unduplicated student populations. By aligning leadership coaching with classroom instruction, the district ensures a cohesive environment where staff at all levels possess the skills necessary to improve academic outcomes and provide personalized support for our most vulnerable students.

Added to Action 2.6 - Artificial Intelligence Professional Development and Literacy

To address the growing need for artificial intelligence literacy, the district will collaborate with external partners to provide targeted professional development focused on AI fluency and ethical integration. This initiative is designed to equip teachers with the skills necessary to leverage AI for personalized learning and instructional efficiency, directly supporting the academic needs of all students. By prioritizing these cutting-edge technological foundations, the district ensures that unduplicated student populations are better prepared for the demands of modern college and career pathways, ultimately driving improved academic outcomes and long-term competitiveness.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.1	Instructional Capacity Building	Coordinate comprehensive educational initiatives for student success in mathematics. The Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction will oversee the development, implementation, and evaluation of educational programs and strategies to enhance teaching and learning outcomes for unduplicated students, including but not limited to; Provide Targeted Professional Development in Mathematics. Monitor strategy implementation progress from math professional development. The Director II of State and Federal Programs and Accountability will ensure compliance with state and federal regulations, coordinate grant funding initiatives, and monitor academic performance metrics to drive continuous improvement within an educational institution. Align assessments to measure progress and identify areas for improvement, enabling targeted interventions and differentiated instruction. Provide professional learning specialists to support teachers in accessing quality instructional materials. Provide specialized training sessions and workshops to math instructors. Provide support and guidance in data analysis. Conduct workshops, modeling lessons, coaching, and collaboration sessions. Contribute to the development of instructional materials catering to diverse student needs and aligning with math standards. Develop the capacity of site leadership to be instructional leaders through training and focused implementation of high-level math instruction. Direct instruction and training in research-based, effective mathematical instruction practices. Observation of specific classroom practices and providing coaching to teachers in mathematics. Expand the current articulation opportunities between RJUHSD and its partner districts (high school and middle school math teachers) increasing both alignment and strengthening the instructional knowledge and capacity of each math instructor and department. Implement highly effective strategies in all math classrooms.	$2,291,330.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Provide professional development research and resources for all instructors as part of capacity building efforts Incorporate engaging, high-leverage action habits into professional development at the beginning of the year as a form of capacity building. Implement coaching cycles for math teachers throughout the year. Ensure administrators participate in coaching cycles throughout the year, integrating high-leverage strategies.		
2.2	Explicit Language Strategies	Provide targeted support that enhances language acquisition and fosters academic success in all subject areas Provide additional ELD sections to sites to support EL students. Identify and implement explicit integrated English language development (ELD) strategies and training for teachers to support language acquisition. Provide professional development through professional learning specialists to use visual aids, hands-on activities, and simplified language to support comprehension while maintaining rigorous content standards. Train instructors to explicitly teach and reinforce academic language skills, such as vocabulary development, reading comprehension strategies, and academic writing, within the context of their specific subject area. Train teachers to increase collaborative learning opportunities for EL, newcomer, and Long-Term English Learner (LTEL) students (pair students with varying language proficiency levels, build language skills through meaningful interactions, use English in academic contexts). Provide professional development to teachers to increase engagement in discussions, debates, presentations, and projects that require EL, newcomer, and Long-Term English Learner (LTEL). LTEL students to use academic language and apply content knowledge. Create intensive, integrated English Language development programs for newly arrived or newcomer students. Provide targeted support to Long-Term English Learners (LTELs). Implement targeted integrated English language development (ELD) programs that provide intensive English language instruction tailored to the proficiency level and individual needs of LTELs with the guidance of professional learning specialists.	$1,451,739.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Incorporate language-rich activities and integrated English language development (ELD) instructional strategies into core content areas. Incorporate culturally relevant materials, texts, examples, and sharing opportunities into instruction. Train instructors to break down learning tasks into manageable steps, provide clear explanations and modeling, and offer guided practice and feedback to help LTELs develop academic language proficiency and content knowledge.		
2.3	Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science)	Ensure equitable access to high-quality education and foster academic success for all students, regardless of background or circumstance. Offer training and support for teachers administering CAASPP interim testing and utilizing formative data for instruction through professional learning specialists. Facilitate professional development to enhance learner-centered, deep thinking and learning, with a focus on strategies to reduce D and F rates in math classrooms, in partnership with various providers. Investigate and provide professional development for sites to support high school students with significant skill gaps, ensuring successful progression in our Integrated Math sequence with an emphasis on unduplicated student groups. Deliver professional development through professional learning specialists on explicit language teaching strategies for teachers, along with establishing a progress monitoring system to assess program effectiveness for EL students with particular emphasis on math, English, and science instruction. Increase counselor and teacher support for students to finish the science pathway from Biology, Physics through Chemistry by the end of their junior year for CAASPP prep. Implement PowerSchool Unified Insights districtwide for data management and analysis of student outcomes data, to support the planning and adjustment for high-quality first instruction.	$4,364,816.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.4	Targeted Intervention and Academic Support	Offer additional academic support (i.e. mathematics tutoring) and opportunities for mastery across subjects, promoting access and academic success for all learners. Credit recovery opportunities for targeted credit deficient students (i.e., summer school, credit recovery during the school year). Implement a high dosage school math and science tutoring program. Implement a targeted selection process based on data analysis to identify students who will benefit most. Utilize pre and post assessments and measure individual student progress and adjust instructional strategies to maximize educational outcomes (Nickow, Oreopoulos, & Quan, 2020).	$728,255.00	Yes
2.5	Co-Taught Learning Support	Ensure universal access to education, accommodate diverse learning needs, and facilitate academic growth and success for students with disabilities (SWD). Provide and expand co-taught courses in IM1, IM2, Eng9, Eng10, and NGSS Bio for the SWDs who require it according to their IEPs at each comprehensive school site. Introduce co-taught DE courses for SWD.	$3,278,335.00	Yes
2.6	Academic Supports and Services for Unduplicated Students	Address the unique challenges socio-economically disadvantaged (SED), homeless, and foster youth (FY) students face, ensuring stability in their education, and promoting their academic success. Establish a plan of support for homeless, foster youth (FY), and low-income (SED) students to help address attendance issues. Increase targeted academic support of SED, FY, and homeless students through Learning Support Specialists (LSS). Maintain a transportation service to ensure students, including those who are low-income (SED), foster youth, and homeless, have access to transportation to and from school as needed.	$1,986,847.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.7	Enhance Guidance Services	Provide academic, college and career guidance to students. Support the unduplicated proportional cost of school counselor positions.	$2,657,429.00	Yes
2.8	Senior Credit Recovery Program	Support 12th-grade students at risk of not graduating. Facilitate the concurrent enrollment of 12th-grade students at risk of not graduating in credit recovery programs at Roseville Adult School. The Executive Director of the Credit Recovery Program will be responsible for developing, implementing, and refining the vision for a comprehensive credit recovery system that ensures equitable access to graduation pathways for all students. This role will oversee the management of program operations, including staffing, budgeting, and resource allocation, to create a structured and effective system that meets student needs. Additionally, the Director will lead data analysis efforts to track student progress, identify areas for improvement, and inform strategic decision-making. Clear and consistent communication with educational partners including district leadership, site administrators, teachers, students, and families. There will be a key focus to ensure alignment, transparency, and program effectiveness. By strengthening credit recovery opportunities, this position will play a vital role in increasing student success, closing achievement gaps, and supporting on-time graduation rates.	$345,110.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	Expand support for students and increase parent involvement.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The Roseville Joint Union High School District has established a strategic goal to expand support for students and increase parent involvement, driven by comprehensive data highlighting areas for improvement within our educational community. Positive indicators, such as student and parent perceptions of school connectedness and safety, provide a foundation for engagement efforts.

Suspension and Expulsion Rates

RJUHSD places a significant emphasis on reducing suspension rates. Suspended students are more likely to fall behind in their studies, miss out on crucial instructional time, and become disconnected from the school environment. Research by Balfanz, Byrnes, and Fox (2015) highlighted the profound impact of even a single suspension during ninth grade, significantly decreasing the likelihood of graduating from high school. Moreover, studies have found that suspension is not effective at deterring poor student behavior (Fenning & Bohanon, 2006; Losen & Skiba, 2011). Instead, suspension tends to be a reactive response by adults that fails to address the underlying causes of misconduct, which may stem from experiences of trauma (Verdugo, 2002). Consequently, RJUHSD is actively focusing a culture of care that examines alternatives to suspension, seeking interventions that target the root causes of disruptive behavior. This proactive approach aims to provide support and resources to students in need, ultimately fostering a more inclusive and supportive learning environment. Current suspension rates currently stand at 4.4% district-wide. Subgroups such as foster youth (FY) and homeless students experience disproportionately high suspension rates at 17% and 16%, respectively. Students with disabilities (SWD), also notable, have a suspension rate of 9.7%, with at least one day of suspension. Addressing these disparities is key to fostering a safe and inclusive learning environment for all students (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023). Expulsion rates remain relatively low at 0.1% overall, but attention is warranted to ensure equitable outcomes across all student demographics (Expulsion Rate, Dataquest - Roseville Joint Union High (CA Dept of Education), 2023). Disaggregated data reveals disparities, with certain groups, such as American Indian and Hispanic students, experiencing slightly higher expulsion rates, warranting further investigation and support.

Absenteeism

Chronic absenteeism is not only a strong predictor of dropout rates but also has far-reaching consequences beyond K-12 education. According to a study by Balfanz and Byrnes (2012) from the Everyone Graduates Center at Johns Hopkins University, chronic absenteeism

as early as sixth grade can foreshadow lower graduation rates. Moreover, the impacts of chronic absenteeism stretch into future educational and career opportunities, affecting college preparedness, attendance, and subsequent employment prospects. On a positive note, chronic absenteeism, defined as the percentage of students absent for 10 percent or more of instructional days they were enrolled to attend, is notably lower in RJUHSD, currently at 15%, compared to the statewide rate of 25.4% (Chronic Absenteeism Rate, Dataquest - Roseville Joint Union High (CA Dept of Education), 2023). Disparities among student subgroups are notable, with rates particularly high among English Learners (EL) at 24%, foster youth (FY) at 33%, and homeless students at 45% (Chronic Absenteeism Rate, Dataquest - Roseville Joint Union High (CA Dept of Education), 2023). Similarly, students from socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) backgrounds and those with disabilities (SWD) also exhibit elevated rates, emphasizing the need for targeted intervention and support.

Extracurricular Activities

Participation in extracurricular activities has been consistently linked with improved academic performance. According to Fredricks and Eccles (2006) students who engage in these activities tend to have higher grades and demonstrate greater aspirations for continuing education. This is often attributed to the development of organizational skills, time management, and a positive attitude towards school (Fredricks & Eccles, 2006). Research shows that students who participate in extracurricular activities are less likely to engage in risky behaviors such as substance abuse and delinquency, largely because these activities offer structured and supervised environments that encourage healthy choices, as highlighted in a report by the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (n.d.). Additionally, involvement in these activities is associated with higher levels of school engagement and attendance. Extracurricular opportunities provide students with compelling reasons to be more invested in their school community, thus enhancing their overall commitment to education. Athletic program participation in RJUHSD, one of the key extracurricular programs, is strong with 4,517 students engaged in sports, representing 44% of the total enrollment of 10,357. This showcases the district's commitment to athletics as an integral part of school life with nearly equal numbers of sports teams for both genders (Female: 188, Male: 181). Despite this commitment, the disparity in participation rates between genders exists, with 1,978 females (40%) compared to 2,539 males (47%) engaging in athletes. This indicates a need for further investigation to ensure equitable opportunities and encouragement for all students to participate in sports.

Co-Curricular Engagement

Co-curricular participation in high schools, additionally, is widely recognized for its positive effects on students' academic, social, and emotional development. Many studies have found that participation in extracurricular activities is positively associated with higher grades, higher academic aspirations, and higher standardized test scores (Broh, 2002). Participation in co-curricular activities result in better exam grades, less disciplinary issues, increased attendance, and less dropout rate from school (Darling, Caldwell, and Smith, 2005). Specific to students who were engaged in fine arts activities, Olson (2008) found students had significantly improved attendance compared to those students who preferred to limit only to studies at school. Being involved in co-curricular activities is significantly related with class attendance and higher class attendance is linked with higher academic achievement (Olson, 2008). In RJUHSD, a range of co-curricular activities including club participation is seen as an integral component of the educational experience, fostering both personal growth and academic enrichment. In reviewing the current data, GBHS stands out with notably more clubs than its counterparts; however, a reassessment of quality club offerings to enhance student involvement and cater to a wider array of interests is warranted. The district-wide participation in additional co-curricular activities, which complement academic learning, involves 4,799 students. The activities, which include AVID, Yearbook, Speech and Debate, and others, are critical as they support diverse aspects of student development, from leadership skills to

creative expression. The high participation rate indicates strong engagement and suggests that these programs are well-received by students, potentially contributing positively to their academic and personal growth.

At-Risk Students

Research on credit recovery programs and concurrent enrollment for at-risk students supports their effectiveness in facilitating graduation and improving academic outcomes. Several studies have demonstrated the positive impact of credit recovery programs on graduation rates and student achievement. For example, a study by the National Dropout Prevention Center found that credit recovery programs can significantly increase graduation rates for at-risk students by providing alternative pathways to earning credits and completing high school requirements (National Dropout Prevention Center, 2024). Additionally, research conducted by the What Works Clearinghouse has highlighted the effectiveness of concurrent enrollment programs in allowing students to earn college credit while still in high school, leading to higher rates of college enrollment and completion (WWC | Find What Works!, n.d.). Facilitating concurrent enrollment of at-risk 12th-grade students in credit recovery programs at Roseville Adult School can effectively address academic challenges and ensure timely graduation. Research confirms the vital role of targeted interventions for students at risk of not graduating, with concurrent enrollment programs recognized as effective strategies for credit recovery and academic progress. Such programs offer opportunities for students to regain missed credits, improve academic standing, and increase graduation rates. Through engaging internal and external partners and launching educational campaigns, RJUHSD can efficiently communicate available resources and support to students, teachers, and parents, enhancing district-wide communication and fostering community partnerships focused on student success.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Suspension rates Data Source: DataQuest	Overall 4.4% EL: 7% FY: 17% Homeless: 16% SED: 8% SWD: 10% African American: 8% American Indian: 8% Asian: 3% Filipino: 2% Hispanic: 7% Two or More Races: 6% Pacific Islander: 6% White: 4%	Overall 4% EL: 6% FY: 21% Homeless: 14% SED: 6% SWD: 10% African American: 10% American Indian: 6% Asian: 2% Filipino: 2% Hispanic: 5%	Overall: 3% EL: 7% FY: 14% Homeless: 7% SED: 5% SWD: 7% African American: 8% American Indian: 3% Asian: 2% Filipino: 2% Hispanic: 4%	Overall: 1.4% EL: 1% FY: 11% Homeless: 10% SED: 2% SWD: 4% African American: 2% American Indian: 2% Asian: 0% Filipino: 0% Hispanic: 1%	Overall: -1.4% EL: 0% FY: -3% Homeless: -9% SED: -3% SWD: -3% African American: 0% American Indian: -5% Asian: -1% Filipino: 0% Hispanic: -3%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			Two or More Races: 5% Pacific Islander: 6% White: 3% LTEL: 9%	Two or More Races: 5% Pacific Islander: 3% White: 3%	Two or More Races: 0% Pacific Islander: 0% White: 0%	Two or More Races: -1% Pacific Islander: -3% White: -1%
3.2	Expulsion Rates Data Source: DataQuest	Overall 0.1% African American: 0.0% American Indian: 0.9% Asian: 0.1% Filipino: 0.0% Hispanic: 0.2% Two or More Races: 0.0% Pacific Islander: 0.0% White: 0.0%	Overall 0% African American: 0.2% American Indian: 0% Asian: 0% Filipino: 0.0% Hispanic: 0.1% Two or More Races: 0.0% Pacific Islander: 0.0% White: 0.0%	Overall: 0.1% African American: 0% American Indian: 0% Asian: 0.2% Filipino: 0% Hispanic: 0% Two or More Races: 0% Pacific Islander: 0% White: 0%	Overall: Maintain or decrease African American: 0.0% American Indian: 0.0% Asian: 0.0% Filipino: 0.0% Hispanic: 0.0% Two or More Races: 0.0% Pacific Islander: 0.0% White: 0.0%	Overall: 0% African American: 0 American Indian: -0.9 Asian: +0.1 Filipino: 0 Hispanic: -0.2 Two or More Races: 0 Pacific Islander: 0 White: 0
3.3	Rate of Student Connection 1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree Data Source: Annual District Survey	Student Survey Rating I feel like I belong at this school: 3.75 I like this school: 3.63 I think this is a good school: 3.80 Students at this school like me: 3.56	Student Survey Rating I feel like I belong at this school: 3.82 I like this school: 3.70 I think this is a good school: 3.89 Students at this school like me: 3.63	Student Survey Rating I feel like I belong at this school: 3.85 I like this school: 3.70 I think this is a good school: 3.88 Students at this school like me: 3.64	Student Survey Rating I feel like I belong at this school: 4.0 I like this school: 4.0 I think this is a good school: 4.0 Students at this school like me: 4.0	Student Survey Rating I feel like I belong at this school: +0.10 I like this school: +0.07 I think this is a good school: +0.08 Students at this school like me: +0.08

