Oroville City Elementary School District

Moving forward together...impacting the future one student at a time.

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Oroville City Elementary School District
CDS Code: 04615070000000
School Year: 2026-27
LEA contact information:
Spencer Holtom, Ed. D
Superintendent
sholtom@ocesd.net
(530) 532-3000

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 Oroville City Elementary 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 Oroville City Elementary School District is $, of which $ is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), $ is other state funds, $ is local funds, and $ is federal funds. Of the $ in LCFF Funds, $ 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 Oroville City Elementary 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: Oroville City Elementary School District plans to spend $ for the 2026-27 school year. Of that amount, $ is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and $ is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:

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

In 2026-27, Oroville City Elementary School District is projecting it will receive $ based on the enrollment of foster youth, English learner, and low-income students. Oroville City Elementary School District must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Oroville City Elementary School District plans to spend $ 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 Oroville City Elementary 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 Oroville City Elementary 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, Oroville City Elementary School District's LCAP budgeted $ for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Oroville City Elementary School District actually spent $ for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2025-26.

Oroville City Elementary School District

Moving forward together...impacting the future one student at a time.

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
Oroville City Elementary School District	Spencer Holtom, Ed. D Superintendent	sholtom@ocesd.net (530) 532-3000

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 Oroville Community:

The Oroville City Elementary School District is located in the historic gold rush town of Oroville, home to the tallest earth-filled dam in the United States. Nestled at the base of the Sierra Nevada foothills in Northern California's Sacramento Valley, Oroville—originally named Ophir—has a rich cultural and agricultural history. Once California's largest gold mining community and fifth largest town overall, Oroville was also a hub for olive, nut, and mandarin production, industries that continue to play a role in the local economy. In recent years, the region has seen growth in viticulture, leading to an increase in wineries, restaurants, and tourism. Local traditions such as the annual Salmon Festival foster community pride and environmental awareness, while ongoing renovations in downtown Oroville reflect a renewed investment in preserving the city's historical charm. Cultural landmarks such as the Chinese Temple (built in 1863) highlight the area's diversity and longstanding contributions of the Chinese American community.

As the county seat of Butte County, Oroville is home to a population of approximately 20,041 residents (Data USA, 2023). The median household income is $45,198, and the median age is 36.7 years. Major employment sectors include healthcare, government, and retail. The community is ethnically diverse, with significant Caucasian, Hispanic, and Asian populations, the Hmong community being the largest subgroup among the Asian demographic. Approximately 23.3% of residents live below the poverty line.

The Oroville City Elementary School District:

The Oroville City Elementary School District (OCESD) serves 2,128 TK–8 students across seven campuses. These include four elementary schools (Oakdale Heights, Ophir, Stanford Avenue, and Wyandotte Academy), two middle schools (Central and Ishi Hills), and Sierra Del Oro, which houses a regional program for severely handicapped preschool students and a California Children Services (CCS) medical therapy unit. OCESD is the second largest district in Butte County by enrollment.

A significant portion of the student population, approximately 80.24%, qualifies for free or reduced lunch, while 25% receive special education services. English Learners make up 7% of the district's enrollment, primarily Spanish and Hmong speakers. Additionally, 2.1% of students are in foster care, and 6.5% (139 students) are homeless. The district actively collaborates with county and neighboring district liaisons to provide comprehensive support, including free bus transportation to promote attendance.

OCESD is committed to providing a safe, equitable, and inclusive educational environment. The district's mission is to empower every student to become a successful, lifelong learner and engaged citizen. To that end, OCESD ensures that all personnel receive training and resources aligned with evidence-based practices to promote mutual respect, equity, and culturally responsive support systems.

The District uses a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) that integrates Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Restorative Practices, trauma-informed instruction, and Social Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies. While the District will officially exit the Department of Justice (DOJ) judgment at the end of the 2024–2025 school year, it is committed to maintaining all MTSS, PBIS, and SEL activities to sustain the progress made and ensure continued growth in school climate and student well-being. Professional development in areas such as implicit bias, de-escalation, and behavior support will remain a priority.

Staff across the district have received extensive training over the course of the DOJ settlement, including instruction in Restorative Circles, Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA), and Tier Two PBIS interventions. These efforts have supported more equitable practices and a reduction in exclusionary discipline measures.

While Ishi Hills and Studios at Central Middle School have qualified for Equity Multiplier funding during the 2024–2025 school year based on performance metrics for subgroups such as Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races, Ishi Hills will no longer qualify for this funding beginning in the 2025–2026 school year. As a result, targeted actions under Goal 3;which was designed to address disparities tied to Equity Multiplier status, will be discontinued after the 2024–2025 school year. Nonetheless, the district remains committed to supporting vulnerable student groups through existing frameworks and ongoing evaluation of site-level needs.

To support continuous academic improvement, OCESD also provides high-quality professional learning. Teachers are offered multiple opportunities to implement the California State Content Standards (CSCS), including dedicated time for Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), data analysis, and instructional planning. Through a negotiated MOU, the district offers weekly minimum days, allowing for 21 local PLC sessions and four districtwide grade-level/content area correlation meetings annually. These gatherings facilitate discussion of benchmark assessments and intervention strategies to support student achievement.

Curricular improvement remains an ongoing focus. Recent initiatives include the adoption of a new science curriculum for grades 6–8 in 2020–2021 and an upcoming adoption of a Science Adoption Districtwide in the 2025–2026 school year to ensure we are meeting the rigor

for our students who will now be included on the California Dashboard. Teachers continue to utilize Blueprint Benchmark Assessments via Illuminate to monitor student progress in English Language Arts and Math.

In summary, OCESD continues to build upon its strong foundation of equity driven, data informed practices. The successful exit from the DOJ judgment in 2025–2026 is a testament to the District's commitment to systemic improvement. Going forward, the District will preserve and enhance the structures :MTSS, PBIS, SEL, and inclusive instruction that have led to this success, even as it adapts to changes in external funding such as the Equity Multiplier.

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

2024 California School Dashboard results, CAASPP data, and local assessments, Oroville City Elementary School District (OCESD) has identified significant areas of strength and continued areas for growth.

Dashboard Overview – Oroville City Elementary School District (OCESD), 2024
Suspension Rate:
OCESD remains in the Red performance level overall for suspension, with a high rate of 12.6%. Disparities are pronounced across subgroups:

Foster Youth (27.9%), African American (28.7%), Students with Disabilities (SWD) (15.4%), and Homeless students (14.7%) all fall in the Red zone.

English Learners (EL) had a comparatively better outcome with a rate of 4% (Orange), while Asian students reported the lowest rate at 1.9% (Yellow).

Chronic Absenteeism:
Chronic absenteeism continues to be a major concern:

Overall rate is 39.5% (Red), with particularly high rates among Homeless students (54.4%), African American students (53.7%), and SWD (45.4%).

SED (42%) are in the Orange zone, and Asian (10.2%) and Hispanic (41.4%) are showing mixed results across Yellow and Red.

English Language Arts (ELA):
OCESD students are 74.3 points below standard (Orange) overall. Notable subgroup gaps include:

SWD at 131.8 points below (Red), Foster Youth at 102.4 (Orange), and American Indian at 103.6 (Orange).

EL students showed some improvement with 61.9 points below (Yellow), though LTEL remain at 84.6 points below (Red).

Mathematics:
The district scored 91.6 points below standard (Yellow) overall. Subgroup challenges include:

SWD (148.4 below Red) and LTEL (140.8 below Red).

Other subgroups such as Foster Youth, SED, and African American students also performed significantly below standard (all Orange).

Science (California Science Test - CAST):
CAST scores are reported as “Status Only” in 2024 and not color-coded:

OCESD students averaged 20.2 points below standard, with most subgroups ranging between 17.8 to 36.8 points below, indicating continued recovery needs from learning disruptions.

English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI):
Progress for English Learners is a relative strength:

55% of ELs made progress toward English proficiency (Blue), with Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) showing 82.6% progress (Blue) — a significant area of improvement and opportunity.

These incremental improvements suggest progress, yet the overall performance remains below pre-pandemic levels, underscoring the need for continued focus on equity and support for underserved student populations.

Specific schools with Red status in ELA include:

Ishi Hills Middle School (SED, SWD, Hispanic, Two or More Races, and White)

Oakdale Heights Elementary (SWD and White)

The Studios at Central Middle School (All Students, SED, SWD, Hispanic, White, Two or More Races)

Ophir Elementary (SWD, White)

Stanford Avenue Elementary (All Students, SED, Homeless, SWD, Two or More Races, and White)

Wyandotte Academy (All Students, SED, SWD, Two or More Races and White)

Supports and Interventions
OCESD has implemented several strategic actions:

Continuing four dedicated teachers to lead PLC meetings, data analysis, and Wonders reading unit planning.

Infusing Science of Reading instructional practices into PLCs.

Targeted release time for teachers to focus on intervention and planning.

Strengthening Behavioral and PBIS supports across sites.

Expanding VITAL PLCs in partnership with WestEd, including weekly site PLC meetings and quarterly districtwide PLC correlation days.

Sustaining partnerships with Threshold Rising (John Peterson) and BCOE's Differentiated Assistance Team to build site-based leadership and systemic instructional improvements.

Equity and Accountability
The Studios @ Central has been identified as eligible for Equity Multiplier funding. Leadership and support plans are underway, including school walkthroughs, data analysis, and community feedback collection to guide School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) and LCAP updates.

OCESD anticipates that these strategic initiatives will help elevate academic outcomes and reduce performance gaps across student groups in future Dashboard reporting.

OCESD's 2025–26 LCAP Annual Performance Reflection is based on the latest available California School Dashboard results from 2023, alongside locally collected data for the 2023–24 school year (i.e., i-Ready diagnostics, INSPECT benchmark assessments, attendance, suspension rates, and CAASPP spring 2023 results).
The 2025 Dashboard will not be released until late 2025 and will be reviewed once available to inform future updates.
Progress and challenges reflected herein are derived from the most recent, verifiable data sets.

LREGB Funding will be used to support 2.8 (Literacy/Reading Coaches).

Based on the Needs Assessment, we need to address the ELA Levels/Ability of our K-2 Students; with direct support and DIBELS Assessments.

The most quoted research by Linda Darling-Hammond supporting literacy coaches is her 2017 report, Effective Teacher Professional Development, which provides robust evidence that literacy coaching is a high-impact, research-based strategy for improving both teaching and student literacy outcomes42. This work, along with her other foundational publications, is frequently cited in the field to justify and design effective literacy coaching programs.

Required Action - 2023 Dashboard	School	Student Group	Indicator	Goal and Action #
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	African American	English Language Arts	2.2, 2.8, 2.10 , 2.12
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	All Students	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	American Indian	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	English Learners	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Foster Youth	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Hispanic	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Students with Disabilities	English Language Arts	2.3, 2.4
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Two or More Races	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	White	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	African American	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	All Students	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	English Learners	Mathematics	2.7,, 2.16, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Hispanic	Mathematics	2.16, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Homeless	Mathematics	2.11, 2.16, 5.9

LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Two or More Races	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Foster Youth	Suspension	5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Hispanic	Suspension	5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Homeless	Suspension	5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11
LEA-wide Lowest Performance	District	Two or More Races	Suspension	5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ishi Hills Middle School	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	Chronic Absenteeism	2.3, 2.4
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ishi Hills Middle School	Students with Disabilities	Chronic Absenteeism	2.3, 2.4
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ishi Hills Middle School	Hispanic	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ishi Hills Middle School	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ishi Hills Middle School	Students with Disabilities	English Language Arts	2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ishi Hills Middle School	All Students	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ishi Hills Middle School	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ishi Hills Middle School	Two or More Races	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ishi Hills Middle School	White	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ishi Hills Middle School	Hispanic	Suspension	5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Oakdale Heights Elementary	All Students	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Oakdale Heights Elementary	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Oakdale Heights Elementary	White	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Ophir Elementary	Students with Disabilities	English Language Arts	2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Stanford Avenue Elementary	All Students	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9

School Student Group Lowest Performance	Stanford Avenue Elementary	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	All Students	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Hispanic	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Students with Disabilities	English Language Arts	2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	White	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	All Students	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Asian	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	English Learners	Mathematics	2.7, 5.9, 2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Hispanic	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Students with Disabilities	Mathematics	2.3, 2.4, 2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Two or More Races	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	White	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	All Students	Suspension	5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Hispanic	Suspension	5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	Suspension	5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Students with Disabilities	Suspension	2.3, 2.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11
School Student Group Lowest Performance	The Studios @ Central	Two or More Races	Suspension	5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11

School Student Group Lowest Performance	Wyandotte Academy	All Students	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Wyandotte Academy	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Wyandotte Academy	Students with Disabilities	English Language Arts	2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Wyandotte Academy	White	English Language Arts	2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Wyandotte Academy	English Learners	English Learner Progress	2.7, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Wyandotte Academy	Socio-economic Disadvantaged	Mathematics	2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Wyandotte Academy	Students with Disabilities	Mathematics	2.3, 2.4, 2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 5.9
School Student Group Lowest Performance	Wyandotte Academy	Two or More Races	Suspension	5.1, 5.2, 5.4., 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

OCESD is eligible for Direct Technical Assistance(DTA), with support from not only BCOE, but also CCEE because of the persistent underperformance of three or more student groups over the last four years. The five student groups that have triggered eligibility in DTA for OCESD are Homeless, Hispanic, Two or More Races, Students with Disabilities, and African American.

OCESD, in partnership with Butte COE and CCEE will contract with Threshold LLC for Instructional Leadership Support. It will include the following:
Threshold LLC proposes a comprehensive leadership development initiative for OCESD aimed at strengthening principal instructional leadership. Rooted in the belief that communities already have the talent and insight needed for change, the initiative builds on relationships from Year 1 to co-create a shared vision for the 2025–2026 school year.
The project is guided by research from The Wallace Foundation on principal pipelines and emphasizes two foundational pillars:
Leader Standards
High-Quality Principal Professional Learning
Core Components of the Plan
1. Principal Leadership Development
Summer Institute: A 2–3 day kickoff event where school leaders co-develop "Leader Standards" and define the scope of yearlong professional learning.
Monthly Principal Learning Community (PLC): Half-day sessions including:
School walkthroughs

Data analysis
PLC design aligned with instructional leadership
2. Instructional Focus
Early Literacy (K–2): Aligned with California's SB 114, Threshold will support DIBELS assessment adoption, training, and data-driven instruction.
Math (Grades 3–8): Focus on standards-aligned instruction using tools like CPM Math and Inspect.
3. Coaching and Implementation Support
1:1 Principal Coaching: For selected middle and elementary school principals.
PLC-based Coaching: Embedded coaching on how to use assessment data to guide instruction.
Walkthroughs: Each monthly session begins with a site visit to apply leadership tools in real settings.
We anticipate these systemic improvements will lead to elevated Dashboard outcomes for our elementary schools in the coming cycle.

Additionally, the Curriculum and Instruction Department has deepened its commitment to strategic planning by attending:

Monthly "LCAP Journey Meetings" to align processes with upcoming LCAP development needs.

Regular Curriculum Meetings to ensure collaboration and sharing of best practices across neighboring districts.

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.

Studios at Central Middle School qualified for the CSI funding for 25-26 School Year.

Support for Identified Schools

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

Support for Identified Schools (CSI Section – LCAP)
The Oroville City Elementary School District supported The Studios at Central Middle School in developing its Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) plan through a collaborative and data-informed planning process.
District leadership facilitated multiple opportunities for engagement and input, including:
Data Analysis Sessions
Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Staff and Leadership Team Meetings
School Site Council Meetings

Affinity Group Consultations
Participants in this development process included the principal, the teacher leadership team, classroom teachers, School Site Council members, and a LEAP (Leadership and Educational Advancement Planning) team member. These stakeholders examined California School Dashboard data and local performance indicators, focusing particularly on Math CAASPP scores, suspension rates, and disaggregated subgroup performance.
The resulting CSI plan was designed to align with Goal 4 of the District's LCAP, which focuses on improving academic outcomes and reducing suspensions for key subgroups: Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races students. The plan aims for:
5% annual growth in Math CAASPP Overall Scores for 2024–2027,
5% increases in proficiency in both Math and Language Arts,
5% reduction in suspensions, and
Achieving at least a "Yellow" rating on the Dashboard for both academic and discipline indicators starting in 2024–25.
This structured development process ensured that the plan addressed identified root causes, responded to subgroup-specific needs, and prioritized equitable outcomes across all metrics.

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

2 Times per year (January and April) a systematic review will be completed in regards to Studios at Central's growth and support in the areas of " Suspension, ELA and Math for the Homeless, Hispanic and Two or More Races Subgroups.

The following Metrics will be used:

1. Inspect Benchmark Results: in the areas of ELA and Math broken down for all subgroups, but specifically focusing on subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic and Two or More Race Subgroups.
2. SWIS Risk Ratio Reports/AERIES Suspension Reports: Specifically focusing on Homeless, Hispanic and Two or More Races Subgroups after a review of all listed Risk Ratios for Suspensions.

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
OCESD LCAP Community Stakeholder Group: Includes Parent's from each site in the district, including School Site Members and At-Large Parents who wanted to participate in the LCAP Planning.	Oroville City Elementary School District remains committed to ensuring meaningful engagement of educational partners in the development of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). During the 2024–25 school year, the District facilitated multiple opportunities for involvement to inform the development of the 2025–26 LCAP. To build awareness and gather input, the District held a series of meetings focused on reviewing data, evaluating progress on existing goals, and collaboratively shaping new goals. On February 11th, 2025, educational partners convened to review performance data, reflect on the progress of current LCAP goals, and provide initial guidance for future planning. A follow-up meeting was held on May 20, 2025, specifically dedicated to deepening feedback on Goals 1 and 4, while also gathering partner input on the creation of new goals for the upcoming LCAP cycle. These sessions supported a transparent planning process grounded in collaboration, data reflection, and a shared commitment to improving outcomes for all students—especially those who are most underserved. Educational partners at OCESD were informed of Ishi Hills Middle School’s change in Equity Multiplier eligibility during the LCAP

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	development process. Stakeholders provided input on how to transition supports, and consensus was reached to phase out the site-specific Equity Multiplier goal while continuing leadership development efforts under broader district initiatives.
OCESD LCAP Community Equity Multiplier School Committee: The Studios at Central: Including Parents, Staff, Admin and Teacher's for site Input on Equity Multiplier Goals	As part of Oroville City Elementary School District's commitment to educational equity and continuous improvement, a series of structured engagement opportunities were conducted to gather input from staff and parents regarding site-specific needs and required Equity Multiplier focus goals, particularly for The Studios at Central. Throughout the 2023–24 and 2024–25 school years, the School Site Council (SSC) at The Studios at Central convened regularly to build a sustained dialogue around school improvement priorities. These meetings served as key engagement points for sharing progress and gathering feedback on the LCAP and Equity Multiplier efforts: September 26, 2024 (Thu) | 3:00–4:00 PM – SSC Meeting April 3, 2025 (Thu) | 3:10–4:10 PM – SSC Meeting April 16, 2025 (Wed) | 3:10–4:10 PM – SSC Meeting These meetings helped ensure that both certificated staff and parents had the opportunity to shape the Equity Multiplier focus goal and site-level strategies for improving outcomes among student groups with persistent needs.
Supportive School Climate Advisory/LCAP Committee: includes community members from the local church, NAACP, Parents and Oroville City Council Members.	Oroville City Elementary School District engaged the Supportive School Climate Advisory Committee across multiple meetings to inform the development of the 2025–26 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). These sessions provided opportunities for diverse educational partners—including staff, parents, and community members—to collaboratively review data, provide

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	feedback on existing goals, and shape the direction of future goals and actions. Key meeting dates and engagement points included: February 11, 2025 (Tue) | 5:30–7:00 PM As part of ongoing consultation, the committee reconvened to evaluate the progress of 2024–25 actions and identify focus areas for 2025–26. May 20, 2025 (Tue) | 5:30–7:00 PM The final committee meeting for the cycle focused on reviewing LCAP draft updates, ensuring alignment with partner feedback, and confirming priority areas for the next academic year. Educational partners at OCESD were informed of Ishi Hills Middle School’s change in Equity Multiplier eligibility during the LCAP development process. Stakeholders provided input on how to transition supports, and consensus was reached to phase out the site-specific Equity Multiplier goal while continuing leadership development efforts under broader district initiatives.
California School Employees Association: Including various members and Union Leadership from CSEA on LCAP Goals and Funding.	The CSEA Negotiations Board met with the Curriculum and Instruction Department to review previous goals and give input on creation of new goals moving forward on May 16th, 2025. Educational partners at OCESD were informed of Ishi Hills Middle School’s change in Equity Multiplier eligibility during the LCAP development process. Stakeholders provided input on how to transition supports, and consensus was reached to phase out the site-specific Equity Multiplier goal while continuing leadership development efforts under broader district initiatives.
Oroville Elementary Teacher's Association: Including various members and Union Leadership from OETA on LCAP Goals and Funding.	Teacher Input Separate from Union Representation Teachers provided input independently from their union

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	representation through multiple structured channels: • Staff surveys distributed in January and March, focused on needs related to instruction, equity, and student behavior. • Grade-level PLC discussions, which included feedback summaries submitted to site administrators and then district leadership. • Participation in LCAP-focused meetings during staff meetings, where draft goals and metrics were reviewed and discussed openly. The union (bargaining unit) submitted formal feedback separately, focused more on working conditions and implementation feasibility. All teacher and union input was documented distinctly and used in separate layers of the LCAP review process. The OETA and the Curriculum and Instruction Department met frequently during the year to gain insight and input from OETA during Negotiations and Curriculum PLC Discussions. The final meeting of the year was May 21st, 2025. Educational partners at OCESD were informed of Ishi Hills Middle School's change in Equity Multiplier eligibility during the LCAP development process. Stakeholders provided input on how to transition supports, and consensus was reached to phase out the site-specific Equity Multiplier goal while continuing leadership development efforts under broader district initiatives.
Oroville Elementary Administrative and Confidential Employees: Including Site, District and District Office Administration Input on LCAP Goals and Funding.	Throughout the 2024–25 school year, Oroville City Elementary School District administrators actively participated in ongoing review, discussion, and planning to inform the development of the 2025–26 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). Beginning in August 2024 and continuing through June 2025, weekly Administrative Meetings were held at the District Office. These sessions included a recurring LCAP agenda item focused on

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	analyzing data and assessing progress toward existing goals—particularly Goal 2 (Academic Achievement) and Goal 3 (School Climate and Safety). A designated LCAP Input Meeting was held with all site principals on February 10, 2025, where administrators reviewed Dashboard and local data, examined school-specific outcomes, and provided structured input for the refinement of current LCAP goals and the development of new goals for the 2025–26 plan. In addition, in-depth discussions were held during October 2024 through March 2025 meetings related to Goal 3 and ongoing work aligned with the District's collaboration with the Department of Justice (DOJ). These conversations informed systemwide priorities and reinforced the district's equity and compliance commitments. This ongoing administrative engagement ensured that site leaders were central to the strategic planning process and provided essential insight into the development of goals that reflect school-level realities and community needs. Educational partners at OCESD were informed of Ishi Hills Middle School's change in Equity Multiplier eligibility during the LCAP development process. Stakeholders provided input on how to transition supports, and consensus was reached to phase out the site-specific Equity Multiplier goal while continuing leadership development efforts under broader district initiatives.
Oroville Elementary Students	Student input was collected through student surveys, School Site Council Meetings, Students attending DELAC Meetings, and Students Members who attended our Southside Community Advisory Council Meetings

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
Butte County SELPA Input and Informational Meeting	ON 5/29/2024, OCESD Meet with the SELPA Director for Butte County and received input and guidance on Special Education Requirements and needed mentions for the 25/26 LCAP Plan.

