
LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Larkspur-Corte Madera School District
CDS Code: 2165370000
School Year: 2026-27
LEA contact information:
Brett Geithman, Ed.D.
Superintendent
bgeithman@lcmschools.org
415.927.6960 x5

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 Larkspur-Corte Madera School District expects to receive in the coming year from all sources.

The text description for the above chart is as follows: The total revenue projected for Larkspur-Corte Madera School District is $27,900,625, of which $17,485,114 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), $1,920,891 is other state funds, $8,096,194 is local funds, and $398,426 is federal funds. Of the $17,485,114 in LCFF Funds, $295,734 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 Larkspur-Corte Madera School District plans to spend for 2026-27. It shows how much of the total is tied to planned actions and services in the LCAP.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: Larkspur-Corte Madera School District plans to spend $29,695,379 for the 2026-27 school year. Of that amount, $2,373,150 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and $27,322,229 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:


General Fund Budget expenditures not included in the LCAP include routine operational and administrative costs necessary to operate the District, such as general administration, business services, insurance, utilities, routine maintenance and operations, facility operations, debt service, transfers, and other base program costs. These expenditures support the overall operation of schools and the District but are not specifically tied to the actions and services identified in the LCAP.

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

In 2026-27, Larkspur-Corte Madera School District is projecting it will receive $295,734 based on the enrollment of Foster Youth, English learner, and low-income students. Larkspur-Corte Madera School District must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Larkspur-Corte Madera School District plans to spend $618,140 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 Larkspur-Corte Madera School District budgeted last year in the LCAP for actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students with what Larkspur-Corte Madera School District estimates it has spent on actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students in the current year.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: In 2025-26, Larkspur-Corte Madera School District's LCAP budgeted $777,323 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Larkspur-Corte Madera School District actually spent $831,393 for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2025-26.

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
Larkspur-Corte Madera School District	Brett Geithman, Ed.D. Superintendent	bgeithman@lcmschools.org 415.927.6960 x5

Plan Summary [2026-27]

General Information

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

The Larkspur-Corte Madera School District is a high-performing K-8 school district, approximately eight miles north of the Golden Gate Bridge in Marin County, California, serving families and students in the cities of Corte Madera and Larkspur. The residents of the Twin Cities community are very supportive of public education in many ways including the 2022-2032 parcel tax measure that passed with 77% approval, the highest in District history. The recent focus of our learning community has been mitigating social-emotional and academic gaps, equity, mathematics, and literacy.

The District has identified the following focus ares to address these gaps:

- Increase systematic and timely intervention (Tiers 1, 2, and 3)
- Implement the newly adopted literacy curriculum K-8 (EL Education)
- Align math and literacy practices with research-based instructional methodologies and curriculum including Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) in mathematics and the science of reading
- Second year of newly adopted assessment practices implementation (i-Ready) including common data analyses protocols to inform instruction, and clear communication of progress to parents
- Implement traditional grade reporting (A-F) with equitable grading practices at Hall Middle
- Continue improving school safety through emergency preparedness, physical elements, and positive behavioral interventions and supports
- Evaluate the use of educational technology and classroom-based screentime

Professional development through coaching, workshops, department and grade level lab days, as well as grade-level/department-specific sessions have been grounded in these top priorities. The average per-pupil spending is approximately $21,000, $6,000 of which is from local revenues including business leases, a parcel tax, and SPARK, the Larkspur-Corte Madera Schools Foundation. This funding allows the District to provide enrichment programs at its schools, including visual and performing arts, STEM, robust technology, a focus on research-based best practices, social-emotional well-being, and a variety of other curricular and after-school activities.

The District's student achievement data from CAASPP places it in the top 10% of California public schools. Cove School and Neil Cummins were awarded 2023 California Distinguished Schools. Hall Middle School was named a 2026 and 2021 California Distinguished School, as well as 2021 National Distinguished School, one of two schools selected by the California Department of Education. Additionally, Cove School and Neil Cummins were named 2026 California Green Ribbon Schools.

The staff is collaborative and compassionate. Together with an active parent community, they serve as catalysts for growth who inspire and promote well-rounded, lifelong learners and future citizens of the world through a challenging, innovative, rigorous curriculum. Class size averages are 24(K-3), 26(4-5), and 29(6-8) students per class. The District is working toward providing an extraordinary education through its commitment to meeting the needs of each student with safe and healthy environments, innovative staff, and an engaging and inspiring curriculum, while at the same time maintaining fiscal stability and promoting strong community involvement.

In 2024–25, the Larkspur-Corte Madera School District launched a comprehensive, community-driven visioning process resulting in Vision 2036: LCMSD Reimagined, which defines the long-term aspirations for students, educators, and the district’s systems. Informed by over 1,200 inputs from students, staff, families, and community members, this collaborative effort articulated what LCMSD graduates should know, be, and be able to do by 2036. It produced the Graduate Portrait, Adult Portrait, and System Portrait, which now guide all strategic direction in the district. LCMSD’s mission is to ensure all students thrive academically, socially, and emotionally through inclusive, equitable, and engaging learning experiences. Grounded in core values such as student-centered learning, equity, innovation, and community collaboration, Vision 2036 directly informed the development of a focused three-to-five year strategic plan. This strategic plan is fully aligned with the district’s LCAP, ensuring coherence, accountability, and sustained progress across all major initiatives to improve outcomes for every student.