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Participating in extracurricular activities is important to me: 3.73	Participating in extracurricular activities is important to me: 3.79	Participating in extracurricular activities is important to me: 3.74	Participating in extracurricular activities is important to me: 4.0	Participating in extracurricular activities is important to me: +0.01
3.4	Rate of Student Perceptions on School Safety 1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree Data Source: Annual District Survey	I feel safe at school: 3.88	I feel safe at school: 3.95	I feel safe at school: 4.03	I feel safe at school: 4.0	I feel safe at school: +0.15
3.5	Rate of Parent Perceptions on School Safety 1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree Data Source: Annual District Survey	My child is safe at school: 3.95 There is adequate supervision during school: 3.72 There is adequate supervision before and after school: 3.56	My child is safe at school: 3.96 There is adequate supervision during school: 3.73 There is adequate supervision before and after school: 3.56	My child is safe at school: 3.99 There is adequate supervision during school: 3.77 There is adequate supervision before and after school: 3.56	My child is safe at school: 4.0 There is adequate supervision during school: 4.0 There is adequate supervision before and after school: 4.0	My child is safe at school: +0.04 There is adequate supervision during school: +0.05 There is adequate supervision before and after school: 0
3.6	Chronic Absenteeism Data Source: CALPADS EOY 3	Overall: 15% EL: 24% FY: 33% Homeless: 45% SED: 25% SWD: 30%	Overall: 13% EL: 25% FY: 48% Homeless: 42% SED: 19% SWD: 28%	Overall: 13% EL: 23% FY: 47% Homeless: 32% SED: 18.5% SWD: 25.5%	Overall: 12% EL: 18% FY: 27% Homeless: 39% SED: 19% SWD: 24%	Overall: -2% EL: -1% FY: +14% Homeless: -13% SED: -6.5% SWD: -4.5%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		African American: 18% American Indian: 24% Asian: 8% Filipino: 6% Hispanic: 20% Two or More Races: 21% Pacific Islander: 17% White: 14%	African American: 20% American Indian: 21% Asian: 9% Filipino: 5% Hispanic: 17% Two or More Races: 18% Pacific Islander: 9% White: 12%	African American: 17% American Indian: 24% Asian: 9% Filipino: 5% Hispanic: 17% Two or More Races: 15% Pacific Islander: 11.5% White: 12%	African American: 12% American Indian: 18% Asian: 2% Filipino: 0% Hispanic: 14% Two or More Races: 15% Pacific Islander: 11% White: 8%	African American: -1% American Indian: 0% Asian: +1% Filipino: -1% Hispanic: -3% Two or More Races: -6% Pacific Islander: -5.5% White: -2%
3.7	Rate of Parent Perceptions on a sense of feeling welcomed, adequately informed of choice for their child's post-secondary options, as well as their child being prepared 1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree Data Source: Annual District Survey	I feel welcome at my child's school: 4.0 The school provides adequate information to students about attending college after graduation: 3.83 The school provides adequate information about non-college options after graduation: 3.36 The school succeeds at preparing its students for future work: 3.73	I feel welcome at my child's school: 4.03 The school provides adequate information to students about attending college after graduation: 3.85 The school provides adequate information about non-college options after graduation: 3.45 The school succeeds at preparing its students for future work: 3.73	I feel welcome at my child's school: 4.05 The school provides adequate information to students about attending college after graduation: 3.94 The school provides adequate information about non-college options after graduation: 3.50 The school succeeds at preparing its students for future work: 3.75	I feel welcome at my child's school: 4.0 The school provides adequate information to students about attending college after graduation: 4.0 The school provides adequate information about non-college options after graduation: 4.0 The school succeeds at preparing its students for future work: 4.0	I feel welcome at my child's school: +0.05 The school provides adequate information about attending college: +0.11 The school provides adequate information about non-college options: +0.14 The school succeeds at preparing students for future work: +0.02

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.8	Number of students participating in co-curricular opportunities (Co-curricular is defined as an activity or program that takes place outside of the traditional classroom but in some manner complements academic learning from the classroom curriculum). Data Source: Internal Data Source	Overall: 4799 students Co-curricular courses include: AVID Yearbook Speech and Debate Student Government Choir Drama Dance Band Media Mock Trial	Overall: 5939 students Co-curricular courses include: AVID Yearbook Speech and Debate Student Government Choir Drama Dance Band Media Mock Trial	Overall: 5821 students Co-curricular courses include: AVID Yearbook Speech and Debate Student Government Choir Drama Dance Band Media Mock Trial	Overall: 4943 Co-curricular courses include: AVID Yearbook Speech and Debate Student Government Choir Drama Dance Band Media Mock Trial	Overall: +1022 students Co-curricular courses include: AVID Yearbook Speech and Debate Student Government Choir Drama Dance Band Media Mock Trial
3.9	Student Athletic Participation Data by Gender Data Source: California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS)	Total Comprehensive Enrollment in Schools Female: 4,904 Male: 5,387 N: 66 Total # of Student Participants by Gender Female: 1,978 Male: 2,539 N: 10 Total # of Sports Teams by Gender Female: 188 Male: 181	Total Comprehensive Enrollment in Schools Female: 5,031 Male: 5,528 N: 53 Total # of Student Participants by Gender Female: 2,114 Male: 2,471 N: 10 Total # of Sports Teams by Gender Female: 198 Male: 187	Total Comprehensive Enrollment in Schools Female: 5,211 Male: 5,687 N: 43 Total # of Student Participants by Gender Female: 2,285 Male: 2,655 N: 11 Total # of Sports Teams by Gender Female: 197 Male: 187	Total Comprehensive Enrollment in Schools Female: 4,904+ Male: 5,387+ N: 66+ Total # of Student Participants by Gender Female: 1,978+ Male: 2,539+ N: 10+ Total # of Sports Teams by Gender Female: 188+ Male: 181+	Total Comprehensive Enrollment in Schools Female: +307 Male: +300 N: -23 Total # of Student Participants by Gender Female: +307 Male: +116 N: +1 Total # of Sports Teams by Gender Female: +9 Male: +6

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.

A description of overall implementation, including any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions, and any relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.

Successful Implementation (Fully Implemented)

Action 3.1 Strategy, Communication, Community Partnerships and Outreach - During the 2025–26 school year, the Communications Department made significant progress in strengthening districtwide communication, outreach, and community engagement. Strategic initiatives included the development of the district's first-ever filmed and printed Annual Report and the expansion of the Student Brand Ambassador program. The department enhanced district storytelling through initiatives such as the Mic Drop video series and RJUHSD Rewind, resulting in over two dozen media spotlights and a significant increase in social media engagement. The establishment of clear Brand Guidelines and a centralized Communications Hub strengthened the district's identity and improved alignment across departments. The district's digital presence expanded substantially, reaching a broad audience and increasing community awareness of district programs and student achievements. In addition, partnerships with organizations such as Leadership Roseville supported ongoing community engagement efforts. These combined efforts strengthened communication systems, increased visibility of student success, and laid the foundation for the development of a comprehensive communications plan to be implemented in the coming year.

Action 3.2 Supportive and Healthy School Culture - The district continued to strengthen systems of support focused on student, family, and staff well-being through expanded wellness programming and partnerships. The Care Solace program remained a critical resource, connecting students, families, and staff to mental health professionals in a timely and accessible manner. The Wellness program expanded its impact through the coordination of 35 interns, increasing capacity to provide social-emotional support services across campuses. Partnerships with regional universities, including CSU Sacramento, William Jessup University, Chico State, and the University of San Francisco, supported the continued development of a strong and sustainable internship program. These efforts ensured that additional social-emotional supports were available on campus to address the needs of the whole child. The district also continued to support student voice and belonging through the Student Summit, providing opportunities for marginalized student groups to build community, strengthen peer connections, and engage in culturally relevant experiences that contribute to a positive school climate.

Action 3.3 Supportive and Safe School Culture - Efforts to promote student health, safety, and awareness were strengthened through targeted initiatives and staff training. FACE Liaisons led districtwide participation in Take Down Tobacco Week, providing students with opportunities to learn about the risks associated with tobacco and vaping through interactive lunchtime activities. Additional outreach included collaboration with health teachers to provide classroom-based education on the impacts of tobacco and vaping products. Staff were also provided with Motivational Interviewing (MI) training at both beginner and advanced levels, equipping them with strategies to effectively engage students, build trust, and address underlying concerns impacting student behavior and well-being. These combined efforts supported a safer and more informed school environment while strengthening staff capacity to respond to student needs.

Action 3.4 Parent Engagement - The district expanded family engagement efforts through coordinated outreach, resource access, and college and career readiness initiatives. FACE and Wellness Center staff hosted family engagement events to share resources and gather input on future supports, while continuing to connect families to county services such as Medi-Cal and SNAP benefits. College and Career

Services Specialists (CCSS) provided targeted one-on-one support for seniors, particularly foster youth, homeless, and other identified students, assisting with FAFSA and CADAA completion, scholarship applications, and college access resources. CCSS also supported students in securing application fee waivers and connecting to Career Technical Education (CTE) internship opportunities, including partnerships with Placer County Health and Human Services. Districtwide events, including the College and Career Fair, Service Academy Night, and Junior Mock Admissions Night, provided students access to a wide range of postsecondary options and direct engagement with college representatives and career pathways. These efforts ensured increased access to information, resources, and opportunities, particularly for unduplicated student groups.

Action 3.6 Language Translation Services - The district improved access to translation and interpretation services by revising the Interpreter/Translator request process to be more efficient and responsive to site and district needs. Additional personnel were hired to expand capacity and ensure timely support for families requiring language assistance. These efforts strengthened communication with multilingual families and increased access to district information and services.

Implementation Challenges (Partially Implemented)

Action 3.5 Data Systems - This action has been partially implemented. Key data systems, including Aeries, ParentSquare, Canvas, Remind, LCAP survey tools, and Catapult/WeTip, have been successfully implemented and continue to strengthen communication, data access, and reporting capabilities across the district. The district website was also updated to include a Safety page, providing parents with accessible information regarding safety procedures and the district's Culture of Care.

Although the district began implementation of Performance Matters during the 2025–26 school year, the platform remains in the pilot phase and has not yet been fully implemented districtwide. Performance Matters is intended to support the administration of district common assessments and classroom assessments through a centralized system designed to streamline assessment practices and improve access to student performance data. Additional time is needed for system development, staff training, and phased implementation before full districtwide rollout during the 2026–27 school year.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

Action 3.5 - Difference is due to additional data systems / software licenses being identified to support Goal 3.

A description of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal.

Based on our analysis of metrics and outcomes, the implementation of actions showed strong overall effectiveness in achieving Goal 3, as demonstrated by both quantitative data and qualitative indicators, with some areas of emerging effectiveness requiring continued refinement.

Actions Demonstrating Strong Effectiveness

Action 3.1 Strategy, Communication, Community Partnerships and Outreach - This action demonstrated strong effectiveness in expanding the scope, reach, and impact of district communication efforts. The Communications Department significantly increased its visibility and

engagement through the launch of innovative video series, the development of the district's first comprehensive annual report, and the generation of over two dozen positive media features. These efforts contributed to a substantial increase in community engagement and strengthened the district's ability to communicate student success and district initiatives. While the department has made significant progress, the volume and scale of work have exceeded current staffing capacity. The addition of a Communications Technician is identified as a critical next step to sustain momentum, enhance responsiveness, and ensure consistent, high-quality communication across all sites. This investment will further strengthen the district's ability to meet the growing needs of students, families, and community partners.

Action 3.2 Supportive and Healthy School Culture - This action demonstrated strong effectiveness through the continued implementation and strengthening of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) across all sites. Schools engaged in guided development of PBIS action plans using Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) data in partnership with PCOE, allowing each site to identify targeted areas for growth. All sites participated in Spring 2026 training, reinforcing a shared commitment to improving school culture and climate. These efforts established a strong foundation for increasing PBIS fidelity in the 2026–27 school year and will support more consistent, systemwide implementation of intervention practices.

Action 3.3 Supportive and Safe School Culture – This action demonstrated strong effectiveness in improving school safety, student connectedness, and staff capacity to respond to student needs. Suspension rates declined from 4% to 3.1%, and expulsion rates remained low, reflecting the positive impact of intervention strategies such as the PAUSE protocol. Expanded staff training, including Crisis Prevention and Response, PREPaRE Workshops, Motivational Interviewing, and ongoing BTAM training, strengthened the district's ability to respond effectively to student needs and crisis situations. The addition of a full-time School Resource Officer at Antelope High School further enhanced safety, mentoring, and communication support. Student perception data showed increased feelings of safety and connectedness, with safety ratings increasing from 3.95 to 4.03, and parent perceptions of safety increasing from 3.95 to 3.99. These improvements demonstrate the effectiveness of coordinated safety practices and the district's continued focus on fostering a Culture of Care. Ongoing efforts to strengthen fidelity of intervention practices and data tracking will further enhance system effectiveness.

Action 3.4 Parent Engagement – This action demonstrated strong effectiveness in increasing family engagement, access to resources, and awareness of postsecondary opportunities. Parent perception data showed continued growth across multiple indicators, including school safety (3.95 to 3.99), supervision during school (3.72 to 3.77), and access to college and career information. Ratings for information about college pathways increased from 3.83 to 3.94, while non-college pathway awareness increased from 3.36 to 3.50, reflecting improved communication and outreach efforts. FACE Liaisons played a critical role in connecting families to community resources and supporting unduplicated student groups. Districtwide events, including the College and Career Fair, Military Academy Night, and the addition of Junior Mock Admission Night, expanded access to postsecondary planning resources. The district also enhanced communication of safety protocols through accessible website resources, strengthening transparency and family trust. These efforts contributed to a more informed, engaged, and supported parent community.

