
LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain
CDS Code: 36678270137224
School Year: 2026-27
LEA contact information:
Wes Wade
Director, Data & Accountability
wwade@mojaveriver.net
760-245-3222

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 Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain 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 Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain is $15,432,566, of which $13,503,859 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), $896,524 is other state funds, $716,891 is local funds, and $315,292 is federal funds. Of the $13,503,859 in LCFF Funds, $3,479,427 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 Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain 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: Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain plans to spend $14,522,574 for the 2026-27 school year. Of that amount, $3,900,881 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and $10,621,693 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:


The LCAP does not include certificated and classified salaries and benefits, including the cost of health and welfare, books and supplies, utilities, vehicle operational costs, operational platforms, and capital outlay.

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

In 2026-27, Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain is projecting it will receive $3,479,427 based on the enrollment of Foster Youth, English learner, and low-income students. Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain plans to spend $3,479,427 towards meeting this requirement, as described in the LCAP.

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

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



This chart compares what Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain budgeted last year in the LCAP for actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students with what Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain estimates it has spent on actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students in the current year.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: In 2025-26, Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain's LCAP budgeted $3,155,664 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain actually spent $3,503,693 for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2025-26.

The difference between the budgeted and actual expenditures of $348,029 had the following impact on Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain’s ability to increase or improve services for high needs students:

The decrease in expected expenditures was not significant enough to have any major impact on services provided to students.

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
Mojave River Academy - Silver Mountain	Wes Wade Director, Data & Accountability	wwade@mojaveriver.net 760-245-3222

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.

Mojave River Academy (MRA) is a public charter school serving students in transition kindergarten through grade 12 through a flexible, individualized independent study model designed to meet the diverse needs of students and families. The school emphasizes personalized learning, strong student-teacher relationships, and family participation as essential components of student success. MRA's program is built around the belief that education is not one-size-fits-all and that students benefit from instruction, pacing, and support tailored to their individual academic and personal needs.

MRA provides students with access to a broad educational experience that includes core academic instruction, intervention support, and enrichment opportunities. The school offers services and structures intended to support the whole child, including academic remediation, social-emotional support, counseling, special education services, and accommodations through the student support process when appropriate. MRA also values parent involvement and collaboration, recognizing families as important educational partners in supporting student achievement and school connectedness.

In addition to core instruction, MRA offers students opportunities to participate in hands-on learning, field trips, enrichment activities, and programs that support college, career, and postsecondary readiness. The school's approach is designed to help students build confidence, maintain progress toward graduation, and access supports that promote success in both academic and personal development. Through its flexible model and individualized supports, MRA seeks to ensure that students are prepared for academic growth, responsible decision-making, and future success.

In order to support a successful transition into kindergarten, Mojave River Academy partners with local early childhood programs, provides transitional kindergarten and kindergarten readiness activities, and hosts family orientation events. These efforts ensure that young learners enter school feeling confident, supported, and excited about their educational journey.

To streamline efforts and promote coherence in planning, Mojave River Academy uses the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) to meet the requirements of the School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA), integrating goals, actions, and resource allocation into one unified plan. This alignment ensures that improvement efforts are strategic, data-informed, and focused on advancing student outcomes across the district.

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

The data reflections are based on the 2025 California Dashboard and local data from the 2023/2024 and 2024/2025 school years. MRA – Silver Mountain continues to focus on improving outcomes in both Mathematics and English Language Arts through ongoing refinement of instructional supports to best serve students in an independent study setting.

Regarding Mathematics, MRA reflects on and retunes our math program each year, with the goal of identifying a structure that best supports the needs of our independent study students. While math performance remains 170.8 points below standard, the school showed improvement by increasing 7.5 points from 2024 to 2025. During the 2024/25 school year, we shifted math support sessions from a focus on tutoring and course-specific support to a focus on addressing significant gaps in student knowledge. These intervention sessions, in conjunction with course-specific support from tutors and independent study teachers, have had a positive impact on student math performance.

Regarding English Language Arts, student performance remains in the red color band at 80.9 points below standard and decreased by 7.3 points from 2024 to 2025. In response, MRA continues to strengthen literacy support through targeted instruction, closer progress monitoring, and strategic intervention for students who need additional academic support.

LCAP Federal Addendum:
The LCAP Federal Addendum is aligned directly with the LCAP and is updated annually, or as needed, to show how federal funds support academic needs.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

Not Applicable

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.

Not Applicable

Support for Identified Schools

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

Not Applicable

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

Not Applicable

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
Center Administration/Principals	Principals met two times a month from August 2025 to May 2026 to review 2025 CA School Dashboard results, local data and budget expenditures. During these meetings district support teams advise and share ideas regarding progress on district LCAP and SPSA goals. During the March through May meetings, Principals discussed the alignment of goals and actions.
District Administration	The district administration staff meets monthly, the week before the board meetings (July 2025 - May 2026). During this meeting, all staff presents data and shares concerns and positive outcomes that relate to LCAP data. These meetings also provide opportunities for staff to discuss budget needs and ensure budgets are aligning to LCAP and SPSA goals.
Classified and other school personnel	Classified staff meets monthly with the CEO. During the June meeting the CEO focuses the meeting on the state of the district. This meeting includes a review of the district LCAP, by goal and action, with a report on all relevant metrics for the district, as well as a review of the California School Dashboard. The group provided feedback about the proposed goal structure to align the actions with board goals.
Student LCAP Advisory Committee	Student surveys were distributed to all students in April 2026 to determine concerns and strengths regarding LCAP and SPSA goals (safety, connectedness, engagement and academic relevance).

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
SELPA	The Desert Mountain SELPA administrator (also known as the California Association of Health Education Linked Professionals CAHELP) works closely with Mojave River Academy via the Oro Grande School District. A draft of the LCAP was presented to the SELPA administrator.
District English Language Advisory Committee (DELAC)	The DELAC information process includes the entire scope of the LCAP plan cycle including data analysis, plan review, priorities, and plan approval. Four DELAC meetings were held between September 18, 2025 and May 14, 2026. Attending representatives of the DELAC were presented with new LCAP information that included new goals and budgetary information.
LCAP District Advisory Committee (PAC).	The 2026-2027 LCAP goals and priorities were presented to the parent group on various dates in April and May 2026.
Governing Board Community Members	The midyear LCAP was presented to the Oro Grande Governing Board February 19, 2026.
Governing Board Community Members	The 2026-2027 LCAP draft was presented at a regularly scheduled Board of Education meeting on June 11, 2026.
Governing Board Community Members	The 2026-2027 LCAP was adopted at a regularly scheduled Board of Education meeting on June 11, 2026.

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

The process of engaging educational partners in the development of the 2026–2027 LCAP provided the district with valuable input regarding the needs of our students. Key themes that emerged through meetings, discussions, and surveys support the continued commitment to the district's existing goals and actions.

Feedback from educational partners strongly influenced the goals and actions outlined in the LCAP. Input reflected a broad range of priorities for the upcoming school year to support student success. These priorities include improving student outcomes, particularly for those with academic and social-emotional needs. Educational partners emphasized the importance of extracurricular opportunities, strengthening foundational skills in English Language Arts and mathematics, and prioritizing support for students who are struggling the most. Maintaining high academic standards, expanding mental health and social-emotional supports, and providing targeted assistance for struggling readers were also identified as critical areas. Additionally, partners highlighted the need for safe and equitable learning environments, innovative and engaging programs, and increased parent and community involvement.

Based on this input, the goals for the 2026–2027 school year will remain the three goals carried over from the 2025–2026 LCAP, as they continue to align with the needs of the Mojave River Academy student population.

Goal 1
Analysis of CAASPP data, along with local reading and math data, indicates continued agreement among parents, teachers, and staff on the need to provide targeted remediation in both English Language Arts and mathematics (Actions 1.1 and 1.2). Professional development will continue to focus on balanced literacy and the science of reading and writing (Action 1.1), along with an increased emphasis on strengthening math instruction through refined intervention methods and structures (Action 1.2). A cyclical model of professional learning will be implemented, including pedagogy, modeled lessons, observation, and ongoing refinement. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will incorporate a PDSA cycle with measurable local goals (Action 1.6).