Elementary Schools: Neil Cummins Elementary, The Cove School

Middle School: Hall Middle School

1,121 Students, K-8

9% Socioeconomically disadvantaged students

5% English learners (5 long-term English learners)

100+ Certificated teachers, librarians, administrators

50+ Classified Staff

Marin County population: 256,318

Larkspur population: 12,110

Corte Madera population: 9,595

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

In our annual review of performance using the California School Dashboard and local data, we recognize both achievements and persistent challenges, particularly within identified student groups such as chronic absenteeism and suspension rates among Hispanic, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities.

Chronic Absenteeism:
Chronic absenteeism improved in the district. Based on the 2024–25 California School Dashboard:

- District-wide, chronic absenteeism was Green for all students, Yellow for Hispanic, Two or More Races, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students and Students with Disabilities, Orange for Asian, and Green for English Learners and White.
- At Hall Middle School, chronic absenteeism declined 6.7% to 11.5%. All student groups were designated Yellow.
- At Cove School, overall absenteeism increased 1.9% to 11.7%. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, White, and Students with Disabilities groups were rated Red, Two or More Races was Orange, and Hispanic was Yellow, indicating persisten concerns.
- Neil Cummins Elementary achieved the greatest sucess with a decrease of 3.3% to 3.7% and a Blue designation. All student groups were Green or Blue except Socioeconomically Disadvantaged in Yellow.

These disaggregated data underscore ongoing equity gaps in attendance, particularly for historically underserved student groups, yet Neil Cummins and Hall are experiencing improvements with the 2024-25 interventions. The elevated absenteeism among students with disabilities, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and Hispanic students is of particular concern due to its direct impact on instructional access, academic performance, and social-emotional wellbeing.

To address these disparities and build on areas of progress, the district will continue to:

- Strengthen Tier 1 and 2 interventions within the MTSS framework.
- Expand culturally responsive family engagement strategies.
- Refine early warning and attendance monitoring systems.
- Ensure translation, outreach, and accessibility to address barriers to attendance.

Suspension Rates:
Suspension rates in LCMSD have decreased significantly from 2022–23 to 2023–24 and to 2024-25 (available dashboard data), reflecting progress in promoting positive behavior and reducing exclusionary discipline. However gaps exist for English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, Hispanic, and Students with Disabilities. LCMSD will continue to expand restorative practices, further culturally responsive

behavior systems, and enhance social-emotional learning supports to address root causes of behavioral incidents and foster a supportive school climate for all students.

Next Steps:
In response to the findings from the California Dashboard and internal assessments, the District will continue implementing proactive strategies to reduce suspension rates and chronic absenteeism, particularly among Hispanic, socioeconomically disadvantaged (SES), and special education student groups. These actions are aligned to both our LCAP goals and our Strategic Plan: Vision 2036. Actions contained in our LCAP will focus on:

Attendance Interventions: The District will enhance its multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for attendance, integrating regular data monitoring, personalized family outreach, and culturally responsive engagement strategies. Continued use of our bilingual Community Liaison, flexible event scheduling, and family-centered programming will support deeper community trust and partnership. Incentives and awareness campaigns rooted in real-time data will be utilized to improve daily attendance for all groups.

PBIS: To address suspension rates among Hispanic students and other identified student groups, the District is committed to continuing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) as a comprehensive framework for promoting positive behavior and fostering a supportive school climate. As part of our district-wide PBIS framework, we will continue integrating restorative practices that emphasize empathy, reconciliation, and conflict resolution. Staff will receive targeted training in culturally responsive practices and trauma-informed approaches to discipline. School sites will further refine behavior intervention protocols with support from a behavior specialist and our PBIS implementation team.

Social-Emotional Support Services: The District continues to expand its K–8 SEL curriculum and has developed a comprehensive wellness program to address the underlying social-emotional needs of students within our Hispanic, socioeconomically disadvantaged, students with disabilities dashboard groups that includes the use of wellness centers, universal mental health screeners, and increased access to counseling services. Through Tier 1 supports embedded in daily routines and Tier 2 interventions in small groups or individual settings, students will receive targeted SEL support aligned with CASEL competencies.

English Language Arts: The District remains in the very high (blue) performance level for English Language Arts, with students scores increasing from 61.3 to 69.4 points above standard on CAASPP. While overall achievement is strong, significant disparities remain among student subgroups. English Learners perform within the Yellow band and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students perform in the Orange performance band, indicating lower performance relative to grade-level expectations. Hispanic and Students with Disabilities performed in the green range. Students identified as White, Asian, or Two or More Races continue to perform in the blue band. In response, the District will prioritize professional development on the science of reading, equitable instructional practices, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to strengthen Tier I instruction. Expanded use of formative assessments will guide targeted interventions, particularly for students in the orange and yellow bands, while curriculum alignment efforts and inclusive instructional design will support literacy growth across all subgroups.

Mathematics: The District continues to perform in the very high (blue) performance band for Mathematics, with students scores increasing from 46.6 to 57.9 points above standard on CAASPP. Along with strong overall performance, narrowing achievement gaps was evident as no students were in the Red or Orange performance bands. English Learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged students were in the Yellow band, and all other student groups were in the Green and Blue performance bands. To further narrow achievement gaps, the District remains

committed to the use of Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI), supported by targeted interventions and expanded use of formative assessments. Professional learning will continue to emphasize Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Tier I differentiation strategies, and culturally responsive pedagogy to ensure instruction is accessible and challenging for all learners. These efforts are designed to accelerate the progress of students currently in the orange and yellow bands while sustaining high achievement for all.

