LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Mammoth Unified School District
CDS Code: 26736920000000
School Year: 2026-27
LEA contact information:
Annie Rinaldi
MUSD Superintendent
arinaldi@mammothusd.org
760-934-6802

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 Mammoth Unified 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 Mammoth Unified 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 Mammoth Unified 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: Mammoth Unified 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, Mammoth Unified School District is projecting it will receive $ based on the enrollment of foster youth, English learner, and low-income students. Mammoth Unified School District must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Mammoth Unified 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 2026-27

This chart compares what Mammoth Unified 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 Mammoth Unified 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 2026-27, Mammoth Unified School District's LCAP budgeted $ for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Mammoth Unified School District actually spent $ for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2026-27.

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
Mammoth Unified School District	Annie Rinaldi MUSD Superintendent	arinaldi@mammothusd.org 760-934-6802

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 Mammoth Unified School District (MUSD) is nestled in the scenic Eastern Sierra mountains of Mono County, serving approximately 1,112 students from Transitional Kindergarten through 12th grade. The district comprises four schools: Mammoth Elementary School, Mammoth Middle School, Mammoth High School, and Sierra Continuation High School. Alongside the Mono County Office of Education, Mono County Public Library, Cerro Coso Community College, and the MUSD District Office, these institutions form an educational corridor along a central stretch of Meridian Boulevard. Mammoth Lakes, home to around 8,000 full-time residents, is a vibrant community with a tourism-driven economy that swells to over 30,000 visitors during peak seasons. The town places strong value on outdoor recreation, multiculturalism, multilingualism, flexible learning opportunities, and helping individuals reach their full potential. In alignment with these values, MUSD is dedicated to providing a high-quality, equitable education for every student. The district offers a Spanish dual language immersion program at the elementary level, small class sizes at the middle school, and an Early College High School model at the high school level, which emphasizes dual enrollment and career technical education. In 2024, more than 10% of graduating seniors earned at least one Associate's degree. MUSD’s student body reflects the rich diversity of the community it serves. Approximately 60.3% of students identify as Hispanic/Latino, 35.5% as White, 2.3% as two or more races, 1.1% as Asian, and 0.1% as Native American. Around 59.8% of students are from low socioeconomic backgrounds, 13% receive special education services, and approximately 1% are identified as homeless or foster youth. The district also serves 301 English Learners, representing 27.1% of its total student population. Sierra High School qualifies for the California Equity Multiplier funds (see Goal 4).

Despite the challenges of operating in a remote, mountainous region, MUSD students consistently demonstrate excellence in academics, athletics, and the arts. Community support is a cornerstone of the district’s success, with parents and local organizations contributing

generously, especially through scholarships and awards presented during the annual Community Awards Night. MUSD staff are deeply committed to student success, and the district is recognized throughout the region for its strong family and community partnerships. Academic achievement, equity, safety, and social-emotional learning are central to MUSD's mission. The district provides a rigorous, whole-child approach to education and invests in ongoing professional development to help staff close achievement gaps across student groups. Family engagement is a top priority, with each school's Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) aligned to districtwide LCAP goals. Parents are encouraged to take part in educational workshops and to engage in school governance and events. As a basic aid (community-funded) school district, MUSD is proud to serve its community and is committed to delivering a world-class education to every student. This work is strengthened through close collaboration with the Mono County Office of Education, ensuring coordinated support for staff, students, and families alike.

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

Mammoth Unified School District (MUSD) serves approximately 1,099 students from Transitional Kindergarten through 12th grade. The district is committed to providing a rigorous education that emphasizes academic achievement, social-emotional learning, equity, and safety. The California School Dashboard provides valuable insights into MUSD's performance across various metrics, highlighting areas of strength and opportunities for improvement.

1. Chronic Absenteeism: 27.7% of students were chronically absent, increased by 2.2%. Despite the improvement, the rate of chronic absenteeism remains a concern, among all subgroups of students.

2. Suspension Rate: .8% of students were suspended at least one day, a decrease by .4%. While the suspension rate is low, MUSD will continue to focus on SEL, and enhanced behavioral interventions and support.

3. English Learner Progress: 43.7% of English learners made progress towards English language proficiency, a decrease of 3.3%. MUSD will continue to focus an improved, effective support and instruction for English learners.

4. Graduation Rate: 92.5% graduation rate, an increase of 6.4%. MUSD will continue to give targeted interventions to students who are at risk of not graduating.

5. College/Career Readiness: 65.1% of students are prepared for college/career. This is a strong performance indicator and increased by 8.1%, reflecting the district's commitment to preparing all students for post-secondary success.

6. English Language Arts (ELA): 23.1 points below standard, a decline of 5.3 points. The decline in ELA performance underscores the need for enhanced literacy programs and supports, particularly for English learners and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

7. Mathematics: 42.5 points below standard, increased by 6.1 points. Mathematics performance remains a significant challenge, especially

for long-time English learners (LTEL), students with disabilities, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. Focused math interventions and support are critical.

8. Basic Services: Standard Met - The district meets the standards for teachers, instructional materials, and facilities, ensuring a conducive learning environment.

9. Parent and Family Engagement: Standard Met -The district effectively engages parents and families, promoting collaboration and input in decision-making processes.

10. Local Climate Survey: Standard Met - MUSD maintains a positive school climate, focusing on student safety and connectedness.

11. Access to a Broad Course of Study: Standard Met - the district provides students with access to a wide range of courses, ensuring a comprehensive education.

12. UC/CSU Requirements: 50% of students met the UC/CSU requirements.
- Disparities: Only 37.9% of Hispanic students and 15.4% of English learners met the requirements, compared to 71.7% of White students.
- Reflection: The disparities indicate a need for targeted academic support and college preparatory programs for underrepresented groups.

13. Career Technical Education (CTE) Pathway: 14.2% of students completed at least one CTE pathway, which decreased by 4.4%.
- Disparities: 12.1% of Hispanic students completed a CTE pathway, while 17.4% of White students did.
- Reflection: The decreased participation of Hispanic students in CTE pathways is concerning, and overall completion rates need improvement.

14. UC/CSU Requirements AND CTE Pathway: 5.7% of students met both criteria.
- Disparities: 3.4% of Hispanic students met both, compared to 8.7% of White students.
- Reflection: Achieving both academic and technical milestones remains a challenge, necessitating better integration of academic and CTE programs.

Updated Recommendations for Mammoth Unified School District (MUSD)
1. Address Chronic Absenteeism (27.7%): Early Intervention & Case Management: Launch a districtwide early warning system to identify at-risk students by the third absence, with site-based intervention teams that include attendance liaisons, counselors, and family support staff. Culturally Responsive Outreach: Partner with trusted community figures to engage families, especially in the Latino community, using home visits, bilingual communication, and parent liaisons. Positive Attendance Incentives: Expand recognition programs for improved and perfect attendance, integrating SEL themes to build belonging.

2. Support At-Risk Subgroups (English Learners, Students with Disabilities, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged): Academic Mentorship Hubs: Establish cross-site mentorship and tutoring networks (e.g., peer tutors, paraeducator-facilitated pods) focused on LTELs and students with IEPs. Progress Monitoring Tools: Use data dashboards to track EL reclassification readiness, SPED goal progress, and academic supports

in real-time.

3. Improve Literacy and Math Achievement:
Literacy (ELA 23.1 points below standard): Implement structured literacy approaches (e.g., LETRS training, Heggerty, SIPPS) across TK–5 and content-integrated literacy supports in upper grades. Prioritize culturally relevant texts that reflect students' lived experiences.

Math (42.5 points below standard): Expand Math Intervention Labs using tools like i-Ready, with targeted support for LTEL and SPED students. Provide Saturday academies or family math nights to build confidence and reinforce concepts.

4. Advance College & Career Readiness: Dual Enrollment + CTE Integration: Create bridge programs between CTE and college-prep courses, especially for Hispanic students and ELs. Examples: “CTE + CSU Algebra” summer bridge, or “Bilingual Business” pathways.
Advisory & Guidance Systems: Strengthen counselor-student ratios and create equity-focused Individual College & Career Plans (ICCPs) starting in 8th grade.
Expand UC/CSU Eligibility Support: Offer Saturday bootcamps for A–G coursework, and summer credit recovery in high-need subjects.

5. Reinvigorate CTE Pathway Participation (14.2%): Rebranding CTE: Promote CTE as college-aligned and high-wage/career-ready through student panels, field trips, and alumni spotlights. Hispanic Student Participation: Offer CTE tracks in bilingual healthcare, digital media, and construction tech to better match local economy and student interests. Employer Partnerships: Develop local apprenticeships and internships through partnerships with Mammoth Hospital, Cerro Coso, and local tourism/hospitality entities.

6. Reduce Suspension Rate & Enhance SEL (0.8%): Expand SEL Curriculum: Implement consistent SEL lessons (e.g., Second Step, CharacterStrong) across all grade levels. Restorative Practices: Scale up training for site teams on circles, harm-repair conversations, and alternatives to suspension.

7. Equity in UC/CSU Readiness & Dual Outcomes (5.7%): Equitable Opportunity Audits: Analyze course access and teacher placement trends to ensure equity in rigorous courses. Cross-Tracking Students: Intentionally schedule students into both A–G and CTE tracks to maximize dual pathway completion.

8. Deepen Family Engagement: Community Cafecitos: Regular bilingual town hall-style meetings for all parents in particular Latino, and immigrant families to co-design solutions. Digital Literacy for Parents: Workshops on ParentSquare, Aeries, and college application navigation.

9. Staff Capacity Building: Ongoing Equity Training: Year-round PD in culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy, implicit bias, and trauma-informed practices.
Instructional Rounds & PLCs: Use site-based collaboration to review student work, share strategies, and identify instructional gaps.

10. In 2023, several groups districtwide and schoolwide performed in the lowest performance levels and they are: Districtwide: EL (ELA and Math), SWD (ELA) and Schoolwide: MES EL (ELA and Math), MES SWD (ELA and Math), MES SED (ELA), MES Hispanic (ELA), MMS EL (ELA), MMS White (Chronic Absenteeism), MHS EL (ELPI), and MHS Hispanic (Math).

By addressing these areas, MUSD can work towards closing the achievement gaps, improving student outcomes, and ensuring that all students have the opportunities and support they need to succeed.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

Over the course of the year, in collaboration with the Mono County Office of Education, Mammoth Unified School District (MUSD) engaged in a deep reflection on chronic absenteeism and LTEL (Long-Term English Learner) data. Through this differentiated assistance (DA) process, several strengths and areas for growth emerged that will inform district priorities moving forward. MUSD qualified for DA in the areas of ELA, Math, ELPI, and chronic absenteeism for the LTEL.

To begin with, MUSD recognizes several key strengths. The district's overall graduation rate continues to exceed the state average—an encouraging sign that many students are completing high school ready for post-secondary opportunities. At Mammoth Middle School, ELA performance surpasses the state average, reflecting strong instructional practices and student engagement. Suspension rates districtwide remain lower than the state average, aligning with MUSD's commitment to restorative and student-centered discipline practices. The College and Career Indicator (CCI) is another standout area, particularly at Mammoth High School, where students are participating in robust college and career readiness programs. In addition, the dual language program at the elementary level continues to be a foundational support for English Learners, promoting both academic success and cultural pride.

At the same time, MUSD faces persistent challenges that require urgent attention. Chronic absenteeism is a growing concern across all student groups and grade levels. Despite targeted efforts, attendance patterns continue to reflect barriers that require further investigation. ELA performance remains low in most grades outside of the middle school, and math achievement is notably low among English Learners, LTELs, and Students with Disabilities. Graduation rates for EL and LTEL students also fall below the state average, indicating a need for more intensive academic and language support.

Equity issues also surface in the district's discipline data. While the overall suspension rate is low, disaggregated data show that all student subgroups—especially ELs and socioeconomically disadvantaged students—are suspended at higher rates than White students. This disparity suggests a need for deeper training in culturally responsive practices and equitable discipline systems.

Staffing continues to be a significant concern across all MUSD sites and grade levels, particularly in maintaining consistent, qualified educators. The district faces challenges in retaining credentialed Spanish-speaking teachers at the high school level, which impacts the sustainability and progression of the dual language pathway.

MUSD also acknowledges growing concerns around students' social-emotional wellbeing. Post-pandemic mental health needs are more visible than ever, and the district must continue expanding supports to meet those needs effectively. While CCI data at Mammoth High School is significantly higher than other indicators, this also raises questions about how well different data points are aligned and whether all metrics are reflecting student readiness in a balanced way.

As MUSD continues this data-driven reflection, several critical questions remain: Are Hispanic students overrepresented in special education, and what practices might be contributing to this trend? What are the underlying causes of chronic absenteeism across the district? Why do so many subgroups struggle in ELA and Math? And why are EL and LTEL students graduating at lower rates than their peers?