Actions Demonstrating Emerging Effectiveness or Somewhat Effective

Action 3.5 Data Systems - This action demonstrated emerging effectiveness in enhancing communication, engagement, and access to information across the district. The implementation of key data systems, including Aeries, ParentSquare, Canvas, Remind, LCAP surveys, and Catapult/WeTip, streamlined districtwide communication and improved access to information for students and families. Parent perception data reflects this progress, with ratings for feeling welcome at their child's school increasing over the past three years from 4.0 to 4.03 to

4.05. Additionally, the updated District Safety webpage provides families with clear and accessible information regarding safety protocols and targeted violence prevention efforts, reinforcing RJUHSD's Culture of Care.

Although Performance Matters was introduced during the 2025–26 school year, full implementation has not yet occurred. The development of the platform and training of staff required a thoughtful, phased approach to ensure proper configuration and build staff capacity. During the 2026–27 school year, the district plans to utilize Performance Matters to administer districtwide math common assessments, while a select group of teachers will pilot the platform for classroom assessments. Additional expansion is planned for Spring 2027, with full districtwide implementation scheduled for the 2027–28 school year. While progress has been made in strengthening communication systems and data access, continued implementation and staff training will be necessary to fully realize the long-term impact of the platform on instructional decision-making and student outcomes.

Action 3.6 Language Translation Services – This action demonstrated emerging effectiveness through improvements in the efficiency and responsiveness of translation and interpretation services. The addition of personnel has increased the district's ability to provide timely and accurate language support, strengthening communication with multilingual families. Parent perception data reflects a strong sense of feeling welcomed, reinforcing the importance of inclusive communication practices. However, as demand continues to grow, there remains a need to expand the number of languages supported and enhance outreach to ensure all families have equitable access to information. Continued investment in translation services will be critical to further improving family engagement and access to educational opportunities.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, target outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

Added to Action 3.1 - Communications and Community Engagement

To strengthen communication and community engagement efforts across RJUHSD, the district will expand communication capacity through the addition of a Communications Technician. This position is identified as a critical next step to sustain momentum, enhance responsiveness, and ensure consistent, high quality communication across all sites. The Communications Technician will support the growing demand for timely district and site communication, assist in highlighting student and staff accomplishments, and strengthen engagement with students, families, and community partners. This investment will further enhance the district's ability to provide clear, accessible, and consistent communication while continuing to build trust, transparency, and strong school-community connections.

Added to Action 3.2 - Professional Development

To foster a safe and supportive school culture, RJUHSD will provide professional development focused on evidence-based strategies, modern intervention models, and communication strategies. These sessions will enhance staff capacity to address the social-emotional, academic, and college-and-career readiness needs of all students, with a specific emphasis on removing barriers for unduplicated populations. By implementing trauma-informed practices and proactive interventions, staff will provide a robust safety net and a more inclusive campus climate for vulnerable students. This investment ensures that our teams are equipped with the updated strategies necessary to close the opportunity gap and provide unduplicated students with the resources required to thrive academically and personally.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.1	Strategy, Communication, Community Partnerships and Outreach	Support the strategy, communication, partnerships and outreach with internal and external partners, to increase the engagement with families and students. Launch an educational campaign for students, teachers, and parents on the significance of academic achievement. Communicate academic resources to district families, students and community. Enhance communication and support for the RJUHSD community.	$426,631.00	Yes
3.2	Supportive and Healthy School Culture	Provide a supportive school culture and climate for all students who are physically, socially, and emotionally healthy. Implement peer support programs and awareness campaigns to foster a supportive school environment. Support Intervention Response Teams (IRT) systems to more effectively monitor and support at risk students and school connectedness. Sustain extracurricular and co-curricular programs. Allocate scheduled release periods and compensation for Athletic Directors to plan, coordinate, and oversee school sports programs Provide opportunities and resources for extra-curricular and co-curricular programs to support school connectedness and expand engagement in the arts, athletics, and clubs. Enhance the Unified Sports program and allocate stipends for a district coordinator and site coaches. Support Student Summits to ensure more frequent opportunities for student engagement and support Maintain the Care Solace program to support the needs of students, families, and staff. Maintain Wellness Coordinators, Wellness Mental Health Specialist and Associates, and the Wellness intern programs.	$3,014,418.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Provide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Coordinator stipends and allocate PBIS District and Site Funds. Support the development of PBIS action plans based on Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) survey data.		
3.3	Supportive and Safe School Culture	Provide a supportive school culture and climate for all students who are physically, socially, and emotionally safe. Provide resources, programs and services that support a learning culture and climate. Establish systematic processes for alternatives to suspensions, with targeted support for unduplicated student groups. Develop clear pathways and supports for students at risk of suspension and expulsion. Provide training and support for Standard Response Protocols, Behavioral Threat and Assessment Management (BTAM), and crisis response for all staff. Assign a School Resource Officer to each school site. Train School Resource Officers on school based interventions, trauma informed practices, classroom engagement, and working with adolescents. Assign campus monitors to each school site. Train specified staff in de-escalation strategies and student engagement techniques. Offer interventions and training in conflict resolution, motivational interviewing, and reframing behavior for school staff with emphasis on supporting unduplicated students. Provide training on recognizing and addressing bullying behaviors for students, teachers, and staff. Support programs for Tobacco Use Prevention Education (TUPE), Restorative Practices, and Attendance Interventions.	$2,844,695.00	Yes
3.4	Parent Engagement	Create a welcoming school environment and access to parent education and outreach opportunities.	$1,175,509.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Support Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Liaisons for parent education, access, and outreach initiatives with specific emphasis on engaging unduplicated students and their families. Conduct parent workshops and informational sessions on navigating the education system, understanding how to use district technology, and advocating for educational needs of their child, with a focus on supporting Homeless, English Learner (EL), and Foster Youth (FY) families. Provide resources and support for teachers on how to foster relationships with parents and students. Enhance Student Support with College & Career Technicians. Organize parent workshops addressing risk behaviors. Host Parent and Student Safety Forums and engage students and families in promoting a safe school environment. Host LCAP Nights to engage the community in discussing and shaping the Local Control and Accountability Plan.		
3.5	Data Systems	Utilize data systems for better connections and engagement between educational partners. Administer the LCAP Survey to gather input from educational partners. Enhance district communication systems and website for improved parent engagement. Train staff to effectively use the various features of district communication tools to better connect with more parents and students. Train EL families to use website features to search for and access information.	$427,212.00	Yes
3.6	Language Translation Services	Foster inclusive communication practices. Offer language translation services to enhance communication and outreach efforts with multilingual families Ensure that all districtwide email communications and community meeting materials are translated into prevalent community languages.	$25,200.00	Yes

Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students [2026-27]

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant
$12,671,080	$0

Required Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the LCAP Year

Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year	LCFF Carryover — Percentage	LCFF Carryover — Dollar	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year
8.714%	0.803%	$1,089,601.37	9.517%

The Budgeted Expenditures for Actions identified as Contributing may be found in the Contributing Actions Table.

Required Descriptions

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

For each action being provided to an entire LEA or school, provide an explanation of (1) the unique identified need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) for whom the action is principally directed, (2) how the action is designed to address the identified need(s) and why it is being provided on an LEA or schoolwide basis, and (3) the metric(s) used to measure the effectiveness of the action in improving outcomes for the unduplicated student group(s).

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.3	**Action:** Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs **Need:** College and career indicator data show low enrollment rates among English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in dual enrollment (DE) courses, with only 16%, N/A, and 41% compared to 56% of all students.	Research highlights the effectiveness of interventions (personalized academic counseling, early identification of high-potential students, expansion of dual enrollment programs) in increasing enrollment and success rates among unduplicated students (Education Commission of the States, 2020; Center for Public Education, 2018). Offering customized support for engaging unduplicated students in college and career	We will monitor progress by tracking several key college and career indicator (CCI) metrics including the college and career indicator on the California Dashboard. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Career Technical Education (CTE) program data indicated disparities in participation rates among unduplicated student groups, with only 7% of EL, N/A for FY, and 17% of SED students having completed CTE pathways compared to 22% of all students. Educational partner feedback indicated a need to communicate diverse course options and to provide targeted support to English Learners (EL), foster youth, and low-income students to promote equitable access, highlighting the need to expand outreach into all pathways, including CTE, DE, AP, and IB programs. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	pathway (AP, IB, CTE, DE) opportunities district-wide will ensure consistency and universal access to resources, aligning with the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils. Engagement will include a comprehensive survey of all students, including unduplicated, to better understand student interest in college and career pathways. Targeted outreach systems, support plan development, and progress monitoring implementation will support engaged populations.	the new outreach and targeted support programs.
2.1	**Action:** Instructional Capacity Building **Need:** Current data shows that overall, 36% of students met or exceeded the math standard on the SBAC. Achievement levels varied among subgroups compared to the overall 36% meeting or exceeding the math standard, with strengths evident in Asian (51%), Filipino (47%), and White (39%) populations, while	The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) in their 2020 publication "Catalyzing Change in High School Mathematics: Initiating Critical Conversations" emphasizes the importance of high-quality instruction in high school mathematics, advocating for focused, coherent, and rigorous teaching practices to enhance student learning. Additionally, Desimone's (2009) research on improving impact studies of teachers' professional development suggests the need for better conceptualizations and measures to assess the effectiveness of	We will monitor progress by tracking several key elements including the effectiveness of professional development trainings, school site support implementation, coaching cycles for both teachers and administrators, and the indicator on the California Dashboard.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	deficits were observed in EL (8%), and SED (24%) groups, among others. Educational partners indicated a need for a comprehensive strategy implemented to enhance math education by improving testing culture, provide training for teachers, emphasize CAASPP's support in curriculum, develop language strategies, support SWD students, engage parents, offer PD, ensure curriculum access, facilitate collaboration, increase tutoring, and develop targeted programs, all aimed at improving math and science achievement. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	professional development programs for math instruction. Offering services and supports such as teacher training in high-quality instruction, curriculum access, increased tutoring and implementation of language development strategies, and collaboration on targeted math instruction programs benefits all high school students, including unduplicated populations, by enhancing their opportunities to succeed in completing math and science pathways.	We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the new supports and services.
2.2	**Action:** Explicit Language Strategies **Need:** The academic performance of English Learner (EL) students is significantly lower than that of the general student population, indicating a critical need for additional support. Specifically, only 3% of EL students are meeting or exceeding the math standard, compared to 36% of all students. In English Language Arts (ELA), just 8% of EL students	Research supports the implementation of various language development strategies in supporting English Learners (ELs) to acquire English language skills essential for academic success in all subjects including mathematics, English, and science. Scaffolding, as described by Hammond and Gibbons and provided through English Learner specialists, provides temporary support tailored to students' needs, facilitating language acquisition and understanding. Similarly, explicit language instruction, provided by individuals who specialize in this work, directly teaches language	We will measure the effectiveness of this action by monitoring math achievement metrics along with graduation rates, the number of EL students who are reclassified, and outcomes on the English Learner Performance Indicator (ELPI).

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	meet or exceed the standard, whereas 61% of all learners achieve this level. Furthermore, in science, a mere 3% of EL students meet or exceed the standard, in stark contrast to 43% of all students. These disparities highlight the urgent need for targeted interventions to support EL students' academic success. Educational partner feedback indicated a need to mitigate the disparities in math, English, and science proficiency among this unduplicated student group through additional supports and resources. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	skills and functions, accelerating ELs' language development and comprehension. Additionally, differentiated instruction addresses diverse learning needs, ensuring equitable access to grade-level content and promoting language proficiency among ELs. (Source: Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). By utilizing a Director II, Multilingual Education & English Learner Support, the district will be able to supplement the existing math, English, and science curriculum to support EL students and provide critical achievement data. This individual will also develop and implement key strategies to increase student achievement, rigorous learning and English acquisition for newcomers, English Learners (EL), and LTEL students in these core areas.	We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the EL program and its initiatives.
2.3	**Action:** Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science) **Need:** Current data shows that overall, 36% of students met or exceeded the math standard on the SBAC. Achievement levels varied among subgroups compared to the overall 36% meeting or exceeding the math standard, with strengths evident in Asian (51%), Filipino (47%), and White (39%) populations, while deficits were observed in EL (8%), and SED (24%) groups, among others.	The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) in their 2020 publication "Catalyzing Change in High School Mathematics: Initiating Critical Conversations" emphasizes the importance of high-quality instruction in high school mathematics, advocating for focused, coherent, and rigorous teaching practices to enhance student learning. Additionally, Desimone's (2009) research on improving impact studies of teachers' professional development suggests the need for better conceptualizations and measures to assess the effectiveness of professional development programs for math instruction.	We will monitor progress by tracking several key elements including the effectiveness of professional development trainings, school site support implementation, coaching cycles for both teachers and administrators, and the indicator on the California Dashboard. We will also seek feedback from students,

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Educational partners indicated a need for a comprehensive strategy implemented to enhance math education by improving testing culture, provide training for teachers, emphasize CAASPP's support in curriculum, develop language strategies, support SWD students, engage parents, offer PD, ensure curriculum access, facilitate collaboration, increase tutoring, and develop targeted programs, all aimed at improving math and science achievement. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Offering services and supports such as teacher training in high-quality instruction, curriculum access, increased tutoring and implementation of language development strategies, and collaboration on targeted math instruction programs benefits all high school students, including unduplicated populations, by enhancing their opportunities to succeed in completing math and science pathways.	parents, and staff about the new supports and services.
2.4	**Action:** Targeted Intervention and Academic Support **Need:** Data reveals academic achievement challenges, with significantly lower proficiency rates for EL and SED students in both math (8% and 24% respectively) and science (3% and 28% respectively) compared to the overall student population. Educational partner feedback indicated a need for targeted, additional supports for students with particular emphasis on additional support opportunities for unduplicated groups.	Offering additional academic support and opportunities for mastery in STEM subjects for unduplicated students promotes inclusivity and diversity in STEM fields. By providing tailored support and resources, schools can encourage unduplicated students to pursue STEM interests and careers, contributing to a more diverse and skilled STEM workforce (Source: National Science Foundation, 2013; National Research Council, 2011). Providing the tutoring program on a districtwide basis will ensure equitable access to academic support for all students, including unduplicated students, regardless of their background or circumstances.	We will measure the effectiveness of our academic achievement actions by tracking the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards in Math, and Science, along with monitoring the percentage of students who took higher-level math courses upon graduation. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the tutoring program.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide		
2.5	**Action:** Co-Taught Learning Support **Need:** Unduplicated pupils, including English Learners, foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students demonstrate lower rates of access to grade level curriculum, lower academic performance in core content areas, and reduced rates of college and career readiness. These students require increased access to instruction, targeted academic supports, and consistent exposure to rigorous, grade level content aligned to graduation and A–G requirements. **Scope:** LEA-wide	The Co-Taught Learning Support model addresses these needs by embedding Specialized Academic Instruction within general education classrooms, allowing students to access grade level curriculum alongside their peers in the least restrictive environment. This model provides real time support, differentiation, and scaffolding, ensuring that unduplicated students receive targeted academic assistance while maintaining access to rigorous coursework. Providing this action on an LEA-wide basis ensures consistent implementation of inclusive practices across all comprehensive sites, eliminates variability in access to co-teaching supports, and strengthens systemwide capacity to meet the needs of unduplicated student groups. This approach promotes access to instruction, supports graduation, and aligns with the district's commitment to improving outcomes for historically underserved students.	2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6
2.7	**Action:** Enhance Guidance Services **Need:** In terms of math course rigor, data shows that 74% of the 2024 graduating cohort took a higher-level math course, with substantial	Counselors have an important role in increasing student achievement and post-secondary success. Counselors are Tier I of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports. They are the first to assess student need and delegate to Tier II or III (Mulhern, 2023).	We will measure the effectiveness of School Counselor Liaisons to support math and science pathway participation by tracking the percentage of students who took a higher