As we reflect on our annual performance and chart a course for the future, the District remains steadfast in its commitment to advancing educational equity and promoting the success of all students. By leveraging the insights gleaned from our data analysis and implementing targeted interventions, we are dedicated to creating an inclusive learning environment where every student has the opportunity to thrive academically, socially, and emotionally.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

In our annual review of performance using the California School Dashboard and local data, we recognize both achievements and persistent challenges, particularly within identified student groups such as chronic absenteeism and suspension rates among Hispanic, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities.

Chronic absenteeism remains an area of focus across LCMSD. While the 2024–25 California School Dashboard reflects overall improvement, disparities persist among specific student groups. District-wide, chronic absenteeism improved to a Green designation for All Students; however, Hispanic, socioeconomically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and students identified as Two or More Races were in the Yellow performance level, and Asian students were in Orange.

At the site level, Hall Middle School demonstrated notable progress, with a 6.7% decrease in chronic absenteeism to 11.5%, with all student groups in the Yellow range. Neil Cummins Elementary showed the strongest performance, with a 3.3% decrease to 3.7%, earning a Blue designation overall, with all student groups in Green or Blue except socioeconomically disadvantaged students (Yellow).

In contrast, Cove School experienced a 1.9% increase in chronic absenteeism to 11.7%, with continued disparities among student groups. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students, White students, and students with disabilities were in the Red performance level, Two or More Races in Orange, and Hispanic students in Yellow.

These disaggregated data continue to underscore persistent and disproportionate attendance challenges, particularly for historically underserved student groups. While districtwide improvements reflect the impact of targeted interventions, elevated absenteeism among students with disabilities, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and Hispanic students remains a concern due to its direct impact on instructional access, academic achievement, and social-emotional well-being.

To address these inequities, LCMSD will continue strengthening its multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for attendance through proactive family engagement, culturally responsive outreach, and real-time data monitoring. The District will expand the use of targeted communication strategies, including translation and accessibility supports, and continue leveraging its bilingual Community Liaison to build trust and reduce barriers to attendance. Additionally, tiered incentive programs and early intervention strategies will be refined to promote consistent attendance and ensure equitable access to learning opportunities for all students.

Similarly, suspension rates across the district have decreased significantly from 2022–23 through 2024–25, reflecting progress in reducing exclusionary discipline practices. However, disparities persist among Hispanic students, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, English Learners, and students with disabilities. These patterns highlight the continued need for sustained, equity-centered approaches to student behavior and discipline.

To address these concerns, the District will continue deepening the implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) as a comprehensive framework for promoting positive behavior and fostering an inclusive school climate. Restorative practices remain central to this work, emphasizing accountability, empathy, and conflict resolution. Additionally, LCMSD will continue expanding access to counseling services, maintaining and enhancing wellness centers, and further implementing its districtwide K–8 social-emotional learning (SEL) program to address the needs of students—particularly those within identified student groups. Staff will continue to receive training in culturally responsive and trauma-informed practices to better support students and reduce disproportionality in discipline outcomes.

These integrated supports are designed to reduce exclusionary discipline, address root causes of behavior, and ensure equitable access to safe, supportive, and engaging learning environments for all students.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

Schools Identified

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

n/a

Support for Identified Schools

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

n/a

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

n/a

Engaging Educational Partners

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

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

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

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

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
Parents (including PTA/O)	Surveys (February 2026); LCAP stakeholder engagement meetings (March and April 2026); School safety stakeholder engagement sessions (August and September 2025); Technology stakeholder engagement meetings (April 2026)
Staff	Surveys (February 2026); LCAP stakeholder engagement meetings (March and April 2026); Technology stakeholder engagement meetings (April 2026); School safety stakeholder engagement sessions (August and September 2025)
Students (grades 3-8)	Surveys (February 2026); Technology stakeholder engagement meetings (April 2026)
Union Leadership (LCMEA and CSEA)	Consultation and input sessions with CSEA and LCMEA/CTA (May 2026)
LCAP Committee: parents, teachers, staff, and administrators (LCAP Parent Advisory Committee)	Four meetings: September 2025, January, March, and April 2026
Special Education	Surveys (February 2026); Consultation with Marin County SELPA (April 2026); LCAP stakeholder engagement meetings (March and April 2026); Technology stakeholder engagement meetings (April 2026)
English Learners	Surveys (February 2026); LCAP stakeholder engagement meetings (March 2026)
Board of Trustees	10 Board Meeting discussion items during 2025-26 school year: (August, September, October, November, December, January, March, April, May, and June)

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
SPARK Foundation	LCAP stakeholder engagement meeting (April 2026); Technology stakeholder engagement meetings (April 2026)
Community Leadership (Councilmembers, business owners) and Members	Technology stakeholder engagement meetings (April 2026); School safety stakeholder engagement sessions (August and September 2025)