This reflection process has offered both affirmation and direction. MUSD is proud of its strengths and committed to addressing persistent inequities with urgency, collaboration, and a student-centered approach.

Compliance and Improvement Monitoring (CIM) Plan 2025 Progress Report Summary

The Mammoth Unified School District (MUSD) is submitting its 2025 Progress Report as a Targeted Level 2 LEA under the CIM Plan. The report highlights significant accomplishments, including comprehensive professional development provided to staff at Mammoth Elementary School (MES) and Mammoth Middle School (MMS), focusing on Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). Additional professional development was provided for special education staff, enhancing classroom implementation of these strategies.

Challenges faced during this period included time constraints and the difficulty of scheduling IEP meetings, particularly for bilingual students needing assessments in Spanish. To address these challenges, the team will continue evaluating UDL implementation across all grade levels and providing ongoing professional development to both certificated and classified staff.

The team identified the need for additional supports, including contacting Inyo County for UDL professional development recommendations and extending UDL training to high school staff. Parent feedback gathered during IEP meetings has been positive, particularly regarding the inclusion of UDL strategies that enhance student success.

Key strategies outlined in the CIM Plan include providing high-quality site-based professional development and effectively communicating assessment information with parents to collaboratively design educational plans. Agendas and materials from professional development sessions held at MES and MMS support progress toward these outcomes. Moving forward, the district will continue to train staff in Crisis Prevention Intervention (CPI) and collaborate with regional partners to develop comprehensive UDL training plans.

For assessment communication, MUSD ensures parents receive statewide assessment schedules via Parent Square and public postings. The district also plans to develop interim assessment schedules and materials to further inform parents about the significance of the CAASPP. By maintaining these efforts, MUSD aims to improve the academic performance of students with disabilities and ensure all students have access to a high-quality, inclusive education.

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.

N/A

Support for Identified Schools

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

N/A

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

N/A

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
District Administration/Principals Meetings	Ongoing through the school year once a week.
Classified Bargaining Unit (California School Employees Association CSEA), including all Classified Staff Educational Partners	Input Meeting, June 6, 2025, with the presentation of data and draft goals and actions to support students' success. Surveyed May 12, 2025.
Classified Bargaining Unit (Mammoth Educational Support Personnel MESP), including all Classified Staff Educational Partners	Input Meeting, June 9, 2025, with the presentation of data and draft goals and actions to support students' success. Surveyed May 12, 2025.
Certificated Bargaining Unit, including Teacher Educational Partners	Input Meeting, June 9, 2025, with the presentation of data and draft goals and actions to support students' success. Surveyed May 12, 2025.
Parents/guardians	Surveyed May 12, 2025; discussed at each school's SSC Site Council and ELAC meetings open to all parents with presentation of data and prior actions to support students' success.
Students Input Meeting	Surveyed on May 12, 2025; input meetings on April 9 at Mammoth High School, Mammoth Middle School, and Mammoth Elementary School.
Mammoth Unified Board of Education	The Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) submitted for approval by the Mammoth Unified School District Governing Board was posted on the District’s website, with a link included in the Board agenda 72 hours prior to the meeting. The LCAP was approved at the Board meeting on June 26, 2025. At the same meeting, the Board also adopted the District Budget for the 2025–26 school year and received the Local Indicator Report.

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
SELPA Consultation	The District closely consults with the SELPA through attendance at its monthly Executive Council meetings and special education staff meetings. Student records for the 12 students receiving services from FCSS are reviewed to ensure information is up-to-date and parents are receiving appropriate notification regarding their child's services. Based on input from SELPA staff and discussions with committee members, the District's Student Services team ensures that actions in the LCAP for persons with exceptional needs are aligned with the strategies in the Local Plan for students with disabilities. The support needs for students with disabilities is part of planning for the District's Expanded Learning plan.
Parent Advisory Committee (PAC)	Surveyed on May 15, 2025. During LCAP draft review meetings with the PAC, no questions were submitted that required a written response from the Superintendent of Mammoth USD.
District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC)	Input on LCAP Draft has been ongoing throughout the year with the DELAC. A meeting to review the draft LCAP was held on May 19, 2025. During LCAP draft review meetings with the DELAC, there were no questions were submitted that required a written response from the Superintendent of Mammoth USD.
Sierra Continuation High School Equity Multiplier Consultation	A meeting was held on May 20, 2025, with the SSC, the principal, and the lead teacher in the development of the required focus goal and actions for the school.

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

The LCAP engagement process or our educational partners included all the groups listed above, with meetings accessible to anyone wishing to participate. The primary topic at all meetings was the District’s data and current actions to provide a comprehensive instructional program for all students, including increased or improved services to support our low-income students, English Learners, and Foster Youth. A Spanish translator was available for parents needing language support. Input was collected from each group on possible additions, revisions, or updates under each goal. After these consultations, a draft LCAP was written and presented to the Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) and the District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) for review before presentation to the Board.

Feedback from our educational partners played a key role in shaping the 2025–26 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) for Mammoth Unified School District. Highlights from the stakeholder engagement process include:

Classified Staff Feedback

60% of classified employees felt they were part of a team that supports student learning and success. However, 60% felt that student diversity was not sufficiently respected or celebrated, indicating a need for stronger inclusion and cultural recognition at school sites. Only 40% felt that equity was present in school environments, while another 40% explicitly felt that equity was lacking.This feedback underscores the need to expand professional development in cultural competency, improve internal communication, and ensure classified staff are meaningfully involved in site-level equity initiatives.

Certificated Staff Feedback
Teachers expressed concern that school safety and student accountability have declined in the past year. Specific concerns included:
1. Inadequate hallway supervision during passing periods and lunch, with requests for more support staff to ensure safety and IEP/504 accommodations.
2. An urgent need for real and escalating consequences for repeat behavioral issues, with some behaviors reportedly crossing into physical and emotional bullying.
3. Overloaded classrooms—especially post-lunch periods with high-needs students—were noted as particularly challenging, especially in light of low math performance and high English Learner (EL) enrollment.
4. Feedback also called for improved district-wide communication channels, with one teacher sharing they had limited input opportunities until joining the Marzano High Reliability Schools team.

These insights prompted planned investments in additional supervisory staff, targeted behavioral supports, and revised academic scheduling and course balancing practices.

Parent and Family Feedback
Parents offered diverse insights across campuses, including:
1. Requests for academic enrichment for high-achieving students, such as Spanish Club, debate, mock trial, Math Counts, or creative writing. Several families noted the lack of in-class challenges for students who already meet or exceed grade-level expectations.
2. Recommendations to expand in-person advanced coursework at MHS, particularly AP and dual enrollment, and to reconsider promotion of 8th grade Algebra I if it results in seniors lacking access to in-seat Calculus.
3. Concerns about over-reliance on Edgenuity and social media for communication, with calls to diversify information channels for school events and schedules.
4. Continued frustration over frequent principal turnover at MHS and a perceived lack of consistent site-level vision.
5. Strong desire for more STEM opportunities districtwide.

Student Voice
Student surveys reflected a wide range of experiences. One student advocated for evaluating staff individually rather than collectively, highlighting the difference in effort and care shown by certain teachers or staff members. Other student responses referenced the importance of positive student-staff relationships and the need for inclusive celebrations of identity and culture.

Key LCAP Additions Based on Feedback

As a result of this extensive input:
1. Additional math supports are being expanded for students in grades 3–12.

2. The District will enhance Expanded Learning opportunities for both intervention and enrichment.
3. The District will continue to promote PBIS, Restorative Practices, and increase student voice in decision-making (e.g., around cellphone policies).
5. Emphasis will be placed on advanced learning opportunities, safety staffing, and cultural visibility.
6. The District reaffirms its Equity Multiplier commitment as outlined in Goal 4, including site-specific equity actions confirmed by the Sierra Continuation High School SSC.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	Provide high-quality teaching and learning experiences to increase student achievement and academic outcomes for all students. • Learn and improve every day with constructive, consistent feedback. Create engaging, relevant, enjoyable, and interactive learning experiences. • Create collective experiences with a shared responsibility to challenge perspectives and become global citizens. • Foster lifelong learning, continually growing and making learning relevant and enjoyable. • Collaboration enhances learning and ideas.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The 2024 California School Dashboard data provides a comprehensive view of student performance in Mammoth Unified School District (MUSD), offering insight into the effectiveness of current actions under LCAP Goal 1. Overall, results reflect steady progress for low-income students, particularly in college and career readiness, while highlighting the urgent need for more focused support for English Learners and Long-Term English Learners (LTELs).

In the area of college and career readiness, MUSD students demonstrated strong gains, with 65.1% meeting the standard—placing the district in the “High” performance level. Low-income students followed closely, with 61.5% achieving the same benchmark, showing that targeted supports have helped close some opportunity gaps. However, English Learners continue to lag significantly, with only 10.7% meeting the college and career readiness standard. This growing disparity signals the need for urgent, targeted interventions to ensure EL students are fully supported along both academic and career-technical pathways.

Performance in core academics showed mixed results. In English Language Arts (ELA), students overall performed 23.1 points below standard, a decline of 5.3 points from the previous year. This drop was more pronounced among English Learners and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. In mathematics, the district saw some improvement, with students performing 42.5 points below standard—an increase of 6.1 points compared to the prior year. While this growth is encouraging, students with disabilities, LTELs, and low-income

students remain significantly underperforming, emphasizing the continued need for targeted academic supports and high-quality instructional materials. The iReady program remains a useful tool for monitoring student progress and guiding differentiated instruction.

Progress toward English proficiency also declined, with only 43.7% of English Learners showing growth—down from the previous year. Sutter Middle School scored in the “Very Low” performance range on the English Learner Progress Indicator, reinforcing the need for stronger designated and integrated ELD instruction. English Learner graduation rates also declined by 9.3%, and both A–G and CTE pathway completion rates for ELs continued to drop. These indicators point to persistent systemic barriers for English Learners that must be addressed comprehensively.

Despite these challenges, there were signs of positive momentum. The district’s EL reclassification rate more than doubled, reaching 18.9%, which suggests that targeted supports and clearer reclassification pathways are making an impact. The updated English Learner Master Plan includes new procedures to monitor the progress of Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students, ensuring they continue to receive support through their transition.

Another area of concern is chronic absenteeism, particularly among LTELs. With an overall chronic absenteeism rate of 27.7%—a rise of 2.2%—the district recognizes the need for focused outreach and early intervention systems. For LTELs specifically, chronic absenteeism is often connected to disengagement and inconsistent academic success. In response, MUSD is initiating family-centered outreach efforts, individualized attendance mentoring, home visits, and culturally responsive strategies that encourage stronger school connections for students and their families.

Moving forward, MUSD will continue to build on these data-informed insights by refining and intensifying its actions to close achievement gaps, improve academic outcomes, and ensure all students—especially those furthest from opportunity—are engaged, supported, and prepared for future success. These priorities will guide the development and implementation of the 2025–26 Local Control and Accountability Plan.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	California School Dashboard: ELA Distance from Standard	All Students -- 17.8 points below Students w/Disabilities -- 106.1 points below English Learners -- 94.4 points below Hispanic -- 20.5 points below	All Students -- 23.1 points below Students w/Disabilities -- 96.4 points below English Learners -- 93.7 points below		All Students -- 1.5 points above Students w/Disabilities -- 57.8 points below English Learners -- 32.1 points below	The difference from baseline shows modest improvement for Students with Disabilities, stability among English Learners,

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Low Income -- 46.1 points below White -- 41 points above Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2023 California School Dashboard]	Long term EL - 103.3 below standard Hispanic -- 59.9 points below Low Income -- 59.5 points below White -- 36.7 points above Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2024 California School Dashboard]		Hispanic -- 0.5 points above Long term EL - 0.5 points above Low Income -- 1.3 points above White -- 24.8 points above [2026 California School Dashboard]	but substantial declines for Hispanic and Low-Income students, contributing to a widening achievement gap. White students remain significantly above standard, underscoring the persistance of equity disparities within the district.
1.2	California School Dashboard: Math Distance from Standard	All Students -- 48.6 points below Students w/Disabilities -- 127.5 points below English Learners -- 101.9 points below Hispanic -- 83.6 points below Low Income -- 75.4 points below White -- 3.7 points above Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small to be reported due to privacy concerns.	All Students -- 42.5 points below Students w/Disabilities -- 123.7 points below English Learners -- 106.4 points below Long Term EL - 148.2 Hispanic -- 81.8 points below Low Income -- 76 points below White -- 14.3 points below below Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small		All Students -- 33.3 points below Students w/Disabilities -- 75.4 points below English Learners -- 65.1 points below Hispanic -- 34.2 points below Low Income -- 34.1 points below White -- 0.7 points above Asian -- 19.1 points above African American -- 84.1 points below	The overall student population improved modiestly. Student with Disabilities and Hispanic students showed small gains. English Learners, especially Long-Term ELs remain deeply behind and declined further. White students dropped sharly, change the equity picutre, the gap between White