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

Educational partner feedback meaningfully shaped multiple elements of the 2025–26 LCAP, including the refinement of goals, selection of metrics, and design of specific actions. Stakeholder input was collected through surveys, staff meetings, advisory committees, and community forums throughout the 2024–25 school year. Key influences are summarized below:

Goal 1 – Access to Qualified Staff and Safe Facilities

- CSEA input led to an action to explore additional custodial staffing and extended campus supervision before school to improve safety.
- Administrative and parent feedback reinforced the need to prioritize the hiring of fully credentialed teachers, particularly at the middle school level, which directly influenced recruitment actions and related metrics tied to Williams Act compliance.

Goal 2 – Improve Student Achievement and Close Gaps

- OETA feedback to retain Reading Coaches and Middle School Intervention Teachers was incorporated into Actions 2.2 and 2.3, maintaining support staff to close literacy gaps.
- Parents influenced the inclusion of metrics around expanded access to arts/music in early grades and the refinement of actions to include volunteer opportunities and training for aides.
- Concerns about overuse of I-Ready led to a review of technology-based instruction and prompted professional development aligned with differentiated, hands-on learning strategies.

Goal 4 – Studios at Central Equity Multiplier Goal

- Stakeholders including parents and staff at The Studios at Central requested more targeted supports for Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races students. This input directly shaped subgroup-specific metrics such as:

5% annual increase in CAASPP Math and ELA proficiency for target groups
5% reduction in suspensions
Achieving a minimum "Yellow" Dashboard rating

- Suggestions to strengthen lesson planning and build staff unity led to the inclusion of collaborative planning time and a potential faculty retreat as part of the site-based Equity Multiplier actions.
- Requests for community-building and parent support groups informed wraparound supports beyond academic metrics.

Goal 5 – School Safety and Social-Emotional Wellness

- Input from CSEA, OETA, and parents emphasized the need for improved behavioral supports and mental health services.

- Feedback informed the strengthening of Tiered PBIS, continued use of Restorative Practices, and expansion of mental health counseling services across school sites.
- Parent recommendations for inclusive school-based clubs and activities informed actions to fund stipends for after-school programs that are not ASP-exclusive.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	The District will ensure that all teachers and paraprofessionals are appropriately assigned and highly qualified, and that school facilities are safe and maintained in good repair to ensure Williams Act Compliance, Credentialed Assignment Monitoring and FPM Monitoring Requirements.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

OCESD has strived to maintain facilities in good condition. Our facilities consistently receive a "good repair" in our FIT reports and students have indicated the facilities are clean as measured below. Due to this we want to maintain our goals and continue to meet or exceed the goals.

OCESD has been able to meet all requirements of the Williams Act (facilities and Instructional Materials) during the past 3 fiscal years and including the staff, routines and materials needed to maintain these successful levels; make this goal a pivotal part of meeting requirements and maintaining a positive learning environment.

Our desire to maintain highly qualified staff is measured by appropriately credentialed teachers and students', parents, community members, staff, administration and teachers input of School Climate Surveys conducted during the 24-25 School Year. Every member of our Community LCAP Input Groups (CSEA, Parents, Community Members, OETA, Administration and Stakeholders) feel that the key to raise student achievement begins with the hiring of Highly Qualified Teachers.

Survey regarding school connectedness, Facilities, academic motivation, and caring adults all include the idea of schools being clean and well maintained as a key factor to school success. These areas also were mentioned during LCAP Input Meetings by all participating groups.

On the Annual LCAP Input Survey Conducted during the 2024 School Year Parents, Community Members, and Stakeholders report:
74% Believe the building is well-maintained
64%Feel their school is safe
66% Feel a part of the school.

On the Elementary School Climate Survey, 2024, Elementary Aged students report:
73% of the school buildings are clean most or all of the time.
87% Like their school
90% report high or moderated on school connectedness.

83% high or moderate academic motivations.

On the Middle School Climate Survey, 2024, Middle School Aged students report:
61% agree or strongly agree they feel a part of the school.
73% agree or strongly agree their school is usually clean and tidy.
76% answered pretty much true or very much true that there are caring adults at school.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	Priority 1 Credentialed Teachers	87% of Teacher's are Highly Qualified for the 23-24 School Year.	95%		100% Level of Highly Qualified Teachers Districtwide	+8%
1.2	Priority 1 Satisfactory on Williams Act Annual Review of Facilities	23-24 School Year was Satisfactory	24-25 School Year was Satisfactory		Maintain Level of Satisfactory Compliance with Williams Act Facilities Reviews	Met
1.3	Priority 1 Sufficient Instructional Materials	23-24 School Year was Satisfactory	24-25 School Year was Satisfactory		Maintain Level of Satisfactory Compliance with Williams Act Facilities Reviews	Met

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.

Goal 1:

The actions under Goal 1 were largely effective in supporting the district's aim to provide clean, safe, and well-maintained facilities alongside access to highly qualified staff.

Action 1.1 (Staffing) led to a meaningful increase in credentialed teacher retention. The district improved from 87% to nearly 99% in teacher qualification, effectively reducing reliance on provisional assignments. This staffing improvement strengthens instructional quality and positively influences student outcomes across content areas.

Action 1.2 (Maintenance for Williams Act Compliance) ensured that all sites met state facilities standards for the second consecutive year. This action supports a safe and conducive learning environment, aligning with stakeholder feedback about the importance of clean, well-maintained schools. It contributes indirectly to academic performance by creating environments more supportive of student engagement.

Action 1.3 (Teacher Induction) remains a strong contributor to teacher support and long-term retention. The district's consistent partnership with BCOE ensures that all new hires receive induction support, positively impacting instructional practice and teacher efficacy.

Action 1.4 (Substitute Coverage) demonstrated improved effectiveness this year. The district was able to consistently staff PD sessions and routine absences with substitutes—something that was not possible the year prior. This improvement enabled smoother implementation of PLCs, district PD, and instructional coaching, which supports improved teaching and learning conditions.

Overall, these actions combined to maintain the district's compliance with Williams Act standards and improve the qualifications of instructional staff, key contributors to student academic success and school climate.

Action #	Action Title	Implementation Level	Rationale / Notes
1.1	Staffing – Hire and Retain Highly Qualified Staff	**5 – Full Implementation & Sustainability**	The district has increased its percentage of highly qualified teachers from **87% to approximately 97–99%**, with only one PIP (in Special Ed). This indicates full and sustained implementation. **Successes** include improved hiring practices and credential clearances. **Challenges** are aligned with statewide shortages in special education staffing.
1.2	Maintenance of Facilities for Williams Act Compliance	**5 – Full Implementation & Sustainability**	The district remains **fully compliant with Williams Act** requirements for two consecutive years. This funding supports above-code maintenance tasks like ceiling tiles, power covers, and bathroom upgrades. **Successes** include proactive repairs and added custodial hours. **Challenges** include the need for additional staffing and hours, which were met by using this funding.

1.3	Teacher Development (Induction)	**5 – Full Implementation & Sustainability**	OCESD maintains a strong partnership with BCOE for induction support. **All new teachers complete the program**, and feedback on support quality is positive. **Successes** include consistent communication with BCOE and successful completion. No challenges were reported.
1.4	Substitute Teachers	**4 – Full Implementation**	Sub coverage has improved significantly, especially during PD days supported by WestEd. **Successes** include ability to staff classrooms consistently and successful sub recruitment. **Challenges** from the prior year (inability to staff subs) have largely been resolved through proactive HR efforts and onboarding support. Still an area for ongoing recruitment, but operating as planned.

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.

Additional staffing costs were incurred to maintain intensive intervention supports (Educational Therapists, added counselor time).

Funds were reallocated from non-essential instructional materials to expand professional learning and PLC release time.

INSPECT implementation and assessment system upgrades were slightly more costly than originally forecast, but justified by the need for valid, actionable interim data.

Overall, expenditures aligned with the intent to increase and improve services for unduplicated pupils and high-need subgroups.

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

Goal Analysis Goal 1:

Action 1.1 – Hire and Retain Highly Qualified Staff

The district significantly increased its percentage of highly qualified teachers from 87% to approximately 97–99%, with only one individual on a Provisional Internship Permit (PIP) in Special Education. This indicates that the action is fully implemented and sustained. The outcome aligns with the Dashboard indicator for Priority 1 (Basic Services), demonstrating that increased recruitment efforts and improved credentialing support were highly effective. The action directly supported improved academic outcomes, with English Learner progress reaching Blue and positive trends in ELA (+3.5 points) and Math (+5.8 points).

Action 1.2 – Maintenance of Facilities for Williams Act Compliance

This action is effective and remains fully implemented and has sustained compliance with the Williams Act for two consecutive years. Funding was used for preventative maintenance and facilities upgrades (e.g., bathroom updates, ceiling repairs). The relationship between the action and improved safety conditions was reinforced by stakeholder feedback and the reduction in school safety concerns reported during engagement activities. However, the district continues to identify staffing capacity as a challenge.

Action 1.3 – Teacher Development (Induction Program)

The district's partnership with BCOE ensured that all new teachers completed their induction with strong support. No challenges were reported, and staff feedback was consistently positive. This professional development action supports long-term retention and capacity-building of fully credentialed educators, contributing to improvements in student performance, especially for English Learners and in foundational subject areas. The effectiveness of this action is reflected in improved staff satisfaction and EL progress (55% in Blue status).

Action 1.4 – Substitute Teachers

This action addressed substitute shortages that previously hindered instructional continuity. Improvements in sub coverage—particularly during professional development (PD) days supported by WestEd—enabled more consistent instruction and allowed teachers to engage in training without disrupting student learning. While still an area of active recruitment, the district considers this action effective and its success is evident in enhanced classroom coverage and instructional quality. This stability supports ongoing academic gains, particularly in Math, where the district moved to Yellow status.

Conclusion:
Each action under Goal 1 contributed meaningfully to the progress noted in student performance metrics and the LEA’s ability to meet Priority 1 and 4 requirements. The increased credentialed staffing (Action 1.1), maintained facilities (Action 1.2), effective induction (Action 1.3), and stabilized substitute coverage (Action 1.4) collectively supported academic growth and equitable access to instruction. No major revisions to these actions are proposed due to their effectiveness and sustainability.

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.

Planned Changes for Goal 1 (2025–26)
Summary:

Oroville City ESD will continue all four actions under Goal 1 with no substantive redesign, based on their successful implementation and documented effectiveness. However, the district will implement refinements to deepen impact and address emerging staffing needs.

Changes & Rationale:

Maintain high levels of credentialed staffing, with special focus on Special Education recruitment (Action 1.1).
Rationale: One persistent PIP in SpEd reflects a broader statewide challenge. Continued efforts in this area will address a persistent gap.

Sustain enhanced maintenance staffing and hours (Action 1.2).
Rationale: Continued funding will support Williams compliance and facilities rated “in good repair,” aligned with community expectations.

Continue partnership with BCOE for induction support (Action 1.3).
Rationale: Existing systems are effective, and leadership continuity with BCOE remains strong.

Expand sub recruitment pipeline (Action 1.4).
Rationale: Though sub coverage has improved. The district will build on this momentum to strengthen capacity further, especially during peak PD times.

Conclusion:
These refinements build on a strong foundation and reflect OCESD’s commitment to continuous improvement in staffing, school safety, and instructional quality—all essential to promoting student learning and well-being.

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	Staffing	The District will hire and retain a highly qualified staff through a highly competitive salary schedule, comparable to districts identified in the collective bargaining agreements. This expenditure is part of our general fund and is not being recorded in our Supplemental and Concentration Fund. This commitment is crucial as we address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, particularly focusing on the subgroups of English Learners, Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities, African American, and American Indian students in the areas of English Language Arts (ELA); English Learners, Homeless, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged, and African American students in the areas of Math; and Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic, and students identifying as Two or More Races in the area of Suspension.	$0.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.2	Maintenance of Facilities and Compliance with Williams Act	The District will hire, train, and utilize maintenance, grounds, custodial, and clerical staff as needed to ensure Williams Act Compliance on an annual basis. This is essential to ensure that we meet all requirements of the Williams Act.	$83,429.00	Yes
1.3	Teacher Development	OCESD will contract with the Butte County Office of Education to provide induction services for our teachers, ensuring and maintaining Highly Qualified Status in compliance with local and state credentialing guidelines. This Teacher Development will be used to ensure our teachers are training in the specific areas found on the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, particularly focusing on the subgroups of English Learners, Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities, African American, and American Indian students in the areas of English Language Arts (ELA); English Learners, Homeless, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged, and African American students in the areas of Math; and Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic, and students identifying as Two or More Races in the area of Suspension.	$13,800.00	Yes
1.4	Substitute Teachers	To support professional development activities and to cover routine teacher absences, the District will maintain our current daily rate, which is comparable to local districts and was raised to ensure a healthy pool of substitutes is maintained. This is particularly important as we address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California and are able to staff quality subs in our teacher's absence.	$80,500.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Improve Student Achievement: The achievement gap will be lessened as student achievement increases among all students, including Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities, White, African American, Asian, American Indian, Two or More Races, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged, and English Learner students; in the areas of Math and ELA.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

22-23 California Dashboard results for OCESD were below expected outcomes and demonstrated Red Indicators on the California Dashboard for 14 Different Subgroups for ELA and Math:
ELA: English Learners, Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities, African American, American Indian, Hispanic, Two or More Races and White Students.
MATH: English Learners, Homeless, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, African America, Hispanic and Two or More Races.
We also discovered that our IReady Data is not correlating to our State Test Scores and we have decided to implement the use of INSPECT Benchmarks for our local assessment data, PLC Focus and Intervention Planning.
Our Dashboard Results demonstrated a stagnate and slight lowering of scores from the year before and required us to review local assessments that are currently in use as our guide for student intervention, test prep and academic deficiency support.
A majority of Goal #2 from the previous LCAP included mandated program maintenance and we will update this goal to include our red indicator dashboard subgroups, as well as updating our local assessment strategy (including PLC Model with INSPECT Benchmarks).

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	Priority 4 SBAC Scores Math	Math CAASPP Spring 2023 Met or Exceeded Standards 17% All Students 14% EL students 6% SWD 13% SED 2% Black 6% Am Indian 17% Asian 16% Hispanic 17% Two + Races 19% White	Math CAASPP Spring 2024 Met or Exceeded Standards 19.% All Students 16% EL students 9% SWD 17% SED 11% Black 5% Am Indian 28% Asian 19% Hispanic 19% Two + Races 19% White		CA State Math Proficiency Levels for 22-23 Met or Exceeded Standards 35% All Students 10% EL students 12% SWD 23% SED 17% Black 22% Am Indian 17% Asian 23% Hispanic 49% Two + Races 49% White	Math CAASPP Spring 2024 Met or Exceeded Standards 19% Increase of 2% overall. All Students 16% Increase of 2% overall EL students 9% SWD Increase of 3% overall 17% SED Increase of 4% overall 11% Black ncrease of 8% overall 5% Am Indian Decrease of 1% overall 28% Asian Increase of 9% overall 19% Hispanic Increase of 3% overall 19% Two + Races Increase of 2% overall 19% White Static Growth 19% White

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.2	Priority 4 SBAC ELA Scores	ELA SBAC Spring 2023 Met or Exceeded Standards 21% All Students 19% EL students 6% SWD 17% SED 10% African Am. 10% Native Indian 22% Asian 19% Hispanic 19% Two +Races 23% White	ELA SBAC Spring 2024 Met or Exceeded Standards 22% All Students 12% EL students 7% SWD 19% SED 17% African Am. 13% Native Indian 31% Asian 19% Hispanic 23% Two +Races 23% White		CA State ELA Proficiency for 22-23 Met or Exceeded Standards 47% All Students 31% EL students 16% SWD 35% SED 30% Black 34% Am Indian 75% Asian 36% Hispanic 60% Two + Races 61% White	ELA SBAC Spring 2024 Met or Exceeded Standards 22% All Students Increase of 1% overall 12% EL students Decrease of 7% overall 7% SWD Increase of 1% overall 19% SED Increase of 2% overall 17% African Am. Increase of 7% overall 13% Native Indian Increase of 3% overall 31% Asian 19% Hispanic Increase of 9% overall 23% Two +Races Increase of 4% overall 23% White Static Growth
2.3	Priority 8 Local Academic Benchmark	OCESD will begin INSPECT Benchmark Testing Schedule 3	District has shown a 10% increase from Benchmark 1		Desired Outcome for 2026–27: At least 15%	District has shown a 10% increase from Benchmark 1

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Metric: Percent increase in students meeting proficiency on INSPECT Benchmark – ELA/MATH Desired Outcome for 2026–27: At least 15% benchmark-to-benchmark growth annually	times a year (Previous to CAASPP Testing Window) District will evaluate Benchmark Data and design 3 Targeted Intervention Sessions that will prepare our students for state testing. 24-25	to Benchmark 2 in overall ELA Percentage. District has demonstrated a 12% increase in Math Percentage from Benchmark 1 to Benchmark 2 in overall Math Percentage.		benchmark-to-benchmark growth in overall percentage annually for ELA and MATH INSPECT Benchmarks.	to Benchmark 2 in overall ELA Percentage. District has demonstrated a 12% increase in Math Percentage from Benchmark 1 to Benchmark 2 in overall Math Percentage. This creates a 5% lower than Metric Goal for ELA and a 3% Less than Metric Goal for Math.
2.4	Priority 2: Progress in implementing academic standards	Implementation Survey 2024 English Language Arts 10% Explore and Research 6% Beginning Development 35% Initial Implementation 58% Full Implementation English Language Development 12% Explore and Research 4% Beginning Development	Implementation Survey 2024 English Language Arts 3% Explore and Research 2% Beginning Development 40% Initial Implementation 55% Full Implementation English Language Development 15% Explore and Research		Target Results for Survey: English Language Arts 0% Explore and Research 0% Beginning Development 25% Initial Implementation 75% Full Implementation English Language Development 0% Explore and Research	English Language Arts Explore and Research decreased by 1 percentage point (from 10% to 9%) Beginning Development decreased by 6 percentage points (from 6% to 0%) Initial Implementation increased by 5 percentage points (from 35% to 40%)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		27% Initial Implementation 57% Full Implementation Math 8% Explore and Research 15% Beginning Development 31% Initial Implementation 46% Full Implementation History 18% Explore and Research 12% Beginning Development 28% Initial Implementation 42% Full Implementation Science 27% Explore and Research 20% Beginning Development 23% Initial Implementation 30% Full Implementation	03% Beginning Development 285% Initial Implementation 55% Full Implementation Math 10% Explore and Research 18% Beginning Development 31% Initial Implementation 48% Full Implementation History 15% Explore and Research 12% Beginning Development 25% Initial Implementation 44% Full Implementation Science 25% Explore and Research 21% Beginning Development 22% Initial Implementation 32% Full Implementation		0% Beginning Development 25% Initial Implementation 75% Full Implementation Math 0% Explore and Research 0% Beginning Development 25% Initial Implementation 75% Full Implementation History 0% Explore and Research 0% Beginning Development 25% Initial Implementation 75% Full Implementation Science 0% Explore and Research 0% Beginning Development 25% Initial Implementation 75% Full Implementation	Full Implementation decreased by 3 percentage points (from 58% to 55%) English Language Development Explore and Research increased by 3 percentage points (from 12% to 15%) Beginning Development decreased by 1 percentage point (from 4% to 3%) Initial Implementation decreased by 2 percentage points (from 27% to 25%) Full Implementation decreased by 2 percentage points (from 57% to 55%) Math

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						Explore and Research increased by 2 percentage points (from 8% to 10%) Beginning Development increased by 3 percentage points (from 15% to 18%) Initial Implementation remained steady at 31% Full Implementation increased by 2 percentage points (from 46% to 48%) History Explore and Research decreased by 3 percentage points (from 18% to 15%) Beginning Development remained steady at 12%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						Initial Implementation decreased by 3 percentage points (from 28% to 25%) Full Implementation increased by 2 percentage points (from 42% to 44%) Science Explore and Research decreased by 2 percentage points (from 27% to 25%) Beginning Development increased by 1 percentage point (from 20% to 21%) Initial Implementation decreased by 1 percentage point (from 23% to 22%) Full Implementation increased by 2

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						percentage points (from 30% to 32%) With the influx of new teacher's this year; we increased our initial levels, but decreased our Full Implementation; due to an influx of new teachers in key areas. We look at this goal growing next year with the addition of new/continued PD.
2.5	Priority 4: Reclassification Rates	19% of EL Students were Reclassified in 22-23	17% of EL Students were Reclassified in 23-24		30% of EL Students will be Classified.	2022–23 school year to 17% in the 2023–24 school year, reflecting a 2 percentage point decline. While we maintained a healthy level of Reclassification of 17%; we have not met our goal of 30%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.6	Priority 4: ELPAC Proficiency Rates	21% of EL Learners increased a level in 22-23	33% of EL Learners increased a level in 23-24		40% or more EL Learners will increase a level of EL Status.	We grew significantly in the areas of EL moving one level this year with an increase of 12% but 7% shore of our goal of 40%.
2.7	Priority 7: Broad Course of Study	All students, including unduplicated pupils and individuals with IEP's in grades 6-8 have equal access to English/language arts, mathematics, science, social science, visual and performing arts, and physical education, as demonstrated by the master schedule and Service Log's for students with IEP Services.	All students, including unduplicated pupils and individuals with IEP's in grades 6-8 have equal access to English/language arts, mathematics, science, social science, visual and performing arts, and physical education, as demonstrated by the master schedule and Service Log's for students with IEP Services.		District will maintain and support all students, including unduplicated pupils and individuals with Special Needs in grades 6-8 have equal access to English/language arts, mathematics, science, social science, visual and performing arts, and physical education, as demonstrated by the master schedule and Service Log's for students with IEP Services.	We have continued with this goal and commit to providing the required Instructional Minutes as per ED. Code, and CDE Requirements.
2.8	Priority 5: Middle School Drop-out Rates	The middle school dropout rate was 0% in 2022-23	The middle school dropout rate was 0% in 2023-24		The Middle School Dropout Rate will remain at 0%.	We have met our goal of maintaining a 0% drop out rate.

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.

Full compliance with Instructional Materials Sufficiency standards (Williams Act).

Continued investment in certificated teacher hiring and retention to maintain appropriate credentialing levels.

Regular site inspections to ensure facilities were maintained in "good repair."

Program offerings across sites were reviewed and updated to ensure access to ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, Visual/Performing Arts, and PE for all students, including unduplicated pupils and students with exceptional needs.

There were no substantive deviations from the planned actions, and the district fully implemented the intended activities.

Action #	Action Title	Implementation Level	Rationale / Notes
2.1	Classroom Supply Budget	**5 – Full Implementation & Sustainability**	All general education teachers received their **$500 classroom supply funds**, confirmed by districtwide email. **Successes**: Teachers appreciate the support. **Challenges**: None reported.
2.2	Professional Development, PLCs, Assessment & Instructional Systems	**4 – Full Implementation**	Protected PLC time was implemented under MOU with OETA. Teachers collaborated on rigorous DOK-level questions and narrowed focus on priority standards. **Successes**: Strong PLC systems, initial InSpec implementation, paraprofessional and new teacher PD, BIP/BSP training. **Challenges**: Overwhelming InSpec assessments, a lapse in Renaissance support, and cultural resistance to I-Ready phase-out delayed some deliverables.
2.3	Strategy Development for Students with Disabilities	**3 – Initial Implementation** *(Improving)*	Staff received SELPA/BIP training, and push-in services were expanded. **Successes**: Mental health and SPED teams trained; increased inclusion practices. **Challenges**: Funding was minimal until now; limited county SPED support. District is reallocating funds to hire more aides.
2.5	Support Services (Instructional Aides, Library Clerks, UPK Aides)	**5 – Full Implementation & Sustainability**	Instructional aides, especially in TK/K, were fully staffed. Library clerks maintained operations despite some turnover. **Successes**: Vital early literacy and classroom support roles. **Challenges**: Typical HR transitions handled effectively.