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	variations among subgroups, such as EL students at 48%, FY with a very low percentage due to cohort size, and SED students at 72%. Educational partners recommended prioritizing equitable access to math curriculum for unduplicated students and dedicating collaboration time for IM1-IM3 teams to enhance course development. Additionally, partners suggested enhancing support for counselors and math teachers to not only increase math enrollment but also improve guidance for students to complete the math and science pathways successfully. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	School counselors have a unique perspective of educator and social-emotional/behavioral specialist. (CASC (2019). Their role is multifaceted and often times they will be the implementers of change. With new staff hired (English Learners, State and Federal Programs, Education Services, etc.) It will be necessary to be able to meet with the new Directors and other departments more frequently to discuss and collaborate on expectations for our at-risk student groups. Offering districtwide school counselors ensures all students, including unduplicated ones, have equitable access to personalized support for academic, social, and emotional needs. This availability promotes early intervention and contributes to improved academic success by providing timely guidance and resources tailored to individual student needs.	level (above IM2) math course upon graduation. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the counselor liaison program program and its overall effectiveness for student achievement.
2.8	**Action:** Senior Credit Recovery Program **Need:** Data shows an overall high school graduation rate of 94%. However, there are notable disparities, with strengths in Asian (96%), and Filipino (98%), populations, while shortfalls are evident in Pacific Islander (92%), EL (74%), FY (N/A), homeless (70%), SWD (78%), Hispanic (91%), and African American (91%) groups.	The study by Slay, Pohl, and McGrew (2012) explores the role of adult education in high school completion, indicating that adult education programs can play a beneficial role in credit recovery for students at risk of not graduating. Their exploratory study suggests that adult education offers flexible options and targeted support that contribute to improved outcomes for students seeking to complete their high school requirements.	We will monitor progress by tracking the academic achievement of 12th grade students in the concurrent enrollment program and the graduation rate indicator on the California Dashboard. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Educational partners suggested several strategies to improve graduation rates: providing more intensive English Language development for EL students, addressing attendance issues among homeless students, and increasing case management to ensure consistent support for students, although acknowledging the need to enhance capacity for more effective and continuous support. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Providing concurrent enrollment of 12th-grade students at risk of not graduating in credit recovery programs at Adult Schools benefits all students, including unduplicated students, by offering tailored support and flexible options to help them meet graduation requirements. This approach can lead to improved outcomes, increased graduation rates, and equitable access to resources for students facing academic challenges.	the supports and services related to this action.
3.1	**Action:** Strategy, Communication, Community Partnerships and Outreach **Need:** The district has received generally positive ratings from families regarding school safety and feeling welcomed, with several areas indicating opportunities for improvement. According to the Annual District Survey, parents largely agree that their child is safe at school (3.95) and that they feel welcome on campus (4.03). However, lower ratings on supervision before and after school (3.56) and perceptions of adequate information about non-college post-secondary options (3.45) suggest a need for targeted improvement. Although this data cannot be disaggregated by	Explanation: In response to parent survey data indicating a need for stronger communication regarding student safety, supervision, and postsecondary options, especially those outside of traditional college pathways, our district will strengthen family engagement through a comprehensive communication initiative. This districtwide action includes refining existing strategies to ensure that all families are informed, welcomed, and prepared to support their child's academic journey. These improvements will focus on enhancing how we share information about student progress, available academic and social-emotional supports, and a full range of college and career readiness options. Rationale:	Metric 3.5 and 3.7 - Rate of Parent Perception. Source: Annual District Survey

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	subgroup, feedback from parent advisory groups and empathy interviews indicates a heightened need for targeted support among English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and low income students. Based on analysis of educational partner input and local survey data, the district has identified key areas for strengthening relationships with families and enhancing communication. While parents express appreciation for the welcoming environment and information about college pathways (3.85), there is a perceived gap in knowledge around non-college options and preparedness for future work (3.73). To address this, the district is committed to improving communication strategies to better inform families about the full range of post-secondary opportunities and ensure consistent messaging around student safety and supervision. These efforts will help deepen trust, promote transparency, and foster a more comprehensive understanding of the academic and social-emotional supports available to students—particularly for our most vulnerable student groups. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Research by Jeynes (2011) shows that when schools clearly communicate available resources and opportunities, it can significantly reduce stress for low income families and help students focus more effectively on learning. This highlights the importance of targeted, clear, and inclusive communication. Survey results indicate that while families feel welcomed at school with a rating of 4.03, there is a need for better communication about noncollege postsecondary options, rated at 3.45, and supervision before and after school, rated at 3.56. Addressing these areas through stronger outreach and two way communication will help create a more inclusive and supportive educational environment for all students. Because our unduplicated student population includes low income students, foster youth, and English learners across all schools, a districtwide approach is essential. This ensures that all families have equitable access to timely and culturally responsive information, which promotes stronger school family partnerships and supports informed decision making. Assessment: The district is working collaboratively with administrators from all school sites to design a responsive communication plan. This plan will include consistent messaging, multiple outreach methods, and culturally relevant engagement strategies. Because communication needs continue to evolve, we are committed to reviewing and updating our practices regularly. Success will be measured by increased parent satisfaction on annual surveys, especially in the areas of academic options, school safety, and support	

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		services. Additional indicators include increased participation in school events, improved family perception data, and stronger relationships between schools and families. By implementing both school level and districtwide strategies, we will ensure that all students and families have access to essential information and the support they need.	
3.2	**Action:** Supportive and Healthy School Culture **Need:** Data reveals an overall suspension rate of 4% highlighting the urgency to implement targeted interventions and support strategies to reduce disciplinary actions, especially among unduplicated student groups, where rates are significantly higher, such as EL at 6%, FY at 21%, and SED at 6%. Educational partners noted that offering interventions and training in conflict resolution and restorative practices would equip staff with the necessary skills to effectively support unduplicated students and cultivate a culture of understanding and empathy. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Research highlights the importance of addressing equity issues in discipline and promoting culturally responsive approaches to behavior management. PBIS and restorative practices training contribute to creating a more equitable and inclusive school environment. By emphasizing positive behavior support and restorative approaches to discipline, we intend to reduce disciplinary disparities and ensure that all students, including those from underserved populations, have access to fair and effective disciplinary practices. (Source: Skiba et al., 2014; Gregory et al., 2016). Providing these interventions and strategies on an LEA-wide basis ensures equitable access to support for all students, aligning with RJUHSD's commitment to fostering a positive and inclusive school environment.	We will measure the effectiveness of our actions by tracking the suspension rate data. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of both PBIS and restorative practice program.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
3.3	**Action:** Supportive and Safe School Culture **Need:** Unduplicated students—specifically English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students—require targeted academic, behavioral, and social-emotional support to thrive in a safe and inclusive school environment. While overall district data reflects generally positive perceptions of school safety and connectedness, subgroup-specific feedback and suspension data indicate persistent equity gaps. Suspension rates for FY students (21%), EL students (6%), and SED students (6%) significantly exceed the district average of 4%, signaling a need for proactive behavioral interventions and alternatives to exclusionary discipline. Additionally, survey data shows lower parent satisfaction with supervision before and after school (3.56) and awareness of non-college post-secondary options (3.45), areas particularly relevant for families of unduplicated pupils. Input from advisory groups and empathy interviews reinforces the need for clearer communication, expanded post-secondary planning, and culturally responsive engagement. To meet these identified needs, the district must implement and expand restorative practices, provide trauma-informed training, increase access to mental health and	Explanation: In response to identified needs from local survey data and feedback from parent advisory groups, RJUHSD is implementing LEA wide actions that focus on enhancing communication, improving school climate, and reducing disciplinary disparities, particularly for unduplicated students including English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Low Income (LI) students. Parent survey results highlighted concerns around limited communication about student safety, before and after school supervision (3.56), and non college post-secondary options (3.45). In response, the district will strengthen two way family engagement efforts to ensure all families are consistently informed about available academic, social emotional, and postsecondary supports. Simultaneously, the district will implement restorative practices, trauma informed strategies, and alternatives to suspension to proactively address discipline gaps and promote a safer, more inclusive school climate for all. Research: Clear, inclusive, and culturally responsive communication reduces barriers for underserved families. Jeynes (2011) found that effective school family communication helps reduce stress in low income households and increases student focus and academic engagement. Similarly, research by Skiba et al. (2014) and Gregory et al. (2016) underscores that traditional exclusionary discipline practices disproportionately impact students from historically underserved backgrounds. Implementing PBIS, restorative practices, and culturally responsive behavioral interventions	Metric 3.5 and 3.7 - Rate of Parent Perception. Source: Annual District Survey

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	behavioral supports, and ensure consistent, multilingual communication with families. Building a more supportive and inclusive culture will directly address disparities and foster long-term academic and social success for our most vulnerable students. **Scope:** LEA-wide	helps reduce these disparities and foster equitable learning environments. Assessment: To measure the effectiveness of these LEA wide actions, RJUHSD will monitor improvements in parent perception survey results, specifically around safety, communication, and post-secondary preparedness. Additionally, progress will be tracked through suspension data disaggregated by subgroup, with a focus on reducing the disproportionately high rates among FY (21 percent), EL (6 percent), and SED (6 percent) students. Success will also be reflected in increased participation in school events, more frequent use of district provided supports, and strengthened school family partnerships. By implementing these actions districtwide, RJUHSD ensures that all students, regardless of school site, have equitable access to essential supports, consistent messaging, and inclusive environments that enable academic and social emotional success.	
3.4	**Action:** Parent Engagement **Need:** The data shows that parents generally feel welcomed at their child's school, with a rating of 4.03 (agree) on feeling welcome. Strengths include the school providing adequate information about attending college (3.85, nearly agree) and preparing students for future work (3.73, nearly agree). However, there are shortfalls in providing information about non-	The research by Barr, Nevarez, and Williams (2014) emphasizes the importance of building community engagement between parents and schools for student success. Similarly, Quint, Pomeroy, and Huneycutt (2017) highlight the role of family engagement in building stronger schools, indicating that collaborative efforts between families and schools contribute to improved student outcomes. Providing family and community engagement liaisons benefits all students, including unduplicated students, by fostering stronger	We will measure the effectiveness of our actions by continuing to administer an annual survey to all parents and students and tracking the Rate of Parent Perceptions on a sense of feeling welcomed, adequately informed of choice for their child's post-secondary options, as

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	college options (3.45, neither agree nor disagree). Educational partners suggested several strategies to improve parent and family engagement, including improving communication and understanding of goals among stakeholders, enhancing parent education and outreach, upgrading district communication systems and the district website for families, and expanding resources for multilingual education and English Learner (EL) families. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	school-family partnerships, improving communication, and ensuring access to resources. These liaisons serve as a bridge between families and schools, supporting student success through tailored support and collaboration between home and school environments.	well as their child being prepared survey metric. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the Family and Community Engagement (FACE) program.
3.5	**Action:** Data Systems **Need:** The data shows that parents generally feel welcomed at their child's school, with a rating of 4.03 (agree) on feeling welcome. Strengths include the school providing adequate information about attending college (3.85, nearly agree) and preparing students for future work (3.73, nearly agree). However, there are shortfalls in providing information about non-college options (3.45, neither agree nor disagree).	The research by Barr, Nevarez, and Williams (2014) emphasizes the importance of building community engagement between parents and schools for student success. Similarly, Quint, Pomeroy, and Huneycutt (2017) highlight the role of family engagement in building stronger schools, indicating that collaborative efforts between families and schools contribute to improved student outcomes. Providing family and community engagement liaisons benefits all students, including unduplicated students, by fostering stronger school-family partnerships, improving communication, and ensuring access to resources.	We will measure the effectiveness of our actions by continuing to administer an annual survey to all parents and students and tracking the Rate of Parent Perceptions on a sense of feeling welcomed, adequately informed of choice for their child's post-secondary options, as well as their child being prepared survey metric.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Educational partners suggested several strategies to improve parent and family engagement, including improving communication and understanding of goals among stakeholders, enhancing parent education and outreach, upgrading district communication systems and the district website for families, and expanding resources for multilingual education and English Learner (EL) families. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	These liaisons serve as a bridge between families and schools, supporting student success through tailored support and collaboration between home and school environments.	We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the Family and Community Engagement (FACE) program.

Limited Actions

For each action being solely provided to one or more unduplicated student group(s), provide an explanation of (1) the unique identified need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) being served, (2) how the action is designed to address the identified need(s), and (3) how the effectiveness of the action in improving outcomes for the unduplicated student group(s) will be measured.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.1	**Action:** Multilingual Education and English Learner Support **Need:** The academic performance of English Learner (EL) students is significantly lower than that of the general student population, indicating a	Research supports the implementation of various language development strategies in supporting English Learners (ELs) to acquire English language skills essential for academic success in all subjects including mathematics, English, and science. Scaffolding, as described by Hammond and Gibbons and provided through English Learner specialists, provides temporary support	We will measure the effectiveness of this action by monitoring math achievement metrics along with graduation rates, the number of EL students who are reclassified, and outcomes on the English

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	critical need for additional support. Specifically, only 8% of EL students are meeting or exceeding the math standard, compared to 36% of all students. In English Language Arts (ELA), just 8% of EL students meet or exceed the standard, whereas 61% of all learners achieve this level. Furthermore, in science, a mere 3% of EL students meet or exceed the standard, in stark contrast to 43% of all students. These disparities highlight the urgent need for targeted interventions to support EL students' academic success. Educational partner feedback indicated a need to mitigate the disparities in math, English, and science proficiency among this unduplicated student group through additional supports and resources. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	tailored to students' needs, facilitating language acquisition and understanding. Similarly, explicit language instruction, provided by individuals who specialize in this work, directly teaches language skills and functions, accelerating ELs' language development and comprehension. Additionally, differentiated instruction addresses diverse learning needs, ensuring equitable access to grade-level content and promoting language proficiency among ELs. (Source: Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). By utilizing a Director II, Multilingual Education & English Learner Support, the district will be able to supplement the existing math, English, and science curriculum to support EL students and provide critical achievement data. This individual will also develop and implement key strategies to increase student achievement, rigorous learning and English acquisition for newcomers, English Learners (EL), and LTEL students in these core areas.	Learner Performance Indicator (ELPI). We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the EL program and its initiatives.
2.6	**Action:** Academic Supports and Services for Unduplicated Students **Need:** Data from RJUHSD reveals disparities, including higher rates of chronic absenteeism among SED (19%), FY (48%), and homeless (42%) students compared to the overall rate of 13%. Additionally, graduation rates vary, with	Studies have shown that stable, reliable transportation reduces absenteeism among vulnerable student populations. For example, a study by Fantuzzo, LeBoeuf, Chen, Rouse, and Culhane (2012) in Philadelphia found that homeless and highly mobile students faced significant challenges in maintaining regular school attendance, largely due to transportation issues. Providing consistent transportation helps maintain routine and reduces the stress associated with	We will measure the effectiveness of this action by monitoring attendance metrics. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	lower rates among SED (90%), FY (N/A), and homeless (70%) students, compared to the overall rate of 94%. Educational partner feedback indicated a need for additional transportation and additional targeted supports to assist these unduplicated groups. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	frequent school changes, which is common among low-income, foster, and homeless youth. Providing improved transportation and targeted support services to this student group and all students within the LEA will help us serve this vulnerable student population and others.	targeted attendance initiatives.
3.6	**Action:** Language Translation Services **Need:** Data from RJUHSD reveals disparities, including higher rates of chronic absenteeism among SED (19%), FY (48%), and homeless (42%) students compared to the overall rate of 13%. Additionally, graduation rates vary, with lower rates among SED (90%), FY (N/A), and homeless (70%) students, compared to the overall rate of 94%. Educational partner feedback indicated a need for additional transportation and additional targeted supports to assist these unduplicated groups.	Studies have shown that stable, reliable transportation reduces absenteeism among vulnerable student populations. For example, a study by Fantuzzo, LeBoeuf, Chen, Rouse, and Culhane (2012) in Philadelphia found that homeless and highly mobile students faced significant challenges in maintaining regular school attendance, largely due to transportation issues. Providing consistent transportation helps maintain routine and reduces the stress associated with frequent school changes, which is common among low-income, foster, and homeless youth. Providing improved transportation and targeted support services to this student group and all students within the LEA will help us serve this vulnerable student population and others.	We will measure the effectiveness of this action by monitoring graduation rates. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the transportation program.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)		

For any limited action contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement that is associated with a Planned Percentage of Improved Services in the Contributing Summary Table rather than an expenditure of LCFF funds, describe the methodology that was used to determine the contribution of the action towards the proportional percentage, as applicable.