The district will also maintain its commitment to providing students with access to a broad course of study, including opportunities in fine arts, STEAM, CTE, and technology, which remain priorities for students, families, and staff (Actions 1.4 and 1.5). Field trips will continue to support and expand students' educational experiences (Action 1.7). Enhanced instructional supports for English Learners will remain a priority, with a focus on increasing the number of students achieving RFEP status and earning the State Seal of Biliteracy (Action 1.3).

Goal 2
Parents and staff continue to express concern regarding students' social-emotional well-being. Additionally, counselors and teachers have identified ongoing challenges with attendance across grade levels. Supporting families with resources and strategies to improve attendance remains a key priority. Educational partners have also advocated for increased teacher training and expanded counseling services.

Student feedback from connectedness and school safety surveys indicates that access to counselors and social workers contributes significantly to students' sense of safety and belonging. These supports will continue to be strengthened (Action 2.2). Review of suspension and chronic absenteeism data suggests that fostering a positive school culture and recognizing positive behaviors are effective strategies to support student success. The district will continue to explore the use of available resources to enhance schoolwide recognition systems and promote a culture of high expectations. Efforts will also focus on supporting students' physical health to improve attendance (Action 2.1). Foster Youth will continue to receive targeted support, including expanded access to mental health services and assistance with basic needs (Action 2.3).

Goal 3
Strengthening partnerships with parents and the community remains a priority. This goal will continue to provide meaningful opportunities for families to share input and participate in decision-making related to academic and social programs. Families will be invited to engage in literacy and math events, fine arts programs, and Latino Literacy initiatives designed to support multilingual learners (Action 3.1).

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	Mojave River Academy will provide a rigorous academic program for all students.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

All students need to have grade-level proficiency in English literacy and Mathematics to understand and access curriculum and secure college and career readiness. This goal will provide services specifically to our English Learners, Students with Disabilities and students that are performing significantly below standard in both reading and math. This goal will also provide a broad course of study and well rounded education for all students. Professional development will ensure all staff is prepared to provide rigorous and research based instruction.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	CAASPP ELA (Distance from Standard - DFS) California School Dashboard	CA Dashboard (2023) CAASPP ELA All Students: -93.9 DFS Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: -91.7 DFS Hispanic: -99.6 DFS English Learners: -110.7 DFS White: -79.4 DFS	CA Dashboard (2024) CAASPP ELA All Students: -73.6 DFS Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: -83.4 DFS Hispanic: -89.3 DFS English Learners: -103.8 DFS (not a numerically	CA Dashboard (2024) CAASPP ELA All Students: -80.9 DFS Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: -82.3 DFS Hispanic: -77.4 DFS English Learners: -100.7 DFS (not a numerically	Increase All students and each subgroups' ELA CAASPP scores by 3 points toward Standards Met per year for a total of 9 points increase towards Standards Met for each group	All Students: -13 increase Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: -9.4 increase Hispanic: -22.2 increase English Learners: -10 increase White: +10.1 decrease

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			significant subgroup) White: -33.2 DFS	significant subgroup) White: -89.5 DFS		
1.2	CAASPP Math (Distance from Standard - DFS) California School Dashboard	CA Dashboard (2023) CAASPP Math All Students: -172.2 DFS Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: -170.7 DFS Hispanic: -179.1 DFS English Learners: -177.8 DFS White: -155.9 DFS	CA Dashboard (2024) CAASPP Math All Students: -178.3 DFS Low Income: -184.5 DFS Hispanic: -191 DFS English Learners: -230.6 DFS (not a numerically significant subgroup) White: -148.3 DFS	CA Dashboard (2024) CAASPP Math All Students: -170.8 DFS Low Income: -175.8 DFS Hispanic: -169.9 DFS English Learners: -168.9 DFS (not a numerically significant subgroup) White: -172.6 DFS	Increase All students and each subgroups' Math CAASPP scores by 3 points toward Standards Met per year for a total of 9 points increase towards Standards Met for each group	All Students: -1.4 decrease Low Income: +5.1 decrease Hispanic: -9.2 increase English Learners: -8.9 increase White: +16.7 decrease
1.3	iReady Scores Reading (% at or above grade level) Local Assessment	Star Reading IRL (23-24 Spring assessment) 19.0% at or above grade level Scores will be transitioned to iReady for 2025-27	iReady Diagnostic May 2025 17.3% of students are at or above grade level in reading	iReady Diagnostic May 2025 15.6% of students are at or above grade level in reading	Increase in the number of students At or Above grade level in Reading on Spring iReady assessments by 3.3% per year, for a total of 10% in three years. The three-year desired outcome is 29.0% at grade level	All students: The baseline year was STAR which is not comparable, however from Year 1 to Year 2 student performance decreased by 1.7%.
1.4	iReady Scores Math (% at or above grade level) Local Assessment	Star Math GE (23-24 Spring assessment) 12.1% at or above grade level	iReady Diagnostic May 2025	iReady Diagnostic May 2026	Increase in the number of students At or Above grade level in Math on Spring	All students: The baseline year was STAR which is not comparable, however from Year

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Scores will be transitioned to iReady for 2025-27	11.0% of students are at or above grade level in math	9.1% of students are at or above grade level in math	iReady assessments by 3.3% per year, for a total of 10% in three years. The three-year desired outcome is 22.1% at grade level	1 to Year 2 student performance decreased by 1.9%.
1.5	English Learner Progress (% making progress) California School Dashboard	CA Dashboard (2023) 27.3% making progress towards English Language proficiency	CA Dashboard (2024) 46.3% making progress towards English Language proficiency LTEL: 47.4% making progress	CA Dashboard (2025) 47.9% making progress towards English Language proficiency LTEL: 47.6% making progress	The desired outcome is to increase the number of English learner students making progress towards proficiency by 25%. To reach this outcome we would need to increase proficiency by at least 5% in the first year and by 10% in each successive year	EL: 20.6% increase LTEL: 0.2% increase (comparative data only available from Year 1 to Year 2)
1.6	Implementation of State Standards (% of teachers trained in State Standards) Local Data	100% of teachers trained in CA State Standards	100% of teachers trained in CA State Standards	100% of teachers trained in CA State Standards	Maintain 100% of teachers trained in CA State Standards	No change, 100%
1.7	Properly Credentialed Teachers (% of teachers fully credentialed) CALSAAS	90.8% of teachers as highly qualified (CALSASS 2023)	84% of teachers as highly qualified (CALSASS 2024)	100% of teachers as highly qualified (CALSASS 2024)	Have 100% of teachers as highly qualified.	9.2% increase