Action #	Action Title	Implementation Level	Rationale / Notes
2.6	Technology Programs and Library Resources	**5 – Full Implementation & Sustainability**	District maintained full Chromebook access and supported GoGuardian for student monitoring. **Successes**: No reported gaps in access. GoGuardian supports student safety. **Challenges**: None reported.
2.7	Bilingual Aides / Translation Support	**5 – Full Implementation & Sustainability**	Spanish and Hmong liaisons supported LPAC, parent meetings, and translation. **Successes**: High parent satisfaction, strong reclassification support. **Challenges**: Staff promotion requires backfill but continuity is planned.
2.8	Literacy Coaches and Intervention Teachers	**5 – Full Implementation**	Reading coaches and intervention teachers provided direct services and collaborated with teachers. **Successes**: Targeted literacy support, strong reporting systems. **Challenges**: Funding (LREBG) is sunsetting; sustainability is a concern.
2.9	Broad Course of Study – Band Program	**5 – Full Implementation & Sustainability**	Band program continued with new teacher hire. **Successes**: Program is popular and seen as a reason families stay in the district. **Challenges**: None reported.
2.10	Use of Local & State Data (Illuminate, InSpec, I-Ready)	**4 – Full Implementation**	Systems in place for benchmark use and review. **Successes**: Effective use of data to guide instruction. **Challenges**: Transitioning away from I-Ready required cultural shift.
2.11	Foster Youth and Homeless Tutoring	**4 – Full Implementation**	Tutoring support offered four days per week; tracked monthly by staff. **Successes**: Services available; tracked by dedicated staff. **Challenges**: Limited teacher participation; program underutilized.
2.12	Homework Help / ELOP Tutoring	**5 – Full Implementation**	Districtwide tutoring provided via ELOP. Foster/homeless youth supported with access assistance (e.g., bus cards). **Successes**: Comprehensive access model. **Challenges**: None reported.
2.13	Supplemental Instructional Materials	**5 – Full Implementation**	Discretionary funds used to support PLC-based instructional needs. **Successes**: Responsive resource for site-level innovation. **Challenges**: None reported.
2.14	Science Curriculum Adoption	**3 – Initial Implementation**	Selection process is in pilot stage with meetings held. **Successes**: Two programs shortlisted. **Challenges**: Timeline delays; process is ongoing.
2.15	Class Size Reduction (TK–3)	**5 – Full Implementation & Sustainability**	24:1 ratio maintained successfully. **Successes**: Stable implementation. **Challenges**: None reported.
2.16	Math & MTSS Intervention Aides	**4 – Full Implementation**	Math instructional aides supported elementary and middle school interventions. **Successes**: Strong integration with intervention teachers. **Challenges**: One position may be lost; funding source needs confirmation.

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.

No major material differences were identified for Goal 2.

Minor cost fluctuations occurred in maintenance and operations budgets, due to inflationary pressure on facilities repairs and replacement parts.

Staffing costs stayed close to original projections.

The overall intent to maintain or improve services was achieved without significant budget deviation.

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

The district implemented a comprehensive set of 16 actions under Goal 2, aimed at improving student outcomes through a broad course of study, targeted intervention supports, and data-informed instructional practices. Based on local and state data, stakeholder input, and implementation observations, these actions were largely effective—though a few areas demonstrated partial or limited effectiveness and will be adjusted accordingly in 2025–26.
Effectiveness ratings by cluster:

ELA and Literacy Supports (Actions 2.1, 2.2, 2.8):
Rating: Somewhat Effective

Classroom resources, PD, PLC time, and literacy coaching were implemented as planned.

CAASPP ELA scores improved modestly across several student groups, and benchmark assessments (InSpec) showed growth in early literacy.

Literacy coaches provided targeted intervention and data support across elementary sites.

Mathematics Instruction and Intervention (Actions 2.10, 2.12, 2.16):
Rating: Partially Effective

Math intervention aides were in place, and PLCs used benchmark data to inform instruction.

However, CAASPP math scores remain below state average for key subgroups, and the transition away from i-Ready impacted alignment.

MTSS implementation varied in quality by site, limiting the reach of interventions.

Broad Course of Study and Enrichment (Actions 2.9, 2.15):
Rating: Effective

A full course of study, including enrichment opportunities like the middle school band program, was sustained.

TK–3 class sizes remained at 24:1, supporting instructional quality and student engagement.

Band enrollment contributed to student retention in the district.

Technology and Assessment Infrastructure (Actions 2.6, 2.10):
Rating: Effective

All students had access to Chromebooks, and assessment systems were functional across grade levels.

Tools like GoGuardian enhanced student safety and digital learning accountability.

Benchmark and diagnostic data were increasingly used in PLCs.

Support for Multilingual Learners and Families (Action 2.7):
Rating: Effective

Hmong and Spanish liaisons provided strong LPAC and reclassification support, and participated in meetings and translation.

Family engagement improved and no parent complaints have been reported in the past three years.

Support for Students with Disabilities (Action 2.3):
Rating: Mixed Effectiveness

The district provided training on behavior intervention plans (BIPs) and inclusive practices.

Push-in models were supported where possible.

However, CAASPP outcomes for SWD remain a concern. New investments in specialized aides will support future improvement.

Support for Foster Youth and Homeless Students (Actions 2.11, 2.12):
Rating: Limited Effectiveness

Academic supports were offered, including after-school tutoring and access-related assistance (gas/bus cards).

However, low staff participation (only $5,000 spent out of allocated funds) limited the program's reach.

Liaisons tracked progress monthly, but direct academic impacts were minimal.

Curriculum Materials and Adoption Planning (Actions 2.13, 2.14):
Rating: Effective (Infrastructure/Supportive)

Supplemental instructional materials were provided as needed through PLC requests.

The science curriculum adoption process progressed with identified pilots planned for 2024–25. These actions support future academic improvements, even if they didn't impact current metrics.

Summary:

The actions under Goal 2 were largely effective in building systems to support literacy, instructional quality, and access to services. Specific areas like ELA, PLC structures, technology access, and multilingual support showed clear evidence of success or making progress. Other areas—including math achievement, foster/homeless supports, and outcomes for SWD—were partially or less effective and will be addressed through targeted improvements in the next LCAP cycle.

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.

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement and Close Gaps

Description of Changes

The district will maintain the overarching structure of Goal 2, continuing all 16 actions. However, several key changes to program implementation and resource allocation will be made in 2025–26 to improve impact and ensure alignment with student needs. These changes emerged in response to observed challenges, stakeholder feedback, and implementation reflection.

Action 2.3 (Support for Students with Disabilities):

Change: District will significantly expand funding and support for students with disabilities by hiring 4 special circumstance aides to provide more individualized instructional and behavioral support in inclusive settings.

Rationale: County-level support has decreased, and district-placed aides are now critical to ensuring appropriate services in the least restrictive environment.

Implication: The change reflects an intentional investment in student equity and will likely improve SWD CAASPP performance over time.

Action 2.8 (Literacy Coaches and Intervention Teachers):

Change: While implementation will continue, the district acknowledged that this action is at risk due to the sunsetting of LREBG funding. Staff emphasized the program's importance but noted it may be reduced if budget constraints intensify.

Rationale: This program was described as "the first to be cut" in a financial downturn, despite being "vital."

Implication: The district may need to shift this action to LCFF or other grant sources to preserve the intervention structure.

Action 2.14 (Science Curriculum Adoption):

Change: The adoption process, which stalled previously due to instructional platform shifts, will move forward next year with two pilot programs identified and scheduled for implementation.

Rationale: Leadership named this as a top curriculum priority.

Implication: This will likely result in new curriculum adoption and associated PD in the following year; potential changes to metrics may follow.

Action 2.10 (Assessment Systems):

Change: The district is moving away from I-Ready and consolidating benchmark assessments under INSPECT and Illuminate.

Rationale: Staff expressed frustration with I-Ready's lack of alignment and advocated for a shift to standards-based benchmarks created by the district.

Implication: This will improve assessment consistency and support PLC use of data. Metrics may shift to more local benchmark tracking rather than i-Ready data.

Action 2.11 (Foster and Homeless Tutoring):

Change: No structural changes were proposed, but the district acknowledged that tutoring participation is low and additional recruitment efforts may be needed.

Rationale: Only $5,000 of available funds were used due to limited teacher interest.

Implication: A program redesign may be necessary if participation doesn't improve; no metric changes were proposed yet, but implementation strategy is under review.

Changes to Metrics:

Benchmark Metrics (Actions 2.2 and 2.10):

Transitioning from I-Ready to INSPECT and Illuminate assessments may necessitate a revision in local benchmark metrics used in the LCAP. The district is prioritizing standards-aligned, DOK 2–3 questions in more focused benchmark tests.

Science Assessment Metrics (Action 2.14):

As the science adoption pilot proceeds, the district may incorporate new curriculum-based formative or summative assessments once implementation begins.

Conclusion:

The district is refining multiple actions under Goal 2 to strengthen outcomes in math, support services for SWD, and data-driven instruction. These refinements represent a shift from system-building to deeper instructional practice, assessment alignment, and increased individualized support. The changes reflect OCESD's commitment to continuous improvement, fiscal responsibility, and equity for all student groups.

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	Classroom Supply Budget: Each regular education classroom will be assigned a $500 budget.	Teachers will be provided a budget to ensure access to supplemental curriculum resources not provided at the sites. While the District will maintain this support, there is currently no accurate measure of effectiveness; however, this initiative is vital for maintaining teacher morale in ensuring we are providing the best materials possible to serve all of our students in OCESD.	$44,275.00	No
2.2	Professional Development:	A. The District will provide certificated, classified, and administrative staff with professional. development to continually update their skills, and learn best practices related to improving student learning and academic achievement. B. School Site PLC Meetings will take place 2 times per month, on Minimum Day Wednesday's upon the MOU with OETA of District Directed Activity Days. These meetings will be used to analyze Benchmark Data, to share best practices, analyze other student data, explore new mindsets for raising student achievement; supporting struggling learners with targeted interventions and specific discussions/planning in the subgroups of English Learners, Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities, African America Hispanic Two Or More Races, Asian in the areas of MATH and ELA. C. Threshold Support for PD with DIBELS and Leadership Coaching. D. Provide for new teachers Math, ELA, Science to support standards and curriculum implementation during New Teacher Orientation Week. E. Provide on-going site/district training on PLC Revitalization, PLC Implementation, PLC Procedures/Norms, PLC Expectations, and PLC	$2,978,591.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Continuous Improvement with Partner WESTEd and the Curriculum and Instruction Department. . F. Provide Restorative Practice training including Circles for new teacher's and provide support for any needed situations with District Support Provider from LEAP. G. The use of educational technology to improve pupil performance--Illuminate Data Review Program and INSPECT Benchmarks. H. Training for paraprofessionals to maximize their effectiveness working with at-risk and students with special needs with an emphasis on de-escalation strategies and campus supervision. I. The District will provide professional development based on curriculum programs such as Illuminate and INSPECT Benchmark Refinement for each grade-level. J. Provide annual training and support with Child Find, accommodations, modifications, 504 and manifestation determination, positive behavior intervention plan and implementation, and specialized instruction. K. Update, Districtwide Report Cards for Grades K-5		
2.3	Strategy Development for SWD:	To address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, in the subgroups of Students with Disabilities focusing on the areas of ELA Math, Chronic Absenteeism, and Suspension Districtwide and at Ishi Hills Middle School, The Studios at Central, Ophir Elementary and Wyandotte Academy; the District will implement the following strategies: A. Ensure that Students with Disabilities (SWD) are supported in the general education classroom to the greatest extent possible. B. Develop a culture that prioritizes supporting students in the least restrictive environment.	$240,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		C. Provide specialized instruction and reasonable accommodations to meet diverse student needs. D. Increase the staff-to-student ratio to enhance individualized support. E. Provide positive behavior intervention support and develop Behavior Intervention Plans (BIP) as needed. These actions are particularly focused on improving outcomes for subgroups identified in the Red Dashboard Indicators, including SWD and SWD Students with any other Subgroup as well.		
2.4	Strategies for Improvement:	To address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, in the subgroups of Students with Disabilities focusing on the areas of ELA Math, Chronic Absenteeism, and Suspension Districtwide and at Ishi Hills Middle School, The Studios at Central, Ophir Elementary and Wyandotte Academy; the District will implement the following strategies: To address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, the District will implement the following strategies: A. Provide training materials, resources, and artifacts to support effective instruction. B. Develop and distribute a professional learning calendar and pacing guide in math and reading. C. Ensure that Students with Disabilities (SWD) are mainstreamed for the appropriate amount of time, in alignment with best practices.	$58,272.00	Yes
2.5	Support Services:	The District will provide instructional aides, library clerks, and instructional resources, including UPK (Universal Pre-Kindergarten) aides, to enhance educational support. These resources are crucial as we address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, particularly focusing on subgroups such as English Learners, Foster Youth, Students with	$488,799.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Disabilities, African American, and American Indian students in the areas of English Language Arts (ELA); English Learners, Homeless, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged, and African American students in the areas of Math; and Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic, and students identifying as Two or More Races in the area of Suspension.		
2.6	Technology Program:	This action aligns the district's technology and library resource initiatives with the state's performance indicators for these subgroups. These actions are critical as the District addresses the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, particularly focusing on the subgroups districtwide. A. To fully support the rigor of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), the District will maintain site technology facilitators and a technology support person based on identified district-wide needs. B. The District will continue to update technology and maintain a replacement program to sustain the 1:1 Chromebook initiative. C. The District will continue to update school library resources to support 21st Century skills, including ongoing support for Destiny (the library management system), providing technology for research purposes, and updating book collections. D. The District will continue to provide Go Guardian, a software application that helps teachers monitor and manage student devices. E. The District will hire summer help to scrub and prepare Chromebooks for redistribution in the fall.	$650,245.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.7	Multilingual Program:	The District will support English Learners (ELs) to reduce the achievement gap by implementing the following strategies: A. The District will review and provide bilingual aides at sites where needed to support EL students in the core academic program. B. Support will be provided to Bilingual Hmong (8 hours) and Spanish-speaking parent liaisons (7 hours), with both positions also supporting parents of students in 504 plans and Special Education (SPED). C. The District will continue to expand its relationship with the African American Family and Cultural Center, Hmong Cultural Center, and Mooretown Rancheria to provide opportunities for African American, Hmong, and American Indian students to improve their performance in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math. D. The District will provide professional development and instructional support for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs). E. Implement a new "designated" and "newcomer" English Language Development (ELD) curriculum for Grades 7 and 8. F. Strengthen the designated ELD instructional program by establishing clearly articulated language goals and providing professional development. These initiatives are crucial as the District addresses the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on improving outcomes for subgroups including English Learners, Districtwide, at the Studios at Central and at Wyandotte Academy.	$89,898.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.8	Additional Instructional Support:	The District will support literacy development and intervention by: A. Providing a literacy/reading coach for each of the elementary schools and an intervention teacher for each middle school. LREBG Funds will be used to fund this action with our Literacy and Reading Coaches utilizing the practice of Evidence-Based Learning Supports: Implementing, expanding, or enhancing tutoring, one-on-one or small group instruction, and other programs designed to accelerate academic proficiency. These actions are designed to address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, particularly focusing on improving outcomes for subgroups including English Learners, Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities, African American, and American Indian students in English Language Arts (ELA). Based on these Needs Assessment in regards to the California Dashboard and Red/Orange Indicators, there is a clear need for Early Literacy Support. DIBELS will be used to monitor the student growth and effectiveness of this action. The most quoted research by Linda Darling-Hammond supporting literacy coaches is her 2017 report, Effective Teacher Professional Development, which provides robust evidence that literacy coaching is a high-impact, research-based strategy for improving both teaching and student literacy outcomes. This work, along with her other foundational publications, is frequently cited in the field to justify and design effective literacy coaching programs.	$1,073,391.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.9	Implement a broad course of study	The District will support the Grades 6–8 band program by providing a dedicated teacher and purchasing necessary band equipment and materials to ensure equitable access to a broad course of study, as outlined in California's State Priority 7 – Course Access (California Education Code § 51210 and § 51220). Research consistently shows that music education enhances student engagement, attendance, and academic achievement, particularly among underrepresented student populations (Arts Education Partnership, 2019). This investment also aligns with the goals of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) to improve services for unduplicated students—English learners, low-income students, and foster youth—by increasing opportunities for enrichment and connectedness to school. A well-supported music program provides a vital outlet for creativity and self-expression and has been shown to increase motivation and a sense of belonging (NAMM Foundation, 2018). Additionally, this action leverages potential funding from Proposition 28 (The Arts and Music in Schools – Funding Guarantee and Accountability Act), which provides dedicated resources to expand access to arts education in California's public schools. By funding a qualified music teacher and providing instruments and materials, the District ensures that all middle school students, regardless of background, have access to high-quality music instruction that supports both academic and social-emotional development.	$123,956.00	Yes
2.10	Assessments	The District will enhance student learning through effective management and use of state and local pupil data by: A. Utilizing state and local pupil data tools such as i-Ready, INSPECT Benchmarks, and Illuminate to improve student learning.	$57,500.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		B. Continuing to provide a student data analysis software program (Illuminate) for academics. Teachers will receive ongoing training in how to use the system and implement the INSPECT Benchmark assessments. C. Developing a coherent system of report cards in which data from assessments will be integrated to provide a comprehensive view of student progress. D. Developing, administering, and analyzing math and ELA INSPECT Benchmark assessments districtwide for the three testing windows according to the Assessment Calendar. These initiatives are aligned with our efforts to address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on improving outcomes for subgroups including English Learners, Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities, African American, and American Indian students in English Language Arts (ELA)/Math)		
2.11	Foster Youth and Homeless	A. Review monthly the academic needs of all homeless and foster youth. B. Provide additional after school support in math, ELA, and study skills as determined by the monthly meetings. C. Monthly counselor check-in to assess if needs or supports are appropriate. D. Reading teachers check-in for academic support.	$5,000.00	No
2.12	Homework Support:	The District will provide tutoring assistance to support student achievement by: A. Offering tutoring assistance to students both virtually and in person.	$96,541.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		B. Providing additional tutoring support after school, funded by the ELOP Grant. These efforts are crucial as we work to address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on improving outcomes in ELA in the Subgroups of All Students, African America, American Indian, EL, Foster Youth, Hispanic SED, SWD, Two or More Races and White; in Math including the Subgroups of African America, American Indian, EL, Foster Youth, Hispanic SED, SWD, Two or More Races and White;		
2.13	Supplemental Materials	The District will provide supplemental materials in English Language Arts (ELA)/English Language Development (ELD), Science, and History-Social Science (HSS) to support the Literacy Standards. These efforts are crucial as we work to address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on improving outcomes in ELA in the Subgroups of All Students, African America, American Indian, EL, Foster Youth, Hispanic SED, SWD, Two or More Races and White; in Math including the Subgroups of African America, American Indian, EL, Foster Youth, Hispanic SED, SWD, Two or More Races and White;	$6,000.00	No
2.14	Science Adoption	The District will identify and purchase a new science program for grades K-5. This initiative supports our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, That my result from the inclusion of the Science Content on the California Dashboard, in reference to all students.	$80,000.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.15	Reduce Class Size	The District will hire teachers to maintain a student-to-teacher ratio of 24:1 in grades TK-3. This effort supports our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators; while preparing our TK-3rd Grades to be prepared to test in 3rd grade and to demonstrate proficiency.	$143,364.00	Yes
2.16	Math MTSS	A. The District will provide instructional aides at each site to support Math Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) at the elementary level, and one instructional aide to support the intervention teacher at each middle school. This support will be funded by the General Fund. B. The District will implement a districtwide math INSPECT Data Review for Standards Mastery, 3 times per year; as Districtwide Grade Level PLC Teams and utilize this data for Intervention Planning. These initiatives are aligned with our efforts to address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on improving outcomes in the area of Math for the following subgroups African America, All Students, English Learners, Hispanic Homeless, and Two or more Races.	$146,880.00	No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	Ishi Hills Middle School will utilize assigned additional funds to address specific subgroups and areas of concern, aiming to demonstrate a 5% annual growth in Math CAASPP Overall Scores for three consecutive school years (2024-2025, 2025-2026, and 2026-2027), specifically targeting Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races subgroups, measured by a 5% increase in Proficiency in Math and Language Arts, a 5% reduction in Suspensions, and achieving a minimum "Yellow" Dashboard Indicator for academics and suspensions starting from the 2024-2025 school year, ensuring equitable progress and improved outcomes for all students.	Equity Multiplier Focus Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Ishi Hills Middle School as Equity Multiplier schools based on their non-stability rates above 25% and socioeconomically disadvantaged rates above 70%.
This goal focuses on improving outcomes for Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races subgroups in the areas of:

ELA proficiency (Target: 5% growth annually)

Math proficiency (Target: 5% growth annually)

Suspension rates (Target: 5% annual decrease)
Actions include: adding a Student Support Specialist at Ishi Hills, expanding restorative practices, intensive Tier II/III PBIS interventions, VITAL PLCs, INSPECT data usage, and small group instruction supports.
These services are designed based on evidence-based practices directly correlated with addressing chronic low academic performance and high discipline rates among identified subgroups.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Priority 4: Pupil Achievement Raising Student Achievement on CAASPP Yearly Assessment in specifically identified DA Subgroups for Ishi Hills Middle School	22-23 Ishi Hills CAASPP Math Results, as per Data Quest: Homeless: 16% Hispanic: 13% Two or More Races: 16% 22-23 Ishi Hills ELA Results, As Per Data Quest: Homeless: 25% Hispanic: 16% Two or More Races: 27%			Ishi Hills CAASPP Math Results in 27-28: Homeless: 65% Hispanic: 65% Two or More Races: 65% Ishi Hills CAASPP ELA Results in 27-28: Homeless: 65% Hispanic: 65% Two or More Races: 65%	
3.2	Priority 4: Directly Addressing Suspension Rates to result in Alternatives to Suspension, Early Intervention and lowered Suspension Rates for Targeted Subgroups of DA Identification	23-24 Suspension Rates as of 5/14/24, as per AERIES Analytics: Homeless: 40% Hispanic: 19% Two or More Races: 26.1%			27-28 Goal of Suspension Rates: Homeless: = or <15% Hispanic: = or < 12% Two or More Races: = or < 12%	
3.3	Priority 5: Pupil Engagement increasing the attendance rates of targeted Differentiated Assistance Groups in goal of lowering Chronic Absence Rate to improve more time for SEL and Academic Support.	Chronic Attendance as of 5/14/2024, as per AERIES Analytics: Homeless: 44% Hispanic: 35% Two or More Races: 34%			Chronic Attendance Goal for 27-28 School Year: Homeless: 10% Hispanic: 10% Two or More Races: 10%	

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.

"During the 2024–25 school year, Ishi Hills Middle School was previously identified as eligible for Equity Multiplier funding. Based on updated data and eligibility criteria for the 2025–26 school year, Ishi Hills Middle School is no longer eligible for Equity Multiplier funding.

The Studios at Central Middle School remains eligible and will continue to receive targeted support and additional staffing through Equity Multiplier resources.

OCESD will continue to provide sustained intervention support for Ishi Hills through base LCAP funding and site-based improvement planning to ensure continuity of services for historically underserved 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.

Additional staffing (Therapists, Counselors) slightly increased actual costs above initial projections.

More funds were redirected toward training in restorative practices and behavioral data systems (e.g., PBIS tracking) than initially budgeted.

Investments remained aligned to the increased and improved services for unduplicated pupils and targeted student groups.

Overall, expenditures supported expanded behavioral and social-emotional supports beyond initial plans.

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

Goal 3 actions were partially effective:

Positive trends in student connectedness were observed through local survey data and restorative circles implementation rates.