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

Stakeholder engagement was an ongoing process; therefore, most aspects were influenced by input and/or cited by the LCAP committee (LCAP Parent Advisory). Key actions were more dedicated to service to high needs students, English learners, more targeted outreach to underrepresented groups, chronic absenteeism, suspension and discipline data, continued focus on personalized learning and professional development, clearly communicating student progress (standards-based grading), all with an overall of equity.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	Close or narrow the equity gap for student groups (English Learner, students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino, and socioeconomically disadvantaged). Subgoals: 1.a. Increase school connectedness for underrepresented parents and students 1.b. Narrow academic achievement equity gaps in literacy and mathematics 1.c. Further implement lessons, parent workshops, and school messaging to support diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Achievement and school connectedness gaps persist as measured by local achievement data (common assessments, CAASPP, as well as LCAP survey data (connectedness). Additionally, subgoal 1.c. has been created to address unexpected student behaviors regarding race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, and gender identification.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	Equity Audits (discipline, attendance, awards/recognition, accelerated math	Disproportionality Scale:	Disproportionality Scale:	Disproportionality Scale:	Special education disproportionality review (all areas of disability) will be	There has been a shift towards more proportionality in math acceleration,

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	placement) (1.a., 1.b., 1.c.)	-Proportional (within 5%): classified employees; Algebra enrollment (gender); Pre-Algebra enrollment (gender) -Somewhat Disproportional (5%-10%): Individualized Educational Plans; Hall Excellence in Learning Awards; -Disproportional (11%-20%): Algebra enrollment; Pre-Algebra enrollment; -Significantly Disproportional (21%+): certificated employees; 504 Plans The 2023-24 special education disproportionality review revealed the district is disproportionate in Hispanic students identified as specific learning disability. The risk ratio is 3.26	-Proportional (within 5%): Pre-Algebra enrollment (EL; 504; gender; students with disabilities); Algebra enrollment (students with disabilities, gender); Excellence in Learning Awards (Hispanic/Latino, EL, students with disabilities, 504); 504 (EL) -Somewhat Disproportional (5%-10%): Pre-Algebra enrollment (Hispanic/Latino); 504 (Hispanic/Latino) -Disproportional (11%-20%): Algebra enrollment (Hispanic/Latino) -Significantly Disproportional (21%+): none	-Proportional (within 5%): Pre-Algebra enrollment (504, gender, students with disabilities); Algebra enrollment (504, gender); Excellence in Learning Awards (Hispanic/Latino, EL, students with disabilities, 504); 504 (EL, socioeconomically disadvantaged) -Somewhat Disproportional (5%-10%): Pre-Algebra enrollment (Hispanic/Latino); Algebra enrollment (Hispanic/Latino, students with disabilities) -Disproportional (11%-20%): Pre-Algebra enrollment (EL); Algebra enrollment (EL) -Significantly Disproportional (21%+): none	reported at a risk ratio of 3 or less. Audits reveal data representative to the entire District.	awards, and 504 plans.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			The 2024-25 special education disproportionality review revealed the district is not disproportionately identifying students with disabilities. Risk Ratio for disproportionality is a Maximum of 3 Current Risk/Ratio has been reduced to 2.31 so the District is no longer disproportionate in SLD/Hispanic.	The 2025-26 special education disproportionality review revealed the district is not disproportionately identifying students with disabilities.		
1.2	Parental Engagement Surveys (1.a., 1.c.)	Cove (subgroup only data): Parent volunteerism (subgroups): 83% have volunteered on campus or through PTO/A or SPARK Foundation Neil Cummins (subgroup only data): Parent volunteerism (subgroups): 76% have volunteered on campus or through PTO/A or SPARK Foundation Hall Middle (subgroup only data):	Parent volunteerism remains strong overall but varies slightly among subgroups. At Cove, 83% of all parents and 75% of subgroup parents reported volunteering on campus or through PTO/A or SPARK Foundation. At Neil Cummins, the rates were 76% for all parents and 65% for subgroup	Parent volunteerism remains strong overall but varies slightly among subgroups. At Cove, 88% of all parents and 92% of subgroup parents reported volunteering on campus or through PTO/A or SPARK Foundation. At Neil Cummins, the rates were 81% for all parents and 82% for subgroup	Volunteerism of subgroups is the same as the whole parent population.	This goal has been met.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Parent volunteerism (subgroups): 40% have volunteered on campus or through PTO/A or SPARK Foundation	parents. At Hall Middle, both groups reported a 40% volunteerism rate.	parents. At Hall Middle, the rates were 63% for all parents and 68% for subgroup parents.		
1.3	Local (LCAP) Surveys (1.a., 1.c.)	Cove (subgroup only data): My child feels a part of the classroom community 91% agree/strongly agree 74% of parents are satisfied with their child's academic growth this year 83% of parents are satisfied with their child's social-emotional growth this year Neil Cummins (subgroup only data): My child feels a part of the classroom community 93% agree/strongly agree 80% of parents are satisfied with their child's academic growth this year 82% of parents are satisfied with their child's social-emotional growth this year	Cove Elementary 93% of all parents agreed or strongly agreed that their child feels part of the classroom community, with 89% of subgroup parents sharing that view. 71% of all parents and 69% of subgroup parents believe the school supports their child’s academic growth. On social-emotional development, 87% of all parents and 86% of subgroup parents responded positively. Neil Cummins Elementary	Cove Elementary 95% of all parents agreed or strongly agreed that their child feels part of the classroom community, with 88% of subgroup parents sharing that view. 72% of all parents and 84% of subgroup parents believe the school supports their child’s academic growth. On social-emotional development, 91% of all parents and 92% of subgroup parents responded positively. Neil Cummins Elementary	95%+ (subgroup) parents report their students feel a part of the classroom community 95%+ (subgroup) parents report they are satisfied with their child's academic growth 95%+ (subgroup) parents report they are satisfied with their child's social-emotional growth	This goal has been met on most measures; however, notable gaps remain at Hall Middle School in classroom community (83% vs. 63%, 20% gap), academic growth (59% vs. 47%, 12% gap), and social-emotional development (80% vs. 69%, 11% gap).