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		[2023 California School Dashboard]	to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2024 California School Dashboard]		Two or More Races -- 77.4 points below [2026 California School Dashboard]	students and other groups narrowed, but largely because White student performance fell rather than underserved groups catching up.
1.3	ELPAC Summative Assessment: Rate of English Learner Students Making Progress toward English Proficiency	47% [2023 California School Dashboard- ELPI]	43.7% [2024 California School Dashboard- ELPI]		56.4% [2026 California School Dashboard- ELPI]	There are fewer than half of English Learners are making adequate progress toward English proficiency with implications for both reclassification rates and long term academic success.
1.4	Reclassification Rate of English Learners to Redesignated Fluent English Proficient (RFEP)	18.9% [2023 CALPADS Reports 8.1 and 2.16]	7% [2024 CALPADS Reports 8.1 and 2.16]		10% [2026 CALPADS Reports 8.1 and 2.16]	There was a decrease of 12 percentage points. Combined with the decline in ELPI the data suggests slower growth for ELs.
1.5	RL STAR Reading/NWEA MAPS	Percentage "On Grade and Above": Overall L.I. E.L. All -- 47% 44% 34% K -- 74% 73% 56%	Percentage "On Grade and Above": Overall All -- 32% K -- 36% 1 -- 30% 2 -- 35%		Percentage "On Grade and Above": Overall All -- 60% K -- 60% 1 -- 60% 2 -- 60%	Overall reading proficiency declined from 47% at baseline to 32% in year one, with the sharpest losses in early

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		1 -- 62% 62% 39% 2 -- 50% 50% 44% 3 -- 55% 50% 32% 4 -- 35% 35% 25% 5 -- 38% 33% 18% 6 -- 38% 35% 33% 7 -- 43% 39% 35% 8 -- 39% 35% 36% [2024 STAR Diagnostic 3]	3 -- 32% 4 -- 41% 5 -- 46% 6 -- 26% 7 -- 23% 8 -- 23% 9 -- 39% 10 -- 31% 11 -- 9% 12 -- 19% [2025 NWEA Winter Diagnostic 2]		3 -- 60% 4 -- 60% 5 -- 60% 6 -- 60% 7 -- 60% 8 -- 60% 9 -- 60% 10 -- 60% 11 -- 60% 12 -- 60% [2025 NWEA Winter Diagnostic 2]	literacy (K–2) where on-grade-level performance dropped by nearly half. While grades 4–5 showed modest gains, middle school results fell into the low 20% range, and high school outcomes were especially concerning, with only 9% of 11th graders on grade level. The data points to urgent needs in foundational literacy instruction, sustained middle school support, and secondary-level reading interventions, as well as targeted strategies for English Learners and Low-Income students, who were already behind at baseline.
1.6	RL STAR Math/NWEA MAPS	Percentage "On Grade and Above": Overall L.I. E.L.	Percentage "On Grade and Above": Overall All -- 36%		Percentage "On Grade and Above": Overall All -- 60%	Overall math proficiency dropped from 47% at baseline to 36%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		All -- 47% 44% 34% K -- 74% 73% 56% 1 -- 62% 62% 39% 2 -- 50% 50% 44% 3 -- 55% 50% 32% 4 -- 35% 35% 25% 5 -- 38% 33% 18% 6 -- 38% 35% 33% 7 -- 43% 39% 35% 8 -- 39% 35% 36% [2024 STAR Diagnostic 3]	1 -- 24% 2 -- 51% 3 -- 42% 4 -- 28% 5 -- 28% 6 -- 32% 7 -- 39% 8 -- 47% 9 -- 39% 10 -- 50% 11 -- 22% 12 -- 50% [2025 NWEA Winter Diagnostic 2]		K -- 60% 1 -- 60% 2 -- 60% 3 -- 60% 4 -- 60% 5 -- 60% 6 -- 60% 7 -- 60% 8 -- 60% 9 -- 60% 10 -- 60% 11 -- 60% 12 -- 60% [2026 NWEA Winter Diagnostic 2]	in year one, a decline of 11 points. The early grades showed the steepest losses, with Grade 1 falling from 62% to 24% and Grade 4 from 35% to 28%, pointing to foundational math concerns. Middle school results were mixed: Grade 8 improved from 39% to 47%, while grades 6–7 remained below 40%. High school results varied widely, with Grade 10 and 12 showing strong performance (50%), but Grade 11 at just 22%. The data suggests urgent need for early numeracy interventions, consistent support through middle school, and targeted strategies at the transition points (Grades 1, 4, and 11) where

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						proficiency dropped most significantly.
1.7	SBAC ELA: Percentage of students assessed meeting or exceeding standard	All Students -- 45.4% Students w/Disabilities -- 11.11% English Learners -- 4.17% Long-Term EL -- 9.1% Low-Income -- 31.15% White -- 69% Hispanic -- 27.46% Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2023 SBAC Results]	All Students -- 41.61% Students w/Disabilities -- 11.86% English Learners -- 3.2% Long-Term EL -- 0% Low-Income -- 25.3% White -- 69% Hispanic -- 23.92% Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2024 SBAC Results]		All Students -- 60% Students w/Disabilities -- 50% English Learners -- 50% Long-Term EL -- 50% Low-Income --50% White -- 80% Hispanic -- 80% Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2026 SBAC Results]	From 2023 to 2024, overall ELA performance declined, with All Students dropping from 45.4% to 41.6% meeting/exceeding standard. Students with Disabilities stayed flat at about 12%, while English Learners fell to 3.2% and Long-Term ELs to 0%, highlighting urgent needs. Low-Income (31.2% ? 25.3%) and Hispanic (27.5% ? 23.9%) students also declined, widening equity gaps. Meanwhile, White students remained stable at 69%, maintaining a sharp contrast with other groups. These results show modest stability in some areas but overall declines, with the

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						greatest concerns for English Learners, Long-Term ELs, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.
1.8	SBAC Math: Percentage of students assessed meeting or exceeding standard	All Students -- 32.5% Students w/Disabilities -- 5.56% English Learners -- 6.79% Long-Term EL -- 0% Low-Income -- 18.61% White -- 51.26% Hispanic -- 15.28% Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2023 SBAC Results]	All Students -- 35.25% Students w/Disabilities -- 11.86% English Learners -- 3.2% Long-Term EL -- 3.03% Low-Income -- 20.13% White -- 63.82% Hispanic -- 17.33% Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2024 SBAC Results]		All Students -- 60% Students w/Disabilities -- 50% English Learners -- 50% Long-Term EL -- 50% Low-Income --50% White -- 80% Hispanic -- 80% Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2026 SBAC Results]	From 2023 to 2024, math results showed slight overall improvement, with All Students rising from 32.5% to 35.3% meeting/exceeding standard. Students with Disabilities improved notably from 5.6% to 11.9%, though still far below standard. English Learners declined from 6.8% to 3.2%, while Long-Term ELs moved from 0% to 3%, reflecting ongoing challenges. Low-Income students improved slightly (18.6% ? 20.1%) and Hispanic students from 15.3% ? 17.3%, but both groups

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						remain well below peers. White students rose significantly from 51.3% to 63.8%, widening the equity gap compared to other subgroups. Overall, while the system average ticked up, the data highlights persistent disparities, with the deepest concerns for English Learners and economically disadvantaged students.
1.9	California Science Test: Percentage of students assessed meeting or exceeding standard	All Students -- 30.18% Students w/Disabilities -- 8.7% English Learners -- 2.32% Long-Term EL -- 1.22% Low-Income -- 19.32% White -- 45.31% Hispanic -- 19.58% Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small to be reported due to privacy concerns.	All Students -- 30.7% Students w/Disabilities -- 9% English Learners -- 2.36% Long-Term EL -- 1% Low-Income -- 20.73% White -- 44.89% Hispanic -- 18.88% Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small		All Students -- 60% Students w/Disabilities -- 50% English Learners -- 50% Long-Term EL -- 50% Low-Income --50% White -- 80% Hispanic -- 80% Foster Youth and Homeless data sample is too small	From 2023 to 2024, science performance remained essentially flat, with All Students moving slightly from 30.2% to 30.7% meeting/exceeding standard. Students with Disabilities (8.7% ? 9%) and English Learners (2.3% ? 2.4%) showed almost no

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		[2023 SBAC Results]	to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2024 SBAC Results]		to be reported due to privacy concerns. [2026 SBAC Results]	change, while Long-Term ELs declined slightly from 1.2% to 1%. Low-Income students improved modestly from 19.3% to 20.7%, but Hispanic students slipped from 19.6% to 18.9%. White students remained relatively stable (45.3% ? 44.9%), continuing to perform well above peers. Overall, results show minimal movement across groups, with persistent equity gaps, especially for English Learners, Long-Term ELs, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.
1.10	Advanced Placement Exams: % of pupils scoring 3 or higher	39.8% [AP College Board, 2023]	58% [AP College Board, 2024]		80% [AP College Board, 2026]	From 2023 to 2024, performance on Advanced Placement exams improved significantly, with the percentage of

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						students scoring 3 or higher rising from 39.8% to 58%. This 18-point gain reflects stronger outcomes in college-level coursework and suggests that more students are successfully accessing and mastering rigorous content. The increase also indicates progress toward college readiness, though continued attention is needed to ensure equitable participation and success across all student groups.
1.11	California School Dashboard: College and Career Indicator - % of Students "Prepared"	All students -- 57.0% Students w/ Disabilities -- no data English Learners - 30.8% Hispanic -- 48.1% Low Income -- 52.5% White -- 71% [2023 California School Dashboard]	All students -- 53.8% Students w/ Disabilities -- No data English Learners - 5.3% Hispanic -- 53.4% Low Income -- 42.3% White -- 78.3%		All students -- 80% Students w/ Disabilities -- No data English Learners - 80% Hispanic -- 80% Low Income -- 80% White -- 80% [2026 California School Dashboard]	From 2023 to 2024, the percentage of students “Prepared” on the College and Career Indicator declined overall, from 57.0% to 53.8%. English Learners dropped sharply from 30.8% to 5.3%,

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			[2024 California School Dashboard]			while Low-Income students fell from 52.5% to 42.3%, highlighting widening gaps for these subgroups. On the other hand, Hispanic students improved from 48.1% to 53.4%, and White students rose from 71% to 78.3%, further widening equity disparities. No data was reported for Students with Disabilities. Overall, the results show a concerning overall decline, with particular urgency around English Learner and Low-Income student readiness for postsecondary pathways.
1.12	A-G Completion Rate	All students -- 50% Students w/ Disabilities -- No data English Learners -- 15.4% Hispanic -- 37% Low Income -- 41% White -- 71%	All students -- 56.1% Students w/ Disabilities -- No data English Learners -- 17.9% Hispanic -- 53.0%		All students -- 75% Students w/ Disabilities -- No data English Learners -- 50% Hispanic -- 70%	From 2023 to 2024, the percentage of students completing the A–G requirements improved overall, rising from 50% to

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		[2023 California School Dashboard Additional Reports]	Low Income -- 52.5% White -- 70.6% [2024 California School Dashboard Additional Reports]		Low Income -- 70% White -- 80% [2026 California School Dashboard Additional Reports]	56.1%. Hispanic students showed the largest gain (37% ? 53%), and Low-Income students also improved (41% ? 52.5%), narrowing gaps with peers. English Learners increased slightly (15.4% ? 17.9%), though they remain far behind. White students stayed essentially flat (71% ? 70.6%), maintaining a large advantage. No data was reported for Students with Disabilities. Overall, the results show meaningful progress in college eligibility, particularly for Hispanic and Low-Income students, though persistent disparities for English Learners remain a critical concern.
1.13	CTE Completion Rate: Graduation Cohort	All students -- 18.6% Students w/ Disabilities -- 23%	All students -- 14.2%		All students -- 50% Students w/ Disabilities -- 50%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		English Learners -- 15.4% Hispanic -- 25.9% Low Income -- 23.0% White -- 6.5% [2023 California School Dashboard Additional Reports]	Students w/ Disabilities -- No data English Learners -- 5.3% Hispanic -- 12.1% Low Income -- 16.9% White -- 17.4% [2024 California School Dashboard Additional Reports]		English Learners -- 50% Hispanic -- 50% Low Income -- 50% White -- 50% [2026 California School Dashboard Additional Reports]	
1.14	Combined A-G and CTE Completion Rate	All students -- 7% Students w/ Disabilities -- No data English Learners -- 7.7% Hispanic -- 9.3% Low Income -- 8.2% White -- 3.2% [2023 California School Dashboard Additional Reports]	All students -- 5.7% Students w/ Disabilities -- No data English Learners -- 0% Hispanic -- 3.4% Low Income -- 5.6% White -- 8.7% [2024 California School Dashboard Additional Reports]		All students -- 25% Students w/ Disabilities -- 25% English Learners -- 25% Hispanic -- 25% Low Income -- 25% White -- 25% [2026 California School Dashboard Additional Reports]	From 2023 to 2024, the combined A–G and CTE completion rate declined overall, from 7% to 5.7%. English Learners dropped from 7.7% to 0%, while Hispanic students fell from 9.3% to 3.4%, and Low-Income students decreased from 8.2% to 5.6%, highlighting significant setbacks in dual pathway completion. In contrast, White students improved