However, chronic absenteeism remained at 39.5%, and suspension rates rose to 12.6%, placing both metrics in Red on the 2024 Dashboard.

Targeted subgroups (Foster Youth, Homeless, SWD, African American students) continued to have disproportionate rates of absenteeism and suspensions.

Behavioral supports improved, but challenges related to mental health, trauma, and family engagement require intensified focus in future cycles.

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.

For the 2025–26 school year, Ishi Hills Middle School no longer qualifies for Equity Multiplier funding based on updated California indicators. While the school is no longer required to include a standalone Equity Multiplier Focus Goal in the LCAP, the District remains committed to sustaining and refining key support systems previously initiated under that funding stream.

As a result, relevant actions and strategies will now be embedded in the Ishi Hills School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) to ensure continuity and school-level accountability. These include:

Expanding Tier 1 supports through the implementation of a new Classroom Behavior Toolkit, which will be distributed to all teachers to promote proactive classroom management and positive behavior norms.

Launching Attendance Improvement Teams at the site level to provide early identification of at-risk students and coordinate family outreach strategies to improve daily attendance.

Continuing restorative practices training, with a focused emphasis on re-entry support following suspensions and consistent use of restorative routines in daily classroom interactions.

Formally integrating community partnerships—such as mental health providers—into Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention systems to better serve students with more intensive needs.

While Ishi Hills is no longer included under the Equity Multiplier designation, the goal structure and commitment to equity remain intact, with a shift toward deeper, site-led implementation through SPSA planning. This ensures that prevention and early intervention systems continue to support student well-being, academic readiness, and school connectedness.

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	Targeted Math Intervention	For the next three school years (24-25, 25-26, and 26-27) Ishi Hills Middle School will demonstrate a 5% growth (each year) in the Content Area of Math as demonstrated by the CAASPP Overall Score in all subgroups but specifically in the subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic and Two or More Races.	$0.00	No
3.2	Targeted ELA Intervention	For the next three school years (24-25, 25-26, and 26-27) Ishi Hills Middle School will demonstrate a 5% growth (each year) in the Content Area of ELA as demonstrated by the CAASPP Overall Score in all subgroups but specifically in the subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic and Two or More Races.	$0.00	No
3.3	Staff Training on Homeless Population Best Support Practices for Teacher's and Support Staff	Ishi Hills will demonstrate a reduction of 5% for the area of suspension, focusing on all students but specifically focused on our Homeless Youth Subgroup.	$0.00	No
3.4	Site Team Building and Expectation Setting in Response to Differentiated Assistance Requirements	By the End of the 24-25, 25-26, and 26-27 School Years, Ishi Hills Middle School will demonstrate nothing lower than a "Yellow Dashboard Indicator" for all subgroups, but will specifically target the subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic, and Two Or More Races in the areas of Suspensions, Math and ELA; as demonstrated by the California Dashboard of Student Achievement. .	$0.00	No
3.5	PBIS Tier 1 Positive Environment	Ishi Hills Middle School will hire a Motivational Speaker to offer a Minimum of 2 Assemblies that demonstrate the importance of School Attendance,	$0.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
	Improvement Student Training	Non Suspension Behavior and Academic Achievement to demonstrate the positive effects that education can have for all of our students, but specifically focused on the subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic and Two or More Areas in the areas of Suspension, ELA and Math as measured by a lowering of 5% or more of Discipline Incidents as measured by SWIS for our Hispanic, Homeless and Two Or More Races Subgroups, for the next 3 academic, school years (24-25, 25-26, and 26-27).		
3.6	Create a Student Support Specialist Position to Support Students in Tier 1 PBIS Support as needed.	Ishi Hills Middle School will will hire a "Temporary" Certificated Teacher to act as a Student Support Specialist for the 24/25 School Year, that will support all students at Ishi Hills Middle School, but will focus specifically on the subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic, Two or More Races in the areas of Suspensions, ELA and Math; as measured by the demonstration of nothing lower than a yellow Dashboard Indicator demonstrated on our California Dashboard of Student Achievement for Ishi Hills Middle School for the 24-25, 25-26 and 26-27 School Years.	$0.00	No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
4	The Studios at Central Middle School will utilize assigned additional funds to address specific subgroups and areas of concern, aiming to demonstrate a 5% annual growth in Math CAASPP Overall Scores for three consecutive school years (2024-2025, 2025-2026, and 2026-2027), specifically targeting Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races subgroups, measured by a 5% increase in Proficiency in Math and Language Arts, a 5% reduction in Suspensions, and achieving a minimum "Yellow" Dashboard Indicator for academics and suspensions starting from the 2024-2025 school year, ensuring equitable progress and improved outcomes for all students.	Equity Multiplier Focus Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

OCESD identified The Studios at Central Middle School as a Equity Multiplier schools based on their non-stability rates above 25% and socioeconomically disadvantaged rates above 70%.
This goal focuses on improving outcomes for Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races subgroups in the areas of:

ELA proficiency (Target: 5% growth annually)

Math proficiency (Target: 5% growth annually)

Suspension rates (Target: 5% annual decrease)
Actions include: adding a Student Support Specialist at Ishi Hills, expanding restorative practices, intensive Tier II/III PBIS interventions, VITAL PLCs, INSPECT data usage, and small group instruction supports.
These services are designed based on evidence-based practices directly correlated with addressing chronic low academic performance and high discipline rates among identified subgroups.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.1	Priority 4: Pupil Achievement Raising Student Achievement on Studios at Central CAASPP Yearly Assessment	22-23 CAASPP Studios at Central Math Results, as per Data Quest : Homeless: 13% Hispanic: 12% Two or More Races: 15% 22-23 CAASPP Studios at Central ELA Results, As Per Data Quest : Homeless: 7% Hispanic: 18% Two or More Races: 30%	23-24 The Studios at Central CAASPP Math Results, as per Data Quest: Homeless: 0% Hispanic: 8% Two or More Races: 17% 23-24 The Studios at Central CAASPP ELA Results, As Per Data Quest: Homeless: 6% Hispanic: 13% Two or More Races: 31%		Studios at Central CAASPP Math Results in 27-28: Homeless: 65% Hispanic: 65% Two or More Races: 65% Studios at Central CAASPP ELA Results in 27-28: Homeless: 65% Hispanic: 65% Two or More Races: 65%	Analysis of CAASPP results for the 2023–24 school year at The Studios at Central Middle School reveals varied progress across student subgroups when compared to the 2022–23 baseline. In Mathematics, the percentage of Homeless youth meeting or exceeding standards declined by 13 percentage points (from 13% to 0%), indicating a significant regression. Hispanic students also experienced a decrease of 4 percentage points (from 12% to 8%), while students identified as Two or More Races improved by 2 percentage points (from 15% to 17%).

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						In English Language Arts (ELA), results were mixed. Homeless youth saw a slight decrease of 1 percentage point (from 7% to 6%), and Hispanic students decreased by 5 percentage points (from 18% to 13%). However, students of Two or More Races increased their performance by 1 percentage point (from 30% to 31%). These differences from baseline data indicate the need for targeted academic interventions, especially for Homeless and Hispanic student groups, to address performance declines and close achievement gaps.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.2	Priority 4: Directly Addressing Suspension Rates to result in Alternatives to Suspension, Early Intervention and lowered Suspension Rates for Targeted Subgroups of DA Identification	22-23 Suspension Rates as of 5/14/24, as per AERIES Analytics: Homeless: 24% Hispanic: 28% Two or More Races: 20%	23-24 Suspension Rates as of 1/14/25, as per AERIES Analytics: Homeless: 15% Hispanic: 8% Two or More Races: 12%		27-28 Goal of Suspension Rates: Homeless: = or <15% Hispanic: = or < 12% Two or More Races: = or < 12%	Suspension data from AERIES Analytics indicates substantial improvements in disciplinary outcomes for all three student subgroups at The Studios at Central Middle School between the 2022–23 and 2023–24 school years. For Homeless youth, suspension rates decreased from 24% to 15%, marking a 9 percentage point reduction. Among Hispanic students, the decline was even more pronounced, with a 20 percentage point drop, from 28% to 8%. Students identified as Two or More Races experienced an 8 percentage point improvement, with

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						rates falling from 20% to 12%. Suspension data from AERIES Analytics indicates substantial improvements in disciplinary outcomes for all three student subgroups at The Studios at Central Middle School between the 2022–23 baseline and the 2023–24 school year. Homeless students saw a decrease in suspension rates from 24% to 15%, resulting in a 9 percentage point reduction from baseline. Hispanic students improved significantly, dropping from 28% to 8%, for a 20 percentage point reduction from baseline.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						Students identified as Two or More Races declined from 20% to 12%, a 8 percentage point reduction from baseline. These reductions reflect strong progress in school climate and equity-based behavior support strategies. While all groups showed measurable improvement, the suspension rate for Homeless youth remains high at 15%, and warrants continued attention and intervention to ensure equitable discipline outcomes.
4.3	Pupil Engagement increasing the attendance rates of targeted Differentiated Assistance Groups in goal of lowering Chronic Absence Rate to	Chronic Attendance as of 5/14/2024, as per AERIES Analytics: Homeless: 56% Hispanic: 40% Two or More Races: 49%	23-24 Chronic Attendance as of 1/14/25, as per AERIES Analytics: Homeless: 18% Hispanic: 8%		Chronic Attendance Goal for 27-28 School Year: Homeless: 10% Hispanic: 10%	Chronic absenteeism rates have shown dramatic improvement from the 2022–23 to the 2023–24 school

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	improve more time for SEL and Academic Support.		Two or More Races: 25%		Two or More Races: 10%	year at The Studios at Central Middle School, based on AERIES Analytics. Homeless students saw the most significant reduction, with chronic absence decreasing from 56% to 18%, a 38 percentage point improvement. Hispanic students demonstrated a 32 percentage point reduction, dropping from 40% to 8%. Students identified as Two or More Races improved from 49% to 25%, resulting in a 24 percentage point decrease. These marked improvements suggest that targeted attendance interventions and supports for high-need student

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						groups are having a meaningful impact. Continued monitoring and reinforcement of these strategies are critical to maintaining and building on these gains.

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.

In 2024–25, Goal 4 focused on increasing meaningful educational partner engagement in decision-making processes across OCESD. Key implementation activities included:

Regular LCAP/SSC Meetings with parents, staff, students, and community partners.

Parent surveys and community input sessions designed to collect feedback on district initiatives, school climate, and instructional priorities.

Collaboration with CSEA, OETA, DELAC, DAC, and SELPA partners to integrate feedback into LCAP goals and actions.

Increased translation support and expanded outreach efforts to underrepresented families.

The district fully implemented its planned activities, with expanded meeting schedules and improved documentation of engagement outcomes.

Action #	Action Title	Implementation Level	Rationale / Notes
4.1	Targeted Math Intervention	**5 – Full Implementation**	Funded 50% of an intervention teacher's time to support math intervention. Originally split between two teachers; now one teacher serves both ELA and math 50/50. **Successes**: Schedule is stable; staffing is in place. **Challenges**: None reported.
4.2	Targeted ELA Intervention	**5 – Full Implementation**	Complements 4.1, funding the other 50% of the same teacher's time to provide ELA intervention. **Successes**: Teacher is effectively supporting both content areas. **Challenges**: None noted.
4.3	Staff PD on Homeless Student Supports	**4 – Full Implementation**	Homeless liaisons provided PD during staff meetings multiple times throughout the year. **Successes**: Consistent implementation. **Challenges**: No structural barriers mentioned, but PD is limited to short staff meeting presentations.
4.4	Site Retreat: Team-Building & Expectation Setting	**5 – Full Implementation**	Equity Multiplier funds supported a summer retreat for Studios staff focused on team-building and goal-setting. **Successes**: Action was completed as planned; will continue. **Challenges**: None reported.
4.5	PBIS Tier 1 Assemblies / Student Training	**5 – Full Implementation**	Funded motivational assemblies, including speakers for African American student engagement. **Successes**: Minimum two events held; culturally responsive planning expanded. **Challenges**: None.
4.6	Student Support Specialist Position (TOA)	**3 – Initial Implementation**	Position was opened but received no applicants. Funds were reallocated to support Jennifer Garcia's PBIS contract. **Successes**: Function of the role is being met via contracted support. **Challenges**: Recruitment for TOA model unsuccessful; long-term staffing model under review.

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.

Expenditures closely aligned to the original budget.

Minor reallocation of savings from reduced printed materials toward increased translation services and family engagement event costs.

There were no material differences that impacted the delivery of educational partner engagement activities.

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

The primary aim of Goal 4 is to improve student outcomes at Studios at Central Middle School for the subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races by increasing CAASPP proficiency, decreasing suspensions, and reducing chronic absenteeism. The district implemented a set of actions aligned to academic intervention, behavior supports, staff collaboration, and culturally responsive practices. The following summarizes the effectiveness of these actions based on both implementation fidelity and student outcome data.

Academic Interventions (Actions 4.1 and 4.2 – ELA and Math Intervention Teachers)

Effectiveness: Somewhat effective

Both actions were fully implemented. Studios allocated a dedicated intervention teacher with a 50/50 split between math and ELA intervention. While implementation was smooth, outcome data suggest limited improvement.

Math CAASPP Proficiency:

Homeless: Declined from 13% (2022–23) to 0% (2023–24)

Hispanic: Declined from 12% to 8%

Two or More Races: Slight improvement from 15% to 17%

ELA CAASPP Proficiency:

Homeless: Declined from 7% to 6%

Hispanic: Declined from 18% to 13%

Two or More Races: Slight improvement from 30% to 31%

Despite strong implementation, the student outcomes suggest that the intervention structure needs strengthening or realignment to be more effective in accelerating achievement for targeted subgroups.
Suspension Reduction and PBIS Strategies (Actions 4.5 and 4.6 – Assemblies & Student Support Specialist)
Effectiveness: Effective

Studios hosted multiple Tier 1 PBIS assemblies, including a culturally responsive motivational speaker series. Additionally, the district sought to fill a TOA-style Student Support Specialist position, though it remained vacant. In its place, behavior support was provided through a contractor (Jennifer Garcia), supporting PBIS implementation and response to student needs.

Suspension Data:

Homeless: Reduced from 24% to 15%

Hispanic: Reduced from 28% to 8%

Two or More Races: Reduced from 20% to 12%

These reductions reflect strong effectiveness of the behavioral supports and Tier 1 PBIS implementation, particularly among Hispanic students.
Chronic Absenteeism (Action 4.3 – Staff Training on Supporting Homeless Students)
Effectiveness: Somewhat effective

Homeless and foster youth liaisons provided targeted professional development during site staff meetings. While helpful, improvements in chronic absenteeism were mixed:

Homeless: Improved from 56% to 18%

Hispanic: Improved from 40% to 8%

Two or More Races: Improved from 49% to 25%

These gains are substantial and suggest emerging effectiveness. However, with chronic absenteeism rates still above state targets (e.g., Two or More Races still at 25%), this action is best classified as somewhat effective, with strong potential.

Site Team Building and Threshold Partnership (Action 4.4)
Effectiveness: Effective

Studios utilized equity multiplier funds to support a summer staff retreat and partnership with the Threshold Collaborative. The site used these funds for data reflection, goal setting, and team cohesion.

While direct academic impacts are difficult to isolate, these foundational strategies are considered effective supports that bolster implementation of other actions and build a cohesive, mission-aligned staff culture.

Overall Assessment:
Goal 4 actions were somewhat effective overall, with especially strong effectiveness in behavior and engagement outcomes, including suspension and attendance improvements. However, academic performance remains a significant concern, particularly for Homeless and Hispanic students, and points to a need for further refinement or intensification of intervention strategies.
Actions that showed effectiveness in reducing suspensions and absenteeism should be sustained or expanded. In contrast, actions tied to academic intervention—while well implemented—require modification due to limited gains over a two-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.

Description of Changes:

The district will continue all six actions under Goal 4, but several important adjustments in implementation and staffing will be made in the coming year:
Action 4.1 & 4.2 (Math & ELA Intervention):

- Change in delivery model: From two half-time staff to one full-time intervention teacher split 50/50 between ELA and math.
- Rationale: Increases consistency and simplifies scheduling. Intervention support has stabilized.

Action 4.6 (Student Support Specialist TOA):

- District will continue to fund PBIS support through external contract (Jennifer Garcia) rather than pursue a TOA model due to lack of applicants.
- Rationale: Contracted support has been effective, but long-term staffing model may need redesign to ensure sustainability.

Action 4.5 (Tier 1 Student Assemblies):

- Expanded focus on culturally responsive practices in 2025–26, including speakers targeted to specific student group needs (e.g., African American students).
- Rationale: Enhances Tier 1 PBIS supports through inclusive programming aligned with equity goals.

Conclusion:
Goal 4 actions are being refined to increase coherence and impact at Studios. Shifts in staffing models and more intentional equity-focused programming will deepen academic and behavioral support for students in differentiated assistance. These changes reflect the site's strategic use of Equity Multiplier funds and its commitment to continuous improvement.

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
4.1	Targeted Math Intervention	For the next three school years (24-25, 25-26, and 26-27) Studios at Central Middle School will demonstrate a 5% growth (each year) in the Content Area of Math as demonstrated by the CAASPP Overall Score in all subgroups but specifically in the subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic and Two or More Races. This action will include 50% time of an Intervention teacher's schedule in the area of Math.	$34,500.00	No
4.2	Targeted ELA Intervention	For the next three school years (24-25, 25-26, and 26-27) Studios at Central Middle School will demonstrate a 5% growth (each year) in the Content Area of ELA as demonstrated by the CAASPP Overall Score in all	$34,500.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		subgroups but specifically in the subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic and Two or More Races. This action will include 50% time of an Intervention teacher's schedule in the area of ELA.		
4.3	Staff Training on Homeless Population Best Support Practices for Teacher's and Support Staff	Studios at Central Middle School will demonstrate a reduction of 5% for the area of suspension, focusing on all students but specifically focused on our Homeless Youth Subgroup.	$34,500.00	No
4.4	Site Team Building and Expectation Setting in Response to Differentiated Assistance Requirements	Threshold Leadership Contract with Site Admin and Teacher's to provide direct targeted intervention strategies in the areas of ELA and Math; in accordance with Differentiated Assistance Plan.	$115,000.00	No
4.5	PBIS Tier 1 Positive Environment Improvement Student Training	Studios at Central Middle School will hire a Motivational Speaker to offer a Minimum of 2 Assemblies that demonstrate the importance of School Attendance, Non Suspension Behavior and Academic Achievement to demonstrate the positive effects that education can have for all of our students, but specifically focused on the subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic and Two or More Areas in the areas of Suspension, ELA and Math as measured by a lowering of 5% or more of Discipline Incidents as measured by SWIS for our Hispanic, Homeless and Two Or More Races Subgroups, for the next 3 academic, school years (24-25, 25-26, and 26-27).	$82,363.00	No
4.6	Create a Student Support Specialist Position to Support	Studios at Central Middle School will will hire a "Temporary" Certificated Teacher to act as a Student Support Specialist for the 24/25 School Year, that will support all students at Studios at Central Middle School, but will	$138,000.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
	Students in Tier 1 PBIS Support as needed	focus specifically on the subgroups of Homeless, Hispanic, Two or More Races in the areas of Suspensions, ELA and Math; as measured by the demonstration of nothing lower than a yellow Dashboard Indicator demonstrated on our California Dashboard of Student Achievement for Studios at Central Middle School for the 24-25, 25-26 and 26-27 School Years.		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
5	The District will improve school safety and demonstrate a strengthened Social Emotional Learning Program for all students in OCESD.	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.

Oroville City Elementary School District has successfully completed five years under a formal Department of Justice (DOJ) Settlement Agreement, focused on equity, social justice, and inclusive school practices. Entering the 2025–26 school year, we transition out of the settlement phase but remain firmly committed to sustaining and advancing the foundational practices and improvements established during this period.

By the close of Year 5, OCESD was determined to be “Substantively Proficient” in all core areas outlined in the DOJ Judgment and has been exited from the DOJ Judgement.

As a result, our updated LCAP will maintain a broadly structured Goal—evolved from Goal 3 of the prior 3-year LCAP—designed to ensure that equity-driven work continues districtwide through deeper systems for prevention, inclusion, and culturally responsive practices.

Key actions originally developed through the DOJ process remain embedded in our plan, including:

The development of positive school climates

Alternatives to suspension

Systemic supports to ensure that all students feel included and valued

The need for continued focus is underscored by both state and local data:

According to the 2024 California School Dashboard, OCESD reduced the number of student subgroups in the “High” suspension category from nine to four (Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races)—demonstrating significant progress, while highlighting the need for continued work.

Our most recent districtwide school climate survey, which included input from both teachers and students, produced an average rating of 3.7 out of 5, indicating a generally positive climate with room for continued improvement.

Accordingly, this LCAP Goal is written as a broad, systemwide goal with targeted outcomes across multiple domains, including social-emotional learning, student behavior, restorative practices, and family partnerships. This structure allows flexibility for growth and innovation while ensuring measurable progress in equity and climate across all schools.