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.8	English Learner Authorization (% of teachers authorized to teacher English Learners) CALSAAS	CALSAAS (2023) 100% of teachers EL certified	CALSAAS (2024) 92.9% of teachers EL certified	CALSAAS (2025) 97.1% of teachers EL certified	Maintain 100% of teachers EL certified	2.9% decrease
1.9	Technology Access (% of students with access) Local Data	100% of students have access to technology	100% of students have access to technology	100% of students have access to technology	Maintain 100% of students have access to technology	No change, 100%
1.10	College and Career (% of students prepared) California School Dashboard	CA Dashboard (2023) College and Career Indicator 13.3% prepared	CA Dashboard (2024) College and Career Indicator 11.6% prepared	CA Dashboard (2025) College and Career Indicator 14.0% prepared	15% college and career ready	0.7% increase
1.11	Graduation Rate (% of students graduated) California School Dashboard	CA Dashboard (2023) Graduation Rates All Students: 66.3% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 65.9% Hispanic: 67.4% English Learners: not a significant subgroup - data not available White: 62.5%	CA Dashboard (2024) Graduation Rates All Students: 75.3% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 73.3% Hispanic: 77.5% English Learners: 70% (not a numerically significant subgroup) White: 76.9%	CA Dashboard (2025) Graduation Rates All Students: 86.0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 85.0% Hispanic: 84.1% English Learners: 93.8% (not a numerically significant subgroup) White: 90.6%	80% graduation rate	All Students: 19.7% increase Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 19.1% increase Hispanic: 16.7% increase White: 28.1% increase
1.12	Master Schedule	100% of students participate in a	100% of students participate in a	100% of students participate in a	100% of students participate in a	No change, 100%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	(% of student with access) Local Data	schedule which allows for present and post high school opportunity	schedule which allows for present and post high school opportunity	schedule which allows for present and post high school opportunity	schedule which allows for present and post high school opportunity	
1.13	Chronic Absenteeism (% of students chronically absent) California School Dashboard	CA Dashboard (2023) All Students: 8.0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 9.3% Students with Disabilities: 9.3% Hispanic: 9.0% English Learners: 28.6% (not a significant subgroup) White: 7.2%	CA Dashboard (2024) All Students: 6.8% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 7.3% SWD: 7.3% Hispanic: 7.0% English Learners: 8.3% (not a numerically significant subgroup) White: 9%	CA Dashboard (2025) All Students: 5.9% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 6.1% SWD: 7.3% Hispanic: % English Learners: 0% (not a numerically significant subgroup) White: 5.8%	Desired outcome is to decrease Chronic Absenteeism to below 5%.	All Students: 2.1% decrease Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 3.2% decrease Students with Disabilities: 2% decrease Hispanic: 4.2% decrease English Learners: 28.6% decrease (not a numerically significant subgroup) White: 1.4% decrease

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.

Mojave River Academy – Silver Mountain demonstrated strong implementation of Goal 1 during the 2025–2026 school year, with all seven actions being fully implemented as planned. There were no substantive differences between the planned actions and their actual implementation across any of the actions.

Actions 1.1 (Literacy and ELA Proficiency), 1.2 (Math Proficiency), 1.3 (English Learner Support), and 1.6 (Academic Professional Development and Instructional Coaching for Staff) were all fully implemented without any reported challenges or substantive differences.

Action 1.4 (Well-rounded Opportunities) was fully implemented, with a notable success being the expansion of career and technical education course offerings through new programs, including eDynamic Learning and TransfrVR, which provided students with additional career and technical education opportunities.

Action 1.5 (Technology) was fully implemented, with the school successfully maintaining 1:1 technology access for all students. Additionally, advanced technology was provided to students participating in career and technical education programs, further supporting student learning and engagement.

Action 1.7 (Field Trips) was fully implemented, with students participating in a variety of field trips, supporting student engagement and exposure to postsecondary opportunities.

Overall, the implementation of Goal 1 reflected a consistent and comprehensive effort to provide a rigorous academic program for all students, with meaningful successes in expanding career technical educations opportunities, maintaining technology access, and connecting students to college experiences.

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.

MRA considers a material difference the greater of either a 10% discrepancy of the budget or $10,000.
1.1 - Literacy and ELA Proficiency - $826,919 was budgeted, however $614,742 was spent. This is a decrease of 25.7%. This is primarily due to reduced personnel costs due to a lack of a reading specialist. Also, more was spent on Action 1.6 for instructional coordinators and professional development.
1.2 - Math Proficiency - $288,817 was budgeted, however $250,407 was spent. This is a decrease of 13.3%. This is primarily due to reduced curricular costs.
1.3 - English Learner Support - $60,814 was budgeted, however $70,702 was spent. This is an increase of 16.3%. This is primarily due to increased supports via personnel as well as new EL curriculum.
1.4 - Well-rounded Opportunities - No material difference.
1.5 - Technology - $107,286 budgeted, however $76,629 was spent. This is a decrease of 28.6%. This is primarily due to fewer student chrome books being needed.
1.6 - Academic Professional Development and Instructional Coaching for Staff - $299,128 was budgeted, however $401,750 was spent. This is an increase of 34.3%. This is primarily due to organizational expansion, added personnel and more PD needed, including the costs for academic coordinators.
1.7 - Field Trips - $4,485 was budgeted, however $13,658 was spent. This is an increase of 204.5%. This is primarily due to transportation cost increases and our science camp.

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

Action 1.1 – Literacy and ELA Proficiency (Aligned Metrics: 1.1 and 1.3)
This action provides reading intervention through a Reading Intervention Specialist utilizing iReady and other resources, principally directed toward English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students.

Metric 1.1 – CAASPP ELA (Distance from Standard)
Overall positive trend. All Students improved 13 points from baseline (-93.9 to -80.9 DFS). Hispanic students showed the strongest gain at

+22.2 points. English Learners improved 10 points. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged improved 9.4 points. The White subgroup is the outlier, declining 10.1 points from baseline (-79.4 to -89.5 DFS). Notably, Year 1 to Year 2 shows a slight regression for All Students (-73.6 to -80.9), meaning the net gain from baseline is real but the most recent year moved backward. The school remains deeply below standard across all subgroups, and the Year 3 target of +3 points per year per group is only being met inconsistently.
Effectiveness: Partially Effective. Net gains from baseline are real for most subgroups and exceed the annual target trajectory for All Students, Hispanic, and EL students. However, the Year 1 to Year 2 regression, the White subgroup decline, and the continued depth below standard prevent a fully effective rating.

Metric 1.3 – iReady Scores Reading (% at or above grade level)
A concerning trend. The baseline used STAR Reading (19.0% at/above grade level), which is not directly comparable to iReady, so Year 1 and Year 2 are the more meaningful comparison points. Reading proficiency declined from 17.3% in Year 1 to 15.6% in Year 2 — a 1.7-point drop. The three-year target is 29.0%, which would require roughly a 13-point increase from current performance. The school is moving in the wrong direction on this metric despite Action 1.1 (Literacy and ELA Proficiency) being one of the largest funded actions at $942,367 for 2026-27. This disconnect between investment and outcome warrants serious programmatic review.
Effectiveness: Not Effective. The year-over-year decline between Year 1 and Year 2 means the school is moving away from its target rather than toward it. Given the substantial funding allocated to Action 1.1, the lack of measurable progress on this local reading metric is one of the most significant concerns in the entire LCAP.

Action 1.2 – Math Proficiency (Aligned Metrics: 1.2 and 1.4)

This action provides small-group math intervention using programs such as iReady Learning Path, principally directed toward English Learners (EL) and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students.

Metric 1.2 – CAASPP Math (Distance from Standard)
The weakest CAASPP metric. All Students showed only a marginal improvement of 1.4 points from baseline (-172.2 to -170.8 DFS), and the trajectory from Year 1 to Year 2 is actually positive (improving from -178.3 to -170.8), suggesting some recovery after an initial dip. Hispanic students and English Learners both improved meaningfully (9.2 and 8.9 points respectively). However, Low Income students worsened by 5.1 points and White students worsened significantly by 16.7 points from baseline. Math performance remains the school's most pressing academic challenge, sitting roughly 170+ points below standard across all groups. The Year 3 target of +9 points total is not on track for most subgroups.
Effectiveness: Partially Effective at best, largely ineffective for key subgroups. The Year 1 to Year 2 recovery is encouraging, and Hispanic and EL gains are notable. However, the overall distance from standard remains enormous, Low Income and White subgroups have worsened from baseline, and the Year 3 target is not on track for most groups. More than any other CAASPP metric, math requires urgent programmatic attention.

Metric 1.4 – iReady Scores Math (% at or above grade level)
Similar pattern to Metric 1.3. Math proficiency declined from 11.0% in Year 1 to 9.1% in Year 2 — a 1.9-point drop. The three-year target is 22.1%, requiring roughly a 13-point increase from current levels. Like reading, the school is trending away from its target. Action 1.2 (Math Proficiency) is funded at $273,323 for 2026-27, and the iReady data does not yet reflect measurable gains from that investment. The LCAP's own analysis acknowledges this ineffectiveness and notes the need for strengthened intervention strategies.