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

A description of the plan for how the additional concentration grant add-on funding identified above will be used to increase the number of staff providing direct services to students at schools that have a high concentration (above 55 percent) of foster youth, English learners, and low-income students, as applicable.

N/A- concentration funds not received

Staff-to-student ratios by type of school and concentration of unduplicated students	Schools with a student concentration of 55 percent or less	Schools with a student concentration of greater than 55 percent
Staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students		
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students		

2026-27 Total Planned Expenditures Table

LCAP Year	1. Projected LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Input Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)
Totals	145,410,606	12,671,080	8.714%	0.803%	9.517%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$14,171,080.00	$14,320,048.00	$233,200.00	$348,010.00	$29,072,338.00	$20,918,112.00	$8,154,226.00

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
1	1.1	Multilingual Education and English Learner Support	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		$704,104.00	$94,400.00	$798,504.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$798,504.00	
1	1.2	Seal of Biliteracy Program Improvements	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
1	1.3	Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$781,964.00	$215,000.00	$155,004.00	$841,960.00	$0.00	$0.00	$996,964.00	
1	1.4	Support for Dual Enrollment (DE) Program	All	No			All Schools		$702,119.00	$320,390.00	$0.00	$789,309.00	$233,200.00	$0.00	$1,022,509.00	
1	1.5	Support for Career Technical Education (CTE) Program	All	No			All Schools		$569,587.00	$667,248.00	$0.00	$1,236,835.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,236,835.00	
2	2.1	Instructional Capacity Building	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$1,615,483.00	$675,847.00	$1,754,245.00	$335,016.00	$0.00	$202,069.00	$2,291,330.00	
2	2.2	Explicit Language Strategies	English Learners	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	All Schools		$1,305,798.00	$145,941.00	$1,305,798.00	$0.00	$0.00	$145,941.00	$1,451,739.00	
2	2.3	Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$1,806,145.00	$2,558,671.00	$1,160,755.00	$3,204,061.00	$0.00	$0.00	$4,364,816.00	
2	2.4	Targeted Intervention and Academic Support	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$297,758.00	$430,497.00	$728,255.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$728,255.00	
2	2.5	Co-Taught Learning Support	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$3,278,335.00	$0.00	$196,713.00	$3,081,622.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,278,335.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
2	2.6	Academic Supports and Services for Unduplicated Students	Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$1,036,847.00	$950,000.00	$1,689,266.00	$297,581.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,986,847.00	
2	2.7	Enhance Guidance Services	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$2,632,429.00	$25,000.00	$2,657,429.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$2,657,429.00	
2	2.8	Senior Credit Recovery Program	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Roseville Adult School 18+		$345,110.00	$0.00	$345,110.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$345,110.00	
3	3.1	Strategy, Communication, Community Partnerships and Outreach	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$394,231.00	$32,400.00	$398,231.00	$28,400.00	$0.00	$0.00	$426,631.00	
3	3.2	Supportive and Healthy School Culture	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$2,729,408.00	$285,010.00	$1,821,831.00	$1,192,587.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,014,418.00	
3	3.3	Supportive and Safe School Culture	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$1,604,288.00	$1,240,407.00	$276,830.00	$2,567,865.00	$0.00	$0.00	$2,844,695.00	
3	3.4	Parent Engagement	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$1,102,306.00	$73,203.00	$593,502.00	$582,007.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,175,509.00	
3	3.5	Data Systems	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$427,212.00	$264,407.00	$162,805.00	$0.00	$0.00	$427,212.00	
3	3.6	Language Translation Services	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		$12,200.00	$13,000.00	$25,200.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$25,200.00	
4	4.1	Integrated Instructional and Literacy Coaching	All	No			Specific Schools: Adelante High School 9-12		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	

2026-27 Contributing Actions Table

1. Projected LCFF Base Grant	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)	Totals by Type	Total LCFF Funds
145,410,606	12,671,080	8.714%	0.803%	9.517%	$14,171,080.00	0.000%	9.746 %	**Total:**	$14,171,080.00
								LEA-wide Total:	$11,658,110.00
								Limited Total:	$2,512,970.00
								Schoolwide Total:	$0.00

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
1	1.1	Multilingual Education and English Learner Support	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$798,504.00	
1	1.3	Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$155,004.00	
2	2.1	Instructional Capacity Building	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,754,245.00	
2	2.2	Explicit Language Strategies	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	All Schools	$1,305,798.00	
2	2.3	Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science)	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,160,755.00	
2	2.4	Targeted Intervention and Academic Support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$728,255.00	

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
2	2.5	Co-Taught Learning Support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$196,713.00	
2	2.6	Academic Supports and Services for Unduplicated Students	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,689,266.00	
2	2.7	Enhance Guidance Services	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$2,657,429.00	
2	2.8	Senior Credit Recovery Program	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Roseville Adult School 18+	$345,110.00	
3	3.1	Strategy, Communication, Community Partnerships and Outreach	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$398,231.00	
3	3.2	Supportive and Healthy School Culture	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,821,831.00	
3	3.3	Supportive and Safe School Culture	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$276,830.00	
3	3.4	Parent Engagement	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$593,502.00	
3	3.5	Data Systems	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$264,407.00	
3	3.6	Language Translation Services	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$25,200.00	

2025-26 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$28,866,817.00	$23,486,111.00

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
1	**1.1**	Multilingual Education and English Learner Support	Yes	$740,282.00	769,698
1	**1.2**	California State Seal of Biliteracy Program Improvements	No	$0.00	0
1	**1.3**	Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs	Yes	$1,022,284.00	947,552
1	**1.4**	Support for Dual Enrollment (DE) Program	No	$1,592,297.00	911,340
1	**1.5**	Support for Career Technical Education (CTE) Program	No	$1,295,235.00	1,092,379
2	**2.1**	Instructional Capacity Building	Yes	$2,362,269.00	1,616,151
2	**2.2**	Explicit Language Strategies	Yes	$1,270,442.00	1,208,625
2	**2.3**	Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science)	Yes	$4,593,757.00	1,834,821
2	**2.4**	Targeted Intervention and Academic Support	Yes	$889,932.00	493,764
2	**2.5**	Co-Taught Learning Support	No	$3,715,976.00	3,267,549
2	**2.6**	Academic Supports and Services for Unduplicated Students	Yes	$1,067,937.00	1,053,511

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
2	**2.7**	Enhance Guidance Services	Yes	$2,690,335.00	2,539,504
2	**2.8**	Senior Credit Recovery Program	Yes	$325,102.00	326,397
3	**3.1**	Strategy, Communication, Community Partnerships and Outreach	Yes	$287,397.00	315,733
3	**3.2**	Supportive and Healthy School Culture	Yes	$2,684,525.00	2,765,455
3	**3.3**	Supportive and Safe School Culture	Yes	$2,669,049.00	2,542,816
3	**3.4**	Parent Engagement	Yes	$1,169,610.00	1,064,903
3	**3.5**	Data Systems	Yes	$465,100.00	710,675
3	**3.6**	Language Translation Services	Yes	$25,288.00	25,238

2025-26 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

6. Estimated LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	7. Total Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	8. Total Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)
11,677,221	$12,018,591.00	$10,923,967.00	$1,094,624.00	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
1	1.1	Multilingual Education and English Learner Support	Yes	$740,282.00	769,698		
1	1.3	Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs	Yes	$152,475.00	59,988		
2	2.1	Instructional Capacity Building	Yes	$1,461,317.00	907,801		
2	2.2	Explicit Language Strategies	Yes	$1,093,672.00	1,056,057		
2	2.3	Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science)	Yes	$1,262,423.00	1,227,867		
2	2.4	Targeted Intervention and Academic Support	Yes	$718,906.00	322,664		
2	2.6	Academic Supports and Services for Unduplicated Students	Yes	$978,740.00	962,953		
2	2.7	Enhance Guidance Services	Yes	$2,690,335.00	2,539,504		
2	2.8	Senior Credit Recovery Program	Yes	$325,102.00	326,397		
3	3.1	Strategy, Communication, Community Partnerships and Outreach	Yes	$252,247.00	267,583		
3	3.2	Supportive and Healthy School Culture	Yes	$1,574,003.00	1,574,329		

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
3	3.3	Supportive and Safe School Culture	Yes	$10,000.00	10,000		
3	3.4	Parent Engagement	Yes	$610,301.00	504,813		
3	3.5	Data Systems	Yes	$123,500.00	369,075		
3	3.6	Language Translation Services	Yes	$25,288.00	25,238		

2025-26 LCFF Carryover Table

9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 + Carryover %)	7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)	11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)	12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)	13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)
135,623,940	11,677,221	.248%	8.858%	$10,923,967.00	0.000%	8.055%	$1,089,601.37	0.803%

Local Control and Accountability Plan Instructions

Plan Summary

Engaging Educational Partners

Goals and Actions

Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students

For additional questions or technical assistance related to the completion of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) template, please contact the local county office of education (COE), or the California Department of Education's (CDE's) Local Agency Systems Support Office, by phone at 916-319-0809 or by email at LCFF@cde.ca.gov.

Introduction and Instructions

The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) requires local educational agencies (LEAs) to engage their local educational partners in an annual planning process to evaluate their progress within eight state priority areas encompassing all statutory metrics (COEs have 10 state priorities). LEAs document the results of this planning process in the LCAP using the template adopted by the State Board of Education.

The LCAP development process serves three distinct, but related functions:

- **Comprehensive Strategic Planning:** The process of developing and annually updating the LCAP supports comprehensive strategic planning, particularly to address and reduce disparities in opportunities and outcomes between student groups indicated by the California School Dashboard (California Education Code [EC] Section 52064[e][1]). Strategic planning that is comprehensive connects budgetary decisions to teaching and learning performance data. LEAs should continually evaluate the hard choices they make about the use of limited resources to meet student and community needs to ensure opportunities and outcomes are improved for all students.

- **Meaningful Engagement of Educational Partners:** The LCAP development process should result in an LCAP that reflects decisions made through meaningful engagement (EC Section 52064[e][1]). Local educational partners possess valuable perspectives and insights about an LEA's programs and services. Effective strategic planning will incorporate these perspectives and insights in order to identify potential goals and actions to be included in the LCAP.

- **Accountability and Compliance:** The LCAP serves an important accountability function because the nature of some LCAP template sections require LEAs to show that they have complied with various requirements specified in the LCFF statutes and regulations, most notably:

    - Demonstrating that LEAs are increasing or improving services for foster youth, English learners, including long-term English learners, and low-income students in proportion to the amount of additional funding those students generate under LCFF (EC Section 52064[b][4-6]).

    - Establishing goals, supported by actions and related expenditures, that address the statutory priority areas and statutory metrics (EC sections 52064[b][1] and [2]).

        - **NOTE:** As specified in EC Section 62064(b)(1), the LCAP must provide a description of the annual goals, for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils identified pursuant to EC Section 52052, to be achieved for each of the state priorities. Beginning in 2023–24, EC

Section 52052 identifies long-term English learners as a separate and distinct pupil subgroup with a numerical significance at 15 students.

- Annually reviewing and updating the LCAP to reflect progress toward the goals (EC Section 52064[b][7]).
- Ensuring that all increases attributable to supplemental and concentration grant calculations, including concentration grant add-on funding and/or LCFF carryover, are reflected in the LCAP (EC sections 52064[b][6], [8], and [11]).

The LCAP template, like each LEA's final adopted LCAP, is a document, not a process. LEAs must use the template to memorialize the outcome of their LCAP development process, which must: (a) reflect comprehensive strategic planning, particularly to address and reduce disparities in opportunities and outcomes between student groups indicated by the California School Dashboard (Dashboard), (b) through meaningful engagement with educational partners that (c) meets legal requirements, as reflected in the final adopted LCAP. The sections included within the LCAP template do not and cannot reflect the full development process, just as the LCAP template itself is not intended as a tool for engaging educational partners.

If a county superintendent of schools has jurisdiction over a single school district, the county board of education and the governing board of the school district may adopt and file for review and approval a single LCAP consistent with the requirements in EC sections 52060, 52062, 52066, 52068, and 52070. The LCAP must clearly articulate to which entity's budget (school district or county superintendent of schools) all budgeted and actual expenditures are aligned.

The revised LCAP template for the 2024–25, 2025–26, and 2026–27 school years reflects statutory changes made through Senate Bill 114 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 48, Statutes of 2023 and Senate Bill 153, Chapter 38, Statues of 2024.

At its most basic, the adopted LCAP should attempt to distill not just what the LEA is doing for students in transitional kindergarten through grade twelve (TK–12), but also allow educational partners to understand why, and whether those strategies are leading to improved opportunities and outcomes for students. LEAs are strongly encouraged to use language and a level of detail in their adopted LCAPs intended to be meaningful and accessible for the LEA's diverse educational partners and the broader public.

In developing and finalizing the LCAP for adoption, LEAs are encouraged to keep the following overarching frame at the forefront of the strategic planning and educational partner engagement functions:

> Given present performance across the state priorities and on indicators in the Dashboard, how is the LEA using its budgetary resources to respond to TK–12 student and community needs, and address any performance gaps, including by meeting its obligation to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, and low-income students?

LEAs are encouraged to focus on a set of metrics and actions which, based on research, experience, and input gathered from educational partners, the LEA believes will have the biggest impact on behalf of its TK–12 students.

These instructions address the requirements for each section of the LCAP but may include information about effective practices when developing the LCAP and completing the LCAP document. Additionally, the beginning of each template section includes information emphasizing the purpose that section serves.

Plan Summary

Purpose

A well-developed Plan Summary section provides a meaningful context for the LCAP. This section provides information about an LEA's community as well as relevant information about student needs and performance. In order to present a meaningful context for the rest of the LCAP, the content of this section should be clearly and meaningfully related to the content included throughout each subsequent section of the LCAP.

Requirements and Instructions

General Information

A description of the LEA, its schools, and its students in grades transitional kindergarten–12, as applicable to the LEA. LEAs may also provide information about their strategic plan, vision, etc.

Briefly describe the LEA, its schools, and its students in grades TK–12, as applicable to the LEA.

- For example, information about an LEA in terms of geography, enrollment, employment, the number and size of specific schools, recent community challenges, and other such information the LEA may wish to include can enable a reader to more fully understand the LEA's LCAP.
- LEAs may also provide information about their strategic plan, vision, etc.
- As part of this response, identify all schools within the LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funding.

Reflections: Annual Performance

A reflection on annual performance based on a review of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) and local data.

Reflect on the LEA's annual performance on the Dashboard and local data. This may include both successes and challenges identified by the LEA during the development process.

LEAs are encouraged to highlight how they are addressing the identified needs of student groups, and/or schools within the LCAP as part of this response.

As part of this response, the LEA must identify the following, which will remain unchanged during the three-year LCAP cycle:

- Any school within the LEA that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2023 Dashboard;
- Any student group within the LEA that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2023 Dashboard; and/or
- Any student group within a school within the LEA that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2023 Dashboard.