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Hall Middle (subgroup only data): My child feels a part of the classroom community 100% agree/strongly agree 63% of parents are satisfied with their child's academic growth this year 73% of parents are satisfied with their child's social-emotional growth this year	A strong 97% of all parents and 96% of subgroup parents reported positive classroom community experiences. 63% of all parents and 55% of subgroup parents agreed that the school supports academic growth. 89% of all parents and 86% of subgroup parents affirmed support for social-emotional development. Hall Middle School 94% of all parents and 96% of subgroup parents felt their child was part of a classroom community. In terms of academic growth, 62% of all parents and 56% of subgroup parents	A strong 95% of all parents and 91% of subgroup parents reported positive classroom community experiences. 74% of all parents and 78% of subgroup parents agreed that the school supports academic growth. 87% of all parents and 91% of subgroup parents affirmed support for social-emotional development. Hall Middle School 83% of all parents and 63% of subgroup parents felt their child was part of a classroom community. In terms of academic growth, 59% of all parents and 47% of subgroup parents		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			responded positively. Social-emotional growth support was rated positively by 88% of both all and subgroup parents.	responded positively. Social-emotional growth support was rated positively by 80% of all parents and 69% of subgroup parents.		
1.4	CAASPP Data (1.b.)	2023 results (percentage of standard met/exceeded): Socioeconomically disadvantaged: 43% (ELA) and 37% (math) English Learners: 19% (ELA) and 15% (math) Hispanic/Latino: 55% (ELA) and 42% (math) Students with disabilities: 50% (ELA) and 33% (math)	2024 results (percentage of standard met/exceeded): Socioeconomically disadvantaged: 46% (ELA) and 33% (math) English Learners: 19% (ELA) and 14% (math) Hispanic/Latino: 57% (ELA) and 46% (math) Students with disabilities: 40% (ELA) and 29% (math)	2025 results (percentage of standard met/exceeded): Socioeconomically disadvantaged: 40% (ELA) and 39% (math) English Learners: 0% (ELA) and 32% (math) Hispanic/Latino: 59% (ELA) and 49% (math) Students with disabilities: 44% (ELA) and 49% (math)	30% growth in ELA and math for each subgroup	Slight increases in all groups from math; and Hispanic/Latino and students with disabilities for ELA. Decreases in SED and EL for ELA.
1.5	District Common Assessments (1.b.)	Baseline data to be collected with newly adopted research-based, Common Core aligned assessments	Initial iReady assessment results for Reading (Mid or Above Grade Level and	Initial iReady assessment results for Reading (Mid or Above Grade Level and	Students meeting or exceeding standards on common assessments will	Year 1 is baseline data

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 28% 2nd grade: 36% 3rd grade: 64% 4th grade: 51% 5th grade: 59% 6th grade: 57% 7th grade: 64% 8th grade: 60% English Learners: 9% Hispanic/Latino: 33% Mid-Year iReady assessment results for Reading (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 59% 2nd grade: 59% 3rd grade: 78% 4th grade: 69% 5th grade: 71% 6th grade: 71% 7th grade: 79% 8th grade: 63% English Learners: 8%	Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 22% 2nd grade: 55% 3rd grade: 65% 4th grade: 53% 5th grade: 55% 6th grade: 62% 7th grade: 62% 8th grade: 64% English Learners: 3% Hispanic/Latino: 32% Mid-Year iReady assessment results for Reading (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 53% 2nd grade: 80% 3rd grade: 80% 4th grade: 69% 5th grade: 67% 6th grade: 59% 7th grade: 69% 8th grade: 75% English Learners: 6%	be at or above the percentage meeting or exceeding standards on CAASPP	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			Hispanic/Latino: 49% DIBELS universal screener mid-year data (at or above benchmark): Cove: K: 72% 1st grade: 86% 2nd grade: 69% Neil Cummins: K: 83% 1st grade: 68% 2nd grade: 69% Initial iReady assessment results for Math (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 19% 2nd grade: 18% 3rd grade: 26% 4th grade: 40% 5th grade: 53% 6th grade: 56% 7th grade: 60% 8th grade: 42%	Hispanic/Latino: 46% DIBELS universal screener mid-year data (at or above benchmark): K: 50% 1st grade: 66% 2nd grade: 85% Initial iReady assessment results for Math (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 7% 2nd grade: 30% 3rd grade: 25% 4th grade: 48% 5th grade: 55% 6th grade: 51% 7th grade: 51% 8th grade: 60% English Learners: 6% Hispanic/Latino: 23% Mid-Year iReady assessment results for Math		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			English Learners: 11% Hispanic/Latino: 23% Mid-Year iReady assessment results for Math (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 48% 2nd grade: 43% 3rd grade: 50% 4th grade: 61% 5th grade: 64% 6th grade: 66% 7th grade: 68% 8th grade: 67% English Learners: 19% Hispanic/Latino: 35%	(Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 44% 2nd grade: 61% 3rd grade: 49% 4th grade: 60% 5th grade: 75% 6th grade: 65% 7th grade: 64% 8th grade: 67% English Learners: 15% Hispanic/Latino: 35%		
1.6	ELPAC (1.b.)	2023 results: 23% of English Learners scored in the proficient band 51% of English Learners are making progress per the California Dashboard.	2024 results: 25% of English Learners scored in Level 4 (Well Developed) 65% (increase of 14%) of English Learners are	2025 Results: 37% of English Learners scored in Level 4 (Well Developed) 62.5% (decrease of 2.2%) of English Learners are	"Very high" (65%+) progress as measured by the California Dashboard	Slight decrease of 2.2%, moving the progress to "medium."