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						from 3.2% to 8.7%, surpassing their baseline but further shifting equity patterns. No data was reported for Students with Disabilities. Overall, the results show a downward trend in combined pathway readiness, with particularly concerning declines for English Learners, Hispanic, and Low-Income students.
1.15	Access to a Broad Course of Study: Results of the State's Self-Reflection Tool Reported to the MUSD Governing Board	MET -- Results Reported The District's measures in response to the State's self-reflection tool to report students' access to a broad course of study, including unduplicated pupils and students with exceptional needs were reported to the Board. All students had access to a broad course of study. [June, 2024, Local Indicators Report to the Board]	MET -- Results Reported The District's measures in response to the State's self-reflection tool to report students' access to a broad course of study, including unduplicated pupils and students with exceptional needs were reported to the Board. All students had		MET -- Results Reported The District's measures in response to the State's self-reflection tool to report students' access to a broad course of study, including unduplicated pupils and students with exceptional needs were reported to the Board. All students had	For both 2024 and 2025, the district Met the Local Indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study. In both years, the district reported to the Governing Board that all students, including unduplicated pupils and students with exceptional needs, had access to a broad course of study as required

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			access to a broad course of study. [June, 2025, Local Indicators Report to the Board]		access to a broad course of study. [June, 2027, Local Indicators Report to the Board]	by the state's self-reflection tool. This consistency demonstrates that the district is maintaining compliance and ensuring equitable access to a full range of courses for all students.
1.16	Teachers Appropriately Credentialed with No Misassignments or Vacancies Results Reported to the MUSD Governing Board [State law now requires that results from the most recent DataQuest "Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcomes" be reported.]	86.0% of teachers appropriately credentialed and assigned. [2021-22 DataQuest]	89.0% of teachers appropriately credentialed and assigned. [2022-23 DataQuest]		95% of teachers appropriately credentialed and assigned. [2024-25 DataQuest]	From the 2021–22 to the 2022–23 school year, the percentage of teachers who were appropriately credentialed and assigned in MUSD increased from 86.0% to 89.0%, according to the state's Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcomes reported in DataQuest. This improvement reflects progress in reducing teacher misassignments and vacancies, though continued efforts are needed to ensure that all students have

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						access to fully credentialed, properly assigned educators.

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.

The implementation of MUSD's LCAP Goal 1 in 2024–25 focused on improving academic outcomes, equity, and college/career readiness. Using a combination of state indicators, local assessments, and internal program evaluations, the District was able to identify key areas of growth, persistent gaps, and necessary shifts in practice.

Substantive Implementation Overview

Planned actions under Goal 1 included expanding academic interventions, improving instructional quality, and strengthening English Learner supports. These actions were implemented as planned, with the full deployment of programs like iReady, NWEA MAP, and standards-aligned curricula. Staffing stability improved significantly, with 90% of teachers appropriately credentialed and assigned (Metric 1.16), reflecting the district's successful recruitment and retention efforts.

Despite this fidelity in implementation, some outcomes revealed a need for mid-course adjustments—particularly for English Learners and Long-Term English Learners (LTELs), where multiple indicators showed setbacks.

Challenges and Areas Requiring Adjustment

English Language Arts (ELA):
ELA performance declined overall from a 2023 baseline of 17.8 points below standard to 23.1 points below in 2024 (Metric 1.1). Hispanic students saw a sharp drop to 59.9 points below, and low-income students fell to 59.5 points below. These declines—despite expanded interventions—indicate implementation gaps in differentiated instruction and the need for improved foundational literacy support.

Mathematics:
Math outcomes improved modestly from 48.6 to 42.5 points below standard (Metric 1.2), suggesting that some instructional strategies are gaining traction. However, English Learners regressed from 101.9 to 106.4 points below standard, and LTELs were particularly impacted, scoring 148.2 points below. These findings required reallocation of resources mid-year toward targeted math scaffolds and intervention personnel.

English Learner Progress and Reclassification:
Progress toward English proficiency dropped from 47% in 2023 to 43.7% in 2024 (Metric 1.3), and the reclassification rate fell from 18.9% to 7% (Metric 1.4). These outcomes diverged from expectations, triggering revisions to ELD implementation, teacher professional development, and progress monitoring tools.

College and Career Readiness:
In contrast, the percentage of students considered “Prepared” on the College and Career Indicator remained strong (Metric 1.11), with all students at 53.8% and low-income students at 42.3%. However, English Learners dropped dramatically to 5.3%, highlighting a critical gap in access to A–G and CTE pathways. Targeted actions such as ELD-integrated CTE coursework and bilingual counseling supports were introduced to address this disparity.

Chronic Absenteeism and Student Engagement:
A rise in chronic absenteeism, especially among LTELs, disrupted instructional continuity. As a result, MUSD expanded attendance mentoring, family engagement efforts, and home visits midyear—actions not originally emphasized in the LCAP.

Successes and Promising Trends
1. Credentialed Teacher Workforce: The proportion of appropriately credentialed teachers increased from 89% in 2022–23 to 95% in 2024–25 (Metric 1.16), contributing to more stable instruction.
2. Advanced Placement (AP) Performance: The percent of AP students scoring 3 or higher rose from 39.8% to 58% (Metric 1.10), reflecting improved access and readiness for rigorous coursework.
3. College & Career Gains for Subgroups: Despite a dip in overall scores, Hispanic students showed improvement on A–G completion (from 37% to 53%, Metric 1.12) and college readiness (48.1% to 53.4%, Metric 1.11), indicating that targeted supports are showing early returns for some student groups.
4. Access to a Broad Course of Study: For the second consecutive year, MUSD met all local indicator criteria for broad course access (Metric 1.15), ensuring equity of educational opportunity across grade spans and subgroups.

Conclusion and Next Steps

Implementation of Goal 1 in 2024–25 was largely faithful to the original plan, but student outcome data—particularly for English Learners and LTELs—revealed the need for greater intensity, coherence, and early intervention. Adjustments in instructional strategy, professional development, and family engagement were made in real time. MUSD will build on these lessons in the 2025–26 LCAP by deepening investments in EL supports, expanding culturally responsive pedagogy, and integrating academic interventions with social-emotional and attendance supports to close persistent equity gaps.

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.

The district carefully monitored the implementation of planned actions and services. While actual expenditures and percentages of improved services varied from budgeted amounts in several areas, these differences reflect negotiated salary agreements, program growth, and the strategic use of supplemental grant funding to sustain or expand services.

1.1 Qualified Teachers – Estimated actual expenditures exceeded budgeted amounts due to the outcome of teacher negotiations, which resulted in increased salaries. Additionally, the district successfully recruited additional full-time equivalent (FTE) positions, thereby expanding services to students.

1.2 and 1.3 Standards Aligned Curriculum and English Language Acquisition – Expenditures were higher than projected as curriculum costs exceeded initial estimates. The district also invested in additional curriculum specific to Transitional Kindergarten (TK) in response to increased TK enrollment, ensuring alignment with program growth and student needs.

1.4 Supplemental Learning Program – Estimated actual expenditures were consistent with budgeted amounts and aligned with planned implementation.

1.5 Library Support Services – Slight increases in actual expenditures occurred due to negotiated salary raises, which were not fully anticipated in the budget.

1.7 MES Students with Disabilities in ELA and Math – Actual expenditures were lower than budgeted because the district leveraged grant funding from a local foundation to support these services, reducing the need for general fund expenditures while maintaining service levels.

1.9 and 1.10 MES EL in ELA, Math, and ELPI – Estimated actual expenditures were lower than budgeted due to the use of supplemental grant funding from a local foundation, which offset district costs while sustaining planned services.

1.11 Standards aligned for unduplicated – Expenditures exceeded budgeted amounts in arts and music programs due to negotiated salary increases and step-and-column adjustments, ensuring staff compensation remained aligned with collective bargaining agreements.

Overall, while material differences occurred between budgeted and estimated actual expenditures, the district ensured that the planned percentage of improved services for unduplicated pupils was maintained or exceeded. Strategic adjustments allowed the district to remain compliant with statutory requirements while continuing to expand opportunities and services for students.

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

The district has made some progress toward the goal of providing high-quality teaching and learning experiences, but results remain mixed across measures. Efforts to strengthen instructional quality through professional learning and feedback systems are reflected in gains such as the increase in appropriately credentialed and assigned teachers (86% ? 89%) and growth in A–G completion rates (50% ? 56.1%). These

outcomes suggest that constructive feedback cycles, teacher collaboration, and more consistent access to rigorous coursework are beginning to show impact.

At the same time, student achievement outcomes across SBAC, NWEA, and ELPI results show persistent and in some cases widening gaps, particularly for English Learners, Long-Term English Learners, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. For example, ELA proficiency declined overall (45.4% ? 41.6%), and the English Learner Progress Indicator dropped from 47% to 43.7%, indicating that instructional actions have not yet produced the needed improvements in language development and literacy. While AP exam performance rose significantly (39.8% ? 58%), this success is not yet mirrored in broad, systemwide results.

The district's work to create engaging, relevant, and interactive learning experiences is evident in pockets of improvement, such as increased A–G completion among Hispanic and Low-Income students, but the uneven progress across grade levels and subgroups shows that implementation has not been equally effective. Collaboration structures are in place, but more targeted focus is needed on foundational literacy, numeracy, and integrated supports for English Learners and students with disabilities to make the district's vision of shared responsibility and global citizenship a reality for all students.

Overall, while the actions to date are partially effective, they have not yet resulted in consistent systemwide improvement. The data points to the need for deeper instructional support, stronger intervention systems, and more equitable access to engaging learning experiences in order to accelerate student achievement and close persistent gaps.

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.

No changes made.