EC Section 52064.4 requires that an LEA that has unexpended Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG) funds must include one or more actions funded with LREBG funds within the 2026-27, 2026-27 and 2027-28 LCAPs, as applicable to the LEA. To implement the requirements of *EC* Section 52064.4, all LEAs must do the following:

- For the 2025–26, 2026–27, and 2027–28 LCAP years, identify whether or not the LEA has unexpended LREBG funds for the applicable LCAP year.
    - If the LEA has unexpended LREBG funds the LEA must provide the following:
        - The goal and action number for each action that will be funded, either in whole or in part, with LREBG funds; and
        - An explanation of the rationale for selecting each action funded with LREBG funds. This explanation must include:
            - An explanation of how the action is aligned with the allowable uses of funds identified in *EC* Section 32526(c)(2); and
            - An explanation of how the action is expected to address the area(s) of need of students and schools identified in the needs assessment required by *EC* Section 32526(d).
                - For information related to the allowable uses of funds and the required needs assessment, please see the Program Information tab on the LREBG Program Information web page.
            - Actions may be grouped together for purposes of these explanations.
            - The LEA may provide these explanations as part of the action description rather than as part of the Reflections: Annual Performance.
    - If the LEA does not have unexpended LREBG funds, the LEA is not required to conduct the needs assessment required by *EC* Section 32627(d), to provide the information identified above or to include actions funded with LREBG funds within the 2026-27, 2026-27 and 2027-28 LCAPs.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

As applicable, a summary of the work underway as part of technical assistance.

Annually identify the reason(s) the LEA is eligible for or has requested technical assistance consistent with EC sections 47607.3, 52071, 52071.5, 52072, or 52072.5, and provide a summary of the work underway as part of receiving technical assistance. The most common form of this technical assistance is frequently referred to as Differentiated Assistance, however this also includes LEAs that have requested technical assistance from their COE.

- If the LEA is not eligible for or receiving technical assistance, the LEA may respond to this prompt as “Not Applicable.”

Comprehensive Support and Improvement
An LEA with a school or schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) under the Every Student Succeeds Act must respond to the following prompts:

Schools Identified

A list of the schools in the LEA that are eligible for comprehensive support and improvement.

- Identify the schools within the LEA that have been identified for CSI.

Support for Identified Schools

A description of how the LEA has or will support its eligible schools in developing comprehensive support and improvement plans.

- Describe how the LEA has or will support the identified schools in developing CSI plans that included a school-level needs assessment, evidence-based interventions, and the identification of any resource inequities to be addressed through the implementation of the CSI plan.

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

A description of how the LEA will monitor and evaluate the plan to support student and school improvement.

- Describe how the LEA will monitor and evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the CSI plan to support student and school improvement.

Engaging Educational Partners

Purpose

Significant and purposeful engagement of parents, students, educators, and other educational partners, including those representing the student groups identified by LCFF, is critical to the development of the LCAP and the budget process. Consistent with statute, such engagement should support comprehensive strategic planning, particularly to address and reduce disparities in opportunities and outcomes between student groups indicated by the Dashboard, accountability, and improvement across the state priorities and locally identified priorities (EC Section 52064[e][1]). Engagement of educational partners is an ongoing, annual process.

This section is designed to reflect how the engagement of educational partners influenced the decisions reflected in the adopted LCAP. The goal is to allow educational partners that participated in the LCAP development process and the broader public to understand how the LEA engaged educational partners and the impact of that engagement. LEAs are encouraged to keep this goal in the forefront when completing this section.

Requirements

Requirements

School districts and COEs: *EC* Section 52060(g) and *EC* Section 52066(g) specify the educational partners that must be consulted when developing the LCAP:

- Teachers,

- Principals,
- Administrators,
- Other school personnel,
- Local bargaining units of the LEA,
- Parents, and
- Students

A school district or COE receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also consult with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for each applicable school.

Before adopting the LCAP, school districts and COEs must share it with the applicable committees, as identified below under Requirements and Instructions. The superintendent is required by statute to respond in writing to the comments received from these committees. School districts and COEs must also consult with the special education local plan area administrator(s) when developing the LCAP.

Charter schools: *EC* Section 47606.5(d) requires that the following educational partners be consulted with when developing the LCAP:

- Teachers,
- Principals,
- Administrators,
- Other school personnel,
- Parents, and
- Students

A charter school receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also consult with educational partners at the school generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for the school.

The LCAP should also be shared with, and LEAs should request input from, schoolsite-level advisory groups, as applicable (e.g., schoolsite councils, English Learner Advisory Councils, student advisory groups, etc.), to facilitate alignment between schoolsite and district-level goals. Information and resources that support effective engagement, define student consultation, and provide the requirements for advisory group composition, can be found under Resources on the CDE's LCAP webpage.

Before the governing board/body of an LEA considers the adoption of the LCAP, the LEA must meet the following legal requirements:

- For school districts, see *Education Code* Section 52062;
    - **Note:** Charter schools using the LCAP as the School Plan for Student Achievement must meet the requirements of *EC* Section 52062(a).
- For COEs, see *Education Code* Section 52068; and
- For charter schools, see *Education Code* Section 47606.5.

- **NOTE:** As a reminder, the superintendent of a school district or COE must respond, in writing, to comments received by the applicable committees identified in the *Education Code* sections listed above. This includes the parent advisory committee and may include the English learner parent advisory committee and, as of July 1, 2024, the student advisory committee, as applicable.

Instructions

Respond to the prompts as follows:

A summary of the process used to engage educational partners in the development of the LCAP.

School districts and county offices of education must, at a minimum, consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units, parents, and students in the development of the LCAP.

Charter schools must, at a minimum, consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, parents, and students in the development of the LCAP.

An LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also consult with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for each applicable school.

Complete the table as follows:

Educational Partners

Identify the applicable educational partner(s) or group(s) that were engaged in the development of the LCAP.

Process for Engagement

Describe the engagement process used by the LEA to involve the identified educational partner(s) in the development of the LCAP. At a minimum, the LEA must describe how it met its obligation to consult with all statutorily required educational partners, as applicable to the type of LEA.

- A sufficient response to this prompt must include general information about the timeline of the process and meetings or other engagement strategies with educational partners. A response may also include information about an LEA's philosophical approach to engaging its educational partners.

- An LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also include a summary of how it consulted with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for each applicable school.

A description of how the adopted LCAP was influenced by the feedback provided by educational partners.

Describe any goals, metrics, actions, or budgeted expenditures in the LCAP that were influenced by or developed in response to the educational partner feedback.

- A sufficient response to this prompt will provide educational partners and the public with clear, specific information about how the engagement process influenced the development of the LCAP. This may include a description of how the LEA prioritized requests of educational partners within the context of the budgetary resources available or otherwise prioritized areas of focus within the LCAP.

- An LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funds must include a description of how the consultation with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds influenced the development of the adopted LCAP.

- For the purposes of this prompt, this may also include, but is not necessarily limited to:
    - Inclusion of a goal or decision to pursue a Focus Goal (as described below)
    - Inclusion of metrics other than the statutorily required metrics
    - Determination of the target outcome on one or more metrics
    - Inclusion of performance by one or more student groups in the Measuring and Reporting Results subsection
    - Inclusion of action(s) or a group of actions
    - Elimination of action(s) or group of actions
    - Changes to the level of proposed expenditures for one or more actions
    - Inclusion of action(s) as contributing to increased or improved services for unduplicated students
    - Analysis of effectiveness of the specific actions to achieve the goal
    - Analysis of material differences in expenditures
    - Analysis of changes made to a goal for the ensuing LCAP year based on the annual update process
    - Analysis of challenges or successes in the implementation of actions

Goals and Actions

Purpose

Well-developed goals will clearly communicate to educational partners what the LEA plans to accomplish, what the LEA plans to do in order to accomplish the goal, and how the LEA will know when it has accomplished the goal. A goal statement, associated metrics and expected outcomes, and the actions included in the goal must be in alignment. The explanation for why the LEA included a goal is an opportunity for LEAs to clearly communicate to educational partners and the public why, among the various strengths and areas for improvement highlighted by performance data and strategies and actions that could be pursued, the LEA decided to pursue this goal, and the related metrics, expected outcomes, actions, and expenditures.

A well-developed goal can be focused on the performance relative to a metric or metrics for all students, a specific student group(s), narrowing performance gaps, or implementing programs or strategies expected to impact outcomes. LEAs should assess the performance of their student groups when developing goals and the related actions to achieve such goals.

Requirements and Instructions

LEAs should prioritize the goals, specific actions, and related expenditures included within the LCAP within one or more state priorities. LEAs must consider performance on the state and local indicators, including their locally collected and reported data for the local indicators that are included in the Dashboard, in determining whether and how to prioritize its goals within the LCAP. As previously stated, strategic planning that

is comprehensive connects budgetary decisions to teaching and learning performance data. LEAs should continually evaluate the hard choices they make about the use of limited resources to meet student and community needs to ensure opportunities and outcomes are improved for all students, and to address and reduce disparities in opportunities and outcomes between student groups indicated by the Dashboard.

In order to support prioritization of goals, the LCAP template provides LEAs with the option of developing three different kinds of goals:

- Focus Goal: A Focus Goal is relatively more concentrated in scope and may focus on a fewer number of metrics to measure improvement. A Focus Goal statement will be time bound and make clear how the goal is to be measured.
    - All Equity Multiplier goals must be developed as focus goals. For additional information, see Required Focus Goal(s) for LEAs Receiving Equity Multiplier Funding below.
- Broad Goal: A Broad Goal is relatively less concentrated in its scope and may focus on improving performance across a wide range of metrics.
- Maintenance of Progress Goal: A Maintenance of Progress Goal includes actions that may be ongoing without significant changes and allows an LEA to track performance on any metrics not addressed in the other goals of the LCAP.

Requirement to Address the LCFF State Priorities

At a minimum, the LCAP must address all LCFF priorities and associated metrics articulated in *EC* sections 52060(d) and 52066(d), as applicable to the LEA. The *LCFF State Priorities Summary* provides a summary of *EC* sections 52060(d) and 52066(d) to aid in the development of the LCAP.

Respond to the following prompts, as applicable:

Focus Goal(s)

Description

The description provided for a Focus Goal must be specific, measurable, and time bound.

- An LEA develops a Focus Goal to address areas of need that may require or benefit from a more specific and data intensive approach.
- The Focus Goal can explicitly reference the metric(s) by which achievement of the goal will be measured and the time frame according to which the LEA expects to achieve the goal.

Type of Goal

Identify the type of goal being implemented as a Focus Goal.

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Identify each of the state priorities that this goal is intended to address.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

- An explanation must be based on Dashboard data or other locally collected data.
- LEAs must describe how the LEA identified this goal for focused attention, including relevant consultation with educational partners.
- LEAs are encouraged to promote transparency and understanding around the decision to pursue a focus goal.

Required Focus Goal(s) for LEAs Receiving Equity Multiplier Funding

Description

LEAs receiving Equity Multiplier funding must include one or more focus goals for each school generating Equity Multiplier funding. In addition to addressing the focus goal requirements described above, LEAs must adhere to the following requirements.

Focus goals for Equity Multiplier schoolsites must address the following:

(A) All student groups that have the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the Dashboard, and

(B) Any underlying issues in the credentialing, subject matter preparation, and retention of the school's educators, if applicable.

- Focus Goals for each and every Equity Multiplier schoolsite must identify specific metrics for each identified student group, as applicable.
- An LEA may create a single goal for multiple Equity Multiplier schoolsites if those schoolsites have the same student group(s) performing at the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the Dashboard or, experience similar issues in the credentialing, subject matter preparation, and retention of the school's educators.
    - When creating a single goal for multiple Equity Multiplier schoolsites, the goal must identify the student groups and the performance levels on the Dashboard that the Focus Goal is addressing; or,
    - The common issues the schoolsites are experiencing in credentialing, subject matter preparation, and retention of the school's educators, if applicable.

Type of Goal

Identify the type of goal being implemented as an Equity Multiplier Focus Goal.

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Identify each of the state priorities that this goal is intended to address.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

- An explanation must be based on Dashboard data or other locally collected data.
- LEAs must describe how the LEA identified this goal for focused attention, including relevant consultation with educational partners.
- LEAs are encouraged to promote transparency and understanding around the decision to pursue a focus goal.
- In addition to this information, the LEA must also identify:
    - The school or schools to which the goal applies

LEAs are encouraged to approach an Equity Multiplier goal from a wholistic standpoint, considering how the goal might maximize student outcomes through the use of LCFF and other funding in addition to Equity Multiplier funds.

- Equity Multiplier funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, funding provided to Equity Multiplier schoolsites for purposes of the LCFF, the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELO-P), the Literacy Coaches and Reading Specialists (LCRS) Grant Program, and/or the California Community Schools Partnership Program (CCSPP).
- This means that Equity Multiplier funds must not be used to replace funding that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement LEA-wide actions identified in the LCAP or that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement provisions of the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP.

Note: *EC* Section 42238.024(b)(1) requires that Equity Multiplier funds be used for the provision of evidence-based services and supports for students. Evidence-based services and supports are based on objective evidence that has informed the design of the service or support and/or guides the modification of those services and supports. Evidence-based supports and strategies are most commonly based on educational research and/or metrics of LEA, school, and/or student performance.

Broad Goal

Description

Describe what the LEA plans to achieve through the actions included in the goal.

- The description of a broad goal will be clearly aligned with the expected measurable outcomes included for the goal.

- The goal description organizes the actions and expected outcomes in a cohesive and consistent manner.
- A goal description is specific enough to be measurable in either quantitative or qualitative terms. A broad goal is not as specific as a focus goal. While it is specific enough to be measurable, there are many different metrics for measuring progress toward the goal.

Type of Goal

Identify the type of goal being implemented as a Broad Goal.

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Identify each of the state priorities that this goal is intended to address.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA developed this goal and how the actions and metrics grouped together will help achieve the goal.

Maintenance of Progress Goal

Description

Describe how the LEA intends to maintain the progress made in the LCFF State Priorities not addressed by the other goals in the LCAP.

- Use this type of goal to address the state priorities and applicable metrics not addressed within the other goals in the LCAP.
- The state priorities and metrics to be addressed in this section are those for which the LEA, in consultation with educational partners, has determined to maintain actions and monitor progress while focusing implementation efforts on the actions covered by other goals in the LCAP.

Type of Goal

Identify the type of goal being implemented as a Maintenance of Progress Goal.

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Identify each of the state priorities that this goal is intended to address.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain how the actions will sustain the progress exemplified by the related metrics.

Measuring and Reporting Results:

For each LCAP year, identify the metric(s) that the LEA will use to track progress toward the expected outcomes.

- LEAs must identify metrics for specific student groups, as appropriate, including expected outcomes that address and reduce disparities in outcomes between student groups.

- The metrics may be quantitative or qualitative; but at minimum, an LEA's LCAP must include goals that are measured using all of the applicable metrics for the related state priorities, in each LCAP year, as applicable to the type of LEA.

- To the extent a state priority does not specify one or more metrics (e.g., implementation of state academic content and performance standards), the LEA must identify a metric to use within the LCAP. For these state priorities, LEAs are encouraged to use metrics based on or reported through the relevant local indicator self-reflection tools within the Dashboard.

- **Required metrics for LEA-wide actions:** For each action identified as 1) contributing towards the requirement to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, including long-term English learners, and low-income students and 2) being provided on an LEA-wide basis, the LEA must identify one or more metrics to monitor the effectiveness of the action and its budgeted expenditures.