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		This is deemed as "medium" progress Reclassification Rate: 28 (0-3 years); 16 (4-5 years); 10 (6+ years); and 41 RFEP.	making progress per the California Dashboard. This is deemed as "very high" progress. Goal met. Reclassification Rate: data are not available until June	making progress per the California Dashboard. This is deemed as "medium" progress. Reclassification Rate: data are not available until June		
1.7	Continue implementation of academic content and performance standards adopted by the state board	Maintain implementation	Maintain implementation		Maintain implementation	Maintain implementation
1.8	Continue ELD support and intervention	Increase services for 2024-25 and 2025-26 and then return to 2023-24 baseline	Increased services for 2024-25.	Maintained increased services for 2025-26.	Maintain implementation	Increased services for 2024-25.
1.9	Continue programs and services for unduplicated students and students with disabilities	Maintain implementation	Maintain implementation	Maintain implementation	Maintain implementation	Maintain implementation

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.

Implementation of Goal #1 aligned with the district's focus on equity, inclusion, and academic growth for English Learners, students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. Key actions included expanded translation services, targeted outreach, equity-focused professional development, enhanced intervention programming supported by i-Ready data and learning labs, and implementation of newly adopted literacy curriculum (EL Education).

Successes: Most measures of school climate were met, and there were slight gains across all student groups, including Hispanic/Latino students and students with disabilities in ELA. Expanded intervention programming, along with the strategic use of i-Ready data and learning

labs, supported more targeted instruction and ongoing progress monitoring. Additionally, Hall Middle School's recognition as a California Distinguished School in the Achievement Gap Closure category reflects the impact of these focused efforts.

Challenge: Despite these successes, notable gaps persist. Classroom community data at Hall indicates disparities (e.g., 83% vs. 63%, a 20-point gap), and similar gaps remain in academic growth and social-emotional development. In ELA, CAASPP declines were observed among socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students and English Learners (EL). These trends point to the need for continued refinement of intervention strategies and a sustained focus on addressing systemic barriers to ensure more equitable outcomes across all student groups.

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.

There were no material differences between Budgeted and Estimated Actual Expenditures or Percentages of Improved Services, with the exception of the Community Liaison position, which began mid-year and resulted in a partial-year expenditure.

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

Most actions under Goal #1 remain in the early stages of full implementation. Year 2 data show encouraging indicators, including high levels of student and parent connectedness, staff access to necessary resources, and slight increases across student groups in ELA, including Hispanic/Latino students and students with disabilities. Intervention programming, learning labs, and the use of i-Ready data continue to support more targeted instruction and progress monitoring. Hall Middle School's recognition as a California Distinguished School for Achievement Gap Closure further reflects these efforts.

However, the data also reveal persistent and, in some cases, widening gaps. Classroom community measures at Hall show notable disparities (e.g., 83% vs. 63%), and declines were observed among socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students and English Learners (EL) in ELA. These outcomes indicate that, despite progress, the actions have not yet resulted in consistent, equitable outcomes across all student groups.

As such, while early implementation data are promising, it remains too early to conclusively determine the overall effectiveness of these actions in closing achievement gaps. Continued implementation, targeted refinement, and additional longitudinal data in 2025–26 will be necessary to fully evaluate impact.

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.

While no major changes were made to the overarching goal or metrics, the district will align upcoming actions more closely with its new long-term direction. During the 2025-26 school year, LCMSD began implementing the 2025-2030 Strategic Plan aligned with Vision 2036, which reinforced the district's commitment to equity, inclusion, and student-centered learning. As a result, the district will strengthen alignment with the Graduate Portrait, especially in how equity practices are integrated into classroom instruction and school culture; increase focus on Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to enhance Tier 1 instruction and ensure greater access for students with IEPs and multilingual learners; and expand the use of diagnostic data and progress monitoring tools, such as i-Ready, to guide more responsive and targeted academic interventions.