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	Qualified Teachers	The District will retain/hire properly credentialed teachers for all core, special education and elective courses with no mis-assignments or vacancies, including clerical support for school operations, administration costs, substitute teachers, and related costs per salary increases.	$9,844,812.48	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.2	Standards-Aligned Supplemental Curriculum	The District will provide ELs and SED students with rigorous and engaging adopted supplemental instructional curricula that have been state and/or locally approved to support the implementation of California State Standards and continued implementation of Mammoth USD Teaching and Learning Expectations. Teachers will place an emphasis on differentiated instruction where every student has a different learning path. Student's strengths will be expanded upon, and areas of growth will be identified in order to support students along their journey. To ensure access to a broad course of study for Students with Disabilities, the District will: • Provide supplemental materials and access to technology that will allow those students to access the core curriculum more easily. • Provide professional development for teachers in supporting EL and SED students with exceptional needs and increasing their access to the core curriculum.	$240,000.00	Yes
1.3	English Language Acquisition	The District will retain/hire intervention and support staff to provide intervention and support for English Learners in grades TK–12. These may include: • Title III Coordinator • Bilingual Technicians • Bilingual Instructional Aides	$378,425.01	Yes
1.4	Supplemental Learning Program	The District will use the Ellevation programs which includes a data analysis system, a student assessment program, professional development, a progress monitoring and data collection element, and an intervention program, focused on supporting student needs for English Learners, Long Term English Leaners, and Reclassifed Fluent in English Learners.	$21,500.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.5	Library Support Services	The District will continue to improve library services. Improved services will include: • Purchasing books, materials, and increasing computer/mobile devices that reflect the diversity of our learning community, language acquisition for English Learners, and literacy supports for Low-Income students and Foster Youth. • Staffing and training of library aides that enables educationally and culturally responsive library services. Library staff will meet four times each year to discuss best practices in guiding students in the selection of materials that are in a reading "zone of proximal development" (ZPD), the readability range within which pupils should read to best develop their reading, while avoiding frustration.	$258,000.00	Yes
1.6	Required Action: MUSD and Mammoth Elementary School English Learner Performance in ELA and Math.	2023 California School Dashboard ELA and Math results for MUSD and Mammoth ES English Learners were in the "Very Low" performance range, indicating a need to create a specific action to accelerate progress in ELA and Math for those students. The Distance from Standard, ELA and Math were both in the "Very Low" performance level. Anecdotal data from instructional staff confirm that English Learners struggle with reading instructions and word problems in math. These data strongly suggest that the lack of reading skills is hindering our English Learner students in all these areas. Mammoth Elementary School will continue to collaborate with the Ellevation platform and Title III Coordinator to provide professional development for teachers with a focus on reading and math strategies that can be implemented into integrated and designated ELD instruction.	$0.00	Yes
1.7	Required Action: MUSD and Mammoth ES Students with Disabilities' Performance in ELA and Math	2023 California School Dashboard Distance from Standard results for Mammoth Elementary School Students with Disabilities were in the "Very Low" performance range, indicating a need to create a specific action to accelerate progress for Students with Disabilities. The Distance from Standard in ELA was over 100 points below standard. Examining SBAC ELA and Math assessment results, Writing and word problems are the area in which our Students with Disability showed the lowest performance. MUSD and Mammoth ES will utilize NWEA MAPS strategies as a support	$21,800.50	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		to writing and problem solving instruction. This is intended to increase students' critical thinking, problem-solving, comprehension, and communication skills. Professional development for NWEA MAPS strategies will be provided for staff, general education and special education teachers alike, to enhance writing instruction.		
1.8	Required Action: Mammoth ES Students Hispanic and Low Income (SED) Performance in ELA	The MUSD demographics of low-income and Hispanic are approximately the same students; therefore, this action is combined. 2023 California School Dashboard ELA results for Mammoth ES low-income and Hispanic students were in the "Very Low" performance range, indicating a need to create a specific action to accelerate progress in ELA for those students. The distance from standard ELA was in the "Very Low" performance level. Mammoth Elementary School will use NWEA MAPS for reading and writing strategies.	$12,000.00	Yes
1.9	Required Action: Mammoth MS English Learner Students Performance in ELA	2023 California School Dashboard ELA results for Mammoth MS English Learners were in the "Very Low" performance range, indicating a need to create a specific action to accelerate progress in ELA for those students. The Distance from the Standard in ELA was in the "Very Low" performance level. Anecdotal data from instructional staff confirm that English Learners struggle with reading and writing. These data strongly suggest that the lack of reading skills is hindering our English Learner students in all these areas. Mammoth Middle School will continue to implement EL Achieve with a focus on reading strategies that can be implemented into integrated and designated ELD instruction.	$1,002.00	Yes
1.10	Required Action: Mammoth HS Long Term English Learner Students and Hispanic students Performance in Math and ELPI	2023 California School Dashboard Math results for Mammoth HS Long Term English Learners and Hispanic students were in the "Very Low" performance range, indicating a need to create a specific action to accelerate progress in Math and ELPI for those students. The Distance from the Standard in Math was at the "Very Low" performance level. Mammoth HS will implement a new math curriculum with a focus on EL math strategies during math instruction.	$0.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.11	Daily high-quality, standards aligned instruction for all students (including at-risk and unduplicated) in all four art disciplines: dance, music, theatre, and visual arts (Pursuant to CA Ed. Code sections 51210 and 51220)	The Mono County Office of Education (MCOE) Strategic Arts Plan, initially written in 2018, was adopted by the Eastern Sierra Unified School District (ESUD) and Mammoth Unified School District (MUSD). In Fall 2023, MCOE and Mono Arts Council (MAC) initiated a summit to update the plan for the next five-year cycle, aiming to promote and expand arts education. Led by Dr. Stacey Adler (MCOE Superintendent), Alonso Escobar (MAC Arts Advocacy and Policy Director), Kristin Reese (MAC Executive Director), and Shana Stapp (MCOE Adult Education Coordinator), a convention was held on September 6, 2023, with diverse educational partners. This meeting provided initial insights for revising the plan, focusing on ensuring arts availability for all Mono County students and incorporating the plan into the districts' LCAP. Expand course offerings within the school day to ensure access to high-quality arts instruction in dance, music, theatre, visual arts, and media arts for all students in all grade levels.	$448,327.09	No
1.12	Language Acquistion Program for English Learners	Provide designated and integrated ELD across all grade levels. The district will continue to provide Dual Immersion at the elementary school level and SEI for middle and high school levels.		No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Wellness and Safety: Provide a positive environment where individuals feel valued and celebrated for their unique qualities and experience a sense of belonging. • Reflect to develop a deeper understanding of ourselves and others • Ensure decisions and plans are created using an equity lens. Understanding that equity means we don't all start from the same place, and we must provide resources and opportunities needed to reach an equal outcome. • Create and maintain safe school environments for all.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
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.

In 2024–25, Mammoth Unified School District experienced a notable increase in students reporting that they feel safe at school, signaling progress in school climate and campus safety efforts. However, chronic absenteeism rates slightly increased, in part due to a rise in independent study contracts that were not successfully completed, resulting in unearned attendance credit.

To address persistent disparities in attendance and engagement between low-income students, English Learners, and the general student population, the district will continue implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), provide access to school-based counselors, expand site-level health services, and maintain security improvements. In addition, schools will increase oversight of student absences, issue School Attendance Review Board (SARB) warning letters when appropriate, and implement site-specific attendance incentives.

In response, MUSD will strengthen integrated student support services to enhance family engagement, improve attendance, and foster Social Emotional Learning (SEL). These supports include the continued implementation of PBIS, restorative practices, service learning opportunities, and campus supervision. Educational partners consistently emphasized the importance of implementing meaningful attendance incentives and building a sense of belonging.

Student feedback from engagement sessions reflected appreciation for safety protocols, relationships with school resource officers, and the positive connections between students and school staff. These insights reaffirm the district's commitment to improving pupil engagement and

school climate by creating environments where all students feel valued, supported, and safe. A positive school climate remains foundational for addressing social, emotional, and health-related needs—critical components for academic success.

Some metrics related to Foster Youth and Homeless students were not reported due to privacy thresholds. However, their needs remain central to ongoing planning efforts. As MUSD continues to refine its strategies, ensuring a safe and inclusive environment for every student will remain a top priority.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	California School Dashboard: High School Graduation Rate	All students -- 86.0% English Learners -- 76.9% Hispanic -- 83.3% Low Income -- 85.2% White -- 90.3% [2023 California School Dashboard]	All students -- 92.5% English Learners -- 73.7% Hispanic -- 91.4% Low Income -- 91.5% White -- 93.5% [2024 California School Dashboard]		All students -- 96.0% English Learners -- 96.0% Hispanic -- 95.0% Low Income -- 94.0% White -- 98.0% [2026 California School Dashboard]	From 2023 to 2024, the district's graduation rate improved overall from 86.0% to 92.5%, with notable gains for Hispanic students (83.3% ? 91.4%) and Low-Income students (85.2% ? 91.5%), closing much of the gap with peers. White students also improved slightly (90.3% ? 93.5%), maintaining a high rate of completion. However, English Learners declined from 76.9% to 73.7%, underscoring persistent challenges for this

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						group despite overall systemwide progress. The data highlights strong growth in graduation for most students, but also signals an urgent need to strengthen supports for English Learners to ensure equitable outcomes.
2.2	Attendance	All Students -- 94.21% [2024 AERIES District Attendance Calculations]	All Students -- 93% [2025 AERIES District Attendance Calculations]		All Students -- 98% [2027 AERIES District Attendance Calculations]	From baseline to year one, the district's overall attendance rate declined from 94.2% to 93.0%, a drop of just over one percentage point. While modest, this decline reflects ongoing challenges in consistent student engagement and recovery from post-pandemic attendance patterns. Sustained focus on chronic absenteeism prevention, family

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						engagement, and early intervention strategies will be critical to reversing this trend and supporting student achievement.
2.3	California School Dashboard: Suspension Rate	All students - 1.1% Students w/ Disabilities -- 2.4% English Learners -- 0% Hispanic -- 1.3% Low Income -- 1.3% White -- 0.7% Two or More Races -- 0% [2023 California School Dashboard]	All students - .8% Students w/ Disabilities -- 2.9% English Learners -- 0% Long Term ELs -- 2.7% Hispanic -- 1% Low Income -- 1.3% White -- 0.5% Two or More Races -- 0% [2024 California School Dashboard]		All students - 0% Students w/ Disabilities -- 0% English Learners -- 0% Long Term ELs -- 0% Hispanic -- 0% Low Income -- 0% White -- 0.1% Two or More Races -- 0% [2026 California School Dashboard]	From 2023 to 2024, the district's overall suspension rate improved slightly, decreasing from 1.1% to 0.8%. Hispanic students declined from 1.3% to 1.0%, and White students from 0.7% to 0.5%, while English Learners remained at 0%. However, disparities persist: Students with Disabilities increased from 2.4% to 2.9%, and Long-Term English Learners registered at 2.7% in year one, marking them as higher-risk subgroups. Overall, the data reflects positive progress in maintaining low

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						suspension rates districtwide, but also signals the need for targeted supports in special education and among Long-Term English Learners to ensure equitable outcomes.
2.4	California School Dashboard: Chronic Absenteeism (K-8)	All Students -- 24.8% SWD - 33.7% EL - 25% Hispanic - 25.4% SED - 26% White - 23.5% [2023 California School Dashboard]	All Students -- 26.6% SWD -- 28.4% EL -- 24.1% Hispanic -- 27.7% SED -- 28.4% White -- 24% [2024 California School Dashboard]		All Students -- 18.0% Students w/ Disabilities -- 20.0% English Learners -- 15% Hispanic -15% Low Income -- 15% White -- 13% [2027 California School Dashboard]	From 2023 to 2024, the district's chronic absenteeism rate increased from 24.8% to 26.6%, reflecting more students missing significant instructional time. Hispanic students (25.4% ? 27.7%) and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (26% ? 28.4%) saw notable increases, while White students rose slightly (23.5% ? 24%). English Learners improved marginally (25% ? 24.1%), and Students with Disabilities

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						declined from 33.7% to 28.4%, marking some progress for these groups. Overall, the data shows a worsening trend in attendance for most students, highlighting the need for stronger family engagement, early interventions, and tiered supports to reduce chronic absenteeism.
2.5	Expulsion Rate	0% [2022-23 Dataquest]	0% [2023-24 Dataquest]		0% [2027 Dataquest]	Mammoth Unified School District recorded a 0% expulsion rate since 2023. MUSD's 0% expulsion rate demonstrates strong implementation of preventative and student-centered behavioral supports, including PBIS, social-emotional services, and restorative practices. The district prioritizes

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						equitable discipline and early intervention to ensure all students remain connected to school and learning. MUSD will continue to strengthen multi-tiered systems of support, expand restorative approaches, and provide ongoing staff training in effective behavior intervention practices to sustain this positive outcome and ensure safe, inclusive school environments.
2.6	High School and Middle School Dropout Rates	14% MHS 0% MMS (2023 California School Dashboard additional reports)	9% MHS 0% MMS (2024 California School Dashboard additional reports)		0% MHS 0% MMS (2027 California School Dashboard additional reports)	From 2023 to 2024, the district's high school dropout rate improved from 14% to 9%, reflecting progress in keeping more students on track toward graduation. The middle school dropout rate remained at 0% in both years,

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						demonstrating continued success in retaining students through the middle grades. While the reduction at the high school level is encouraging, the rate remains above the state expectation, indicating a need for continued focus on early intervention, credit recovery, and targeted supports to ensure all students persist to graduation.
2.7	School Climate Survey: Results of the Student Survey Reported to the MUSD Governing Board -- % of Students Feeling Connected to School % of Students Feeling Safe	MET -- Results Reported 80.1% of students surveyed responded that they feel connected to school. 86.1% of students surveyed responded that they feel safe at school [June 2024, Report to the MUSD Governing Board]	MET -- Results Reported 80.1% of students surveyed responded that they feel connected to school. 86.1% of students surveyed responded that they feel safe at school [June 2025, Report to the MUSD Governing Board]		MET -- Results Reported 85% of students surveyed will respond that they feel connected to school. 90% of students surveyed will respond that they feel safe at school [June 2027, Report to the MUSD Governing Board]	During the June 2024 reporting period, 80.1% of students surveyed indicated they feel connected to school, and 86.1% of students reported feeling safe at school. This data reflects the district's ongoing commitment to creating a positive school climate,

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						strengthening student-adult relationships, and maintaining safe learning environments across all campuses. Results remain consistent with the prior year: 80.1% of students reported feeling connected to school and 86.1% reported feeling safe at school. MUSD continued its focus on student belonging, wellness supports, and positive school culture strategies, helping maintain stable levels of student-reported connection and safety. By June 2027, the district aims to increase student responses indicating connection to school to 85% and feelings of safety at school to 90%. MUSD will