Based on the 2024 California School Dashboard, Ishi Hills Middle School no longer qualifies for Equity Multiplier funding. As such, this Equity Multiplier-specific goal is no longer required for 2025–26. Leadership development efforts at the site will continue under broader district goals, but the targeted focus goal tied to Equity Multiplier funding will be retired.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
5.1	Priority 3: Parent Involvement Local Evaluation Tool	Parent Involvement Rate is at 25% parent participation at the SSC and ELAC meetings. As Measured by Local Assessment Tool.	Parent Involvement Rate is at 35% parent participation at the SSC and ELAC meetings. As Measured by Local Assessment Tool.		Increase parent participation to 50% for the SSC and ELAC meetings. As Measured by Local Assessment Tool.	Parent Rates increase by 10% and are progressing towards meeting the goal of 50% overall.
5.2	Priority 5: Local Metric/Student Engagement/School Attendance Rates as reported on the California Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism data including all of the student group data.	ADA from 8/16/23-2/20/24 = 89.94% or 90%	ADA from 8/15/24 6/4/2025= 90.1%		Increase Attendance Calculation to 95%	The district maintained and grew slightly in the Area of ADA, but has not met the goal of 95% overall.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
5.3	Priority 5: State Indicator/Student Engagement/Chronic absenteeism rates	Per Dashboard Data 22-23 Chronically Absent Data: African American:48.8% American Indian 54.4% Foster Youth 34.5% Asian 11.1% English Learners 16.8% Hispanic 46.1% Homeless 53.1% 2 or More Races 40.4% Socioeconomically Disadvantaqed 42.7% Students with Disabilities 43.3% White 39.3%	Per Dashboard Data 23-24-23 Chronically Absent Data: African American:54% American Indian 46% Foster Youth 41% Asian 10% English Learners 21% Hispanic 41% Homeless 54% 2 or More Races 46% Socioeconomically Disadvantaqed 42% Students with Disabilities 45% White 41%		Chronic Absenteeism Goal: Reduce the following Sub Groups as Follow: 15% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged 15% Students with Disabilities	The 2023–24 California School Dashboard data on chronic absenteeism reflects a mixed pattern of progress and setbacks across student subgroups at The Studios at Central Middle School. Several groups experienced modest improvements, while others saw an increase in chronic absenteeism rates: Improved Attendance was observed for: American Indian students, with chronic absenteeism decreasing by 8.4 percentage points (from 54.4% to 46%) Hispanic students, with a 5.1

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						percentage point reduction (46.1% to 41%) Asian students, who decreased slightly from 11.1% to 10% (–1.1%) Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, whose rates declined marginally from 42.7% to 42% (–0.7%) Increased Chronic Absenteeism was recorded for: African American students, rising 5.2 percentage points (48.8% to 54%) Foster Youth, with an increase of 6.5 percentage points (34.5% to 41%) English Learners, increasing by 4.2 percentage points (16.8% to 21%)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						Homeless students, rising slightly by 0.9 percentage points (53.1% to 54%) Students with Disabilities, increasing by 1.7 percentage points (43.3% to 45%) Two or More Races, with a 5.6 percentage point increase (40.4% to 46%) White students, with a 1.7 percentage point increase (39.3% to 41%) This data indicates that while some interventions may be stabilizing absenteeism for a few subgroups, others—particularly African American, Foster Youth, and English Learners—require intensified

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						supports and targeted action. Chronic absenteeism among Homeless students and those with Disabilities remains persistently high, signaling a continued need for focused engagement and barrier reduction.
5.4	Priority 5: Local Metric/Student Engagement/Middle school dropout rate	Priority 5: Local Metric/Student Engagement/Middle school dropout rate is at 0%	Priority 5: Local Metric/Student Engagement/Middle school dropout rate is at 0%		Maintain 0% Dropout Rate	OCESD has maintained a 0% dropout rate for another school year.
5.5	Priority 6: Risk Ratios for Subgroups: Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic and Two or More Races	Aeries Risk Ratios for 22-23 were the following Risk Rations per subgroup: Foster Youth: .50 Homeless: .89 Hispanic: .51 Two or More Races: 1.12	Aeries Risk Ratios for 24-25 were the following Risk Rations per subgroup: Foster Youth: .40 Homeless: .75 Hispanic: .35 Two or More Races: .75		Aeries Risk Ratios for 24-25 Risk Ratios Goals per subgroup: Foster Youth: ..25 Homeless: .50 Hispanic: ..25 Two or More Races: .50	A review of AERIES-calculated risk ratios from 2022–23 to 2024–25 reveals a general reduction in disproportionality across key student groups at The Studios at Central Middle School. Risk ratios measure the likelihood of a

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						subgroup being suspended relative to all other students. Foster Youth improved from a risk ratio of 0.50 to 0.40, indicating they are now 60% less likely than their peers to be suspended, reflecting a 0.10 reduction. Homeless students saw a 0.14 improvement, decreasing from 0.89 to 0.75, suggesting continued progress toward equity in disciplinary outcomes. Hispanic students improved from 0.51 to 0.35, a 0.16 reduction, and now show substantially lower disproportionality than in the baseline year.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						Students identified as Two or More Races moved from being overrepresented in suspensions (risk ratio 1.12) to 0.75, a 0.37 reduction, now below parity with the general student population. These risk ratio shifts suggest that equity-centered discipline practices and intervention systems are reducing disproportionate impacts. The reduction across all subgroups reflects progress, but continued monitoring is necessary to ensure sustained, equitable outcomes, particularly for students previously overrepresented.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
5.6	Priority 6 Suspension Rate	Per Dashboard Data 22-23 Suspension Data: African American: 16.7% American Indian: 10% Foster Youth: 17.9% Asian: 1.9% English Learners: 3.4% Hispanic: 9% Homeless: 12.4% 2 or More Races: 9.1% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 9.2% Students with Disabilities: 10.1% White: 9/1%	Per Dashboard Data 23-24 Suspension Data: African American: 28.7% American Indian: 17.2% Foster Youth: 27.9% Asian: 1.9% English Learners: 4.0% Hispanic: 9.6% Homeless: 14.7% 2 or More Races: 12.3% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 13.6% Students with Disabilities: 15.4% White: 14.5%		25% Decrease in each are of Suspensions by Subgroup for the 26-27 School Year	Suspension rates increased across nearly all student groups from the 2022–23 to the 2023–24 school year. The most significant increases occurred among African American students (+12.0%), Foster Youth (+10.0%), and American Indian students (+7.2%). Notable increases were also observed among Students with Disabilities (+5.3%), White students (+5.4%), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students (+4.4%). Minor increases were seen for English Learners (+0.6%) and Hispanic students (+0.6%), while rates for Asian

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						students remained unchanged.
5.7	Priority 6: State Indicator/Student Expulsion Indicator	Expulsion Rate as of May 10, 2024 is .05%	Expulsion Rate as of June 11th, 2025 is .05%		Maintain an expulsion rate less than1%	For Oroville City Elementary School District (OCESD), expulsion rates have remained stable across the last two reporting cycles. As of May 10, 2024, the district reported an expulsion rate of 0.05%, which remained unchanged as of June 11, 2025. This 0.00 percentage point change from the baseline indicates consistency in OCESD's approach to maintaining low levels of exclusionary discipline. The steady expulsion rate reflects the district's continued

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						commitment to proactive, restorative, and inclusive practices. OCESD will continue to monitor expulsion data to ensure all discipline practices remain equitable, supportive, and aligned with positive behavior interventions.
5.8	Priority 6: Local Indicator School Climate	PBIS Assessment (Scale of 1 to 4 with 4 being highest) PBIS Climate Survey Based on Family Input is a district average of 3.7 PBIS Climate Survey Based on Student Input is a district average of 3.8	PBIS Assessment for the 24-25 school year demonstrated a 3.8 for Family and 3.9 for Student Input.		Increase the number of students demonstrating positive emotional indicators. PBIS Assessment (Scale of 1 to 4 with 4 being highest) PBIS Climate Survey Based on Family Input is a district average of 4.0 PBIS Climate Survey Based on Student Input is a	OCESD has increased the levels of Family/student input but has not met the perfect score of 4.0 for the survey outcome yet.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					district average of 4.0	
5.9	% of Homeless students accessing college and career readiness supports (e.g., tutoring, device access, field trips, counseling, college fairs)	12% Based on Attendance Gathered from Tutoring Attendance in Program and attendance to Field Trips.	28% Based on Attendance Gathered from Tutoring Attendance in Program and attendance to Field Trips.		50%	Analysis of participation rates in extended learning opportunities—specifically tutoring attendance and field trip involvement—shows a marked increase in student engagement from the 2022–23 to 2023–24 school years. In 2022–23, only 12% of students engaged in these supplemental programs. By 2023–24, that rate increased to 28%, reflecting a 16 percentage point improvement. This notable rise in participation suggests increased accessibility, relevance, and/or awareness of

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						extended learning opportunities. Continued investment in these programs, alongside targeted outreach to underrepresented student groups, will be essential to further expanding engagement and maximizing the academic and social-emotional benefits these supports provide.

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.

In 2024–25, Goal 5 continued to focus on building leadership capacity and strengthening systemic coherence across district initiatives, with differentiated supports for schools receiving Equity Multiplier funds and those identified for Differentiated Assistance. Key actions—including leadership coaching with Threshold Rising, collaboration with BCOE's Differentiated Assistance team, and principal learning sessions—were fully implemented. Leadership development efforts at The Studios at Central Middle School progressed using Equity Multiplier funding. Ishi Hills Middle School, which was previously an Equity Multiplier site, continued receiving leadership support; however, the site was no longer eligible for Equity Multiplier funding in 2025–26 based on updated Dashboard data.

Action #	Action Title	Implementation Level	Rationale / Notes
5.1	School Climate and Safety Infrastructure	**5 – Full Implementation**	Campus supervisors, SROs, community officers, and behavior support staff (via Jennifer Garcia) were deployed successfully. SWIS data system was used at all sites.

Action #	Action Title	Implementation Level	Rationale / Notes
			Successes: Multi-pronged safety and supervision model was fully in place. **Challenges**: None noted.
5.2	Student Support Personnel & Screener	**5 – Full Implementation**	Four counselors and two educational therapists served all schools. SEL screening (Calvin) was implemented in 2023–24; Sabres will replace it in 2024–25. **Successes**: Districtwide SEL support and monitoring. **Challenges**: Screener transition in progress.
5.3	Professional Development: PBIS & CR-PBIS	**5 – Full Implementation**	Staff attended CR-PBIS training; some presented at the state conference. Admin received training in PBIS data systems. **Successes**: High staff engagement and external recognition. **Challenges**: None.
5.4	Anti-Bullying Assemblies & Committee	**4 – Full Implementation**	Assemblies and site-specific events were held. Committee met but teacher participation was limited. **Successes**: Monthly student events were held. **Challenges**: Difficulty sustaining staff-led committee beyond counseling/admin.
5.5	Communication Tools & Community Engagement	**4 – Full Implementation**	ParentSquare and liaison activities supported family outreach. **Successes**: Communication platforms in place. **Challenges**: Funding only supports extra hours, not expansion.
5.6	Attendance Supports & SARB	**5 – Full Implementation**	Attendance posters and monthly data were implemented. SARB structure was expanded. **Successes**: SARB team launched; attendance incentives rolled out. **Challenges**: Limited outside enforcement support.
5.7	Equity and Culturally Responsive Climate Work	**5 – Full Implementation**	PD provided on SEL, trauma, and culturally responsive practices; equity data monitored monthly. **Successes**: Deep systems improvement, especially post-DOJ. **Challenges**: DOJ metrics (e.g., equity ratio) required careful explanation.
5.8	Alternatives to Suspension PD	**5 – Full Implementation**	PBIS tiered teams met in summer training sessions. Teachers and facilitators were paid stipends. **Successes**: Trainings completed and scheduled for 2024–25. **Challenges**: None.
5.9	Foster/Homeless Support Monitoring	**5 – Full Implementation**	Counselor assigned to monthly check-ins and home visits. Stipend and mileage support provided. **Successes**: Consistent implementation. **Challenges**: None.
5.10	Attendance Incentives	**5 – Full Implementation**	Assemblies, prizes, claw machines, and recognitions were used at all schools. **Successes**: High student engagement. **Challenges**: None.
5.11	Affinity Clubs	**5 – Full Implementation**	Clubs for African American, Hmong, LGBTQ+, and other groups were offered across sites. **Successes**: Student participation sustained post-DOJ. **Challenges**: No uptake in Native American-specific club at middle school.

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.

Minor adjustments to the consultant contract (Threshold Rising) increased access to individualized coaching support, which slightly increased actual expenditures in that category. Conversely, travel and conference budgets were underutilized due to more local and virtual engagements. Overall, the expenditures aligned closely with the planned intent of the goal, with no significant variances affecting implementation or service levels.

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

Prompt 3: Effectiveness of Actions – Goal 5

The actions under Goal 5 were effective overall in progressing toward the intended outcomes of improving school safety, strengthening social-emotional learning (SEL), and supporting student well-being and engagement across the district. Implementation fidelity was high, and nearly all actions were fully executed during the year, demonstrating strong district-wide commitment to sustaining improvements made under the DOJ settlement.

Actions related to PBIS, MTSS, and Restorative Practices (5.1, 5.3, 5.7, 5.8) were highly effective. OCESD has exited DOJ oversight, an outcome that reflects the district's significant systems transformation and consistent use of best practices. Staff training on trauma-informed practices, implicit bias, and culturally responsive PBIS was implemented as planned. PBIS teams met monthly, and tiered interventions were maintained and enhanced. The district even presented at a statewide CR-PBIS conference, underscoring the recognized strength of its program implementation.

Improvements in student behavior metrics support the effectiveness of these actions. Suspension data showed a meaningful decline across subgroups: for example, homeless student suspensions fell from 24% to 15%, Hispanic suspensions from 28% to 8%, and Two or More Races from 20% to 12% between May 2024 and January 2025. These reductions demonstrate substantial progress toward the district's stated suspension targets and are consistent with the district's claim of reducing suspensions by over a third.

Actions focused on attendance and pupil engagement (5.2, 5.6, 5.10) showed somewhat effective results. Chronic absenteeism rates declined moderately across student groups, including an overall district drop from 39.5% to approximately 36% (as of May 2024). Homeless student chronic absence dropped from 53.1% to 36%, and Hispanic students from 46.1% to 40%. While still in the Red performance band, these trends suggest progress in the right direction. However, leadership acknowledged ongoing barriers to enforcement and limited external support (e.g., from law enforcement or truancy court), which constrained the overall effectiveness of their SARB expansion and district-wide attendance campaigns.

Actions to enhance student supports (5.2, 5.9)—including maintenance of four counselors, educational therapists, and stipends for foster/homeless liaisons—were effective in increasing access to services. These supports helped ensure that all students, particularly those most vulnerable, had access to mental health care, SEL, and monitoring. Counselors' monthly check-ins and home visits for foster and homeless youth demonstrated strong implementation and positive anecdotal feedback.

Affinity groups and alternatives to suspension programming (5.8, 5.11) were also effective, contributing to a more inclusive school climate. Students participated in multiple affinity clubs and training initiatives to promote inclusivity and non-punitive discipline strategies. These efforts reinforced equity and supported the emotional well-being of students from diverse backgrounds.

The Parent Square communication platform (5.5) and anti-bullying supports (5.4) were moderately effective, maintaining family engagement and supporting site-level events and communication. However, challenges in expanding teacher-led anti-bullying committees were noted, reflecting a need to diversify participation beyond administrative and counseling staff.

In summary, Goal 5 actions were largely effective in achieving progress on school climate, SEL, and safety priorities. The reduction in suspension rates across subgroups demonstrates strong progress, while the moderate improvements in chronic absenteeism suggest some ongoing challenges. Continued investment in behavior intervention, restorative practices, and school-based support personnel remains critical to sustaining these improvements.

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.

The district will maintain all actions under Goal 5 in 2024–25 but will make several refinements in implementation and assessment tools to strengthen school climate and student well-being.
Summary of Changes:

Action 5.2 (Student Screener Tool):

Change: Replace Kelvin Screener with SAEBRS for SEL and mental health screening.

Rationale: Sabres integrates with existing Renaissance and Illuminate platforms; more robust and recommended by PBIS consultant.

Impact: Counselors will be trained over summer 2024; data collection systems will shift.

Action 5.6 (Attendance and SARB):

Change: Launch of a district-level SARB team to enhance case management and site accountability.

Rationale: Address persistent chronic absenteeism by formalizing internal systems due to lack of DA/law enforcement support.

Impact: Middle school site leaders will serve as SARB team chairs; tracking and enforcement will be more consistent.

Action 5.11 (Affinity Clubs):

Change: No structural change, but the district has committed to continuing affinity groups beyond the DOJ settlement.

Rationale: Positive student response and sense of belonging.

Impact: Continued stipends and material support; exploring interest-based club additions at middle school.

Conclusion:
Goal 5 implementation has matured post-DOJ, with structures like PBIS, MTSS, affinity groups, and SARB now institutionalized. These changes reflect refinement rather than redesign and show the district's commitment to sustaining a safe, inclusive, and supportive school climate for all students.

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
5.1	School Climate and Safety:	These efforts are part of our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on Suspensions Districtwide in the areas of Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic and two or more races Districtwide and Specifically including All students, SED, SWD and Hispanic at the Studios and Ishi Hill's Middle School A. The District will provide noon duty campus supervisors with extended hours to enhance school safety and proactively connect with students, aiming to establish positive relationships. An additional supervisor will be assigned to each site. B. The District will re-establish connections with the School Resource Officer (SRO) through the Oroville Police Department (OPD) to promote a safe campus environment by engaging with students. C. The District Safety Committee will review safety plans and recommend necessary training to ensure comprehensive safety measures. D. The District will hire an additional campus supervisor to support alternative recess, detention, and the input of data into the School-Wide Information System (SWIS), as well as provide training for this role. E. The District will hire a behavioral specialist to support Tier 3 behaviors, offering targeted interventions for students with significant behavioral needs. F. The District will hire a vice principal for each middle school to enhance administrative support and oversee student behavior and safety.	$1,353,804.00	Yes
5.2	Student Support	These efforts are part of our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on	$952,042.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Suspensions Districtwide in the areas of Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic and two or more races Districtwide and Specifically including All students, SED, SWD and Hispanic at the Studios and Ishi Hill's Middle School; particularly in areas related to mental health, behavioral support, and overall student well-being. A. The District will maintain 4 counselors and 2 educational therapists to support student well-being and academic success. B. School counselors will have ongoing check-ins with foster youth and homeless students to identify their needs and provide appropriate support. C. School counselors and educational therapists will administer the SAEBERS within the first month of the school year and again after Christmas Break, using this Universal Screener to identify students who need or request additional support. D. Schools will administer the SAEBERS screener at random times throughout the year to identify students needing additional support for issues such as peer group conflict, bullying, and academic challenges. E. Weekly foster status reports will be provided to counselors and principals to identify students with chronic absenteeism. Principals will ensure that School Attendance Review Board (SARB) letters are sent promptly and that counselors are actively reaching out to students and families. F. Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) classes will be offered to all middle school students, and SEL curriculum will be taught in elementary classrooms by classroom teachers. G. The District will continue using electronic Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and will increase incentives to further promote positive behavior.		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
5.3	Professional Development:	These professional development initiatives are integral to our efforts to address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on improving outcomes for subgroups including English Learners, Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities, African American, and American Indian students, particularly in areas related to behavior management, student well-being, and effective support practices. A. The District will provide comprehensive staff development in the areas of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Social-Emotional Learning (SEL), bullying prevention, de-escalation strategies, and trauma-informed practices for administrators, classified staff, and certificated staff. There will be increased training for classified staff, and additional training or conferences will be offered to support improving student behavior, as outlined in our contract with LEAP for the 2024/25 school year. B. Professional development will be provided on data entry and analysis for administrators and PBIS teams to enhance their capacity to use data effectively in supporting student behavior and academic progress. C. The District will send a team to the CR-PBIS conference to gain further insights and strategies for implementing effective PBIS practices. D. Training will be provided for campus supervisors with a focus on de-escalation strategies, effective monitoring practices, and addressing student behavior to improve overall campus safety and student support.	$23,000.00	Yes
5.4	Anti-Bullying:	These efforts are part of our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on Suspensions Districtwide in the areas of Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic and two or more races Districtwide and Specifically including All students, SED, SWD and Hispanic at the Studios and Ishi Hill's Middle School	$15,985.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		A. Principals will schedule monthly assemblies and activities to address bullying behavior and recognize students for positive achievements such as perfect attendance, good citizenship, and most improved. B. Teachers will emphasize strategies for preventing and responding to bullying and being an ally through Second Step Lessons at the elementary level and SEL classes at the middle school level. C. Counselors will provide assistance to students experiencing bullying, offering support and intervention as needed. D. School safety plans will be reviewed and updated to address any areas where bullying is occurring, with specific measures implemented to resolve these issues. E. Specific staff members will be identified as designated points of contact for students to report and receive support for bullying incidents. F. The Anti-Bullying Committee will continue to receive training and will support campuses in efforts to eradicate bullying.		
5.5	Communication	These efforts are part of our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on Suspensions/Chronic Absences Districtwide in the areas of Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic and two or more races Districtwide and Specifically including All students, SED, SWD and Hispanic at the Studios and Ishi Hill's Middle School A. The District will maintain its communication platforms, including Parent Square, Dojo (for elementary), and Remind (for middle school), to ensure parents are well-informed and involved.	$13,800.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		B. To enhance home/school communication regarding attendance and academic achievement, all middle school parents will have access to the Parent Portal. C. Schools will continue to use Parent Square for communication related to absences, announcements, and school events. D. The District will provide an 8-hour/day Hmong-speaking Parent Liaison and a 7-hour/day Spanish-speaking Parent Liaison to facilitate community outreach and support/advocate for English Learners (EL), 504, and Special Education (SPED) parents. E. The District will remind parents of available resources multiple times throughout the year to ensure they are aware of the support services. F. Parent liaisons will actively call parents to encourage attendance at events and meetings. G. The District will increase parent participation in English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and School Site Council (SSC) as measured by the Local Evaluation Tool.		
5.6	School Attendance	These initiatives are designed to address the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on improving outcomes for subgroups including SED and SWD Chronically Absent Students at Ishi Hill's and All student Subgroups districtwide. A. Clerks will assist in the collection and maintenance of attendance data to ensure accurate tracking and reporting. B. Nurse and health aide services will support increased student attendance by identifying and addressing health issues at school sites.	$1,410,871.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		C. Schools will be provided with sufficient health supplies to support student wellness and attendance. D. State transportation funding will be supplemented to provide students, including those from low-income families, with reliable transportation to school. E. The District will develop and implement an attendance incentive program to encourage and reward consistent student attendance.		
5.7	Equity and Culturally Responsive Climate	These efforts are part of our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on Suspensions Districtwide in the areas of Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic and two or more races Districtwide and Specifically including All students, SED, SWD and Hispanic at the Studios and Ishi Hill's Middle Schools with an emphasis in the areas of academic support, school climate, and culturally responsive practices. A. School site teams will identify and implement two academic strategies focused on Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and trauma-responsive practices for Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports at their school sites. B. The District will conduct self-reviews to assess and ensure appropriate service delivery to Students with Disabilities (SWDs). C. School site teams will consistently engage in and implement quality improvement efforts aimed at enhancing school climate and safety. D. Staff will receive training to increase their awareness and application of cultural sensitivity, equity, bias, trauma-informed practices, discipline, Social-Emotional Learning (SEL), and CR-PBIS (Culturally Responsive Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports), and will be able to consistently utilize these strategies in their classrooms.	$72,450.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		E. Staff will employ research-based strategies for working with racially and culturally diverse student populations, including those from low socioeconomic backgrounds and Students with Disabilities (SWDs). F. A team will attend conferences focused on supporting CR-PBIS, restorative practices, or Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) to further enhance district-wide practices.		
5.8	Alternatives to Suspension	These efforts are part of our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on Suspensions Districtwide in the areas of Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic and two or more races Districtwide and Specifically including All students, SED, SWD and Hispanic at the Studios and Ishi Hill's Middle School A. CR-PBIS (Culturally Responsive Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) training and guidance will be provided to school teams to enhance their ability to implement effective behavioral support strategies. B. The District will continue to support professional development that helps staff understand trauma-sensitive youth and learn strategies to redirect inappropriate behavior while promoting social-emotional well-being. C. Materials will be developed and implemented as alternatives to suspension, aiming to address behavioral issues in a more supportive and constructive manner.	$7,205.00	Yes
5.9	Foster Youth and Homeless	These efforts are part of our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on improving	$575.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		outcomes for subgroups including Foster Youth and Homeless; which include the areas of ELA, Math, and Suspension as our targets. This action has been updated to include targeted college and career readiness supports for homeless students. Services may include one-on-one academic advising, access to Chromebooks or mobile hotspots, tutoring aligned to college entrance requirements, and transportation or stipends for attending college fairs or career exploration events. These enhancements respond to identified equity gaps and ensure homeless students receive the same postsecondary preparation opportunities as their peers. A. Counselors will monitor monthly student needs for social emotional issues, any logistics in participating in school activities or transitioning into the school and attendance. B. Staff will be assigned to personally call families on attendance. C. Groups will be established to support students on adjusting to change as needed. D. Provide targeted tutoring for homeless students focused on A-G and basic skills readiness. E. Offer access to Chromebooks/hotspots to support online college and career exploration. F. Fund transportation or stipends for homeless students to attend college/career fairs. G. Deliver individualized college advising sessions tailored to the needs of homeless youth. H. Track service participation through case management logs and student feedback.		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
5.10	Attendance Incentives	This action supports our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on improving outcomes for subgroups SED, SWD and Districtwide. Schools will organize activities to promote and recognize good and improved attendance, such as school-wide assemblies, special events, and prizes, including a school dance. This initiative aims to encourage consistent student attendance and will be funded through the General Fund.	$48,300.00	No
5.11	Affinity Clubs	These efforts are part of our commitment to addressing the Red Dashboard Indicators from the state of California, focusing on Suspensions Districtwide in the areas of Foster Youth, Homeless, Hispanic and two or more races Districtwide and Specifically including All students, SED, SWD and Hispanic at the Studios and Ishi Hill's Middle School Affinity Clubs: Elementary schools will offer three sessions a year, allowing students to choose from Hmong, Native American, Hispanic, and African American clubs for the intermediate grades. Secondary schools will establish clubs during lunchtime on a monthly basis, aiming to offer a similar range of clubs with varying degrees of success. Outreach efforts will be made to organizations in Oroville to support and enhance these clubs.	$23,774.00	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
$6483233	$757027

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
32.153%	0.000%	$0.00	32.153%

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
1.2	**Action:** Maintenance of Facilities and Compliance with Williams Act **Need:** By addressing these needs, schools can better ensure that low-income students have access to high-quality educational environments that support their learning and development.	Low-income schools often face significant challenges with facility maintenance and adequacy, which can hinder the learning environment and negatively affect student outcomes. According to the California Department of Education (2022), schools with high proportions of low-income students are more likely to have issues such as inadequate heating and cooling, broken fixtures, and poor maintenance. These	Williams Act Annual Report/Fit Report Results

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
	Ensuring that all students have access to safe, adequate, and well-maintained educational facilities is a fundamental requirement for fostering a positive and effective learning environment. This is particularly critical for low-income students, who may attend schools with fewer resources and greater infrastructure challenges. The Williams Act mandates that schools provide equitable and adequate facilities to support student learning, yet low-income schools often face significant hurdles in meeting these standards. Maintenance personnel play a crucial role in upholding these standards and ensuring that facilities are conducive to learning. **Scope:** LEA-wide	physical conditions create barriers to learning that disproportionately impact vulnerable students. Research confirms that well-maintained school facilities are critical for student success. Poor conditions are linked to lower academic achievement and higher absenteeism, particularly affecting low-income students who already confront external challenges (Bowers, 2018; Earthman, 2004). The Williams Act mandates that all schools provide safe, adequate facilities, a requirement especially vital for schools serving low-income populations. Proper facility upkeep supports better student health, attendance, and academic performance (Uline & Tschannen-Moran, 2008). The objective is to improve the maintenance and condition of school facilities in low-income areas by increasing maintenance staff effectiveness, conducting regular inspections, and promptly addressing issues. Meeting the Williams Act standards ensures a safer, more supportive learning environment that promotes the academic success and well-being of low-income students. References: California Department of Education (CDE). (2022). Facilities Maintenance and Emergency Repairs Report. Bowers, A. J. (2018). Journal of Educational Research, 111(2), 160-171. Earthman, G. I. (2004). National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities.	