    - These required metrics may be identified within the action description or the first prompt in the increased or improved services section, however the description must clearly identify the metric(s) being used to monitor the effectiveness of the action and the action(s) that the metric(s) apply to.

- **Required metrics for Equity Multiplier goals**: For each Equity Multiplier goal, the LEA must identify:

    - The specific metrics for each identified student group at each specific schoolsite, as applicable, to measure the progress toward the goal, and/or

    - The specific metrics used to measure progress in meeting the goal related to credentialing, subject matter preparation, or educator retention at each specific schoolsite.

- **Required metrics for actions supported by LREBG funds**: To implement the requirements of *EC* Section 52064.4, LEAs with unexpended LREBG funds must include at least one metric to monitor the impact of each action funded with LREBG funds included in the goal.

    - The metrics being used to monitor the impact of each action funded with LREBG funds are not required to be new metrics; they may be metrics that are already being used to measure progress towards goals and actions included in the LCAP.

Complete the table as follows:

Metric #

- Enter the metric number.

Metric

- Identify the standard of measure being used to determine progress towards the goal and/or to measure the effectiveness of one or more actions associated with the goal.

Baseline

- Enter the baseline when completing the LCAP for 2024–25.
    - Use the most recent data associated with the metric available at the time of adoption of the LCAP for the first year of the three-year plan. LEAs may use data as reported on the 2023 Dashboard for the baseline of a metric only if that data represents the most recent available data (e.g., high school graduation rate).
    - Using the most recent data available may involve reviewing data the LEA is preparing for submission to the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) or data that the LEA has recently submitted to CALPADS.
    - Indicate the school year to which the baseline data applies.
    - The baseline data must remain unchanged throughout the three-year LCAP.
        - This requirement is not intended to prevent LEAs from revising the baseline data if it is necessary to do so. For example, if an LEA identifies that its data collection practices for a particular metric are leading to inaccurate data and revises its practice to obtain accurate data, it would also be appropriate for the LEA to revise the baseline data to align with the more accurate data process and report its results using the accurate data.
        - If an LEA chooses to revise its baseline data, then, at a minimum, it must clearly identify the change as part of its response to the description of changes prompt in the Goal Analysis for the goal. LEAs are also strongly encouraged to involve their educational partners in the decision of whether or not to revise a baseline and to communicate the proposed change to their educational partners.
    - Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one- or two-year LCAP may identify a new baseline each year, as applicable.

Year 1 Outcome

- When completing the LCAP for 2025–26, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies.
    - Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one-year LCAP may provide the Year 1 Outcome when completing the LCAP for both 2025–26 and 2026–27 or may provide the Year 1 Outcome for 2025–26 and provide the Year 2 Outcome for 2026–27.

Year 2 Outcome

- When completing the LCAP for 2026–27, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies.

- Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one-year LCAP may identify the Year 2 Outcome as not applicable when completing the LCAP for 2026–27 or may provide the Year 2 Outcome for 2026–27.

Target for Year 3 Outcome

- When completing the first year of the LCAP, enter the target outcome for the relevant metric the LEA expects to achieve by the end of the three-year LCAP cycle.
    - Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one- or two-year LCAP may identify a Target for Year 1 or Target for Year 2, as applicable.

Current Difference from Baseline

- When completing the LCAP for 2025–26 and 2026–27, enter the current difference between the baseline and the yearly outcome, as applicable.
    - Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one- or two-year LCAP will identify the current difference between the baseline and the yearly outcome for Year 1 and/or the current difference between the baseline and the yearly outcome for Year 2, as applicable.

Timeline for school districts and COEs for completing the "**Measuring and Reporting Results**" part of the Goal.

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2024–25** or when adding a new metric.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2024–25** or when adding a new metric.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2025–26**. Leave blank until then.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2026–27**. Leave blank until then.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2024–25** or when adding a new metric.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2025–26** and **2026–27**. Leave blank until then.

Goal Analysis:

Enter the LCAP Year.

Using actual annual measurable outcome data, including data from the Dashboard, analyze whether the planned actions were effective towards achieving the goal. "Effective" means the degree to which the planned actions were successful in producing the target result. Respond to the prompts as instructed.

Note: When completing the 2024–25 LCAP, use the 2023–24 Local Control and Accountability Plan Annual Update template to complete the Goal Analysis and identify the Goal Analysis prompts in the 2024–25 LCAP as "Not Applicable."

A description of overall implementation, including any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions, and any relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.

- Describe the overall implementation of the actions to achieve the articulated goal, including relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.
    - Include a discussion of relevant challenges and successes experienced with the implementation process.
    - This discussion must include any instance where the LEA did not implement a planned action or implemented a planned action in a manner that differs substantively from how it was described in the adopted LCAP.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

- Explain material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and between the Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services, as applicable. Minor variances in expenditures or percentages do not need to be addressed, and a dollar-for-dollar accounting is not required.

A description of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal.

- Describe the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal. “Effectiveness” means the degree to which the actions were successful in producing the target result and “ineffectiveness” means that the actions did not produce any significant or targeted result.
    - In some cases, not all actions in a goal will be intended to improve performance on all of the metrics associated with the goal.
    - When responding to this prompt, LEAs may assess the effectiveness of a single action or group of actions within the goal in the context of performance on a single metric or group of specific metrics within the goal that are applicable to the action(s). Grouping actions with metrics will allow for more robust analysis of whether the strategy the LEA is using to impact a specified set of metrics is working and increase transparency for educational partners. LEAs are encouraged to use such an approach when goals include multiple actions and metrics that are not closely associated.
    - Beginning with the development of the 2024–25 LCAP, the LEA must change actions that have not proven effective over a three-year period.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, target outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

- Describe any changes made to this goal, expected outcomes, metrics, or actions to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis and analysis of the data provided in the Dashboard or other local data, as applicable.
    - As noted above, beginning with the development of the 2024–25 LCAP, the LEA must change actions that have not proven effective over a three-year period. For actions that have been identified as ineffective, the LEA must identify the ineffective action and must include a description of the following:

- The reasons for the ineffectiveness, and
- How changes to the action will result in a new or strengthened approach.

Actions:

Complete the table as follows. Add additional rows as necessary.

Action #

- Enter the action number.

Title

- Provide a short title for the action. This title will also appear in the action tables.

Description

- Provide a brief description of the action.
    - For actions that contribute to meeting the increased or improved services requirement, the LEA may include an explanation of how each action is principally directed towards and effective in meeting the LEA's goals for unduplicated students, as described in the instructions for the Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students section.
    - As previously noted, for each action identified as 1) contributing towards the requirement to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, including long-term English learners, and low-income students and 2) being provided on an LEA-wide basis, the LEA must identify one or more metrics to monitor the effectiveness of the action and its budgeted expenditures.
    - These required metrics may be identified within the action description or the first prompt in the increased or improved services section; however, the description must clearly identify the metric(s) being used to monitor the effectiveness of the action and the action(s) that the metric(s) apply to.

Total Funds

- Enter the total amount of expenditures associated with this action. Budgeted expenditures from specific fund sources will be provided in the action tables.

Contributing

- Indicate whether the action contributes to meeting the increased or improved services requirement as described in the Increased or Improved Services section using a “Y” for Yes or an “N” for No.
    - **Note:** for each such contributing action, the LEA will need to provide additional information in the Increased or Improved Services section to address the requirements in *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5 [5 *CCR*] Section 15496 in the Increased or Improved Services section of the LCAP.

***Actions for Foster Youth*:** School districts, COEs, and charter schools that have a numerically significant foster youth student subgroup are encouraged to include specific actions in the LCAP designed to meet needs specific to foster youth students.

Required Actions

For English Learners and Long-Term English Learners

- LEAs with 30 or more English learners and/or 15 or more long-term English learners must include specific actions in the LCAP related to, at a minimum:
    - Language acquisition programs, as defined in *EC* Section 306, provided to students, and
    - Professional development for teachers.
    - If an LEA has both 30 or more English learners and 15 or more long-term English learners, the LEA must include actions for both English learners and long-term English learners.

For Technical Assistance

- LEAs eligible for technical assistance pursuant to *EC* sections 47607.3, 52071, 52071.5, 52072, or 52072.5, must include specific actions within the LCAP related to its implementation of the work underway as part of technical assistance. The most common form of this technical assistance is frequently referred to as Differentiated Assistance.

For Lowest Performing Dashboard Indicators

- LEAs that have Red Dashboard indicators for (1) a school within the LEA, (2) a student group within the LEA, and/or (3) a student group within any school within the LEA must include one or more specific actions within the LCAP:
    - The specific action(s) must be directed towards the identified student group(s) and/or school(s) and must address the identified state indicator(s) for which the student group or school received the lowest performance level on the 2023 Dashboard. Each student group and/or school that receives the lowest performance level on the 2023 Dashboard must be addressed by one or more actions.
    - These required actions will be effective for the three-year LCAP cycle.

For LEAs With Unexpended LREBG Funds

- To implement the requirements of *EC* Section 52064.4, LEAs with unexpended LREBG funds must include one or more actions supported with LREBG funds within the 2025–26, 2026–27, and 2027–28 LCAPs, as applicable to the LEA. Actions funded with LREBG funds must remain in the LCAP until the LEA has expended the remainder of its LREBG funds, after which time the actions may be removed from the LCAP.
    - Prior to identifying the actions included in the LCAP the LEA is required to conduct a needs assessment pursuant to *EC* Section 32526(d). For information related to the required needs assessment please see the Program Information tab on the LREBG

Program Information web page. Additional information about the needs assessment and evidence-based resources for the LREBG may be found on the California Statewide System of Support LREBG Resources web page. The required LREBG needs assessment may be part of the LEAs regular needs assessment for the LCAP if it meets the requirements of *EC* Section 32627(d).

- School districts receiving technical assistance and COEs providing technical assistance are encouraged to use the technical assistance process to support the school district in conducting the required needs assessment, the selection of actions funded by the LREBG and/or the evaluation of implementation of the actions required as part of the LCAP annual update process.
- As a reminder, LREBG funds must be used to implement one or more of the purposes articulated in *EC* Section 32526(c)(2).
- LEAs with unexpended LREBG funds must include one or more actions supported by LREBG funds within the LCAP. For each action supported by LREBG funding the action description must:
  - Identify the action as an LREBG action;
  - Include an explanation of how research supports the selected action;
  - Identify the metric(s) being used to monitor the impact of the action; and
  - Identify the amount of LREBG funds being used to support the action.

Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students

Purpose

A well-written Increased or Improved Services section provides educational partners with a comprehensive description, within a single dedicated section, of how an LEA plans to increase or improve services for its unduplicated students as defined in *EC* Section 42238.02 in grades TK–12 as compared to all students in grades TK–12, as applicable, and how LEA-wide or schoolwide actions identified for this purpose meet regulatory requirements. Descriptions provided should include sufficient detail yet be sufficiently succinct to promote a broader understanding of educational partners to facilitate their ability to provide input. An LEA's description in this section must align with the actions included in the Goals and Actions section as contributing.

Please Note: For the purpose of meeting the Increased or Improved Services requirement and consistent with *EC* Section 42238.02, long-term English learners are included in the English learner student group.

Statutory Requirements

An LEA is required to demonstrate in its LCAP how it is increasing or improving services for its students who are foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income, collectively referred to as unduplicated students, as compared to the services provided to all students in proportion to the increase in funding it receives based on the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the LEA (*EC* Section 42238.07[a][1], *EC*

Section 52064[b][8][B]; 5 *CCR* Section 15496[a]). This proportionality percentage is also known as the "minimum proportionality percentage" or "MPP." The manner in which an LEA demonstrates it is meeting its MPP is two-fold: (1) through the expenditure of LCFF funds or through the identification of a Planned Percentage of Improved Services as documented in the Contributing Actions Table, and (2) through the explanations provided in the Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students section.

To improve services means to grow services in quality and to increase services means to grow services in quantity. Services are increased or improved by those actions in the LCAP that are identified in the Goals and Actions section as contributing to the increased or improved services requirement, whether they are provided across the entire LEA (LEA-wide action), provided to an entire school (Schoolwide action), or solely provided to one or more unduplicated student group(s) (Limited action).

Therefore, for *any* action contributing to meet the increased or improved services requirement, the LEA must include an explanation of:

- How the action is increasing or improving services for the unduplicated student group(s) (Identified Needs and Action Design), and
- How the action meets the LEA's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state and any local priority areas (Measurement of Effectiveness).

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

In addition to the above required explanations, LEAs must provide a justification for why an LEA-wide or Schoolwide action is being provided to all students and how the action is intended to improve outcomes for unduplicated student group(s) as compared to all students.

- Conclusory statements that a service will help achieve an expected outcome for the goal, without an explicit connection or further explanation as to how, are not sufficient.

- Further, simply stating that an LEA has a high enrollment percentage of a specific student group or groups does not meet the increased or improved services standard because enrolling students is not the same as serving students.

For School Districts Only

Actions provided on an **LEA-wide** basis at **school districts with an unduplicated pupil percentage of less than 55 percent** must also include a description of how the actions are the most effective use of the funds to meet the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state and any local priority areas. The description must provide the basis for this determination, including any alternatives considered, supporting research, experience, or educational theory.

Actions provided on a **Schoolwide** basis for **schools with less than 40 percent enrollment of unduplicated pupils** must also include a description of how these actions are the most effective use of the funds to meet the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state and any local priority areas. The description must provide the basis for this determination, including any alternatives considered, supporting research, experience, or educational theory.

Requirements and Instructions

Complete the tables as follows:

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants

- Specify the amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grant funds the LEA estimates it will receive in the coming year based on the number and concentration of foster youth, English learner, and low-income students. This amount includes the Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant.

Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant

- Specify the amount of additional LCFF concentration grant add-on funding, as described in *EC* Section 42238.02, that the LEA estimates it will receive in the coming year.

Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year

- Specify the estimated percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the LCAP year as calculated pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(7).

LCFF Carryover — Percentage

- Specify the LCFF Carryover — Percentage identified in the LCFF Carryover Table. If a carryover percentage is not identified in the LCFF Carryover Table, specify a percentage of zero (0.00%).

LCFF Carryover — Dollar

- Specify the LCFF Carryover — Dollar amount identified in the LCFF Carryover Table. If a carryover amount is not identified in the LCFF Carryover Table, specify an amount of zero ($0).

Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year

- Add the Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year and the Proportional LCFF Required Carryover Percentage and specify the percentage. This is the LEA's percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the LCAP year, as calculated pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(7).

Required Descriptions:

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

For each action being provided to an entire LEA or school, provide an explanation of (1) the unique identified need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) for whom the action is principally directed, (2) how the action is designed to address the identified need(s) and why it is being provided on an LEA or schoolwide basis, and (3) the metric(s) used to measure the effectiveness of the action in improving outcomes for the unduplicated student group(s).

If the LEA has provided this required description in the Action Descriptions, state as such within the table.

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

Provide an explanation of the unique identified need(s) of the LEA's unduplicated student group(s) for whom the action is principally directed.

An LEA demonstrates how an action is principally directed towards an unduplicated student group(s) when the LEA explains the need(s), condition(s), or circumstance(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) identified through a needs assessment and how the action addresses them. A meaningful needs assessment includes, at a minimum, analysis of applicable student achievement data and educational partner feedback.

How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis

Provide an explanation of how the action as designed will address the unique identified need(s) of the LEA's unduplicated student group(s) for whom the action is principally directed and the rationale for why the action is being provided on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis.

- As stated above, conclusory statements that a service will help achieve an expected outcome for the goal, without an explicit connection or further explanation as to how, are not sufficient.
- Further, simply stating that an LEA has a high enrollment percentage of a specific student group or groups does not meet the increased or improved services standard because enrolling students is not the same as serving students.