Effectiveness: Not Effective. The consistent year-over-year decline and the growing gap between current performance and the Year 3 target indicate that current math intervention strategies are not producing the desired results at the local assessment level. The school's own LCAP narrative concurs with this assessment.

Action 1.3 – English Learner Support (Aligned Metrics: 1.5 and 1.8)

This action provides rigorous, supplemental California state standards-aligned ELD curriculum for English Learners.

Metric 1.5 – English Learner Progress (% making progress toward proficiency)
The strongest performing metric in Goal 1. EL progress jumped from 27.3% at baseline to 47.9% in Year 2 — a 20.6-point increase that far exceeds the target trajectory of 5% in Year 1 and 10% in each subsequent year. Year 1 to Year 2 shows a slight additional gain (46.3% to 47.9%), suggesting the improvement is holding rather than plateauing. Long-Term English Learners showed essentially flat progress year-over-year (47.4% to 47.6%), a 0.2-point gain, indicating that LTEL-specific supports may need strengthening even as overall EL progress is strong.
Effectiveness: Highly Effective for overall EL population. The 20.6-point gain from baseline exceeds the three-year target trajectory by a wide margin. The one caveat is that LTEL progress is essentially flat between Year 1 and Year 2, suggesting that while EL supports broadly are working well, Long-Term English Learners may need more targeted differentiation within Action 1.3.

Metric 1.8 – English Learner Authorization (% of teachers EL certified)
Shows a slight net decline from baseline. Starting at 100% EL certified, it dropped to 92.9% in Year 1 and partially recovered to 97.1% in Year 2 — still 2.9 points below the baseline and the 100% target. While the trend is moving in the right direction, full recovery to 100% has not yet been achieved. Given the school's significant EL population and the focus of multiple LCAP actions on English Learners, closing this remaining gap is important.
Effectiveness: Partially Effective. The improving trend from Year 1 to Year 2 is positive, but the metric has not returned to baseline levels and remains below the 100% target. Given the centrality of English Learner support to the school's LCAP, full EL authorization among all teachers is an important goal to close out in Year 3.

Action 1.4 – Well-rounded Opportunities (Aligned Metrics: 1.10 and 1.12)

This action provides students with access to elective classes, CTE courses, and dual-enrollment classes, principally directed toward Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students and English Learners (EL).

Metric 1.10 – College and Career Indicator (% prepared)
Modest but positive movement. Prepared students went from 13.3% at baseline to 14.0% in Year 2, after a dip to 11.6% in Year 1. The Year 3 target is 15%, which is within reach if the upward trend continues. The Year 1 dip followed by Year 2 recovery is similar to the credentialing pattern and may reflect enrollment or cohort variation rather than a programmatic issue. Overall, this metric is trending positively but remains low in absolute terms.
Effectiveness: Partially Effective. The net gain from baseline is small at only 0.7 points, and the absolute percentage of college and career ready students remains very low at 14%. However, the Year 3 target of 15% is within reach, and the recovery from the Year 1 dip is encouraging. Full effectiveness would require sustaining the upward trend and reaching the target in Year 3.

Metric 1.12 – Master Schedule (% of students with access)
Maintained at 100% across all years. Target is met and stable. No concerns.
Effectiveness: Effective. This is a maintenance goal that is being fully and consistently met. Universal schedule access is a structural requirement that the school is reliably delivering.

Action 1.5 – Technology (Aligned Metrics: 1.3, 1.4, and 1.9)

This action provides instructional technology and devices to support core curriculum programs, principally directed toward Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students and English Learners (EL).

Metric 1.9 – Technology Access (% of students with access)
Maintained at 100% across all three years. Target is met and stable. No concerns.
Effectiveness: Effective. Universal technology access is a maintenance goal that is being fully met. In the context of an independent study model, this is a foundational requirement and its consistent achievement is important, even if access alone has not translated into improved academic outcomes on other metrics.

Metric 1.3 – iReady Scores Reading (% at or above grade level)
A concerning trend. The baseline used STAR Reading (19.0% at/above grade level), which is not directly comparable to iReady, so Year 1 and Year 2 are the more meaningful comparison points. Reading proficiency declined from 17.3% in Year 1 to 15.6% in Year 2 — a 1.7-point drop. The three-year target is 29.0%, which would require roughly a 13-point increase from current performance. The school is moving in the wrong direction on this metric despite Action 1.1 (Literacy and ELA Proficiency) being one of the largest funded actions at $942,367 for 2026-27. This disconnect between investment and outcome warrants serious programmatic review.
Effectiveness: Not Effective. The year-over-year decline between Year 1 and Year 2 means the school is moving away from its target rather than toward it. Given the substantial funding allocated to Action 1.1, the lack of measurable progress on this local reading metric is one of the most significant concerns in the entire LCAP.

Metric 1.4 – iReady Scores Math (% at or above grade level)
Similar pattern to Metric 1.3. Math proficiency declined from 11.0% in Year 1 to 9.1% in Year 2 — a 1.9-point drop. The three-year target is 22.1%, requiring roughly a 13-point increase from current levels. Like reading, the school is trending away from its target. Action 1.2 (Math Proficiency) is funded at $273,323 for 2026-27, and the iReady data does not yet reflect measurable gains from that investment. The LCAP's own analysis acknowledges this ineffectiveness and notes the need for strengthened intervention strategies.
Effectiveness: Not Effective. The consistent year-over-year decline and the growing gap between current performance and the Year 3 target indicate that current math intervention strategies are not producing the desired results at the local assessment level. The school's own LCAP narrative concurs with this assessment.

Action 1.6 – Academic Professional Development and Instructional Coaching for Staff (Aligned Metrics: 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, and 1.7)

This action provides instructional coaching and professional development in all core content areas, principally directed toward Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students and English Learners.

Metric 1.3 – iReady Scores Reading (% at or above grade level)
A concerning trend. The baseline used STAR Reading (19.0% at/above grade level), which is not directly comparable to iReady, so Year 1 and Year 2 are the more meaningful comparison points. Reading proficiency declined from 17.3% in Year 1 to 15.6% in Year 2 — a 1.7-point drop. The three-year target is 29.0%, which would require roughly a 13-point increase from current performance. The school is moving in the wrong direction on this metric despite Action 1.1 (Literacy and ELA Proficiency) being one of the largest funded actions at $942,367 for 2026-27. This disconnect between investment and outcome warrants serious programmatic review.
Effectiveness: Not Effective. The year-over-year decline between Year 1 and Year 2 means the school is moving away from its target rather than toward it. Given the substantial funding allocated to Action 1.1, the lack of measurable progress on this local reading metric is one of the most significant concerns in the entire LCAP.

Metric 1.4 – iReady Scores Math (% at or above grade level)
Similar pattern to Metric 1.3. Math proficiency declined from 11.0% in Year 1 to 9.1% in Year 2 — a 1.9-point drop. The three-year target is 22.1%, requiring roughly a 13-point increase from current levels. Like reading, the school is trending away from its target. Action 1.2 (Math Proficiency) is funded at $273,323 for 2026-27, and the iReady data does not yet reflect measurable gains from that investment. The LCAP's own analysis acknowledges this ineffectiveness and notes the need for strengthened intervention strategies.
Effectiveness: Not Effective. The consistent year-over-year decline and the growing gap between current performance and the Year 3 target indicate that current math intervention strategies are not producing the desired results at the local assessment level. The school's own LCAP narrative concurs with this assessment.

Metric 1.6 – Implementation of State Standards (% of teachers trained)
Stable at 100% across baseline, Year 1, and Year 2. The target is to maintain 100%, which is being met consistently. No concerns with this metric.
Effectiveness: Effective. The target is a maintenance goal and it is being fully met every year. No gap exists between the target and the outcome.

Metric 1.7 – Properly Credentialed Teachers (% highly qualified)
Improved significantly from 90.8% at baseline to 100% in Year 2, after a dip to 84% in Year 1. The recovery from that Year 1 dip to full credentialing in Year 2 is a positive result and meets the 100% target. Worth monitoring to ensure it holds in Year 3.
Effectiveness: Effective. The Year 3 target of 100% has been achieved in Year 2, and the recovery from the Year 1 dip demonstrates the school's ability to course-correct on staffing quality. Sustained performance at this level in Year 3 would confirm full effectiveness.