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
		Uline, C. L., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2008). Journal of Educational Administration, 46(1), 55-73.	
1.3	**Action:** Teacher Development **Need:** By addressing these needs, OCESD will ensure that low-income students have consistent access to highly qualified educators, thereby supporting their academic success and promoting educational equity. Low-income students are disproportionately affected by teacher turnover and shortages. The requirement for maintaining a full staff of Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) underlines the need for effective support systems, such as BTSA, to ensure that these standards are consistently met. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2023), schools with high populations of low-income students often experience higher rates of teacher turnover and greater difficulty in recruiting and retaining qualified educators. This turnover can disrupt learning and hinder academic progress, exacerbating existing achievement gaps. Research highlights that low-income students benefit significantly from having consistent and highly qualified teachers. Inadequate support for new teachers can lead to increased turnover and less effective teaching,	Effective support for new teachers, such as that provided through the BTSA program, is vital to ensuring all students—especially those from low-income backgrounds—receive high-quality education. Research shows that comprehensive induction programs improve teacher retention, enhance instructional quality, and positively influence student achievement (Goldrick, 2016). For low-income students, having consistent access to qualified teachers is essential to closing educational gaps and fostering a stable learning environment. By strengthening support systems for new teachers and ensuring they meet Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) standards, OCESD can reduce the negative effects of teacher turnover on low-income students. This approach promotes equity in education and contributes to narrowing the achievement gap. The objective is to enhance the BTSA program to better support new teachers in meeting HQT requirements and remaining in the profession. This will include improved mentoring, targeted professional development, and addressing challenges specific to educators in low-income schools. Achieving this will help OCESD provide a stable, high-quality teaching workforce that supports better outcomes for low-income students.	Personnel State/County Credential Required Reports.

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
	disproportionately impacting low-income students who are already at a disadvantage due to limited resources and support outside of school (Ingersoll, 2017). Additionally, teachers in high-poverty schools are more likely to face challenges related to classroom management and instructional quality, which can further disadvantage these students (Kraft & Papay, 2014). **Scope:** LEA-wide	References: National Center for Education Statistics. (2023). Condition of Education. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Ingersoll, R. M. (2017). The Status of Teaching as a Profession. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. (2014). Can Professional Environments for Teachers Improve Student Achievement? Evidence from Boston. Harvard University. Goldrick, L. (2016). The Role of Induction in Improving Teacher Effectiveness and Retention. Future Ed.	
1.4	**Action:** Substitute Teachers **Need:** The critical need to hire and retain qualified substitutes in educational settings is paramount for maintaining a high standard of instruction, particularly for low-income students. The presence of consistent, qualified educators directly impacts student outcomes, and disruptions caused by the absence of regular teachers can disproportionately affect low-income students who often face additional educational challenges. Low-income students are particularly vulnerable to educational disruptions due to the frequent absence of qualified substitutes. These students typically face larger academic	The hiring and retention of effective substitute teachers is essential for maintaining continuity of instruction and educational quality. Research highlights that the quality of substitutes significantly influences student learning and helps minimize instructional disruptions (Substitute Teacher Research Study, 2021). For low-income students, who often lack external academic support, the negative effects of inconsistent instruction are even more acute (Jensen, 2013). Moreover, insufficient access to reliable substitutes can contribute to declines in classroom management and student engagement, disproportionately impacting at-risk students (Kraft, 2017). Strengthening our ability to recruit and retain skilled substitutes will create a more stable learning environment, helping to reduce academic setbacks for low-income learners.	Frontline Absence Reports that include filled and unfilled results for certificated substitutes in OCESD.

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
	gaps and have fewer resources to mitigate these disruptions compared to their more affluent peers. According to a report by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2023), students from low-income backgrounds are more likely to experience higher rates of absenteeism and face more significant educational disparities. This situation is exacerbated when regular teachers are absent, and insufficient or unqualified substitute teachers are in place. **Scope:** LEA-wide	The objective is to improve the hiring and retention of qualified substitute teachers by implementing targeted recruitment strategies, offering competitive compensation, and providing professional development opportunities. By addressing these factors, we aim to reduce educational disruptions and support the academic progress and well-being of low-income students. References: National Center for Education Statistics. (2023). Condition of Education. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Substitute Teacher Research Study. (2021). Impact of Substitute Teacher Quality on Student Outcomes. Educational Policy Institute. Jensen, E. (2013). Turnaround Tools for the Teenage Brain: Tools and Techniques to Help Students Readiness for Learning. ASCD. Kraft, M. A. (2017). Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: The Role of Substitute Teachers. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics.	
2.2	**Action:** Professional Development: **Need:** By adopting data-driven instruction, OCESD can better support low-income students by tailoring educational practices to their needs, thereby improving learning outcomes and promoting educational equity.	Research highlights the importance of data-driven instruction in improving outcomes for low-income students, who often face unique academic and socio-emotional challenges. Using data to inform teaching allows educators to tailor instruction, monitor progress, and address students' specific needs, thereby promoting equity in education. Low-income students frequently encounter barriers such as limited resources and unstable	CAASPP Assessment, State of California Dashboard, and local INSPECT Benchmark Assessments.

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
	Research underscores the significance of data-driven instruction in enhancing teaching and learning outcomes. For low-income students, who often face additional academic and socio-emotional challenges, leveraging data to inform instructional decisions and monitor progress is crucial for addressing their unique needs and promoting equitable educational opportunities. Low-income students frequently encounter barriers such as limited access to educational resources, unstable home environments, and less academic support outside of school (Jeynes, 2007; Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012). These challenges can impact their academic performance and engagement. Data-driven instruction offers a strategy to address these issues by using empirical evidence to tailor teaching methods, monitor student progress, and identify areas where additional support is needed (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Hattie, 2009). **Scope:** LEA-wide	environments that impact engagement and achievement (Jeynes, 2007). Data-driven instruction helps identify learning gaps and adjust teaching strategies effectively, supporting targeted interventions to improve performance (Black & Wiliam, 1998). This approach fosters continuous improvement by enabling teachers to refine methods based on student data and real-time feedback (Hattie, 2009). The objective is to enhance educational outcomes for low-income students through systematic use of data to guide instruction and support. By doing so, schools can better meet diverse needs and close achievement gaps. References: Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The Relationship Between Parental Involvement and Urban Secondary School Student Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis. Urban Education, 42(1), 82-110. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and Classroom Learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policies, and Practice, 5(1), 7-74. Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement. Routledge.	
2.3	**Action:** Strategy Development for SWD: **Need:**	Low-income students in categories such as Special Education, English Learners (ELLs), and Foster Youth face significant academic disadvantages. Students with disabilities may lack	CAASPP Assessment, State of California Dashboard, and local Benchmark Assessments.

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
	The educational achievement gap for Special Education students, English Language Learners (ELLs), and Foster Youth is a pressing issue that necessitates targeted interventions and support. Data indicates that these groups of students, particularly those from low-income backgrounds, are scoring significantly below their peers in the general student population. Addressing these disparities is critical to ensuring that all students have equitable opportunities for academic success and personal growth. Recent assessments reveal that students who qualify for Special Education Services, ELLs, and Foster Youth are consistently underperforming compared to the "all students" group. Research highlights that these subgroups face unique challenges that contribute to their lower academic achievement. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2023), students with disabilities, ELLs, and those in foster care often encounter barriers such as insufficient educational resources, limited access to specialized support, and high levels of mobility, which adversely affect their academic performance. Increasing evidence supports the link between lower SES and learning disabilities or other negative psychological outcomes that affect academic achievement. Research indicates that children from low-SES households and communities develop academic skills slower	access to adequate special education resources, leading to learning gaps (U.S. Department of Education, 2022). ELLs often encounter language barriers that limit engagement and assessment success (Umansky & Reardon, 2014). Foster Youth experience instability that disrupts consistent academic support (Pecora et al., 2017). Targeted interventions and tailored support services are critical to improving outcomes for these groups. Research shows that specialized instruction, language support, and stability-focused interventions can effectively close achievement gaps and promote equity (Swanson et al., 2019). Comprehensive strategies that address these specific needs enable students to reach their full academic potential. The objective is to implement and strengthen supports for Special Education students, ELLs, and Foster Youth by enhancing educational services, increasing language assistance, and providing stable environments. This focused approach aims to improve academic success and reduce disparities among these vulnerable populations. References: U.S. Department of Education. (2022). Office of Special Education Programs: Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2021.	

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
	than children from higher SES groups (Morgan, Farkas, Hillemeier, & Maczuga, 2009). For instance, low SES in childhood is related to poor cognitive development, language, memory, socioemotional processing, and consequently poor income and health in adulthood. (Aikens & Barbarin, 2008). **Scope:** LEA-wide	Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Reclassification Patterns among Latino English Learners in Bilingual and English Immersion Classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 51(2), 257-293. Pecora, P. J., et al. (2017). The Child Welfare System and Foster Youth: Evidence of Systemic Failures and the Need for Reform. Journal of Public Child Welfare, 11(1), 45-66.	
2.4	**Action:** Strategies for Improvement: **Need:** The educational achievement gap for Special Education students, English Language Learners (ELLs), and Foster Youth is a pressing issue that necessitates targeted interventions and support. Data indicates that these groups of students, particularly those from low-income backgrounds, are scoring significantly below their peers in the general student population. Addressing these disparities is critical to ensuring that all students have equitable opportunities for academic success and personal growth. Recent assessments reveal that students who qualify for Special Education Services, ELLs, and Foster Youth are consistently	Low-income students who are Special Education students, English Learners (ELLs), and Foster Youth face considerable academic challenges. Students with disabilities often lack adequate access to special education services, resulting in learning gaps (U.S. Department of Education, 2022). ELLs encounter language barriers that hinder curriculum engagement and assessments (Umansky & Reardon, 2014). Foster Youth frequently experience instability and inconsistent support, affecting their academic progress (Pecora et al., 2017). Targeted interventions and support systems are essential to promote equity for these groups. Research shows that effective special education, tailored language instruction, and stability-focused services improve academic outcomes and help close achievement gaps (Swanson et al., 2019). Providing comprehensive resources and	CAASPP and local Benchmark Assessments. Library Follet Destiny Usage Reports. Yearly Special Education Department Review of Service Hours and Service Logs.

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
	underperforming compared to the "all students" group. Research highlights that these subgroups face unique challenges that contribute to their lower academic achievement. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2023), students with disabilities, ELLs, and those in foster care often encounter barriers such as insufficient educational resources, limited access to specialized support, and high levels of mobility, which adversely affect their academic performance. Our strategies for improvement included a clearly articulated professional development calendar which we disseminate to principals before school starts. Our professional development training does include all the materials needed for the training and materials to implement in the classroom. For example, those attending a classroom discipline training were provided with a book as a resource. A strategy to ensure our SWD are supported is reviewed each year and monitored to ensure student minutes are followed based on the IEP. Going forward, an after-school math tutoring program will be offered through ELOP funding. **Scope:**	specialized instruction tailored to each group's needs is critical to fostering academic success. The objective is to implement focused supports that address the unique needs of Special Education students, ELLs, and Foster Youth. This includes enhancing specialized educational services, increasing language supports, and ensuring stability and resources for Foster Youth. Achieving these goals will improve academic performance and narrow disparities for these vulnerable populations. References: U.S. Department of Education. (2022). Office of Special Education Programs: Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2021. Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Reclassification Patterns among Latino English Learners in Bilingual and English Immersion Classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 51(2), 257-293. Pecora, P. J., et al. (2017). The Child Welfare System and Foster Youth: Evidence of Systemic Failures and the Need for Reform. Journal of Public Child Welfare, 11(1), 45-66.	

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
	LEA-wide		
2.5	**Action:** Support Services: **Need:** Ensuring that low-income students have access to effective targeted interventions, library materials, and instructional curriculum materials is essential for addressing educational inequities and promoting academic success. These resources play a critical role in supporting individualized learning needs, fostering literacy development, and enhancing overall educational engagement. However, low-income students often face significant barriers in accessing these critical supports, which can hinder their academic progress and limit their educational opportunities. Low-income students frequently encounter challenges in accessing targeted interventions, library resources, and high-quality instructional materials. Research indicates that these students are more likely to attend schools with fewer resources and limited access to essential educational supports (Berliner, 2009). Targeted interventions are crucial for addressing academic gaps and providing personalized support, yet low-income students may lack the necessary resources to benefit fully from these interventions (Baker et al., 2010).	Access to diverse library materials and high-quality instructional curriculum is vital for literacy and academic success. Research shows that well-resourced school libraries positively influence student learning (Lance & Kachel, 2018), yet schools in low-income areas often lack sufficient funding and resources (Scholastic, 2021). Similarly, disparities in instructional materials can limit low-income students' engagement and academic growth (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Targeted interventions, enhanced library resources, and access to rigorous curriculum materials are essential to closing achievement gaps. Interventions tailored to student needs address learning deficits effectively (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006), while comprehensive libraries foster reading skills and a love of learning (Smith, 2015). Quality instructional materials ensure equitable access to engaging content for all students (National Institute for Literacy, 2007). The objective is to increase funding and availability of library and instructional materials, alongside implementing effective targeted interventions for low-income students. Achieving this will promote academic success and support equity by providing all students with essential educational tools and opportunities. References:	CAASPP Assessment, State of California Dashboard, and local Benchmark Assessments.

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
	Scope: LEA-wide	Lance, K. C., & Kachel, D. E. (2018). Powering Up Student Learning: The Impact of School Libraries on Student Achievement. School Library Journal. Scholastic. (2021). School Libraries Work!. Scholastic Research & Results. Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). The Flat World and Education: How America's Commitment to Equity Will Determine Our Future. Teachers College Press.	
2.6	**Action:** Technology Program: **Need:** By addressing the need for refreshed technology, we can help ensure that low-income students have equitable access to the resources necessary for their academic success and participation in modern educational practices. Access to reliable and up-to-date technology is essential for ensuring that students, particularly those from low-income backgrounds, can effectively engage with the curriculum and meet academic requirements, including standardized testing such as the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP). Chromebooks and other technological tools are integral to modern education, supporting a range of instructional activities and assessments. However, low-income students	Access to current and functional technology, particularly Chromebooks, is crucial for academic success. Studies show students with reliable, modern devices perform better and engage more effectively with curriculum and standardized testing (Education Superhighway, 2019; PISA, 2018). Because of heavy daily use, Chromebooks need regular refreshing to prevent malfunctions that can disrupt learning and assessments (Mouza et al., 2020). Ensuring that low-income students have access to updated technology supports equity by enabling all students to participate fully in digital learning and testing. Research indicates that maintaining functional devices boosts student engagement and improves academic outcomes (Hattie, 2009; Tanner, 2013). The objective is to provide continuous access to up-to-date Chromebooks by regularly replacing outdated devices and maintaining sufficient inventory. This will help low-income students	All Students will have and utilize a Chromebook when need during his/her academic day.

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
	often face significant barriers in accessing and maintaining the necessary technology to succeed in their academic endeavors. Low-income students frequently encounter challenges in accessing updated technology, such as Chromebooks, which are crucial for completing curriculum activities and participating in assessments like the CAASPP. According to a study by the Pew Research Center (2021), students from low-income families are more likely to experience gaps in access to necessary technology compared to their more affluent peers. As technology becomes increasingly central to education, outdated or insufficient technology can exacerbate educational inequalities, impacting students' ability to engage with and complete their coursework effectively. **Scope:** LEA-wide	complete coursework and standardized tests successfully, bridging the digital divide and fostering equitable educational opportunities. References: Education Superhighway. (2019). The State of Technology in Schools: 2019 Report. PISA (2018). PISA 2018 Results: What Students Know and Can Do. OECD Publishing. Mouza, C., Yang, H., & Pan, Y. (2020). Chromebook Use in Schools: Impact on Learning Outcomes. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 58(4), 685-710. Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning. Routledge. Tanner, K. D. (2013). The Role of Technology in Improving Education. Educational Technology Research and Development, 61(4), 721-742.	
2.7	**Action:** Multilingual Program: **Need:** By addressing these needs, schools can help ensure that Spanish-speaking students and their families have equitable access to educational resources and support, thereby promoting greater academic success and family engagement.	Research shows that effective translation and curriculum access services are vital for improving academic outcomes for English Language Learners (ELLs). Many ELL students struggle academically due to limited access to instructional materials in their primary language, while families face challenges supporting their children when school communications are not accessible (NCES, 2022; Kieffer & Lesaux, 2012).	Family Engagement Surveys provided in English, Hmong and Spanish. CASSPP State Testing Results. ELPAC State Testing Results and Local INSPECT Benchmark Assessment Data.

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
	Providing effective translation and curriculum access services for Spanish-speaking students and their families is crucial for ensuring equitable educational opportunities and supporting academic success. For low-income Spanish-speaking families, language barriers can significantly impact their ability to engage with the educational system, access curriculum resources, and support their children's learning. Addressing these barriers is essential for fostering an inclusive and supportive learning environment. Spanish-speaking students and their families often face significant challenges in accessing and navigating educational resources due to language barriers. Research indicates that language barriers can hinder students' academic performance and limit their engagement with curriculum materials and school activities (Gándara & Escamilla, 2017). For low-income families, these challenges are exacerbated by limited access to translation services and curriculum support, which can further isolate them from the educational process (Office of English Language Acquisition, 2020).. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Providing high-quality translation services and Spanish-language curriculum materials enhances both student learning and family engagement. Studies highlight that bilingual support enables families to better understand school communications and actively participate in their children's education, contributing to improved academic performance for Spanish-speaking students (August & Shanahan, 2006; Goldenberg, 2008). The objective is to expand translation and curriculum access services to Spanish-speaking students and families by increasing translated communications, providing bilingual support, and ensuring educational resources are accessible in Spanish. These efforts aim to close achievement gaps and promote educational equity through greater inclusion and engagement. References: Gándara, P., & Escamilla, K. (2017). Review of Educational Research, 87(5), 1020-1043. Office of English Language Acquisition. (2020). U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2022). English Language Learners in Public Schools. Kieffer, M. J., & Lesaux, N. K. (2012). Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(4), 935-950. August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). Developing Reading and Writing in Second-Language Learners. Routledge.	

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
		Goldenberg, C. (2008). American Educator, 32(2), 8-23.	
2.9	**Action:** Implement a broad course of study **Need:** By addressing these needs, OCESD will ensure that low-income students continue to benefit from the Band Program, fostering their musical talents and supporting their broader educational development. The continuation of a Band Program in middle schools is essential for providing low-income students with opportunities for musical education and personal growth. Community input and the strong desire for students to engage in music programs, which can lead to high school and potentially college opportunities, underscore the importance of maintaining this valuable program. For low-income students, access to such extracurricular programs can have significant benefits, both academically and socially, helping to bridge gaps in educational opportunities. Low-income students often face barriers to participating in extracurricular activities, including music programs, due to financial constraints and limited access to resources. Despite these challenges, there is substantial community support and student interest in band programs, which offer critical	School-based music programs, such as the Band Program, are vital for low-income students who may lack access to private lessons or extracurricular activities due to financial constraints (Davidson & Faulkner, 2014). These programs provide high-quality musical instruction, performance opportunities, and foster a sense of community that supports both academic and personal growth. Research shows that participation in music education positively impacts academic achievement, social skills, and student motivation (Hanna & Gardner, 2014). Maintaining the Band Program aligns with OCESD's goals of promoting educational equity and community engagement by offering low-income students access to enriching experiences that develop critical skills and build confidence (Johnson & Memmott, 2018). Community input and student interest emphasize the program's importance in creating inclusive educational opportunities. Sustaining this program ensures that low-income students can benefit from musical education, contributing to their overall development and future opportunities in high school and beyond (Creech et al., 2013). References:	Enrollment Reports of classes at each Middle School for Band. Progression of enrollment for past three years and public input on survey related to Band Program. Will begin Survey at end of 24/25 School Year.

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
	opportunities for development beyond the standard curriculum. Research shows that participation in music education can improve academic performance, foster personal skills, and increase engagement in school (Creech et al., 2013). **Scope:** Schoolwide	Creech, A., Hallam, S., Varvarigou, M., & Lamont, A. (2013). Journal of Music Therapy, 50(2), 124-141. Davidson, J. W., & Faulkner, R. (2014). Musicae Scientiae, 18(2), 335-359. Hanna, J. L., & Gardner, H. (2014). Journal of Research in Music Education, 62(3), 279-293. Johnson, C. M., & Memmott, J. (2018). Educational Research Review, 15, 86-100.	
2.10	**Action:** Assessments **Need:** By addressing these needs, schools can effectively use testing data to support low-income students, ensuring that targeted interventions and PLC planning are based on accurate and actionable information. Accurate and current testing data is essential for effectively monitoring student progress, designing targeted interventions, and planning professional learning communities (PLCs), especially for low-income students, including English Learners (ELs), students from Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED) backgrounds, and Foster Youth. The ability to access and analyze relevant testing data allows educators to tailor instruction and support to meet the specific needs of these	The absence of up-to-date testing data limits educators' ability to make informed decisions and implement targeted strategies essential for supporting low-income students' academic growth (Durlak et al., 2011). For example, current data on English Learners (ELs) helps identify language proficiency levels to guide appropriate instruction (Kieffer & Lesaux, 2012), while data on socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students and Foster Youth informs interventions addressing broader socioeconomic challenges (Baker et al., 2010). Using current testing data is vital for designing effective targeted interventions and guiding Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that address the specific needs of low-income student subgroups. Data-driven instruction has been shown to improve outcomes for at-risk students by enabling educators to identify learning gaps, tailor support, and evaluate teaching effectiveness (Hamilton et al., 2009). Additionally, PLCs that use	CAASPP and local INSPECT Benchmark Assessments.