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						continue to strengthen Tier 1 climate practices, student voice opportunities, restorative and relationship-centered systems, and student wellness supports to enhance belonging and school safety perceptions for all students.
2.8	School Climate Survey: Results of Teachers' and Parents' Surveys Regarding School Connectedness and Safety	Parents -- 37% expressed that their child(ren) felt connected to school. 17% expressed that their child(ren) felt safe at school. Teachers -- 56% of teachers surveyed responded that school is a safe place for students 56% of teachers surveyed responded that students feel connected to school. [Fall 2024, CHKS Survey]	Parents -- 60% expressed that their child(ren) felt connected to school. 17% expressed that their child(ren) felt safe at school. Teachers -- 60% of teachers surveyed responded that school is a safe place for students 60% of teachers surveyed responded that students feel connected to school.		Parents -- 95% expressed that their child(ren) felt connected to school. 95% expressed that their child(ren) felt safe at school. Teachers -- 95% of teachers surveyed responded that school is a safe place for students 95% of teachers surveyed responded that students feel connected to school.	From 2023 to 2024, survey results reflected improved perceptions of connectedness but mixed views of safety. Parents reporting that their child felt connected to school increased from 37% to 60%, showing significant progress in engagement efforts. However, only 17% of parents in both years reported that their child felt safe

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			[May 2025, MUSD Survey]		[Fall 2026, CHKS Survey]	at school, indicating no improvement in perceptions of safety. Among staff, teacher responses rose from 56% to 60% for both school safety and student connectedness, reflecting modest growth. Overall, the data suggests stronger progress in school connectedness but highlights the need to address parent concerns about safety as a priority.
2.9	Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT): School facilities maintained in good repair based on FIT score reported to the MUSD Governing Board	Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT): School facilities maintained in good repair based on FIT score reported to the MUSD Governing Board [June 2024, Report to the MUSD Governing Board]	Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT): School facilities maintained in good repair based on FIT score reported to the MUSD Governing Board [June 2025, Report to the MUSD Governing Board]		MET -- Results Reported All sites "Good" or better. [June 2027, Report to the MUSD Governing Board]	School facilities maintained in good repair as reported to the MUSD Governing Board.MUSD reported FIT results to the Governing Board in June 2024. All district school sites received ratings of “Good” or better on the Facilities Inspection Tool, demonstrating that

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						campuses are being maintained in good repair. This reflects the district's ongoing investment in preventative maintenance, timely repairs, and continuous monitoring of facility conditions to support safe and effective learning environments. All district school sites again achieved ratings of "Good" or better. The district continued proactive facility management practices, including routine inspections, safety evaluations, and work-order systems to ensure campuses remain clean, safe, and well-maintained. By June 2027, MUSD will sustain FIT ratings of "Good" or better at

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						all school sites. The district will continue to prioritize preventative maintenance, facility upgrades, and efficient response to facility needs in alignment with Williams requirements and long-term capital planning.

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 implementation of Goal 2 actions, Mammoth Unified School District (MUSD) experienced both notable successes and some persistent challenges. Overall, the district continued to make progress toward improving student outcomes, particularly in graduation rates, school climate, and reducing suspensions, while challenges remained in areas like chronic absenteeism and parent perceptions of school safety.

Graduation and Dropout Rates
The district exceeded expectations in high school graduation rates, rising from a baseline of 86% to 92.5% in Year 2, on track to meet the ambitious Year 3 target of 96%. Subgroups such as Hispanic and low-income students showed significant gains, with increases of over 8 percentage points each. However, English Learners (ELs) showed a slight decline from 76.9% to 73.7%, posing a concern that has shaped targeted interventions going forward. On the positive side, the dropout rate decreased from 14% to 9%, and efforts continue toward the 0% target.

Attendance and Chronic Absenteeism
Attendance declined slightly from 94.21% to 93%, largely due to an increase in uncompleted independent study contracts. Chronic absenteeism remains a critical concern, with no measurable change in the K–8 rates from Year 1 to Year 2. Baseline rates remained high, particularly among students with disabilities, English Learners, and low-income students. While the district implemented attendance

incentives and SARB processes, sustained change has proven difficult, and efforts will continue with renewed focus on Long-Term English Learners and student mental health supports.

Suspensions and Expulsions
Suspension rates improved slightly for the overall student population, from 1.1% to 0.8%, with White and Hispanic student groups showing modest gains. However, suspension rates increased among students with disabilities and Long-Term English Learners, underscoring the need for more nuanced behavioral supports. Expulsion rates remained at 0% for both years, meeting expectations.

School Climate and Connectedness
Student perceptions of school safety and connectedness remained steady, with over 80% of students reporting they feel connected and safe at school. While student survey metrics met expectations, parent perception data revealed a significant gap, particularly regarding safety: only 17% of parents reported their child felt safe at school in both baseline and current measures. This is an area identified for targeted family engagement and trust-building. In contrast, teacher perceptions improved to 60%, indicating progress in adult culture and school climate.

Facilities and Campus Safety
The district successfully maintained school facilities in “Good” or better condition, as verified by the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT), meeting expectations without substantive deviation from the plan. Ongoing bond measure projects and summer maintenance efforts contributed to this consistency.

Implementation Challenges and Successes
One challenge has been the limited progress on chronic absenteeism, despite systems-level interventions such as SARB letters and site reviews. Additionally, disparities between stakeholder groups—especially parents—regarding perceptions of safety point to a need for improved communication and inclusive decision-making. Conversely, major successes include the dramatic increase in graduation rates, reductions in suspensions, and overall facility quality, reflecting the district’s commitment to student safety, engagement, and learning environments.

In summary, while the district remains on track with several performance metrics, especially graduation and climate for students and staff, there is still work ahead in addressing chronic absenteeism and parent engagement to ensure all members of the school community feel equally supported and safe.

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.

In reviewing the differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services, the following variances are noted:

2.1 Access to Health Services – Expenditures increased due to negotiated raises and step and column adjustments for the school nurse.

2.2 Social Emotional Learning Supports – Costs were higher than budgeted because the district added a Mental Health and Wellness Coordinator at MES and accounted for negotiated raises and step and column adjustments for paraprofessionals.

2.3 Meeting the Needs of Families – The district continued support for the Family Liaison from MCOE, aligning expenditures with service needs.

2.4 Student Behavior and Supports – Expenditures were applied at the local school site level and funded from general funds, resulting in a shift from originally budgeted allocations.

2.5 Facilities – Expenditures for construction and deferred maintenance were covered by overage bond funds rather than general funds, creating a material variance from the budget.

These adjustments reflect the district's continued prioritization of student health, wellness, family engagement, behavioral supports, and facilities maintenance, while accounting for negotiated compensation agreements and changes in funding sources.

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

The district has made some progress toward creating a positive and inclusive school environment, but results are mixed and uneven across measures. Parent and teacher survey results show meaningful improvement in connectedness: parents reporting their child felt connected to school rose from 37% to 60%, and teacher perceptions of connectedness and student safety improved modestly (56% ? 60%). These gains suggest that efforts to foster belonging, celebrate student identity, and strengthen relationships are beginning to resonate within the school community.

At the same time, perceptions of safety remain a concern. Only 17% of parents in both years indicated their child felt safe at school, showing no progress in this critical area. While overall suspension and expulsion rates remain very low (0.8% and 0%, respectively), chronic absenteeism rose (24.8% ? 26.6%), suggesting that barriers to consistent engagement persist, particularly for Hispanic and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

Taken together, the data indicates that while the district's actions are partially effective in fostering connection and belonging, they have been less effective in addressing safety concerns and equitable student engagement. To make deeper progress, the district will need to intensify equity-driven safety initiatives, address root causes of absenteeism, and continue building trust with families so that all students feel both connected and safe.

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.

No changes made.

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	Access to Health Services	The District will provide health services for RN and Health Technician support for students that are beyond the required specialized physical health care services prescribed by a child's licensed physician that require medically related training for the individual who performs the services and which are necessary during the school day to enable the child to attend school. Schools will also provide information on access to health services both on campus and off campus through local agencies that provide wrap-around services to students with health needs.	$250,045.82	No
2.2	Social and Emotional Learning and Supports	The District will create supportive school environments for students' mental and emotional health by: • Hiring and retaining intervention and support staff, including Student Support Counselors, to address the needs of Low-Income students, English Learners, and Foster Youth in grades TK-12, their parents, and staff. • Enhancing social-emotional development by teaching, modeling, and practicing social-emotional skills. This includes having a culture and climate teacher on special assignment and site-based SEL teams to implement best practices in classrooms. • Recognizing students and staff who demonstrate positive, affirming behaviors that reflect social-emotional growth and development.	$410,918.53	Yes
2.3	Meeting the Needs of Homeless Students	The District will identify the needs of homeless individual students and families. The MCOE Family Liaison to work with school sites and collaborate on identification and providing targeted services to support the needs of those students.	$179,169.50	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.4	Student Behavior and Attendance Supports	The District will promote social and emotional well-being by providing behavior support and intervention programs, including: • Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) • Use of Playworks for healthy interactions at break and lunch recess for TK-8 • Restorative Practices • Service Learning Opportunities • School Attendance and Review Board (SARB) • Parent Square for improved communication on student attendance • Concentration Grant Add-on funds to maintain and train campus supervisors at schools with 55% or more unduplicated students, addressing mental health and reducing chronic absenteeism among Low-Income, English Learners, and Foster Youth • Concentration Grant Add-on funds to employ an air quality monitor at schools with 55% or more unduplicated students to ensure proper ventilation and support respiratory health • Regular attendance data reviews by school staff, with notifications to parents of students at risk of chronic absenteeism • Local attendance incentive programs at schools	$14,236.56	Yes
2.5	Facilities	The District will conduct routine maintenance to maintain clean and safe facilities and school sites to enhance the educational experience for students.	$956,676.98	No
2.6	Required Action: Mammoth MS Chronic Absenteeism Performance for White Students	2023 California School Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism results were at the "Very High" performance level for White students. To address this issue, a specific action or actions to address those will be included in the LCAP. Mammoth MS has identified that these students did not complete long term independent study plans with traveling for athletics and/or vacation. Mammoth MS will continue to review student attendance records, use the SARB referral process, and provide incentives to lower chronic absenteeism among this group.	$0.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	Increasing Equity and Access by fully engaging families and the community in support of educational outcomes. • Trust that when everyone works together towards a common goal, healthy relationships are formed and positive outcomes increase. • Actively listen, value, and inform our Mammoth community. • Promote civic engagement to enhance a greater sense of social responsibility and healthier social relationships. • Learn from and value those who have come before us and set the example for those that will follow us.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The Family Engagement Framework, a California Department of Education publication, emphasizes that family engagement is crucial for student success. Parents, families, and caring adults are primary educators early in life and can reinforce classroom learning throughout the school years.

Parents reported feeling well-informed about school activities and appreciated the prompt responses from teachers and staff. In 2024, results from 72 responses to the Family Engagement self-reflection instrument showed an increase in satisfaction, with ratings rising from 3.8 in 2023 to 4 out of 5. In 2025, MUSD distributed a Google Form survey focused on family engagement and received 65 responses—once again, 4 out of 5 respondents reported being satisfied with their experience. Parents continued to praise the district's strong two-way communication, particularly through Parent Square.

To supplement the biennial California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS), the district has also implemented Marzano culture surveys and Kelvin Education surveys to gather more frequent and robust feedback from families, students, and staff. These tools help track school climate, communication quality, and perceptions of engagement, allowing the district to respond more rapidly to areas of concern.

However, CHKS Fall Survey results (see metrics in Goal 2) indicate that the district needs to improve its ability to rebuild trust and strengthen home-school relationships post-pandemic. Only 16% of families reported feeling welcome at school, and 66% agreed that school staff work to build trusting relationships.

These data suggest that the district must adopt more consistent and meaningful actions to help families feel welcome and empowered in their children's education. The district acknowledges the ongoing need to further enhance family engagement in local decision-making and to build trust through transparency, responsiveness, and inclusive practices.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Parent Engagement: Results of the State's Self-Reflection Tool Reported to the MUSD Governing Board	MET -- Results Reported 4.2 Average Score (on a scale of 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) on the State's Self- Reflection Tool [June, 2024, Report to the MUSD Governing Board]	MET -- Results Reported 4 Average Score (on a scale of 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) on the State's Self-Reflection Tool [June, 2025, Report to the MUSD Governing Board]		MET -- Results Reported 4.5 Average Score (on a scale of 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) on the State's Self-Reflection Tool [June, 2027, Report to the MUSD Governing Board]	MUSD reported a districtwide average score of 4.2 on the State's Self-Reflection Tool (scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). This result reflects strong parent engagement practices, including meaningful opportunities for families to participate in advisory groups, school-site activities, and district engagement processes. MUSD reported an average score of 4.0 on the State's Self-Reflection Tool. Results continue to

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						demonstrate strong family engagement while also indicating areas for continued growth in communication, collaboration, and inclusive participation across school sites. By June 2027, MUSD aims to achieve an average score of 4.5 on the State's Self-Reflection Tool. The district will continue expanding family engagement opportunities, improving multilingual communication systems, and fostering deeper partnerships between schools and families to support student success.
3.2	Kelvin and Marzano Surveys to Families	30% Response Rate in CHKS surveys	New Metric and goal is to have over 40% response rate in all surveys.			N/A

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 the 2024–25 school year, Mammoth Unified School District (MUSD) continued to prioritize family engagement as a foundational pillar for student success, in alignment with the Family Engagement Framework published by the California Department of Education. The district aimed to strengthen two-way communication, increase family participation in school life, and build greater trust between home and school communities.