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	Increase availability of translation services (1.a.)	Further translation options for in-person, Zoom, written, and website content. Use technology tools and partnerships as applicable.	$22,462.00	Yes
1.2	Increase targeted outreach, parent education, and community connectedness (1.a., 1.c.)	Further create and implement systems and structures to strategically communicate through different mediums, specifically for underrepresented subgroups, including special education.	$39,533.10	Yes
1.3	Approach all professional development offerings with an equity lens	Engage staff, including special education staff, in professional development in newly adopted literacy curriculum, to be adopted science curriculum, to be adopted math curriculum, Cognitively Guided Instruction in math, social justice lessons, MTSS Tier I strategies, newly adopted research-based common assessments, equitable grading practices (standards-based learning and grading), and English Language Development, with an overlay of equity and how this translates to classroom practice.	$583,478.38	Yes
1.4	Engage staff in formative and summative data analysis and goal development for students (1.b.)	Using newly adopted and to be adopted research-based assessments in literacy, math, and science, engage staff in regular (at least once per trimester) data analyses with their respective grade levels/departments. Use these data to generate specific next steps for students below grade level expectations and underrepresented subgroups, including special education. This includes data analysis for students with disabilities as outlined in the Compliance and Improvement Monitoring Process.	$106,931.45	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.5	Increase systematic intervention for English Learners, ELA, and mathematics. (1.b.)	For 2024-25 and 2025-26, expand intervention specialist FTE by 3.0 district-wide with a focus on serving underrepresented subgroups.	$267,184.03	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards in literacy, mathematics, and science for all students, with an emphasis on accelerating the academic growth of identified student groups (Hispanic/Latino, socioeconomically disadvantaged, special education, English Learner). Subgoals 2.a. All students will make at least one year's growth in literacy and mathematics 2.b. Systematic and timely intervention through a multi-tiered system of supports will be increased 2.c. Further personalized learning structures 2.d. Consistently and clearly measure and communicate student progress	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Academic growth as measured cross-sectionally and longitudinally is essential to determine the impact specific variables (such as math intervention, EL intervention, literacy intervention, curriculum adoption) have on student achievement, with the overarching goal that all students will make at least one year's growth. To gauge academic growth targets, the District calculates a CAASPP mean gain scaled score by grade level and content area by grade level for itself and the peer group, as defined by Hanover Research. LCMSD scaled score mean gain is then measured against the peer group's mean gain. LCMSD's goal is for students to experience higher growth rates than the peer group. This type of growth model is called simple fixed effects modeling.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	CAASPP Data (2.a., 2.d.)	2023 results (standard met/exceeded): ELA 79% Math 73%	2024 results (standard met/exceeded): ELA 76%	2025 results (standard met/exceeded): ELA 78%	Growth at/above similar schools Increase the percentage of	CAASPP scores are at similar schools

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Science: 59% Grades 3-5: ELA: 79% Math: 82% Cove; 73% Neil Cummins Science: 77% Cove; 58% Neil Cummins Grades 6-8: ELA: 79% Math: 69%	Math 71% Science: 63% Cove ELA: 76% Neil Cummins ELA: 73% Hall ELA: 77% Cove Math: 77% Neil Cummins Math: 69% Hall Math: 71% Simliar Schools Comparison: ELA 0% from mean Math -2% from mean Science +1% from mean	Math 76% Science: 65% Cove ELA: 73% Neil Cummins ELA: 79% Hall ELA: 77% Cove Math: 81% Neil Cummins Math: 77% Hall Math: 72%	students meeting/exceeding standards academic achievement in mathematics and English language arts to 85% for elementary and middle school ELA, 80% for middle school math, and 75% in science for grades 5 and 8. New for 2025-26: Less than 20% on CAASPP met/exceeded range between classrooms at each grade level	Increase in ELA, Math and Science Elementary gaps for ELA, Math, and Science are 10%, 6%, and 10%, respectively. Middle school gaps for ELA, Math, and Science are 12%, 8%, and 10%, respectively.
2.2	LCMSD Literacy Common Assessments (2.a., 2.b., 2.c., 2.d.)	Implement recently adopted research-based assessments Continue DIBELS universal screener	Initial iReady assessment results for Reading (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 28% 2nd grade: 36% 3rd grade: 64% 4th grade: 51% 5th grade: 59% 6th grade: 57%	Initial iReady assessment results for Reading (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 22% 2nd grade: 55% 3rd grade: 65% 4th grade: 53% 5th grade: 55% 6th grade: 62%	Student achievement will be predictive of CAASPP achievement	2024-25 is Baseline

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			7th grade: 64% 8th grade: 60% Mid-Year iReady assessment results for Reading (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 59% 2nd grade: 59% 3rd grade: 78% 4th grade: 69% 5th grade: 71% 6th grade: 71% 7th grade: 79% 8th grade: 63% DIBELS universal screener mid-year data (at or above benchmark): Cove: K: 72% 1st grade: 86% 2nd grade: 69% Neil Cummins: K: 83% 1st grade: 68% 2nd grade: 69%	7th grade: 62% 8th grade: 64% Mid-Year iReady assessment results for Reading (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 53% 2nd grade: 80% 3rd grade: 80% 4th grade: 69% 5th grade: 67% 6th grade: 59% 7th grade: 69% 8th grade: 75% DIBELS universal screener mid-year data (at or above benchmark): K: 50% 1st grade: 66% 2nd grade: 85%		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.3	LCMSD Math Common Assessments (2.a., 2.b., 2.c., 2.d.)	Implement recently adopted research-based assessments	iReady common assessment data: Initial iReady assessment results for Math (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 19% 2nd grade: 18% 3rd grade: 26% 4th grade: 40% 5th grade: 53% 6th grade: 56% 7th grade: 60% 8th grade: 42% Mid-Year iReady assessment results for Math (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 48% 2nd grade: 43% 3rd grade: 50% 4th grade: 61% 5th grade: 64% 6th grade: 66% 7th grade: 68% 8th grade: 67%	Initial iReady assessment results for Math (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 7% 2nd grade: 30% 3rd grade: 25% 4th grade: 48% 5th grade: 55% 6th grade: 51% 7th grade: 51% 8th grade: 60% Mid-Year iReady assessment results for Math (Mid or Above Grade Level and Early On Grade Level): 1st grade: 44% 2nd grade: 61% 3rd grade: 49% 4th grade: 60% 5th grade: 75% 6th grade: 65% 7th grade: 64% 8th grade: 67%	Student achievement will be predictive of CAASPP achievement	2024-25 is Baseline