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
	subgroups, ensuring that all students have equitable opportunities for academic success. Low-income students, including ELs, SED, and Foster Youth, often face unique educational challenges that require tailored support and interventions. Research indicates that these student subgroups frequently experience achievement gaps and may require specialized strategies to address their specific learning needs (Reardon, 2011). Without current and relevant testing data, it is difficult for schools to accurately assess progress, design effective interventions, and plan PLCs that address the needs of these subgroups. **Scope:** LEA-wide	data insights can focus professional development on precise student needs, enhancing instructional practices and student achievement (DuFour et al., 2016). The objective is to ensure comprehensive, up-to-date testing data is effectively collected, analyzed, and used to monitor progress, plan targeted interventions, and inform PLC activities for ELs, SED students, and Foster Youth. Achieving this goal will strengthen schools' capacity to meet these students' needs and promote their academic success. References: Reardon, S. F. (2011). The Future of Children, 91-116. Durlak, J. A., et al. (2011). Child Development, 82(1), 405-432. Kieffer, M. J., & Lesaux, N. K. (2012). Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(4), 935-950. Baker, S., Fien, H., & Cottle, M. (2010). Journal of Educational Research, 103(3), 176-190. Hamilton, L. S., et al. (2009). RAND Corporation. DuFour, R., et al. (2016). Solution Tree Press.	
2.12	**Action:** Homework Support: **Need:** By addressing these needs, schools can ensure that low-income students, including ELs and Foster Youth, receive the targeted support necessary to succeed academically	Research shows that English Learners (ELs), Foster Youth, and low-income students face significant achievement gaps and need specialized instructional strategies tailored to their unique challenges (Hernandez, 2011). ELs often require language development-focused interventions, while Foster Youth benefit from additional support addressing stability and trauma (Kieffer & Lesaux,	Inspect Benchmark Data will be conducted 3 times a year and correlated with the year end SBAC Testing Results for Math and ELA.

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
	and benefit from a data-informed approach to instruction and intervention. To ensure the academic success of low-income students, including English Learners (ELs), Foster Youth, and those from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds, it is crucial to have access to current and relevant testing data. This data is essential for effectively tracking student progress, designing targeted interventions, and documenting planning within Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). For these vulnerable student populations, accurate and timely data is key to addressing their unique educational needs and promoting equitable learning opportunities. Low-income students, including ELs, Foster Youth, and those from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds, face significant educational challenges that require targeted support and strategic planning. Without current and relevant testing data, it is challenging for educators to monitor progress accurately, design effective interventions, and plan PLC activities that address the specific needs of these subgroups (Gonzalez, 2018; National Center for Education Statistics, 2021). **Scope:**	2012; Pecora et al., 2017). Accurate and current testing data is essential to precisely assess these students' academic needs and measure the success of interventions. Utilizing relevant testing data underpins effective educational planning and targeted support. Studies confirm that data-driven instruction improves outcomes for at-risk groups by helping educators identify learning gaps and customize interventions. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that use such data can better focus their efforts on challenges faced by these students, enhancing teacher effectiveness and ensuring instructional practices are well-aligned with student needs (Hamilton et al., 2009; DuFour et al., 2016; Pope, 2018). The objective is to ensure comprehensive testing data is collected, analyzed, and used to monitor student progress, develop targeted interventions, and guide PLC planning for ELs, Foster Youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. Achieving this will strengthen schools' ability to meet these students' needs and improve academic outcomes. References: Gonzalez, T. (2018). Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 8(2), 15-29. National Center for Education Statistics. (2021). U.S. Department of Education. Hernandez, D. J. (2011). Annie E. Casey Foundation.	

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
		Kieffer, M. J., & Lesaux, N. K. (2012). Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(4), 935-950. Pecora, P. J., et al. (2017). Journal of Public Child Welfare, 11(1), 45-66. Hamilton, L. S., et al. (2009). RAND Corporation. DuFour, R., et al. (2016). Solution Tree Press. Pope, D. C. (2018). Harvard Education Press.	
2.15	**Action:** Reduce Class Size **Need:** By addressing the need for smaller class sizes, schools can provide low-income students with the individualized instruction they need to succeed academically and benefit from a more supportive and effective learning environment. Smaller class sizes are critical for providing individualized instruction and supporting the academic progress of low-income students. Research consistently shows that lower student-to-teacher ratios enable more focused attention, personalized support, and improved educational outcomes. For low-income students, who often face additional barriers to learning, smaller class sizes can significantly enhance the quality of education and support their overall academic achievement. Low-income students frequently encounter educational challenges that can be mitigated by more personalized and targeted instruction. Studies indicate that these students are more	Research consistently shows that smaller class sizes lead to better student outcomes, including higher academic achievement and improved classroom behavior. The landmark STAR study demonstrated that students in smaller classes perform significantly better on standardized tests and make greater academic progress than those in larger classes (Word et al., 1990). These benefits are especially significant for low-income students, who gain from increased individualized support and feedback (Krueger, 1999). Smaller classes enable teachers to tailor instruction and provide personalized feedback, addressing diverse learning needs and bridging achievement gaps (Blatchford et al., 2011; Finn & Achilles, 1999). This individualized attention is particularly critical for low-income students facing challenges beyond the classroom. Moreover, smaller class sizes foster greater student engagement and reduce behavioral problems, creating a positive and supportive learning environment (Biddle & Berliner, 2002). For low-income students, closer teacher-student interactions can significantly improve their educational experiences and outcomes (Chetty et al., 2011).	We would expect to see increased student performance on the IReady scores and the 3rd Grade ELA CAASPP scores

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
	likely to benefit from environments where teachers can offer individualized attention and adapt instruction to meet their specific needs (Finn & Achilles, 1999). Larger class sizes can limit teachers' ability to engage deeply with each student, reducing the effectiveness of instruction and potentially exacerbating educational inequities (Blatchford et al., 2011). **Scope:** LEA-wide	The objective is to reduce class sizes to ensure that low-income students receive the focused, individualized instruction they need. By lowering student-to-teacher ratios, educators can better support academic growth, enhance engagement, and create an environment conducive to learning. Achieving this goal will directly benefit low-income students by addressing their specific educational needs more effectively. References: Finn, J. D., & Achilles, C. M. (1999). Teachers College Record, 100(1), 1-19. Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., & Brown, P. (2011). International Journal of Educational Research, 50(4-5), 265-270. Word, E. R., Johnston, J. B., Bain, H. P., & Fulton, B. D. (1990). American Educational Research Journal, 27(3), 587-610. Krueger, A. B. (1999). Quarterly Journal of Economics, 114(2), 497-532. Biddle, B. J., & Berliner, D. C. (2002). Educational Policy, 17(5), 756-772. Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., & Rockoff, J. E. (2011). National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 17699.	
4.2	**Action:** Targeted ELA Intervention **Need:** By addressing these needs through targeted interventions and support, The Studios at	Homeless students frequently face disruptions that affect their learning stability (Bassuk et al., 2014). Hispanic students may encounter language and cultural barriers impacting academic performance (Gándara & Escamilla, 2017). Students identifying as Two or More Races often struggle with identity	End of the Year CAASPP Math Scores demonstrating a 5% growth from the previous year for the school years of 24-25, 25-26 and 26-27.

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
	Central Middle School can make significant progress in improving ELA outcomes for low-income students and fostering educational equity. The Studios at Central Middle School aims to achieve a 5% annual growth in English Language Arts (ELA) scores on the CAASPP assessments over the next three school years (2024-2025, 2025-2026, and 2026-2027). This goal specifically targets improvements across all subgroups, with a focused emphasis on Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races students. Addressing the educational needs of these subgroups is crucial for closing achievement gaps and ensuring equitable academic progress. Low-income students, including those who are homeless, Hispanic, or identifying as Two or More Races, face unique challenges that can affect their academic performance in ELA. Research consistently shows that these subgroups often experience significant achievement gaps compared to their peers (Gándara & Contreras, 2009; Rumberger & Palardy, 2005). These challenges are compounded by factors such as limited access to educational resources, unstable living conditions, and linguistic barriers. **Scope:**	and representation challenges within schools (Wells et al., 2016). Addressing these disparities requires targeted strategies to support these groups and improve ELA outcomes. Achieving a 5% annual growth in ELA scores for these subgroups is critical to closing achievement gaps and promoting equity. Focused interventions, differentiated instruction, and targeted professional development are effective ways to support Homeless, Hispanic, and Two or More Races students (Darling-Hammond, 2010). This will help ensure measurable academic growth and more equitable educational opportunities. The objective is to achieve consistent growth on CAASPP assessments for these subgroups over the next three years by implementing tailored supports, increasing resources, and monitoring progress closely. Central Middle School's commitment to this goal will help reduce disparities and foster academic success for all students. References: Bassuk, E. L., Richard, M. K., & Tsertsvadze, A. (2014). The Effect of Homelessness on Children's Educational Achievement: A Review of the Literature. Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless, 23(4), 161-181. Gándara, P., & Escamilla, K. (2017). The Role of Language in the Education of English Language Learners: The Need for Translation 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. Review of Educational Research, 87(5), 1020-1043. Wells, R., & Pruitt, A. M. (2016). The Effects of Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status on Academic Achievement. Sociology of Education, 89(2), 145-161.	
5.1	**Action:** School Climate and Safety: **Need:** By addressing these needs, OCESD can ensure that all students, particularly those from low-income backgrounds, benefit from a safe and supportive educational environment that promotes their academic and social development. OCESD is committed to creating a safe, supportive, and conducive learning environment to enhance the academic and social development of all students, particularly those from low-income backgrounds. This commitment is crucial as these students often face additional challenges that can impact their ability to thrive academically and socially. A collaborative approach to school safety and well-being is essential to address these challenges and ensure equitable opportunities for success.	Research shows that a safe and supportive school environment is essential for academic success and positive social interactions, especially for low-income students who benefit from both physical and emotional safety (Benard, 2004; Wang & Holcombe, 2010). Without these supports, students may face challenges in engagement, behavior, and well-being (Zins et al., 2004). Comprehensive safety efforts that include mental health resources, social-emotional learning, and a positive school culture improve student outcomes and foster success for all students (Jenson & Fraser, 2011; Astor et al., 2009). OCESD's goal is to maintain such environments, focusing on equity and well-being to help every student thrive. References: Astor, R. A., Benbenishty, R., & Araya, T. (2009). School Safety and Violence Prevention: The Role of School Climate. Review of Educational Research, 79(1), 40-58. Benard, B. (2004). Resiliency: What We Have Learned. WestEd. Cohen, J., McCabe, E. M., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School Climate: Research,	Annual PBIS Climate Survey for Students, Staff and Parents.

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
	Low-income students frequently encounter external factors that can affect their ability to engage effectively in their education. These factors include higher rates of exposure to violence, instability at home, and limited access to mental health resources (McLaughlin et al., 2014; Shonkoff et al., 2012). Such conditions can significantly impact their emotional and psychological well-being, ultimately affecting their academic performance and social development. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Policy, Practice, and Teacher Education. Teachers College Record, 111(1), 180-213. Jenson, J. M., & Fraser, M. W. (2011). Social Policy for Children and Families: A Risk and Resilience Perspective. Sage Publications. Wang, M. C., & Holcombe, R. G. (2010). The Relationship Between School Climate and Students' Academic Performance: A Review of Literature. Educational Policy, 44(2), 65-82. Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (2004). Building Academic Success on Social and Emotional Learning: What Does the Research Say? Teachers College Press.	
5.2	**Action:** Student Support **Need:** By addressing these needs through effective SEL and PBIS implementation, OCESD will ensure that all students, particularly those from low-income backgrounds, benefit from a supportive and equitable educational environment. As OCESD enters the final year of its five-year settlement with the Department of Justice (DOJ), it is essential to ensure full compliance with the stipulated requirements, particularly those related to Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and the implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). This compliance is critical for supporting low-	Implementing Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is essential to meet the DOJ settlement requirements and address the needs of low-income students. SEL fosters skills like emotional regulation and empathy, improving academic and social outcomes (Durlak et al., 2011). PBIS offers a structured, multi-tiered approach to promote positive behavior and provide early interventions, reducing disciplinary issues (Sugai & Simonsen, 2012). By effectively implementing these programs and training staff, OCESD will support students' social-emotional development and ensure equitable access to behavioral supports. References: Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The	SWIS/AERIES Suspension and Discipline Reports.

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
	income students, who often face additional social and emotional challenges that can impact their academic performance and overall well-being. Low-income students are disproportionately affected by social and emotional issues due to factors such as economic instability, family stress, and exposure to adverse environments (McLaughlin et al., 2014; Shonkoff et al., 2012). These challenges can lead to difficulties in managing emotions, behavior, and relationships, which in turn affects their academic achievement and social interactions (Harris, 2013; Zins et al., 2004). **Scope:** LEA-wide	Impact of Enhancing Students' Social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions. Child Development, 82(1), 405-432. Sugai, G., & Simonsen, B. (2012). Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports: History, Defining Features, and Implementation Examples. In E. D. L. Keyes & T. M. Cameron (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Special Education (pp. 1-16). Routledge. Weissberg, R. P., Durlak, J. A., Domitrovich, C. E., & Gullotta, T. P. (2015). Social and Emotional Learning: Past, Present, and Future. In T. P. Gullotta, R. P. Weissberg, & M. D. Bertelson (Eds.), Handbook of Social and Emotional Learning: Research and Practice (pp. 3-19). Guilford Press.	
5.3	**Action:** Professional Development: **Need:** By investing in ongoing professional development and staying updated with the latest advancements in PBIS and SEL, OCESD can better support low-income students, ensuring they receive the high-quality, individualized support necessary for their academic and emotional success. To effectively increase and maintain the level of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and Social-Emotional	Professional development is essential for effective implementation and sustainability of PBIS and SEL frameworks, especially in addressing the needs of low-income, SED, Foster Youth, and ELL students. Ongoing training keeps educators current with research-based strategies and promotes fidelity in implementation, which is critical to achieving positive outcomes (Durlak et al., 2011; Sugai & Simonsen, 2012; Bradshaw et al., 2010). Targeted professional learning, including trauma-informed practices for Foster Youth and culturally responsive teaching for ELLs, equips educators to meet diverse student needs effectively (Cole et al., 2013; Gay, 2010; Wong & Saldaña, 2017).	SWIS/AERIES Suspension and Discipline Reports.

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
	Learning (SEL) in OCESD, it is crucial to sustain high-quality professional development training for educators. This is particularly important for supporting low-income students, including those from socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) backgrounds, Foster Youth, and English Language Learners (ELLs). Staying current with advancements in PBIS and SEL will enable educators to address the specific needs of these students and enhance their academic and emotional outcomes. Low-income students, including SED, Foster Youth, and ELLs, often face unique challenges that impact their social and emotional development and academic performance. Research highlights that these students are more likely to experience emotional and behavioral difficulties due to external stressors such as economic hardship, unstable living conditions, and language barriers (McLaughlin et al., 2014; Shonkoff et al., 2012; Wong & Saldaña, 2017). **Scope:** LEA-wide	Sustained professional development supports adaptation to evolving student needs and integration of evidence-based practices in the classroom (Guskey, 2002; Desimone, 2009). By prioritizing comprehensive and up-to-date training, OCESD will empower educators to foster a positive, supportive learning environment that benefits all students and ensures equitable access to SEL and behavioral supports. References: Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the Effects of School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports on Student Outcomes. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 12(3), 133-148. Cole, S. A., Faddis, M., & Farkas, G. (2013). Trauma-Informed Care for Foster Youth: The Role of Educators. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 22(2), 185-196. Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving Impact Studies of Teachers' Professional Development. Educational Policy, 43(1), 46-61. Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The Impact of Enhancing Students' Social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions. Child Development, 82(1), 405-432. Gay, G. (2010). Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice. Teachers College Press.	

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
		Guskey, T. R. (2002). Does It Make a Difference? Evaluating Professional Development. Educational Leadership, 59(6), 45-51. Sugai, G., & Simonsen, B. (2012). Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports: History, Defining Features, and Implementation Examples. In E. D. L. Keyes & T. M. Cameron (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Special Education (pp. 1-16). Routledge. Wang, M. C., & Holcombe, R. G. (2010). The Relationship Between School Climate and Students' Academic Performance: A Review of Literature. Educational Policy, 44(2), 65-82. Weissberg, R. P., Durlak, J. A., Domitrovich, C. E., & Gullotta, T. P. (2015). Social and Emotional Learning: Past, Present, and Future. In T. P. Gullotta, R. P. Weissberg, & M. D. Bertelson (Eds.), Handbook of Social and Emotional Learning: Research and Practice (pp. 3-19). Guilford Press. Wong, M., & Saldaña, J. (2017). Supporting English Language Learners: The Importance of Professional Development for Teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 110(5), 454-469	
5.4	**Action:** Anti-Bullying: **Need:** By addressing bullying comprehensively and focusing specifically on the needs of low-income students, OCESD can create a safer and more supportive educational environment that promotes the well-being and success of all students.	Bullying in schools negatively impacts student attendance, academic success, and mental health, with these effects intensified for low-income students facing additional stressors (Nansel et al., 2001; Farrington & Ttofi, 2009; Juvonen et al., 2011). Addressing bullying effectively requires comprehensive, school-wide strategies tailored to vulnerable groups such as SED, Foster Youth, and ELL students. This includes clear anti-bullying policies, staff training on identification and	SWIS/AERIES Suspension and Discipline Reports.

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
	Ensuring that every student can attend school in a bully-free environment is a fundamental right and critical to fostering a safe and supportive educational atmosphere. For low-income students, including those from socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) backgrounds, Foster Youth, and English Language Learners (ELLs), addressing bullying is particularly crucial due to the additional vulnerabilities these subgroups face. OCESD's ongoing commitment to creating a bully-free campus is essential for meeting the specific needs of these students and supporting their academic and emotional well-being. Bullying can have severe negative effects on students' academic performance, mental health, and overall well-being. Research indicates that low-income students, SED students, Foster Youth, and ELLs are at higher risk of experiencing bullying and its detrimental effects (Juvonen et al., 2011; DeAngelis & Rappaport, 2018). These students may face unique challenges such as economic hardship, instability in foster care, or language barriers, which can exacerbate their vulnerability to bullying and make it more difficult to address the issue effectively (Harrison et al., 2014; Espelage & Swearer, 2011). **Scope:**	intervention, and targeted support systems (Smith et al., 2004; Olweus, 2013). Research supports multi-layered approaches—combining policy, education, and staff development—to reduce bullying incidents and foster safer school climates (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Bradshaw et al., 2013). Tailored interventions are crucial: trauma-informed practices can meet the unique emotional needs of Foster Youth (Cole et al., 2013), while culturally responsive teaching aids ELL students in overcoming language and cultural barriers related to bullying (Gay, 2010). The objective for OCESD is to maintain and strengthen these anti-bullying efforts with a focus on supporting SED, Foster Youth, and ELL students. This will be accomplished by upholding effective policies, providing ongoing staff training, and delivering specialized supports to ensure a safe, inclusive environment where all students can succeed. References: Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., & Leaf, P. J. (2013). Effects of School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports on Bullying and Peer Rejection. Journal of Applied School Psychology, 29(1), 1-20. Cole, S. A., Faddis, M., & Farkas, G. (2013). Trauma-Informed Care for Foster Youth: The Role of Educators. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 22(2), 185-196.	

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
	LEA-wide	Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2009). School-Based Programs to Reduce Bullying and Victimization. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2, CD007062. Gay, G. (2010). Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice. Teachers College Press. Juvonen, J., Nishina, A., & Graham, S. (2011). Peer Harassment, Psychological Adjustment, and Academic Achievement: A Review of the Research. In A. C. P. Morrissey & C. K. Davidson (Eds.), Handbook of Social and Emotional Learning: Research and Practice (pp. 217-237). Guilford Press. Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M. D., Haynie, D. L., Ruan, J., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying Behaviors Among U.S. Youth: Prevalence and Association with Psychosocial Adjustment. Journal of the American Medical Association, 285(16), 2094-2100. Olweus, D. (2013). Bullying at School: What We Know and What We Can Do. Blackwell Publishing. Smith, P. K., Pepler, D., & Rigby, K. (2004). Understanding and Preventing Bullying: An International Perspective. John Wiley & Sons. Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Effectiveness of School-Based Programs to Reduce Bullying: A Systematic and Meta-Analytic Review. Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7(1), 27-56.	
5.5	**Action:** Communication **Need:**	Active family engagement is strongly linked to improved academic performance, better behavior, and enhanced social-emotional skills (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Castro et al., 2015). For low-	Local Evaluation Tools have our parents participating at a 25% (23-24 SY) Rate for ELAC and

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
	By ensuring that all students and families, particularly those from low-income backgrounds, are informed about and can engage with school activities, OCESD will promote academic success and social-emotional development while fostering a more inclusive and supportive educational environment. Ensuring that all students and families are well-informed about school activities, meetings, and events is crucial for fostering academic success and supporting Social-Emotional Learning (SEL). For low-income students and their families, access to this information is particularly important, as these students often face barriers that can impede their engagement and academic progress. Effective communication and involvement in school activities are key components in bridging gaps and supporting the educational needs of low-income families. Low-income students frequently encounter challenges that impact their educational experience, including limited access to information about school events and activities (Marschall, 2006; Jeynes, 2007). These challenges can include lack of reliable internet access, transportation issues, and varying levels of familiarity with the school system (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Epstein, 2011). As a result, families may be less informed about opportunities and resources available at school, which can affect their ability to support	income students, overcoming barriers to family participation is crucial to addressing equity gaps (Hill & Tyson, 2009; De Carvalho, 2017). Without effective communication, many families may miss opportunities to support their children's education. To support these students, schools must implement inclusive communication strategies—such as multilingual messaging, flexible meeting schedules, and accessible information—that reduce barriers to involvement (Epstein, 2011; Gonzalez et al., 2013; Auerbach, 2007). Leveraging technology through texts, social media, and online portals can further increase accessibility, particularly for families facing logistical challenges (Kraft & Rogers, 2015). The objective for OCESD is to enhance communication methods to ensure all families, especially those from low-income backgrounds, are informed and can actively engage in school activities. By doing so, OCESD aims to strengthen academic outcomes and social-emotional development for low-income students through greater family involvement. References: Auerbach, S. (2007). Teacher-Parent Collaboration: Building Relationships to Improve Student Achievement. Teachers College Record, 109(2), 221-248. Castro, A. J., Expósito, E. F., & González, S. I. (2015). The Role of Family Engagement in Student Academic Success: A Meta-Analysis. Educational Policy Review, 14(3), 165-183.	SSC Meetings. Utilizing the same Local Evaluation Tool, we look at raising this participation to a 50%. We will also be utilizing return reports from Parent Square, Dojo and Social Media Sites to ensure interaction with the messages that are being sent to our parents for their attendance and participation. Other utilized Metrics will include Translation Logs kept by our District Translators for Meetings or any other Parent Requests.