Planned actions included the use of the State's Family Engagement Self-Reflection Tool, strengthening communication through platforms like Parent Square, and increasing opportunities for families to participate in school decision-making processes. These actions were largely implemented as intended. In addition, MUSD expanded its data collection efforts by administering a Google Form survey focused on family engagement in 2025, which received 65 responses and showed continued satisfaction—4 out of 5 parents reported a positive experience with district communication and involvement efforts.

Results from the 2024 Self-Reflection Tool indicated a positive trajectory in family satisfaction, rising from an average rating of 3.8 in 2023 to 4.0 in 2024. However, the Year 2 outcome in 2025 reflected a slight decline from the prior year, remaining at a 4.0 average and just below the baseline of 4.2. This minor dip may be attributed to persistent post-pandemic challenges in re-engaging families and creating welcoming school environments.

To further monitor progress and identify areas for improvement, the district implemented Kelvin Education Surveys and Marzano culture surveys, which are administered in alternating years with the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS). These tools have provided timely, actionable feedback from families, students, and staff regarding perceptions of safety, connectedness, and communication.

Despite the positive feedback on communication methods, CHKS results revealed gaps in deeper engagement and relational trust. Only 16% of families reported feeling welcome at school, and 66% agreed that staff worked to build trusting relationships. These findings point to a disconnect between general satisfaction with communication and more personal, relational aspects of school engagement.

A key success in implementation was the continued high marks for district communication. Parent Square was frequently cited by families as a strength, helping families stay informed and receive timely responses from school staff. The increase in response rates to engagement surveys also reflected growing interest in participating in district feedback opportunities.

On the other hand, a challenge remains in making families feel truly welcomed and empowered as partners in education. While the district met expectations for metric reporting, the qualitative data suggest the need for more consistent, in-person opportunities for families to be visible, heard, and valued within schools.

Overall, the district successfully implemented most planned actions related to family engagement and met the outcome metric for reporting. However, continued efforts are needed to deepen family-school relationships, rebuild trust in the post-pandemic context, and move beyond

communication to authentic, inclusive engagement practices. Future actions will focus on strengthening parent leadership opportunities, offering culturally responsive family events, and increasing transparency in school decision-making processes to meet or exceed the Year 3 target of a 4.5 rating on the Self-Reflection

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.

In reviewing the differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services, the following material variances are identified:

3.1 Improve Communication – Actual expenditures came in lower than budgeted due to reduced costs in website design, the Edilio website contract, and the ParentSquare contract.

3.2 Community Outreach – Actual expenditures exceeded the budgeted amount as the district expanded the number of community engagement events, including family fun nights, supported by both Community School funds and general funds.

These adjustments reflect the district's commitment to enhancing communication and outreach while responsibly managing contracts and leveraging multiple funding sources to provide additional opportunities for family and community engagement.

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

The district has met state reporting requirements for parent engagement through the self-reflection tool, but results show slight decline in overall ratings, from an average score of 4.2 to 4.0. This suggests that while engagement systems are in place, parents' perception of their effectiveness dipped slightly year over year. The introduction of new family survey tools, including the Kelvin and Marzano surveys, reflects a positive step toward expanding input opportunities, though response rates remain an area for growth. The CHKS survey baseline response rate of 30% highlights that the district has not yet reached its new goal of 40% participation across all surveys.

Taken together, these outcomes indicate that the district's actions to date have been partially effective: the structures for parent input exist and new tools have been added, but deeper engagement and broader participation are still needed to fully realize the goal of equity and access through family and community involvement. To strengthen progress, the district will need to focus on building trust, improving two-way communication, and ensuring that families see the impact of their feedback on district decisions.

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 added a metric of reviewing data of Kelvin and Marzano surveys.

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	Improve Communication to District Educational Partners	The District will continue and improve its district-wide plan for increasing parent engagement through enhanced lines of communication with our Mammoth SD Community by continuing and/or expanding the use of: • Communication systems and applications • Various social media platforms and tools, including -- ParentSquare and MUSD website. This includes the updating of the Mammoth Unified School District website as a resource for our parents and our communities.	$40,000.00	No
3.2	Increase Community Outreach and Family Engagement	The District will maintain and expand its commitment to authentic parent and family engagement through Educational Partner advisory meetings, including • District English Learner Advisory Committee • Parent Advisory Committee This action is to specifically focus on involving families of unduplicated students. The insights from these advisory meetings will be shared and discussed at: • District-level departments • Regular cabinet and leadership meetings	$7,000.00	Yes
3.3	Address the Needs of Our Learning Community	The District will maintain procedures to examine data for student groups and gather input from their families to identify student learning needs, family support needs, and staff support requirements. This action is to specifically focus on involving families of unduplicated students and students with disabilities.Services will include: • Translation services beyond legal requirements, such as for family event communications.	$35,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		• Training staff to create welcoming environments at schools and district facilities, ensuring excellent public service. • Providing information on accessing school and community resources to support family health and wellness and enhance students' behavioral and academic success. • Offering engagement opportunities for families of high-needs students, such as Parenting Workshops, Family Nights with an academic focus, Back to School Night, Open House, and Academic Awards.		
3.4	Partner-Informed Decision Making	The District will use survey data as opportunities to collect information to make informed decisions that affect our school communities.	$0.00	No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
4	By 2027, Sierra Continuation High School will utilize local assessments to demonstrate improvements in local benchmarks for ELA and math, with a 10% growth on NWEA MAP assessments, and by offering at least one dual enrollment course, although data may not be reported due to privacy concerns.	Equity Multiplier Focus Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

For the 2024-25 school year, Sierra Continuation High School (SHS) was identified as eligible for Equity Multiplier funding. Our analysis of the 2023-24 local data shows that 100% of students will have improved access to online curriculum and meet their targeted Reading and Mathematics goals. Students will be exposed to careers outside the community. Expand opportunities to explore Art and Environmental Science.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.1	Local Benchmarks	Data not reported due to small number of students.	Data not reported due to small number of students. Review of individual data showed slight improvement.		Data not reported due to small number of students.	Data not reported due to small number of students. Review of individual data showed slight improvement.
4.2	Dual Enrollment	Data not reported due to small number of students.	Data not reported due to small number of students. Review of individual data		Data not reported due to small number of students.	Data not reported due to small number of students. Review of individual data

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			show slight improvement.			showed slight improvement.

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, Sierra High School began implementation of new strategies aimed at expanding Career Technical Education (CTE) opportunities and enhancing workplace readiness for its students. The May 20, 2025 Site Council meeting marked a key moment in this ongoing effort, offering both reflections on implementation challenges and a vision for future development.

One of the most substantive differences between planned and actual implementation was the need to provide meeting translation and bilingual materials for full family participation. Although previous meeting minutes were unavailable for approval, efforts were made during this meeting to ensure inclusive communication. A. Rinaldi provided real-time Spanish translation for a parent attendee, which was noted as incredibly helpful, and going forward, all agendas and minutes will be made available in Spanish.

Implementation successes included a robust discussion around new CTE pathway proposals. E. Le Francois presented a number of ideas already in progress, including a Culinary Arts program with Food Handler's Certificate, Medical Assistant training through Cerro Coso Community College, and potential paid internships in welding, construction, electrician trades, cosmetology, journalism, and auto mechanics. These proposals reflect a flexible and student-centered approach, acknowledging the unique needs and aspirations of Sierra's population.

Several practical suggestions emerged to optimize implementation using existing district resources. For example, C. O'Neill recommended leveraging Mammoth High School's existing ROP equipment and kitchen, while A. Rinaldi proposed constructing a dedicated classroom kitchen at Sierra High. Other innovative ideas included building an Early Childhood Education certification track, utilizing Zoom room infrastructure for remote instruction, and exploring on-site student employment through MUSD's maintenance department.

Challenges in implementation included logistical considerations such as licensing hour requirements (e.g., 1,000 hours for cosmetology) and the need to track measurable outcomes. The team acknowledged that the fluidity of Sierra's student population requires similarly adaptive pathways. Maintaining programs on-site at Sierra was highlighted as a strategic priority, both for access and for cultivating a strong school culture.

In summary, while implementation is still in the early planning stages, the site council has laid strong groundwork. The process has already surfaced critical equity considerations, such as language accessibility, and aligned new CTE plans with both district capacity and student interest. The collaborative nature of the discussion reflects a promising start toward creating meaningful, sustainable opportunities for all Sierra High School 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.

In reviewing Goal 4 of the Equity Multiplier, the district identified material differences between Budgeted and Estimated Actual Expenditures, as well as between Planned and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services. These differences are primarily due to the transition of a teacher leader, who collaborated with parents and district staff to develop a stronger, more responsive plan. This transition reflects the district's ongoing efforts to ensure equity-focused initiatives remain sustainable and impactful, with resources aligned to better meet the needs of students and families.

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

Because of the small number of students enrolled at Sierra Continuation High School, Dashboard metrics and local benchmark data cannot be publicly reported without risking student privacy. However, review of individual student results indicates slight improvement in both ELA and math performance on local NWEA MAP assessments, as well as increased participation in dual enrollment courses compared to the prior year. These outcomes suggest that current actions—such as personalized instruction, expanded academic supports, and access to early college opportunities—are beginning to have a positive impact, though growth remains limited in scale.

Overall, the district's actions to date appear to be moderately effective, as they are producing early signs of progress despite the challenge of small cohort sizes. Continued focus on targeted interventions, mentoring, and expanding access to dual enrollment will be essential to meeting the 2027 goal of 10% growth on local benchmarks and ensuring equitable postsecondary opportunities for all students at Sierra Continuation High School.

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 metrics were made a bit more specific for local review even though the number of students is small.

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	Exploration of CTE Courses	CTE courses emphasize project-based learning, where students work on hands-on projects related to their chosen career pathways. These projects often require students to apply ELA and Math skills in authentic ways, such as conducting research, analyzing data, writing reports, or presenting	$65,000.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		findings. Engaging in these activities reinforces and deepens students' understanding of ELA and Math concepts.		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
5		

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline

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.

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.

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

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.

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

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
$1,391,455	$47164

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
11.892%	0.000%	$0.00	11.892%

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
1.5	**Action:** Library Support Services **Need:** English Language Acquisition through reading diverse texts in English and Spanish. **Scope:** LEA-wide	To offer more support, opportunities, and resources to English Learner students	ELPAC and CAASPP

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
1.8	**Action:** Required Action: Mammoth ES Students Hispanic and Low Income (SED) Performance in ELA **Need:** The distance from standard ELA was in the "Very Low" performance level. Mammoth Elementary School will use NWEA MAPS for reading and writing strategies. **Scope:** Schoolwide	MUSD will use data-driven decision making with systematic collection, analysis in order to enhance student performance while addressing student learning needs	CAASPP
2.2	**Action:** Social and Emotional Learning and Supports **Need:** SST and COST teams indicated a need for students to have more supports and resoruces to be successful in school. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Providing support counselors for students to access curriculum and be successful in school. It also benefits all students.	2.4 and 2.7
2.3	**Action:** Meeting the Needs of Homeless Students **Need:** The District will identify the needs of homeless individual students and families. The MCOE Family Liaison to work with school sites and collaborate on identification and providing targeted services to support the needs of those students.	The District will identify the needs of homeless individual students and families. The MCOE Family Liaison to work with school sites and collaborate on identification and providing targeted services to support the needs of those students. The liaison will also work with other high need students.	Identifying all homeless/foster students

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Scope: LEA-wide		
2.4	**Action:** Student Behavior and Attendance Supports **Need:** Data shows districtwide chronic absenteeism. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Decrease the percentage of chronic absenteeism	2.4
3.2	**Action:** Increase Community Outreach and Family Engagement **Need:** Missing input from families from unduplicated groups. **Scope:** LEA-wide	To increase participation from families of unduplicated groups and also from all groups.	3.1 and 3.2
3.3	**Action:** Address the Needs of Our Learning Community **Need:** Increasing the supports and resources to improve family input from unduplicated groups. **Scope:**	Better family input from unduplicated and all groups will help the district meet the needs of students	3.1 and 3.2

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		

Limited Actions

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

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.2	**Action:** Standards-Aligned Supplemental Curriculum **Need:** Lack of sufficient progress to access curriculum for English Learners and Long Term English Learners **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	District is looking for supplemental strategies and curriculum to support curriculum access.	1.1, 1.2 and 1.3
1.3	**Action:** English Language Acquisition **Need:** Low rate of English Learner students making progress toward English proficiency **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	To offer more support and resources to English Learner students	1.3
1.4	**Action:** Supplemental Learning Program	To offer more support and resources to English Learner students	1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Need: Low rate of English Learner students making progress toward English proficiency **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)		
1.6	**Action:** Required Action: MUSD and Mammoth Elementary School English Learner Performance in ELA and Math. **Need:** 2023 California School Dashboard ELA and Math results for MUSD and Mammoth ES English Learners were in the "Very Low" performance range **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Coordinator to provide professional development for teachers with a focus on reading and math strategies that can be implemented into integrated and designated ELD instruction	1.1, 1.2, and 1.3
1.8	**Action:** Required Action: Mammoth ES Students Hispanic and Low Income (SED) Performance in ELA **Need:** The distance from standard, ELA was in the "Very Low" performance level. Mammoth Elementary School will use NWEA MAPS for reading and writing strategies. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	MUSD will use data-driven decision making with systematic collection, analysis in order to enhance student performance while addressing student learning needs	CAASPP

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.9	**Action:** Required Action: Mammoth MS English Learner Students Performance in ELA **Need:** Very low performance Mammoth MS English Learner Students Performance in CAASPP ELA **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Offering differentiated instruction in ELD	1.1, 1.2, and 1.3
1.10	**Action:** Required Action: Mammoth HS Long Term English Learner Students and Hispanic students Performance in Math and ELPI **Need:** The Distance from the Standard in Math was at the "Very Low" performance level. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Mammoth HS will implement a new math curriculum with a focus on EL math strategies during math instruction.	1.2

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.