Action 1.7 – Field Trips (Aligned Metrics: 1.11 and 1.13)

This action provides field trips to improve school engagement, principally directed toward Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students.

Metric 1.11 – Graduation Rate (% graduated)
The standout metric across the entire LCAP. All Students improved from 66.3% at baseline to 86.0% in Year 2 — a 19.7-point gain that already exceeds the 80% Year 3 target. Every reported subgroup improved substantially: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged +19.1 points, Hispanic +16.7 points, White +28.1 points. English Learners reached 93.8% in Year 2, though noted as not a numerically significant

subgroup. The consistent improvement across all subgroups over both years suggests this is a durable trend rather than a one-year anomaly, and it is the clearest evidence of program-wide effectiveness in Goal 1.
Effectiveness: Highly Effective. The Year 3 target has been exceeded two years early across all reported subgroups. Gains are large, consistent, and broad-based. This metric represents the strongest evidence of program effectiveness in the entire LCAP and should be examined closely to understand what is driving these results.

Metric 1.13 – Chronic Absenteeism (% chronically absent)
Steady improvement across nearly all subgroups. All Students declined from 8.0% to 5.9% — a 2.1-point improvement. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged improved 3.2 points, Hispanic improved 4.2 points, and White improved 1.4 points. Students with Disabilities improved 2.0 points but remain the highest subgroup at 7.3%, unchanged from Year 1, suggesting this group needs targeted attention. English Learners showed a dramatic improvement (28.6% to 0%), though this subgroup is noted as not numerically significant, so caution is warranted in interpreting that figure. The <5% overall target is close but not yet achieved.
Effectiveness: Mostly Effective. Consistent improvement across nearly all subgroups and a clear trajectory toward the <5% target. The one area of concern is Students with Disabilities, whose rate has stalled at 7.3% between Year 1 and Year 2, suggesting current supports are not translating into attendance improvement for this group specifically.

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 only substantial change will be to Action 1.1, for which additional summer school funding will be applied using LREBG funds.

While no significant changes have been identified for this goal, Mojave River Academy will maintain ongoing evaluation to monitor SPSA implementation through regular data analysis cycles, progress monitoring of identified metrics, and continued staff collaboration. School leadership and instructional staff will review student benchmark assessments, attendance data, and behavior indicators to measure progress toward SPSA goals. Input from educational partners will also inform both mid-year and end-of-year reviews, supporting data-driven adjustments that ensure continued alignment with student needs and SPSA outcomes. Additionally, strategies will be further refined during implementation to better meet the unique needs of diverse families and to strengthen participation and engagement.

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	Literacy and ELA Proficiency	Reading Intervention Specialist will provide instructional interventions utilizing iReady and other resources to increase reading comprehension and fluency. This action is principally directed to English Learners and	$942,367.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students and will be measured by Metrics 1.1 and 1.3.		
1.2	Math Proficiency	Teachers in small group settings during the school day will provide math intervention programs such as iReady Learning Path. These interventions will be principally directed for our English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students and will be measured by Metrics 1.2 and 1.4.	$273,323.00	Yes
1.3	English Learner Support	The Educational Services Department will provide rigorous, supplemental California state standards-aligned ELD curriculum. These programs will be measured by Metrics 1.5 and 1.8.	$76,104.00	Yes
1.4	Well-rounded Opportunities	Mojave River Academy students will participate in a well rounded educational experience, which includes: elective classes, CTE courses, and dual-enrollment classes. These opportunities are provided to enhance the daily schedule for students and increase student engagement. These will result in higher levels of student engagement and are principally directed towards Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. This action will be measured by Metrics 1.10 and 1.12.	$176,108.00	Yes
1.5	Technology	Mojave River Academy will provide an instructional technology program and devices to assist the core curriculum programs and increase technical skills.These programs will be offered daily in the classroom and will be principally directed to Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students and English Learners. This action will be measured by Metrics 1.3, 1.4, and 1.9.	$61,873.00	Yes
1.6	Academic Professional Development and Instructional Coaching for Staff	Instructional coordinators, contracted professional development, and support staff from the MRA Curriculum and Instruction department will provide rigorous academic training in all core content areas. This professional development will increase CAASPP ELA scores and math	$465,810.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		CAASPP and will be principally directed towards low income students. This action will be measured by Metrics 1.3, 1.4, 1.6 and 1.7.		
1.7	Field Trips	Transportation will provide field trips that improve school engagement. This action will be principally directed for Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. This will be measured by Metrics 1.11 and 1.13.	$13,551.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Mojave River Academy will provide a safe and healthy learning environment.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Mojave River Academy recognizes that students have needs that extend beyond the academic setting. In an effort to support our community and family partnerships, Mojave River Academy feels that it is essential to provide access to and communication about welfare services. Similarly, Mojave River Academy
knows that students need support socially and emotionally to become positive contributing members of the community, maintain low suspension/expulsion rates, and decrease chronic absenteeism rates.
Mojave River Academy also recognizes that safe, clean facilities help students feel engaged and safe at school.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	Student Safety Survey (% of students who feel safe) Local Data	Student Survey (2024) 95.4% of all students who responded feel physically and/or emotionally safe at school	Fall 2024 Student Survey Local Data 98.4% of all students who responded feel physically and/or emotionally safe at school	Spring 2026 Student Survey Local Data 95.8% of all students who responded feel physically and/or emotionally safe at school	Have 97% of students report that they feel safe at school	Of the students who responded: 0.4% increase
2.2	Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT)	FIT (2023-2024)	FIT (2024-2025)	FIT (2025-2026)	Maintain 100% of items inspected to be in good repair	No change, 100%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	(% of items in good repair) Local Data	100% of items inspected to be in good repair	100% of items inspected to be in good repair	100% of items inspected to be in good repair		
2.3	School Attendance Rate (% of student attendance data) Local Data	Average Daily Attendance Rate is 95.7% (2022-2023)	Local Data 2024-2025 as of June 1, 2025 Average Daily Attendance Rate 98.1%	Local Data 2025-2026 as of May 31, 2026 Average Daily Attendance Rate 98.1%	The desired outcome is to increase to 96% or above attendance rate.	All students: 2.4% increase
2.4	Suspension Rate (% of student suspensions) California School Dashboard	CA Dashboard (2023) Suspension Rate is 0% English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, Hispanic, African American, White, Two or more races - all 0%	CA Dashboard (2024) Suspension Rate is 0% English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, Hispanic, African American, White, Two or more races - all 0%	CA Dashboard (2025) Suspension rate is 0% for all student subgroups	Desired outcome in three years is to be at or below 1%	No change, 0%
2.5	Expulsion Rate (% of expulsion rate) DataQuest	Expulsion Rate 0%	Expulsion Rate 0%	Expulsion Rate 0%	The outcome is to maintain below a 0.5% expulsion rate.	No change, 0%
2.6	Chronic Absenteeism Rate (% of students chronically absent) California School Dashboard	CA Dashboard (2023) All Students: 8.0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 9.3% SWD: 9.3% Hispanic: 9.0%	CA Dashboard (2024) All Students: 6.8% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 7.3% SWD: 7.3%	CA Dashboard (2025) All Students: 5.9% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 6.1% SWD: 7.3%	The desired outcome is to decrease to below 5% Chronic Absenteeism	All Students: 2.1% decrease Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 3.2% decrease Students with Disabilities: 2% decrease

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		English Learners: 28.6% (not a significant subgroup) White: 7.2%	Hispanic: 7.0% English Learners: 8.3% (not a numerically significant subgroup) White: 9%	Hispanic: 4.8% English Learners: 0% (not a numerically significant subgroup) White: 5.8%		Hispanic: 4.2% decrease English Learners: 28.6% decrease (not a numerically significant subgroup) White: 1.4% decrease
2.7	Student Connectedness Survey (% of students who feel connected) Local Data	Student Survey (2024) 98.6% of all students who responded feel connected to an adult at school	Fall 2024 Student Survey Local Data 96.8% of all students who responded feel connected to an adult at the school	Spring 2026 Student Survey Local Data 94.1% of all students who responded feel connected to an adult at the school	Maintain more than 97% of students feeling connected to the school via a trusted adult	Of the students who responded: 4.5% decrease

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.