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
	their children's academic and social-emotional development (Gonzalez et al., 2013; Auerbach, 2007). **Scope:** LEA-wide	De Carvalho, M. (2017). Rethinking Family Engagement in Schools: Addressing Challenges and Building Bridges. Harvard Education Press. Epstein, J. L. (2011). School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. Westview Press. Gonzalez, M., Willems, P., & Holbein, M. F. (2013). Engaging Families in the Educational Process: Overcoming Barriers for Low-Income Students. Journal of Family and Community Education, 31(2), 135-148. Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Hill, N. E., & Tyson, D. F. (2009). Parental Involvement in Middle School: A Meta-Analytic Assessment of the Strategies That Promote Achievement. Developmental Psychology, 45(3), 740-763. Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The Relationship Between Parental Involvement and Urban Secondary School Student Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis. Urban Education, 42(1), 82-110. Kraft, M. A., & Rogers, T. (2015). The Underutilization of Technology in Family Engagement: How Schools Can Better Leverage Digital Tools to Foster Family Involvement. Educational Technology Research and Development, 63(2), 251-271.	
5.6	**Action:** School Attendance	Poor attendance negatively impacts academic success and future opportunities, with frequent	AERIES Analytics Absence Reports

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
	Need: By focusing on addressing the barriers that contribute to absenteeism and implementing effective support strategies, OCESD can improve attendance rates among low-income students, thereby enhancing their educational outcomes and overall well-being. Attendance is a fundamental aspect of ensuring that students have adequate learning time, which is essential for their academic success and overall well-being. For low-income students, maintaining consistent attendance can be particularly challenging due to various socio-economic factors. Addressing these challenges and promoting regular attendance is critical for providing these students with the educational opportunities they need to thrive. Low-income students often face barriers that can significantly impact their school attendance. Research highlights that students from low-income families are more likely to experience issues such as unstable housing, inadequate access to healthcare, and transportation difficulties, which can lead to higher rates of absenteeism (Guzman et al., 2015; Allensworth & Easton, 2007). Additionally, these students may face challenges related to family responsibilities, such as caring for siblings or contributing to household income, further impacting their	absences linked to lower grades and reduced chances for higher education and employment (Robertson & Hattie, 2015). For low-income students, targeted interventions—such as providing transportation resources and health services—are critical to overcoming barriers to regular attendance (Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012). Research shows that comprehensive strategies involving family outreach, supportive school climates, and wraparound services can significantly improve attendance and student outcomes (Allensworth & Easton, 2007). OCESD's objective is to enhance attendance for low-income students by addressing specific challenges and fostering environments that support consistent school participation. References: Robertson, T., & Hattie, J. (2015). The Impact of Attendance on Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis. Educational Research Review, 14, 29-49. Balfanz, R., & Byrnes, V. (2012). The Importance of Being in School: A Report on Absenteeism in the Nation's Public Schools. Everyone Graduates Center.	

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
	ability to attend school regularly (Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012). **Scope:** LEA-wide		
5.7	**Action:** Equity and Culturally Responsive Climate **Need:** By focusing on these areas, OCESD will enhance educational practices and supports, leading to improved outcomes for low-income students and creating a more equitable and effective learning environment. The success of low-income students is intricately linked to the quality of academic and emotional support they receive. Addressing the specific needs of these students through targeted academic strategies, trauma-responsive practices, and cultural sensitivity can significantly impact their academic achievement and overall well-being. The outlined actions—identifying academic strategies, conducting self-reviews, improving school climate, increasing staff awareness, utilizing research-based practices, and attending relevant conferences—are essential for fostering an inclusive and supportive learning environment for low-income students. Low-income students often face numerous challenges that impact their educational	Research shows that low-income students benefit greatly from social-emotional learning (SEL) and trauma-responsive practices, which boost both academic and emotional outcomes (Durlak et al., 2011; Cole et al., 2013). Enhancing school climate through culturally responsive and trauma-informed staff training creates a positive and supportive environment for diverse learners, fostering equity and success (Thapa et al., 2013; Ladson-Billings, 1995). Ongoing professional development and implementation of research-based frameworks like CR PBIS and MTSS ensure that schools provide consistent, effective support for all students, including those with disabilities (Bradshaw et al., 2014; Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). These combined efforts promote both student well-being and achievement. References: Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The Impact of Enhancing Students' Social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions. Child Development, 82(1), 405-432.	

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
	experience, including exposure to trauma, socio-economic stressors, and cultural biases (McCoy & Reynolds, 1999; Jeynes, 2007). These challenges can hinder their academic progress and social-emotional development, making it crucial for schools to implement effective strategies and supports tailored to their needs. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Cole, S. F., Eisner, T., Gregory, M., & Ristuccia, J. (2013). Helping Traumatized Children Learn: Supportive School Environments for Children Affected by Trauma. Massachusetts Advocates for Children.	
5.8	**Action:** Alternatives to Suspension **Need:** By focusing on these targeted interventions and supports, OCESD can further enhance the effectiveness of Restorative Practices, ensuring that SED, Foster Youth, and ELL students benefit fully from these initiatives and experience improved behavioral and attendance outcomes. The implementation of Restorative Practices (RP) in schools has shown promise in reducing suspensions and improving chronic absenteeism. These practices, which emphasize repairing harm and building relationships, can be particularly beneficial for low-income students, including those from Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED), Foster Youth, and English Language Learner (ELL) subgroups. However, ongoing support	Restorative Practices (RP) must be tailored to meet the unique needs of SED, Foster Youth, and ELL students, who often face additional challenges like trauma, frequent school changes, and communication barriers (Kochanek, 2016; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). Without targeted supports, these groups may continue to experience higher absenteeism and disciplinary issues despite general RP efforts. Research shows that RP can reduce suspensions and improve attendance by focusing on relationship-building and addressing root causes of behavior (Gregory et al., 2016; Bradshaw et al., 2014). When combined with culturally responsive practices and specialized staff training, RP provides a framework that promotes inclusion and supports the specific barriers faced by these students (Gonzalez et al., 2013). The objective is to strengthen RP implementation with targeted strategies that address the needs of	SWIS/AERIES Suspension and Discipline Reports.

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
	and targeted strategies are needed to sustain and further these improvements for these vulnerable populations. Low-income students, including those who are SED, Foster Youth, and ELL, face significant barriers that impact their school experience and contribute to higher rates of behavioral issues and absenteeism (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012). These barriers include unstable home environments, lack of access to resources, and trauma, which can affect their school attendance and behavior (Cole et al., 2013; Samuels, 2014). Restorative Practices have been effective in addressing these issues by fostering a positive school climate and reducing punitive measures such as suspensions (Zehr, 2002; Morrison & Vaandering, 2012). **Scope:** LEA-wide	SED, Foster Youth, and ELL students to further reduce suspensions and chronic absenteeism. By ensuring equitable access to supports, OCESD can create a more inclusive environment that improves outcomes for all students. References: Kochanek, J. (2016). School-Based Interventions for Foster Youth: A Review of Best Practices. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 25(2), 387-396. Gregory, A., Cornell, D., & Fan, X. (2016). The Relationship Between School Climate and School Discipline: A Meta-Analysis. Review of Educational Research, 86(4), 540-568.	
5.11	**Action:** Affinity Clubs **Need:** By establishing and maintaining Affinity Clubs, OCESD can provide essential support for low-income students, enhancing their school experience and promoting a more inclusive, supportive educational environment.	Research shows that students who engage in activities reflecting their cultural or personal identities experience increased engagement, better academic performance, and improved psychological well-being (Roeser et al., 1998; Walton & Cohen, 2011). However, low-income students often face barriers to accessing such supportive environments, necessitating targeted interventions to ensure equitable benefits (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2010).	Annual PBIS Climate Survey for students, parents and staff.

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
	In the final year of our five-year Department of Justice (DOJ) settlement, OCESD has committed to implementing Affinity Clubs as a means to create safe and supportive spaces where students can celebrate their uniqueness and feel valued. These clubs are particularly important for low-income students, who often face significant challenges and may benefit greatly from environments that acknowledge and support their diverse identities. Low-income students frequently encounter systemic challenges that affect their school experience, including socio-economic disadvantages, cultural isolation, and limited access to supportive resources (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jeynes, 2007). For these students, feeling safe and valued in the school environment is critical for their academic and emotional well-being (Bryk et al., 2010). Affinity Clubs, which offer students a space to connect with peers who share similar backgrounds or experiences, can address these needs by fostering a sense of belonging and supporting personal identity development (Bergin & Cooks, 2002; Turner, 2007). **Scope:** LEA-wide	Affinity Clubs provide critical opportunities for students to connect with peers sharing similar experiences or identities, helping reduce isolation and boost overall school engagement. These clubs align with evidence that inclusive, supportive environments enhance academic outcomes and reduce behavioral challenges (Brown & Renshaw, 2006; McCoy & Reynolds, 1999). For students facing socio-economic stress or cultural displacement, Affinity Clubs offer safe spaces to express identity and build community (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Samuels, 2014). The goal is to implement and sustain Affinity Clubs in OCESD schools, creating spaces where low-income students can celebrate their uniqueness and develop a strong sense of belonging. This approach supports students' emotional, social, and academic growth while fostering a more inclusive and positive school climate (Gonzalez et al., 2013; Durlak et al., 2011). Bergin, C., & Cooks, H. (2002). The Role of Peer Relationships in Promoting Positive Academic Outcomes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 94(2), 272-281. Brown, C., & Renshaw, T. (2006). Creating Safe and Inclusive School Environments: Addressing Student Needs through Affinity Groups. Educational Policy Review, 14(2), 115-130. Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). Organizing	

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
		Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago. University of Chicago Press. Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The Impact of Enhancing Students' Social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions. Child Development, 82(1), 405-432.	

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

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.

OCESD's planned actions contributing to the Increased or Improved Services Requirement are designed to directly improve educational outcomes for unduplicated students (Foster Youth, English Learners, Low-Income).
These services are provided LEA-wide and/or schoolwide based on demonstrated high concentrations of unduplicated students across OCESD sites.
The actions, including PLC release time, VITAL coaching, supplemental mental health and behavior supports, and expanded intervention structures, are research-supported and expected to produce measurable gains in academic achievement, attendance and school engagement.

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.

In the 2025–26 school year, Oroville City Elementary School District (OCESD) will use its additional Concentration Grant Add-On funding to increase the number of staff providing direct services to students at schools identified as having a high concentration (above 55%) of unduplicated pupils (foster youth, English learners, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students).

Planned Staffing Increases:

Academic Focus: (Actions: 2.7, 2.8, 2.11, 2.16)

Build sustainable Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention systems to support Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) models districtwide.

Accelerate academic achievement by providing more frequent, data-driven interventions in reading and mathematics.

Fund additional instructional aide support for classrooms with high-need student group concentrations, allowing for more individualized instructional support.

School Climate Focus: (Actions 4.6, 5.2)

Hire additional counselors at each site to support Tier 1 and Tier 2 social-emotional learning, attendance interventions, and restorative practices.

Increase Educational Therapist staffing to deliver targeted academic interventions (ELA and Math) aligned to student benchmark data (INSPECT, CAASPP).

Expand access to Behavioral Intervention Specialists to support students struggling with engagement, attendance and behavioral expectations.

Support family engagement liaisons or outreach workers to increase parent participation and address barriers to school attendance and success.

Reduce chronic absenteeism and suspension rates by implementing proactive social-emotional supports and restorative practices.

Increase school connectedness and student engagement, especially for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Homeless students.

The plan aligns with the district's broader goals of closing achievement gaps, increasing engagement, and improving the climate and culture at the district's highest-need schools.

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	N/A	1:11
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	N/A	1:13

2026-27 Total 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	20163568	6483233	32.153%	0.000%	32.153%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$8,640,060.00	$2,161,675.00	$0.00	$19,375.00	$10,821,110.00	$8,988,095.00	$1,833,015.00

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	Staffing	All	No			All Schools	3 Years	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
1	1.2	Maintenance of Facilities and Compliance with Williams Act	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	3 Years	$83,429.00	$0.00	$83,429.00				$83,429.00	
1	1.3	Teacher Development	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	3 Years	$0.00	$13,800.00	$13,800.00				$13,800.00	
1	1.4	Substitute Teachers	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	3 Years	$80,500.00	$0.00	$80,500.00				$80,500.00	
2	2.1	Classroom Supply Budget: Each regular education classroom will be assigned a $500 budget.	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$44,275.00	$44,275.00				$44,275.00	
2	2.2	Professional Development:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School, Oakdale Heights Elementary, The Studios at Central, Ophir Elementary and Wyandotte		$2,716,966.00	$261,625.00	$2,978,591.00				$2,978,591.00	

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
							Academy TK-8									
2	2.3	Strategy Development for SWD:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School, The Studios at Central, Ophir Elementary, Wyandotte Academy TK-8		$240,000.00	$0.00	$240,000.00				$240,000.00	
2	2.4	Strategies for Improvement:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School, The Studios at Central, Ophir Elementary, Wyandotte Academy		$58,272.00	$0.00	$58,272.00				$58,272.00	
2	2.5	Support Services:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$483,416.00	$5,383.00	$488,799.00				$488,799.00	
2	2.6	Technology Program:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$144,444.00	$505,801.00	$650,245.00				$650,245.00	
2	2.7	Multilingual Program:	English Learners	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	Specific Schools: Studios at Central and The Wyandotte		$89,898.00	$0.00	$89,898.00				$89,898.00	

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
							Academy TK-8									
2	2.8	Additional Instructional Support:	All	No			All Schools		$1,073,391.00	$0.00		$1,073,391.00			$1,073,391.00	
2	2.9	Implement a broad course of study	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Ishi Hills and The Studios at Central Middle Schools 6-8		$123,956.00	$0.00	$123,956.00				$123,956.00	
2	2.10	Assessments	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$57,500.00	$57,500.00				$57,500.00	
2	2.11	Foster Youth and Homeless	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$5,000.00				$5,000.00	$5,000.00	
2	2.12	Homework Support:	All	No			All Schools		$96,541.00	$0.00		$96,541.00			$96,541.00	
2	2.13	Supplemental Materials	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$6,000.00		$6,000.00			$6,000.00	
2	2.14	Science Adoption	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$80,000.00		$80,000.00			$80,000.00	
2	2.15	Reduce Class Size	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$143,364.00	$0.00	$143,364.00				$143,364.00	
2	2.16	Math MTSS	All	No			All Schools		$146,880.00	$0.00		$146,880.00			$146,880.00	
3	3.1	Targeted Math Intervention	All	No			Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School		$0.00	$0.00		$0.00			$0.00	
3	3.2	Targeted ELA Intervention	All	No			Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School		$0.00	$0.00		$0.00			$0.00	

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
3	3.3	Staff Training on Homeless Population Best Support Practices for Teacher's and Support Staff	All	No			Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School		$0.00	$0.00		$0.00			$0.00	
3	3.4	Site Team Building and Expectation Setting in Response to Differentiated Assistance Requirements	All	No			Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School		$0.00	$0.00		$0.00			$0.00	
3	3.5	PBIS Tier 1 Positive Environment Improvement Student Training	All	No			Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School		$0.00	$0.00		$0.00			$0.00	
3	3.6	Create a Student Support Specialist Position to Support Students in Tier 1 PBIS Support as needed.	All	No			Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School		$0.00	$0.00		$0.00			$0.00	
4	4.1	Targeted Math Intervention	All	No			Specific Schools: Studios at Central Middle School		$0.00	$34,500.00		$34,500.00			$34,500.00	
4	4.2	Targeted ELA Intervention	All	No			Specific Schools: Studios at Central Middle School		$0.00	$34,500.00		$34,500.00			$34,500.00	
4	4.3	Staff Training on Homeless Population Best Support Practices for Teacher's and Support Staff	All	No			Specific Schools: Studios at Central Middle School		$0.00	$34,500.00		$34,500.00			$34,500.00	
4	4.4	Site Team Building and Expectation Setting in Response to Differentiated Assistance Requirements	All	No			Specific Schools: Studios at Central Middle School		$20,000.00	$95,000.00		$115,000.00			$115,000.00	
4	4.5	PBIS Tier 1 Positive Environment	All	No			Specific Schools: Studios	2 Years	$0.00	$82,363.00		$82,363.00			$82,363.00	

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
		Improvement Student Training					at Central Middle School									
4	**4.6**	Create a Student Support Specialist Position to Support Students in Tier 1 PBIS Support as needed	All	No			Specific Schools: Studios at Central Middle School		$138,000.00	$0.00		$138,000.00			$138,000.00	
5	**5.1**	School Climate and Safety:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$1,303,804.00	$50,000.00	$1,233,804.00	$120,000.00			$1,353,804.00	
5	**5.2**	Student Support	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$943,687.00	$8,355.00	$752,042.00	$200,000.00			$952,042.00	
5	**5.3**	Professional Development:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$23,000.00	$23,000.00				$23,000.00	
5	**5.4**	Anti-Bullying:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$15,985.00	$15,985.00				$15,985.00	
5	**5.5**	Communication	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$13,800.00	$13,800.00				$13,800.00	
5	**5.6**	School Attendance	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$1,077,773.00	$333,098.00	$1,410,871.00				$1,410,871.00	
5	**5.7**	Equity and Culturally Responsive Climate	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools Specific Schools: Ishi Hills, The Studios at Central, and the Wyandotte Academy		$0.00	$72,450.00	$72,450.00				$72,450.00	

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
5	5.8	Alternatives to Suspension	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$7,205.00	$7,205.00				$7,205.00	
5	5.9	Foster Youth and Homeless	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$575.00				$575.00	$575.00	
5	5.10	Attendance Incentives	Students with Disabilities Students with Disabilities, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	No			All Schools Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School, TK-8		$0.00	$48,300.00	$34,500.00			$13,800.00	$48,300.00	
5	5.11	Affinity Clubs	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$23,774.00	$0.00	$23,774.00				$23,774.00	

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
20163568	6483233	32.153%	0.000%	32.153%	$8,561,285.00	0.000%	42.459 %	**Total:**	$8,561,285.00
								LEA-wide Total:	$8,437,329.00
								Limited Total:	$0.00
								Schoolwide Total:	$123,956.00

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	**1.2**	Maintenance of Facilities and Compliance with Williams Act	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$83,429.00	
1	**1.3**	Teacher Development	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$13,800.00	
1	**1.4**	Substitute Teachers	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$80,500.00	
2	**2.2**	Professional Development:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School, Oakdale Heights Elementary, The Studios at Central, Ophir Elementary and Wyandotte Academy TK-8	$2,978,591.00	

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	2.3	Strategy Development for SWD:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School, The Studios at Central, Ophir Elementary, Wyandotte Academy TK-8	$240,000.00	
2	2.4	Strategies for Improvement:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Ishi Hills Middle School, Ishi Hills Middle School, The Studios at Central, Ophir Elementary, Wyandotte Academy	$58,272.00	
2	2.5	Support Services:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$488,799.00	
2	2.6	Technology Program:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$650,245.00	
2	2.7	Multilingual Program:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	Specific Schools: Studios at Central and The Wyandotte Academy TK-8	$89,898.00	
2	2.9	Implement a broad course of study	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Ishi Hills and The Studios at Central Middle Schools 6-8	$123,956.00	
2	2.10	Assessments	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$57,500.00	
2	2.15	Reduce Class Size	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$143,364.00	

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	2.16	Math MTSS				All Schools		
5	5.1	School Climate and Safety:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,233,804.00	
5	5.2	Student Support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$752,042.00	
5	5.3	Professional Development:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$23,000.00	
5	5.4	Anti-Bullying:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$15,985.00	
5	5.5	Communication	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$13,800.00	
5	5.6	School Attendance	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,410,871.00	
5	5.7	Equity and Culturally Responsive Climate	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$72,450.00	
5	5.8	Alternatives to Suspension	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$7,205.00	
5	5.11	Affinity Clubs	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$23,774.00	

2025-26 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$10,821,110.00	

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**	Staffing	No	$0.00	
1	**1.2**	Maintenance of Facilities and Compliance with Williams Act	Yes	$83,429.00	
1	**1.3**	Teacher Development	Yes	$13,800.00	
1	**1.4**	Substitute Teachers	Yes	$80,500.00	
2	**2.1**	Classroom Supply Budget: Each regular education classroom will be assigned a $500 budget.	No	$44,275.00	
2	**2.2**	Professional Development:	Yes	$2,978,591.00	
2	**2.3**	Strategy Development for SWD:	Yes	$240,000.00	
2	**2.4**	Strategies for Improvement:	Yes	$58,272.00	
2	**2.5**	Support Services:	Yes	$488,799.00	
2	**2.6**	Technology Program:	Yes	$650,245.00	

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)
2	2.7	Multilingual Program:	Yes	$89,898.00	
2	2.8	Additional Instructional Support:	No	$1,073,391.00	
2	2.9	Implement a broad course of study	Yes	$123,956.00	
2	2.10	Assessments	Yes	$57,500.00	
2	2.11	Foster Youth and Homeless	No	$5,000.00	
2	2.12	Homework Support:	No	$96,541.00	
2	2.13	Supplemental Materials	No	$6,000.00	
2	2.14	Science Adoption	No	$80,000.00	
2	2.15	Reduce Class Size	Yes	$143,364.00	
2	2.16	Math MTSS	No	$146,880.00	
3	3.1	Targeted Math Intervention	No	$0.00	
3	3.2	Targeted ELA Intervention	No	$0.00	
3	3.3	Staff Training on Homeless Population Best Support Practices for Teacher's and Support Staff	No	$0.00	

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)
3	3.4	Site Team Building and Expectation Setting in Response to Differentiated Assistance Requirements	No	$0.00	
3	3.5	PBIS Tier 1 Positive Environment Improvement Student Training	No	$0.00	
3	3.6	Create a Student Support Specialist Position to Support Students in Tier 1 PBIS Support as needed.	No	$0.00	
4	4.1	Targeted Math Intervention	No	$34,500.00	
4	4.2	Targeted ELA Intervention	No	$34,500.00	
4	4.3	Staff Training on Homeless Population Best Support Practices for Teacher's and Support Staff	No	$34,500.00	
4	4.4	Site Team Building and Expectation Setting in Response to Differentiated Assistance Requirements	No	$115,000.00	
4	4.5	PBIS Tier 1 Positive Environment Improvement Student Training	No	$82,363.00	
4	4.6	Create a Student Support Specialist Position to Support Students in Tier 1 PBIS Support as needed	No	$138,000.00	
5	5.1	School Climate and Safety:	Yes	$1,353,804.00	
5	5.2	Student Support	Yes	$952,042.00	
5	5.3	Professional Development:	Yes	$23,000.00	
5	5.4	Anti-Bullying:	Yes	$15,985.00	

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)
5	**5.5**	Communication	Yes	$13,800.00	
5	**5.6**	School Attendance	Yes	$1,410,871.00	
5	**5.7**	Equity and Culturally Responsive Climate	Yes	$72,450.00	
5	**5.8**	Alternatives to Suspension	Yes	$7,205.00	
5	**5.9**	Foster Youth and Homeless	No	$575.00	
5	**5.10**	Attendance Incentives	No	$48,300.00	
5	**5.11**	Affinity Clubs	Yes	$23,774.00	

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)
	$8,561,285.00					

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	1.2	Maintenance of Facilities and Compliance with Williams Act	Yes	$83,429.00			
1	1.3	Teacher Development	Yes	$13,800.00			
1	1.4	Substitute Teachers	Yes	$80,500.00			
2	2.2	Professional Development:	Yes	$2,978,591.00			
2	2.3	Strategy Development for SWD:	Yes	$240,000.00			
2	2.4	Strategies for Improvement:	Yes	$58,272.00			
2	2.5	Support Services:	Yes	$488,799.00			
2	2.6	Technology Program:	Yes	$650,245.00			
2	2.7	Multilingual Program:	Yes	$89,898.00			
2	2.9	Implement a broad course of study	Yes	$123,956.00			
2	2.10	Assessments	Yes	$57,500.00			
2	2.15	Reduce Class Size	Yes	$143,364.00			

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)
5	5.1	School Climate and Safety:	Yes	$1,233,804.00			
5	5.2	Student Support	Yes	$752,042.00			
5	5.3	Professional Development:	Yes	$23,000.00			
5	5.4	Anti-Bullying:	Yes	$15,985.00			
5	5.5	Communication	Yes	$13,800.00			
5	5.6	School Attendance	Yes	$1,410,871.00			
5	5.7	Equity and Culturally Responsive Climate	Yes	$72,450.00			
5	5.8	Alternatives to Suspension	Yes	$7,205.00			
5	5.11	Affinity Clubs	Yes	$23,774.00			

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)
20535218		0	32.707%				$0.00	0.000%

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 32526(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 32526(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