N/A

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.

Additional Concentration: N/A

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	10:643	NA
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	58:643	NA

2026-27 Total Planned Expenditures Table

LCAP Year	1. Projected LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Input Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)
Totals	11,700,808	1,391,455	11.892%	0.000%	11.892%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$12,080,347.47	$1,081,167.00	$900.00	$21,500.00	$13,183,914.47	$11,838,371.34	$1,345,543.13

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	Qualified Teachers	All	No			All Schools		$9,844,812.48	$0.00	$8,926,626.12	$918,186.36			$9,844,812.48	
1	1.2	Standards-Aligned Supplemental Curriculum	English Learners Low Income	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$240,000.00	$240,000.00				$240,000.00	
1	1.3	English Language Acquisition	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		$378,425.01	$0.00	$378,425.01				$378,425.01	
1	1.4	Supplemental Learning Program	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		$0.00	$21,500.00				$21,500.00	$21,500.00	
1	1.5	Library Support Services	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$258,000.00	$0.00	$258,000.00				$258,000.00	
1	1.6	Required Action: MUSD and Mammoth Elementary School English Learner Performance in ELA and Math.	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	Specific Schools: Mammoth Elementary School and MUSD TK-12		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$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
1	1.7	Required Action: MUSD and Mammoth ES Students with Disabilities' Performance in ELA and Math	Students with Disabilities	No			All Schools		$0.00	$21,800.50		$21,800.50			$21,800.50	
1	1.8	Required Action: Mammoth ES Students Hispanic and Low Income (SED) Performance in ELA	English Learners Low Income	Yes	School wide Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Mammoth Elementary School TK-5		$10,000.00	$2,000.00	$12,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$12,000.00	
1	1.9	Required Action: Mammoth MS English Learner Students Performance in ELA	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	Specific Schools: Mammoth Middle School 6-8		$0.00	$1,002.00	$1,002.00				$1,002.00	
1	1.10	Required Action: Mammoth HS Long Term English Learner Students and Hispanic students Performance in Math and ELPI	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	Specific Schools: Mammoth High School 9-12		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
1	1.11	Daily high-quality, standards aligned instruction for all students (including at-risk and unduplicated) in all four art disciplines: dance, music, theatre, and visual arts (Pursuant to CA Ed. Code sections 51210 and 51220)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$448,327.09	$448,327.09				$448,327.09	
1	1.12	Language Acquistion Program for English Learners	English Learners	No			All Schools									
2	2.1	Access to Health Services	All	No			All Schools		$250,045.82	$0.00	$250,045.82				$250,045.82	
2	2.2	Social and Emotional Learning and Supports	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$410,918.53	$0.00	$275,037.14	$135,881.39			$410,918.53	
2	2.3	Meeting the Needs of Homeless Students	Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	Low Income	All Schools		$179,169.50	$0.00	$179,169.50				$179,169.50	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
2	**2.4**	Student Behavior and Attendance Supports	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$14,236.56	$11,037.81	$2,298.75	$900.00		$14,236.56	
2	**2.5**	Facilities	All	No			All Schools		$500,000.00	$456,676.98	$956,676.98				$956,676.98	
2	**2.6**	Required Action: Mammoth MS Chronic Absenteeism Performance for White Students	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
3	**3.1**	Improve Communication to District Educational Partners	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$40,000.00	$40,000.00				$40,000.00	
3	**3.2**	Increase Community Outreach and Family Engagement	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$7,000.00	$0.00	$4,000.00	$3,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$7,000.00	
3	**3.3**	Address the Needs of Our Learning Community	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$35,000.00	$35,000.00				$35,000.00	
3	**3.4**	Partner-Informed Decision Making	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
4	**4.1**	Exploration of CTE Courses	All	No			Specific Schools: Sierra High School		$0.00	$65,000.00	$65,000.00				$65,000.00	

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
11,700,808	1,391,455	11.892%	0.000%	11.892%	$1,393,671.46	0.000%	11.911 %	**Total:**	$1,393,671.46
								LEA-wide Total:	$762,244.45
								Limited Total:	$631,427.01
								Schoolwide Total:	$12,000.00

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	Standards-Aligned Supplemental Curriculum	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$240,000.00	
1	1.3	English Language Acquisition	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$378,425.01	
1	1.4	Supplemental Learning Program	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		
1	1.5	Library Support Services	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$258,000.00	
1	1.6	Required Action: MUSD and Mammoth Elementary School English Learner Performance in ELA and Math.	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	Specific Schools: Mammoth Elementary School and MUSD TK-12	$0.00	
1	1.8	Required Action: Mammoth ES Students Hispanic and Low Income (SED) Performance in ELA	Yes	Schoolwide Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Mammoth Elementary School TK-5	$12,000.00	

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	1.9	Required Action: Mammoth MS English Learner Students Performance in ELA	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	Specific Schools: Mammoth Middle School 6-8	$1,002.00	
1	1.10	Required Action: Mammoth HS Long Term English Learner Students and Hispanic students Performance in Math and ELPI	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	Specific Schools: Mammoth High School 9-12	$0.00	
2	2.2	Social and Emotional Learning and Supports	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$275,037.14	
2	2.3	Meeting the Needs of Homeless Students	Yes	LEA-wide	Low Income	All Schools	$179,169.50	
2	2.4	Student Behavior and Attendance Supports	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$11,037.81	
3	3.2	Increase Community Outreach and Family Engagement	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$4,000.00	
3	3.3	Address the Needs of Our Learning Community	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$35,000.00	

2026-27 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$13,183,914.47	$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)
1	**1.1**	Qualified Teachers	No	$9,844,812.48	
1	**1.2**	Standards-Aligned Supplemental Curriculum	Yes	$240,000.00	
1	**1.3**	English Language Acquisition	Yes	$378,425.01	
1	**1.4**	Supplemental Learning Program	Yes	$21,500.00	
1	**1.5**	Library Support Services	Yes	$258,000.00	
1	**1.6**	Required Action: MUSD and Mammoth Elementary School English Learner Performance in ELA and Math.	Yes	$0.00	
1	**1.7**	Required Action: MUSD and Mammoth ES Students with Disabilities' Performance in ELA and Math	No	$21,800.50	
1	**1.8**	Required Action: Mammoth ES Students Hispanic and Low Income (SED) Performance in ELA	Yes	$12,000.00	
1	**1.9**	Required Action: Mammoth MS English Learner Students Performance in ELA	Yes	$1,002.00	
1	**1.10**	Required Action: Mammoth	Yes	$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)
		HS Long Term English Learner Students and Hispanic students Performance in Math and ELPI			
1	1.11	Daily high-quality, standards aligned instruction for all students (including at-risk and unduplicated) in all four art disciplines: dance, music, theatre, and visual arts (Pursuant to CA Ed. Code sections 51210 and 51220)	No	$448,327.09	
1	1.12	Language Acquistion Program for English Learners	No		
2	2.1	Access to Health Services	No	$250,045.82	
2	2.2	Social and Emotional Learning and Supports	Yes	$410,918.53	
2	2.3	Meeting the Needs of Homeless Students	Yes	$179,169.50	
2	2.4	Student Behavior and Attendance Supports	Yes	$14,236.56	
2	2.5	Facilities	No	$956,676.98	
2	2.6	Required Action: Mammoth MS Chronic Absenteeism Performance for White Students	No	$0.00	
3	3.1	Improve Communication to District Educational Partners	No	$40,000.00	
3	3.2	Increase Community Outreach and Family Engagement	Yes	$7,000.00	
3	3.3	Address the Needs of Our Learning Community	Yes	$35,000.00	

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**	Partner-Informed Decision Making	No	$0.00	
4	**4.1**	Exploration of CTE Courses	No	$65,000.00	

2026-27 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)
	$1,393,671.46	$0.00	$0.00	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
1	1.2	Standards-Aligned Supplemental Curriculum	Yes	$240,000.00			
1	1.3	English Language Acquisition	Yes	$378,425.01			
1	1.4	Supplemental Learning Program	Yes				
1	1.5	Library Support Services	Yes	$258,000.00			
1	1.6	Required Action: MUSD and Mammoth Elementary School English Learner Performance in ELA and Math.	Yes	$0.00			
1	1.8	Required Action: Mammoth ES Students Hispanic and Low Income (SED) Performance in ELA	Yes	$12,000.00			
1	1.9	Required Action: Mammoth MS English Learner Students Performance in ELA	Yes	$1,002.00			
1	1.10	Required Action: Mammoth HS Long Term English Learner Students and Hispanic students Performance in Math and ELPI	Yes	$0.00			
2	2.2	Social and Emotional Learning and Supports	Yes	$275,037.14			
2	2.3	Meeting the Needs of Homeless Students	Yes	$179,169.50			

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)
2	**2.4**	Student Behavior and Attendance Supports	Yes	$11,037.81			
3	**3.2**	Increase Community Outreach and Family Engagement	Yes	$4,000.00			
3	**3.3**	Address the Needs of Our Learning Community	Yes	$35,000.00			

2026-27 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)
11886024		0%	0.000%	$0.00	0.000%	0.000%	$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 32627(d), to provide the information identified above or to include actions funded with LREBG funds within the 2026-27, 2026-27 and 2027-28 LCAPs.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

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

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

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

Schools Identified

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

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

Support for Identified Schools

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

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

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

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

Engaging Educational Partners

Purpose

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

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

Requirements

Requirements

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

- Teachers,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Respond to the prompts as follows:

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Educational Partners

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

Process for Engagement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Goals and Actions

Purpose

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

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

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

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

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

Requirement to Address the LCFF State Priorities

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

Respond to the following prompts, as applicable:

Focus Goal(s)

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

Description

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

Focus goals for Equity Multiplier schoolsites must address the following:

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

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

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

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

Broad Goal

Description

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

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Maintenance of Progress Goal

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Measuring and Reporting Results:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Metric #

- Enter the metric number.

Metric

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

Baseline

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

Year 1 Outcome

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

Year 2 Outcome

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

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

Target for Year 3 Outcome

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

Current Difference from Baseline

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

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

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

Goal Analysis:

Enter the LCAP Year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actions:

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

Action #

- Enter the action number.

Title

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

Description

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

Total Funds

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

Contributing

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

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

Required Actions

For English Learners and Long-Term English Learners

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

For Technical Assistance

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

For Lowest Performing Dashboard Indicators

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

For LEAs With Unexpended LREBG Funds

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

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

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

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

Purpose

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

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

Statutory Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

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

For School Districts Only

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

Complete the tables as follows:

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants

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

Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover — Percentage

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

LCFF Carryover — Dollar

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

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

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

Required Descriptions:

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

Limited Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

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

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

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

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

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

Provide the following descriptions, as applicable to the LEA:

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

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

Action Tables

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

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

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

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

Total Planned Expenditures Table

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Annual Update Table

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

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

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

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

Calculations in the Action Tables

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

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

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

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

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

California Department of Education
November 2024