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

Identify the metric(s) being used to measure the progress and effectiveness of the action(s).

Note for COEs and Charter Schools: In the case of COEs and charter schools, schoolwide and LEA-wide are considered to be synonymous.

Limited Actions

For each action being solely provided to one or more unduplicated student group(s), provide an explanation of (1) the unique identified need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) being served, (2) how the action is designed to address the identified need(s), and (3) how the effectiveness of the action in improving outcomes for the unduplicated student group(s) will be measured.

If the LEA has provided the required descriptions in the Action Descriptions, state as such.

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

Provide an explanation of the unique need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) being served identified through the LEA's needs assessment. A meaningful needs assessment includes, at a minimum, analysis of applicable student achievement data and educational partner feedback.

How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)

Provide an explanation of how the action is designed to address the unique identified need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) being served.

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

Identify the metric(s) being used to measure the progress and effectiveness of the action(s).

For any limited action contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement that is associated with a Planned Percentage of Improved Services in the Contributing Summary Table rather than an expenditure of LCFF funds, describe the methodology that was used to determine the contribution of the action towards the proportional percentage, as applicable.

- For each action with an identified Planned Percentage of Improved Services, identify the goal and action number and describe the methodology that was used.

- When identifying a Planned Percentage of Improved Services, the LEA must describe the methodology that it used to determine the contribution of the action towards the proportional percentage. The percentage of improved services for an action corresponds to the amount of LCFF funding that the LEA estimates it would expend to implement the action if it were funded.

- For example, an LEA determines that there is a need to analyze data to ensure that instructional aides and expanded learning providers know what targeted supports to provide to students who are foster youth. The LEA could implement this action by hiring additional staff to collect and analyze data and to coordinate supports for students, which, based on the LEA's current pay scale, the LEA estimates would cost $165,000. Instead, the LEA chooses to utilize a portion of existing staff time to analyze data relating to students who are foster youth. This analysis will then be shared with site principals who will use the data to coordinate services provided by instructional assistants and expanded learning providers to target support to students. In this example, the LEA would divide the estimated cost of $165,000 by the amount of LCFF Funding identified in the Total Planned Expenditures Table and then convert the quotient to a percentage. This percentage is the Planned Percentage of Improved Services for the action.

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

A description of the plan for how the additional concentration grant add-on funding identified above will be used to increase the number of staff providing direct services to students at schools that have a high concentration (above 55 percent) of foster youth, English learners, and low-income students, as applicable.

An LEA that receives the additional concentration grant add-on described in *EC* Section 42238.02 is required to demonstrate how it is using these funds to increase the number of staff who provide direct services to students at schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent as compared to the number of staff who provide direct services to students at schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is equal to or less than 55 percent. The staff who provide direct services to students must be certificated staff and/or classified staff employed by the LEA; classified staff includes custodial staff.

Provide the following descriptions, as applicable to the LEA:

- An LEA that does not receive a concentration grant or the concentration grant add-on must indicate that a response to this prompt is not applicable.

- Identify the goal and action numbers of the actions in the LCAP that the LEA is implementing to meet the requirement to increase the number of staff who provide direct services to students at schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent.

- An LEA that does not have comparison schools from which to describe how it is using the concentration grant add-on funds, such as a single-school LEA or an LEA that only has schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, must describe how it is using the funds to increase the number of credentialed staff, classified staff, or both, including custodial staff, who provide direct services to students at selected schools and the criteria used to determine which schools require additional staffing support.

- In the event that an additional concentration grant add-on is not sufficient to increase staff providing direct services to students at a school with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, the LEA must describe how it is using the funds to retain staff providing direct services to students at a school with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent.

Complete the table as follows:

- Provide the staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students with a concentration of unduplicated students that is 55 percent or less and the staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, as applicable to the LEA.
    - The LEA may group its schools by grade span (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and High Schools), as applicable to the LEA.
    - The staff-to-student ratio must be based on the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff and the number of enrolled students as counted on the first Wednesday in October of each year.
- Provide the staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is 55 percent or less and the staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, as applicable to the LEA.
    - The LEA may group its schools by grade span (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and High Schools), as applicable to the LEA.
    - The staff-to-student ratio must be based on the number of FTE staff and the number of enrolled students as counted on the first Wednesday in October of each year.

Action Tables

Complete the Total Planned Expenditures Table for each action in the LCAP. The information entered into this table will automatically populate the other Action Tables. Information is only entered into the Total Planned Expenditures Table, the Annual Update Table, the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table, and the LCFF Carryover Table. The word “input” has been added to column headers to aid in identifying the column(s) where information will be entered. Information is not entered on the remaining Action tables.

The following tables are required to be included as part of the LCAP adopted by the local governing board or governing body:

- Table 1: Total Planned Expenditures Table (for the coming LCAP Year)
- Table 2: Contributing Actions Table (for the coming LCAP Year)
- Table 3: Annual Update Table (for the current LCAP Year)
- Table 4: Contributing Actions Annual Update Table (for the current LCAP Year)
- Table 5: LCFF Carryover Table (for the current LCAP Year)

Note: The coming LCAP Year is the year that is being planned for, while the current LCAP year is the current year of implementation. For example, when developing the 2024–25 LCAP, 2024–25 will be the coming LCAP Year and 2023–24 will be the current LCAP Year.

Total Planned Expenditures Table

In the Total Planned Expenditures Table, input the following information for each action in the LCAP for that applicable LCAP year:

- **LCAP Year**: Identify the applicable LCAP Year.
- **1. Projected LCFF Base Grant**: Provide the total amount estimated LCFF entitlement for the coming school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant program, the former Home-to-School Transportation program, and the Small School District Transportation program, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). Note that the LCFF Base Grant for purposes of the LCAP also includes the Necessary Small Schools and Economic Recovery Target allowances for school districts, and County Operations Grant for COEs.

  See *EC* sections 2574 (for COEs) and 42238.02 (for school districts and charter schools), as applicable, for LCFF entitlement calculations.
- **2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants:** Provide the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants estimated on the basis of the number and concentration of unduplicated students for the coming school year.
- **3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year:** This percentage will not be entered; it is calculated based on the Projected LCFF Base Grant and the Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). This is the percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the coming LCAP year.
- **LCFF Carryover — Percentage:** Specify the LCFF Carryover — Percentage identified in the LCFF Carryover Table from the prior LCAP year. If a carryover percentage is not identified in the LCFF Carryover Table, specify a percentage of zero (0.00%).
- **Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year:** This percentage will not be entered; it is calculated based on the Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year and the LCFF Carryover —

Percentage. ***This is the percentage by which the LEA must increase or improve services for unduplicated pupils as compared to the services provided to all students in the coming LCAP year.***

- **Goal #**: Enter the LCAP Goal number for the action.
- **Action #**: Enter the action's number as indicated in the LCAP Goal.
- **Action Title**: Provide a title of the action.
- **Student Group(s)**: Indicate the student group or groups who will be the primary beneficiary of the action by entering "All," or by entering a specific student group or groups.
- **Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?:** Type "Yes" if the action **is** included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement; OR, type "No" if the action is **not** included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement.
- If "Yes" is entered into the Contributing column, then complete the following columns:
    - **Scope**: The scope of an action may be LEA-wide (i.e., districtwide, countywide, or charterwide), schoolwide, or limited. An action that is LEA-wide in scope upgrades the entire educational program of the LEA. An action that is schoolwide in scope upgrades the entire educational program of a single school. An action that is limited in its scope is an action that serves only one or more unduplicated student groups.
    - **Unduplicated Student Group(s)**: Regardless of scope, contributing actions serve one or more unduplicated student groups. Indicate one or more unduplicated student groups for whom services are being increased or improved as compared to what all students receive.
    - **Location**: Identify the location where the action will be provided. If the action is provided to all schools within the LEA, the LEA must indicate "All Schools." If the action is provided to specific schools within the LEA or specific grade spans only, the LEA must enter "Specific Schools" or "Specific Grade Spans." Identify the individual school or a subset of schools or grade spans (e.g., all high schools or grades transitional kindergarten through grade five), as appropriate.
- **Time Span**: Enter "ongoing" if the action will be implemented for an indeterminate period of time. Otherwise, indicate the span of time for which the action will be implemented. For example, an LEA might enter "1 Year," or "2 Years," or "6 Months."
- **Total Personnel**: Enter the total amount of personnel expenditures utilized to implement this action.
- **Total Non-Personnel**: This amount will be automatically calculated based on information provided in the Total Personnel column and the Total Funds column.

- **LCFF Funds**: Enter the total amount of LCFF funds utilized to implement this action, if any. LCFF funds include all funds that make up an LEA's total LCFF target (i.e., base grant, grade span adjustment, supplemental grant, concentration grant, Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant, and Home-To-School Transportation).
    - **Note:** For an action to contribute towards meeting the increased or improved services requirement, it must include some measure of LCFF funding. The action may also include funding from other sources, however the extent to which an action contributes to meeting the increased or improved services requirement is based on the LCFF funding being used to implement the action.
- **Other State Funds**: Enter the total amount of Other State Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
    - **Note:** Equity Multiplier funds must be included in the "Other State Funds" category, not in the "LCFF Funds" category. As a reminder, Equity Multiplier funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, funding provided to Equity Multiplier schoolsites for purposes of the LCFF, the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP. This means that Equity Multiplier funds must not be used to replace funding that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement LEA-wide actions identified in the LEA's LCAP or that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement provisions of the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP.
- **Local Funds**: Enter the total amount of Local Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
- **Federal Funds**: Enter the total amount of Federal Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
- **Total Funds**: This amount is automatically calculated based on amounts entered in the previous four columns.
- **Planned Percentage of Improved Services**: For any action identified as contributing, being provided on a Limited basis to unduplicated students, and that does not have funding associated with the action, enter the planned quality improvement anticipated for the action as a percentage rounded to the nearest hundredth (0.00%). A limited action is an action that only serves foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income students.
    - As noted in the instructions for the Increased or Improved Services section, when identifying a Planned Percentage of Improved Services, the LEA must describe the methodology that it used to determine the contribution of the action towards the proportional percentage. The percentage of improved services for an action corresponds to the amount of LCFF funding that the LEA estimates it would expend to implement the action if it were funded.

      For example, an LEA determines that there is a need to analyze data to ensure that instructional aides and expanded learning providers know what targeted supports to provide to students who are foster youth. The LEA could implement this action by hiring additional staff to collect and analyze data and to coordinate supports for students, which, based on the LEA's current pay scale, the LEA estimates would cost $165,000. Instead, the LEA chooses to utilize a portion of existing staff time to analyze data relating to students who are foster youth. This analysis will then be shared with site principals who will use the data to coordinate services provided by instructional assistants and expanded learning providers to target support to students. In this example, the LEA would divide the estimated cost of $165,000 by the amount of LCFF Funding identified in the Data Entry Table and then convert the quotient to a percentage. This percentage is the Planned Percentage of Improved Services for the action.

Contributing Actions Table

As noted above, information will not be entered in the Contributing Actions Table; however, the 'Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?' column will need to be checked to ensure that only actions with a "Yes" are displaying. If actions with a "No" are displayed or if actions that are contributing are not displaying in the column, use the drop-down menu in the column header to filter only the "Yes" responses.

Annual Update Table

In the Annual Update Table, provide the following information for each action in the LCAP for the relevant LCAP year:

- **Estimated Actual Expenditures**: Enter the total estimated actual expenditures to implement this action, if any.

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

In the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table, check the 'Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?' column to ensure that only actions with a "Yes" are displaying. If actions with a "No" are displayed or if actions that are contributing are not displaying in the column, use the drop-down menu in the column header to filter only the "Yes" responses. Provide the following information for each contributing action in the LCAP for the relevant LCAP year:

- **6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants:** Provide the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants estimated based on the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the current school year.
- **Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions**: Enter the total estimated actual expenditure of LCFF funds used to implement this action, if any.
- **Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services:** For any action identified as contributing, being provided on a Limited basis only to unduplicated students, and that does not have funding associated with the action, enter the total estimated actual quality improvement anticipated for the action as a percentage rounded to the nearest hundredth (0.00%).
    - Building on the example provided above for calculating the Planned Percentage of Improved Services, the LEA in the example implements the action. As part of the annual update process, the LEA reviews implementation and student outcome data and determines that the action was implemented with fidelity and that outcomes for foster youth students improved. The LEA reviews the original estimated cost for the action and determines that had it hired additional staff to collect and analyze data and to coordinate supports for students that estimated actual cost would have been $169,500 due to a cost of living adjustment. The LEA would divide the estimated actual cost of $169,500 by the amount of LCFF Funding identified in the Data Entry Table and then convert the quotient to a percentage. This percentage is the Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services for the action.

LCFF Carryover Table

- **9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant**: Provide the total amount of estimated LCFF Target Entitlement for the current school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant program,

the former Home-to-School Transportation program, and the Small School District Transportation program, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). Note that the LCFF Base Grant for purposes of the LCAP also includes the Necessary Small Schools and Economic Recovery Target allowances for school districts, and County Operations Grant for COEs. See *EC* sections 2574 (for COEs) and 42238.02 (for school districts and charter schools), as applicable, for LCFF entitlement calculations.

- **10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year:** This percentage will not be entered. The percentage is calculated based on the amounts of the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9) and the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (6), pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8), plus the LCFF Carryover – Percentage from the prior year. This is the percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the current LCAP year.

Calculations in the Action Tables

To reduce the duplication of effort of LEAs, the Action Tables include functionality such as pre-population of fields and cells based on the information provided in the Data Entry Table, the Annual Update Summary Table, and the Contributing Actions Table. For transparency, the functionality and calculations used are provided below.

Contributing Actions Table

- **4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)**
    - This amount is the total of the Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) column.
- **5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services**
    - This percentage is the total of the Planned Percentage of Improved Services column.
- **Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the coming school year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)**
    - This percentage is calculated by dividing the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4) by the Projected LCFF Base Grant (1), converting the quotient to a percentage, and adding it to the Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (5).

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

Pursuant to *EC* Section 42238.07(c)(2), if the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4) is less than the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and Concentration Grants (6), the LEA is required to calculate the difference between the Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (5) and the Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (7). If the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4) is equal to or greater than the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and Concentration Grants (6), the Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services will display “Not Required.”

- **6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and Concentration Grants**

- This is the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants the LEA estimates it will actually receive based on the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the current school year.

- **4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)**
  - This amount is the total of the Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds).
- **7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions**
  - This amount is the total of the Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds).
- **Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)**
  - This amount is the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (7) subtracted from the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4).
- **5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)**
  - This amount is the total of the Planned Percentage of Improved Services column.
- **8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)**
  - This amount is the total of the Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services column.
- **Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)**
  - This amount is the Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (5) subtracted from the Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (8).

LCFF Carryover Table

- **10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 plus Carryover %)**
  - This percentage is the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (6) divided by the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9) plus the LCFF Carryover – Percentage from the prior year.
- **11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)**
  - This percentage is the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (7) divided by the LCFF Funding (9), then converting the quotient to a percentage and adding the Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (8).
- **12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount LCFF Carryover (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)**

- If the Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (11) is less than the Estimated Actual Percentage to Increase or Improve Services (10), the LEA is required to carry over LCFF funds.

  The amount of LCFF funds is calculated by subtracting the Estimated Actual Percentage to Increase or Improve Services (11) from the Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (10) and then multiplying by the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9). This amount is the amount of LCFF funds that is required to be carried over to the coming year.

- **13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)**

  - This percentage is the unmet portion of the Percentage to Increase or Improve Services that the LEA must carry over into the coming LCAP year. The percentage is calculated by dividing the LCFF Carryover (12) by the LCFF Funding (9).

California Department of Education
November 2024