Mojave River Academy – Silver Mountain demonstrated strong and consistent implementation of Goal 2 during the 2025–2026 school year, with all three actions being fully implemented as planned. There were no substantive differences between the planned actions and their actual implementation, and no specific challenges were reported.

Action 2.1 (Health Services) was fully implemented, with community health programs continuing to be provided to all students to support decreased chronic absenteeism and increased student connectivity.

Action 2.2 (Social/Emotional Support) was fully implemented, with staff providing access to counseling, social emotional programs, and social services support to help decrease chronic absenteeism rates and increase student connectivity.

Action 2.3 (Foster Youth Mental Health Services) was fully implemented, with the comprehensive mental health support program continuing to serve Foster Youth through mental health assessments, access to licensed counselors or therapists, trauma-informed care training for staff, and partnerships with community organizations.

Overall, the implementation of Goal 2 reflected a steady commitment to providing a safe and healthy learning environment for all students, with particular attention to the social-emotional and physical well-being of Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students and Foster Youth.

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.

MRA considers a material difference the greater of either a 10% discrepancy of the budget or $10,000.
2.1 Health Services - $107,990 was budgeted while $85,995 was spent. This is a decrease of 20.4%. This is primarily due to a decrease in personnel costs, as well as more costs going to Action 2.2.
2.2 Social/Emotional Support - No material difference.
2.3 Foster Youth Mental Health Services - $19,922 was budgeted, however $10,226 was spent. This is a decrease of 48.7%. This is primarily due to a lack of need of services and decreased need for personnel.

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

Action 2.1 - Health Services (Aligned Metrics: 2.6)

This action provides health services to all students.

Metric 2.6 – Chronic Absenteeism Rate
Steady improvement overall. All Students fell from 8.0% to 5.9%, approaching but not yet reaching the <5% target. Subgroup trends are mostly positive. Students with Disabilities are the one subgroup showing no improvement between Year 1 and Year 2, remaining at 7.3%, which stands out given the otherwise broadly improving trend.
Effectiveness: Mostly Effective. The overall trend is clearly positive and the target is within reach for most subgroups. The stall in improvement for Students with Disabilities between Year 1 and Year 2 is the primary gap, and targeted supports for this group will be important in Year 3 to fully meet the goal.

Action 2.2 – Social/Emotional Support (Aligned Metrics: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.7)

This action provides access to counseling, social-emotional programs, and social services support, principally directed toward Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students.

Metric 2.1 – Student Safety Survey (% feeling safe)
Inconsistent trend. Starting at 95.4% baseline, it rose to 98.4% in Year 1 but fell back to 95.8% in Year 2 — essentially flat relative to baseline and below the 97% target. The Year 1 spike followed by regression suggests that the high result may have been situational. The school needs to examine what changed between Year 1 and Year 2 to understand why perceived safety declined despite continued investment in health and social-emotional supports.
Effectiveness: Not Effective to date. While Year 1 showed promise, the regression in Year 2 to near-baseline levels means no net progress has been made toward the 97% target. With Year 3 as the final year of this LCAP cycle, a meaningful and sustained improvement in student safety perception will be needed to demonstrate effectiveness.

Metric 2.2 – Facilities Inspection Tool (% of items in good repair)
100% across all three years. Target is met and stable. No concerns.
Effectiveness: Effective. A perfect and consistent result across all years. The maintenance target is being fully met with no variance.

Metric 2.3 – School Attendance Rate (% average daily attendance)
Strong and consistent. ADA increased from 95.7% at baseline to 98.1% in both Year 1 and Year 2, exceeding the 96% target by over 2 points. The stability between Year 1 and Year 2 at exactly 98.1% suggests this is a reliable outcome and not subject to significant fluctuation.
Effectiveness: Highly Effective. The target has been exceeded by a meaningful margin and held consistently across two years. The 2.4-point improvement from baseline is substantial in the context of attendance rates, and the stability of the result across both years suggests it reflects genuine programmatic success rather than a one-time outcome.

Metric 2.4 – Suspension Rate
0% across all years for all student subgroups. The target is to remain at or below 1%, which is being met with room to spare. This is a consistently excellent result for a TK-12 school and reflects positively on school culture.
Effectiveness: Highly Effective. A sustained 0% suspension rate across all subgroups over the full measurement period is a remarkable outcome. The target is not only met but maximally achieved, and the consistency across years and subgroups indicates this reflects a genuinely positive school culture rather than underreporting.

Metric 2.5 – Expulsion Rate
0% across all years. Target is to remain below 0.5%, which is comfortably met. Consistent with the suspension data, this points to a strong and stable school climate in terms of disciplinary outcomes.
Effectiveness: Highly Effective. Like the suspension rate, the expulsion rate is at its best possible value across all years. The target is fully met with no variance, reflecting a sustained commitment to restorative and supportive rather than exclusionary discipline practices.

Metric 2.7 – Student Connectedness Survey (% feeling connected to a trusted adult)
The most concerning metric in Goal 2. The percentage of students feeling connected to a trusted adult has declined every year: 98.6% at baseline, 96.8% in Year 1, 94.1% in Year 2 — a cumulative 4.5-point drop that now sits below the 97% target. This is a consistent downward trend, not a one-year fluctuation. It is particularly notable because Action 2.2 (Social/Emotional Support) is the single largest LCAP action at $1,367,097 planned for 2026-27, and it is directly aligned to this metric.
Effectiveness: Not Effective. A consistent decline across both years, falling further below the target each year, is the clearest sign of ineffectiveness in Goal 2. The school's largest single expenditure is tied to actions aligned with this metric, making the downward trend a high-priority concern. The LCAP does not yet identify a specific corrective strategy, which should be addressed in Year 3 planning.

Action 2.3 - Foster Youth Mental Health Services (Aligned Metrics: 2.6 and 2.7)

This action provides a comprehensive mental health support program tailored specifically to the needs of Foster Youth within our district.

Metric 2.6 – Chronic Absenteeism Rate
Steady improvement overall. All Students fell from 8.0% to 5.9%, approaching but not yet reaching the <5% target. Subgroup trends are

mostly positive. Students with Disabilities are the one subgroup showing no improvement between Year 1 and Year 2, remaining at 7.3%, which stands out given the otherwise broadly improving trend.
Effectiveness: Mostly Effective. The overall trend is clearly positive and the target is within reach for most subgroups. The stall in improvement for Students with Disabilities between Year 1 and Year 2 is the primary gap, and targeted supports for this group will be important in Year 3 to fully meet the goal.

Metric 2.7 – Student Connectedness Survey (% feeling connected to a trusted adult)
The most concerning metric in Goal 2. The percentage of students feeling connected to a trusted adult has declined every year: 98.6% at baseline, 96.8% in Year 1, 94.1% in Year 2 — a cumulative 4.5-point drop that now sits below the 97% target. This is a consistent downward trend, not a one-year fluctuation. It is particularly notable because Action 2.2 (Social/Emotional Support) is the single largest LCAP action at $1,367,097 planned for 2026-27, and it is directly aligned to this metric.
Effectiveness: Not Effective. A consistent decline across both years, falling further below the target each year, is the clearest sign of ineffectiveness in Goal 2. The school's largest single expenditure is tied to actions aligned with this metric, making the downward trend a high-priority concern. The LCAP does not yet identify a specific corrective strategy, which should be addressed in Year 3 planning.

Summary: Foster Youth are not a numerically significant subgroup, however it seems that MRAs efforts with mental health services are having mixed results. While a smaller percentage of students feel connected than the baseline year, other metrics are moving in a positive direction.

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 will be made to the planned goals, metrics, outcomes or actions.

While no significant changes have been identified for this goal, Mojave River Academy will maintain ongoing evaluation to monitor SPSA implementation through regular data analysis cycles, progress monitoring of identified metrics, and continued staff collaboration. School leadership and instructional staff will review student benchmark assessments, attendance data, and behavior indicators to measure progress toward SPSA goals. Input from educational partners will also inform both mid-year and end-of-year reviews, supporting data-driven adjustments that ensure continued alignment with student needs and SPSA outcomes. Additionally, strategies will be further refined during implementation to better meet the unique needs of diverse families and to strengthen participation and engagement.

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	Health Services	Health Services will provide to students and provide community health programs. These services will help decrease chronic absenteeism rates and increase student connectivity and will be principally directed towards low income students as measured by M 2.6	$171,961.00	Yes
2.2	Social/Emotional Support	Staff will provide access to counseling, social emotional programs and social services support . These services will help decrease chronic absenteeism rates and increase student connectivity and will be principally directed towards low income students. Measured by M 2.1, M 2.2, M 2.3, M 2.4, M 2.5 and M 2.7.	$1,367,097.00	Yes
2.3	Foster Youth Mental Health Services	The school will implement a comprehensive mental health support program tailored specifically to the needs of foster youth within our district. This program will include regular mental health assessments, access to licensed counselors or therapists, trauma-informed care training for staff working directly with foster youth, and partnerships with community organizations to provide additional support services as needed. This action will be principally directed for Foster Youth students. Measured by M 2.6 and M 2.7.	$1,000.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	Mojave River Academy will engage families and the community.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Mojave River Academy values the contributions and involvement of all Educational Partners, including students, parents, caregivers, and the community. The District's focus on meeting the needs of its Educational Partners continues to be a high priority. The creation of this goal demonstrates Mojave River Academy's commitment to including the community as true members of the decision-making process. This goal will increase opportunities to hear and respond to family comments and concerns in welcoming and safe environments. By implementing the listed actions and measures of data reflected in the metrics, Mojave River Academy will continue to engage all Educational Partners.

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 Participation Survey (% of parents who feel involved in the decision making process) Local Data	2023-2024 Local Survey Data 50% of parents surveyed responded that they participate in the decision making process	Fall 2024 Local Survey Data 99.4% of parents who responded agreed that they are given the opportunity to participate in the decision making process	Spring 2026 Local Survey Data 100% of parents who responded agreed that they are given the opportunity to participate in the decision making process	2026-2027 Local Survey Data 80% of parents surveyed will respond that they participate in the decision making process	Of the parents who responded: 50% increase
3.2	Parent and Family Engagement California School Dashboard Local Indicator	CA Dashboard 2023 Parent and Family Engagement- Standard Met	CA Dashboard 2024	CA Dashboard 2025	CA Dashboard 2026 Maintain Standard Met	No change, Standard Met

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			Parent and Family Engagement- Standard Met	Parent and Family Engagement- Standard Met		

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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

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

Mojave River Academy – Silver Mountain fully implemented Goal 3 during the 2025–2026 school year. There were no substantive differences between the planned action and its actual implementation, and no specific challenges were reported.

Action 3.1 (Parent Participation and Engagement) was fully implemented, with parent advisory groups continuing to participate in advising and developing programs to support English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. Programs such as family literacy nights, Latino Family Literacy, STEM events, and fine art events were provided to increase student engagement and parent participation. Site administration continued to implement programs supporting family literacy, social support, and academic supports for students.

Overall, the implementation of Goal 3 reflected a continued commitment to engaging families and the community as meaningful partners in supporting student success at Mojave River Academy – Silver Mountain.

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.

MRA considers a material difference the greater of either a 10% discrepancy of the budget or $10,000.
3.1 Parent Participation and Engagement - No material difference.

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

Action 3.1 – Parent Participation and Engagement (Aligned Metrics: 3.1 and 3.2)

This action supports parent advisory groups in advising and developing programs for English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. It includes new programs such as family literacy nights, Latino Family Literacy, STEM events, and fine art events. A site administrator implements programs to support family literacy, social support programs, and academic supports for students. These programs are principally directed toward English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students.

Metric 3.1 – Parent Participation Survey (% participating in decision-making)

Dramatic improvement. The baseline showed 50% of parents felt they participated in decision-making. By Year 1, that figure reached 99.4%, and Year 2 held at 100% — a 50-point increase from baseline that far exceeds the 80% Year 3 target. It is worth noting that the LCAP narrative itself acknowledges that in-person participation at site events remains a challenge in the independent study model.
Effectiveness: Highly Effective by the stated metric. The Year 3 target has been exceeded by 20 points and held for two consecutive years.

Metric 3.2 – Parent and Family Engagement (CA Dashboard Local Indicator)
Maintained at "Standard Met" across baseline, Year 1, and Year 2. The target is to maintain Standard Met, which is being achieved. No change and no concerns.
Effectiveness: Effective. The maintenance target is being fully and consistently met. As a binary metric it provides limited insight into the quality or depth of family engagement, but from a compliance and accountability standpoint the school is meeting the state standard without interruption.

Summary: Based on the current difference from baseline for both aligned metrics, Action 3.1 has been highly effective 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.

No changes will be made to the planned goals, metrics, outcomes or actions.

While no significant changes have been identified for this goal, Mojave River Academy will maintain ongoing evaluation to monitor SPSA implementation through regular data analysis cycles, progress monitoring of identified metrics, and continued staff collaboration. School leadership and instructional staff will review student benchmark assessments, attendance data, and behavior indicators to measure progress toward SPSA goals. Input from educational partners will also inform both mid-year and end-of-year reviews, supporting data-driven adjustments that ensure continued alignment with student needs and SPSA outcomes. Additionally, strategies will be further refined during implementation to better meet the unique needs of diverse families and to strengthen participation and engagement.

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	Parent Participation and Engagement	Parent advisory groups will participate in advising and developing programs to support our English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. New programs including family literacy nights, Latino Family Literacy, STEM events, and fine art events. A site admin will implement new programs to support family literacy, social support	$351,687.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		programs and academic supports for students. These programs will increase student engagement and will increase parent participation. These programs will be principally directed toward our English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. Measured by Metrics 3.1 and 3.2.		

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
$3,479,427	$384,046

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
35.763%	0.000%	$0.00	35.763%

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
1.1	**Action:** Literacy and ELA Proficiency **Need:** Reading and ELA proficiency of English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students. **Scope:**	Providing instructional support through a highly vetted, researched-based intervention curriculum, iReady, and providing an intervention specialist will target the needs of English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students.	Metrics 1.1 and 1.3

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		
1.2	**Action:** Math Proficiency **Need:** Math Skills for English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students **Scope:** LEA-wide	Math support teachers and tutors will be available to assist students. Students will also have access to iReady for Math support.	Metrics 1.2 and 1.4
1.4	**Action:** Well-rounded Opportunities **Need:** Give students access to a well rounded education of courses including dual enrollment and CTE. **Scope:** LEA-wide	This action will give students access to courses that will prepare them for graduation and career tech opportunities.	Metrics 1.10 and 1.12
1.5	**Action:** Technology **Need:** Reading and ELA proficiency of English Learners and Low Income Students. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Due to resource inequities, MRA will provide a chrome book program for students in order to ensure reliable internet connectivity. This action will provide increased opportunities and will help close the digital divide for our Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and English Learners. Students will have access to technology to support their learning in literacy through digital curriculum.	Metrics 1.3, M 1.4, M 1.9

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
1.6	**Action:** Academic Professional Development and Instructional Coaching for Staff **Need:** The 2025 math and ELA CAASPP scores for our Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and English Learners confirms the need for instructional academic coaches in English Language Arts, math, and English Language Development. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Mojave River Academy will provide coaching and professional development for teachers. This professional development promotes researched-based instructional strategies to increase proficiency in English Language Arts, math, and English Language Development. Through a differentiated coaching model, teachers will work with instructional academic coordinators to plan and develop scope and sequences, analyze data, and develop instructional strategies to best meet the needs of unduplicated students.	Metrics 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, and 1.7
1.7	**Action:** Field Trips **Need:** Chronic Absenteeism, CAASPP ELA and Math **Scope:** LEA-wide	Provide students with an opportunity to engage in various educational experiences.	Metrics 1.11 and 1.13
2.1	**Action:** Health Services **Need:** Chronic Absenteeism Rates **Scope:** LEA-wide	Students and families will have health education programs (nutrition, personal hygiene), daily health care for students with chronic health care issues (diabetes and asthma) and assistance with connecting to community health resources. This action provides additional registered nurses and licensed vocational nurses on campus to provide care and lead staff training. These health services are principally directed for our low income population and have been a vital component in this rural area.	M 2.6

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
2.2	**Action:** Social/Emotional Support **Need:** Social/Emotional Support and Connectedness **Scope:** LEA-wide	Providing social emotional support and counseling services for our low-income students is a top priority. Counselors provide individual and group counseling, referrals to clinical counseling, and collaboration with teachers to promote a positive mindset for students. These programs and services are principally directed to support the needs of our Low Income students.	M 2.1, M 2.2, M 2.3, M 2.4, M 2.5 and M 2.7
3.1	**Action:** Parent Participation and Engagement **Need:** Creating opportunities for parents to engage in decision making is a top priority for Mojave River Academy. This data demonstrates the need to provide more opportunities for the school to work with families and the community to ensure shared decision making. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Research shows, “When parents are involved at school, the performance of all the children at school, not just their own, tends to improve. The more comprehensive and well planned the partnership between school and home, the higher the student achievement” (Henderson, A.T., and Nancy Berla. 1995. A New Generation of Evidence: The Family Is Critical to Student Achievement. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Education, 14–16).	Metrics 3.1 and 3.2

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
1.3	**Action:** English Learner Support	Provide leveled curriculum and support for English Learners.	Metrics 1.5 and 1.8

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Need: Support students in English acquisition. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)		
2.3	**Action:** Foster Youth Mental Health Services **Need:** School Connectedness and Safety Survey, Chronic Absenteeism Rates **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	These programs will implement a comprehensive mental health support program tailored specifically to the needs of Foster Youth within our district. This program will include regular mental health assessments, access to licensed counselors or therapists, trauma-informed care training for staff working directly with Foster Youth, and partnerships with community organizations to provide additional support services as needed.	M 2.6 and M 2.7

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 grant funding will be used to maintain the social worker and social programs, which will continue to support a decrease in the amount of students that are chronically absent from school. This social worker will continue to work at the site with the counseling staff, social nursing staff and administration to provide resources for students and families. The social worker will conduct home visits and analyze data to show the effectiveness of programs. This additional staff member will continue to work on action items established in Goal 2 of the 2025-2026 LCAP (Action 2.1 and 2.2).

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	No comparison school	No comparison school
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	No comparison school	No comparison school

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	9,729,179	3,479,427	35.763%	0.000%	35.763%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$3,479,427.00	$131,331.00	$0.00	$290,123.00	$3,900,881.00	$3,182,644.00	$718,237.00

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
1	1.1	Literacy and ELA Proficiency	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$549,124.00	$393,243.00	$811,036.00	$131,331.00			$942,367.00	
1	1.2	Math Proficiency	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$272,274.00	$1,049.00	$273,323.00				$273,323.00	
1	1.3	English Learner Support	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		$40,308.00	$35,796.00	$76,104.00				$76,104.00	
1	1.4	Well-rounded Opportunities	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$152,478.00	$23,630.00	$176,108.00				$176,108.00	
1	1.5	Technology	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$8,273.00	$53,600.00	$41,382.00			$20,491.00	$61,873.00	
1	1.6	Academic Professional Development and Instructional Coaching for Staff	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$439,500.00	$26,310.00	$362,593.00			$103,217.00	$465,810.00	
1	1.7	Field Trips	Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$13,551.00	$13,551.00				$13,551.00	
2	2.1	Health Services	Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	Low Income	All Schools		$69,632.00	$102,329.00	$130,705.00			$41,256.00	$171,961.00	
2	2.2	Social/Emotional Support	Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	Low Income	All Schools		$1,303,829.00	$63,268.00	$1,241,938.00			$125,159.00	$1,367,097.00	
2	2.3	Foster Youth Mental Health Services	Foster Youth	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Foster Youth	All Schools		$0.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00				$1,000.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
3	3.1	Parent Participation and Engagement	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$347,226.00	$4,461.00	$351,687.00				$351,687.00	

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
9,729,179	3,479,427	35.763%	0.000%	35.763%	$3,479,427.00	0.000%	35.763 %	**Total:**	$3,479,427.00
								LEA-wide Total:	$3,402,323.00
								Limited Total:	$77,104.00
								Schoolwide Total:	$0.00

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
1	**1.1**	Literacy and ELA Proficiency	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$811,036.00	
1	**1.2**	Math Proficiency	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$273,323.00	
1	**1.3**	English Learner Support	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$76,104.00	
1	**1.4**	Well-rounded Opportunities	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$176,108.00	
1	**1.5**	Technology	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$41,382.00	
1	**1.6**	Academic Professional Development and Instructional Coaching for Staff	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$362,593.00	
1	**1.7**	Field Trips	Yes	LEA-wide	Low Income	All Schools	$13,551.00	
2	**2.1**	Health Services	Yes	LEA-wide	Low Income	All Schools	$130,705.00	

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
2	2.2	Social/Emotional Support	Yes	LEA-wide	Low Income	All Schools	$1,241,938.00	
2	2.3	Foster Youth Mental Health Services	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Foster Youth	All Schools	$1,000.00	
3	3.1	Parent Participation and Engagement	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$351,687.00	

2025-26 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$3,465,162.30	$3,391,317.00

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**	Literacy and ELA Proficiency	Yes	$826,919.16	614,742
1	**1.2**	Math Proficiency	Yes	$288,817.16	250,407
1	**1.3**	English Learner Support	Yes	$60,814.00	70,702
1	**1.4**	Well-rounded Opportunities	Yes	$182,753.05	191,834
1	**1.5**	Technology	Yes	$107,286.31	76,629
1	**1.6**	Academic Professional Development and Instructional Coaching for Staff	Yes	$299,128.10	401,750
1	**1.7**	Field Trips	Yes	$4,484.53	13,658
2	**2.1**	Health Services	Yes	$107,989.89	85,995
2	**2.2**	Social/Emotional Support	Yes	$1,351,587.34	1,445,824
2	**2.3**	Foster Youth Mental Health Services	Yes	$19,922.00	10,226
3	**3.1**	Parent Participation and Engagement	Yes	$215,460.76	229,550

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)

2025-26 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

6. Estimated LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	7. Total Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	8. Total Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)
3,452,539	$3,155,664.30	$3,503,693.00	($348,028.70)	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
1	1.1	Literacy and ELA Proficiency	Yes	$826,919.16	614,742		
1	1.2	Math Proficiency	Yes	$288,817.16	250,407		
1	1.3	English Learner Support	Yes	$60,814.00	70,702		
1	1.4	Well-rounded Opportunities	Yes	$177,646.53	158,528		
1	1.5	Technology	Yes	$82,168.24	430,071		
1	1.6	Academic Professional Development and Instructional Coaching for Staff	Yes	$199,219.84	310,853		
1	1.7	Field Trips	Yes	$4,484.53	13,658		
2	2.1	Health Services	Yes	$56,531.89	83,728		
2	2.2	Social/Emotional Support	Yes	$1,223,680.19	1,331,228		
2	2.3	Foster Youth Mental Health Services	Yes	$19,922.00	10,226		
3	3.1	Parent Participation and Engagement	Yes	$215,460.76	229,550		

2025-26 LCFF Carryover Table

9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 + Carryover %)	7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)	11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)	12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)	13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)
9,457,502	3,452,539	0	36.506%	$3,503,693.00	0.000%	37.047%	$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