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.4	LCMSD Science Common Assessments (2.a., 2.b., 2.c., 2.d.)	Identify and implement research-based assessments	Trimester 1: 6th Grade: Emerging: 25% Approaching: 19% Proficient: 43% Surpassing: 13% 7th Grade: Emerging: 6% Approaching: 32% Proficient: 44% Surpassing: 19% 8th Grade: Emerging: 12% Approaching: 17% Proficient: 71% Surpassing: 0% Trimester 2: 6th Grade: Emerging: 2% Approaching: 6% Proficient: 20% Surpassing: 72% 7th Grade: Emerging: 20% Approaching: 32% Proficient: 24% Surpassing: 24%	Trimester 1 6th Grade: A: 77% B: 11% C: 5% D: 1% F: 7% 7th Grade: A: 48% B: 30% C: 11% D: 5% F: 6% 8th Grade: A: 64% B: 13% C: 5% D: 5% F: 13% Trimester 2 6th Grade: A: 80% B: 12% C: 4% D: 3% F: 2% 7th Grade: A: 18% B: 33% C: 19% D: 21%	Student achievement will be predictive of CAASPP achievement	Year 1 is baseline data

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			8th Grade: Emerging: 5% Approaching: 23% Proficient: 72% Surpassing: 0%	F: 9% 8th Grade: A: 58% B: 16% C: 5% D: 8% F: 13%		
2.5	Intervention cycle data: MTSS level 2 (2.b.)	Baseline to be developed in fall of 2024	Number of students participating in Tier 2 interventions (Hall; Session 1a Elementary; Session 1b Elementary; Session 2a Elementary; Session 2b Elementary) Math: 60; 91; 86; 79; 80 Literacy: 9; 89; 97; 92; 82 EL: 9; 44; 44 Targeted outreach: 110 families	Number of students participating in Tier 2 interventions in T2 Elementary Reading Intervention: 87 Elementary Math Intervention: 68 Hall Math Intervention: 28 EL: 45 Number of students participating in Tier 2 interventions in T3 Elementary Reading Intervention: 72 Elementary Math Intervention: 73 Hall Math Intervention: 32 EL: 45	85%+ responding to intervention	Baseline was determined in 2024-25.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.6	ELPAC Summative Assessments (2.a., 2.d.)	2023 results: 23% of English Learners scored in the proficient band 51% of English Learners are making progress per the California Dashboard. This is deemed as "medium" progress	2024 results: 25% of English Learners scored in Level 4 (Well Developed) 65% (increase of 14%) of English Learners are making progress per the California Dashboard. This is deemed as "very high" progress. Goal met. Reclassification Rate: data are not available until June	2025 results: 37% of English Learners scored in Level 4 (Well Developed) 62.5% (decrease of 2.2%) of English Learners are making progress per the California Dashboard. This is deemed as "medium" progress. Reclassification Rate: data are not available until June	"Very high" (65%+) progress as measured by the California Dashboard	Slight 2.2% decrease, moving the goal from met to "medium" progress
2.7	High School Math Pathways (2.a.)	Algebra Foundations: 20% Algebra I: 38% Geometry I: 56% Advanced Algebra: 2%	Algebra Foundations: 9% (at mean) Algebra I: 41% (at mean) Geometry I: 48% (above mean) Advanced Algebra: 1%	Algebra Foundations: 1% (at mean) Algebra I: 30% (below mean) Geometry I: 57% (above mean) Integrated Math I: 12% Advanced Algebra: 1%	Algebra Foundations: below feeder schools mean Algebra I: at/below feeder schools mean Geometry I: above feeder schools mean	Algebra Foundations: reduced the number and are closer to the goal Algebra I: at goal Geometry I: at goal
2.8	Implement personalized learning ELA and math software (2.a., 2.c.)	Implement recently adopted personalized learning software	iReady MyPath was implemented for reading and math in grades 1-8.	iReady MyPath was maintained for reading and math in grades 1-8.	All students will engage in 30-49 minutes per week of MyPath for each reading and math	Baseline was determined. Outcome was modified to reflect iReady recommendations

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			On average, grades 1-8 students are spending 22 minutes on MyPath math and 20 on MyPath reading per week	On average, grades 1-8 students are spending 19 minutes (Cove: 23; NC: 22; Hall: 14) on MyPath math and 18 minutes (Cove: 23; NC: 24; Hall: 9) on MyPath reading per week		of 30-49 minutes per week
2.9	Mixed-methods research study on Hall's implementation of standards-based grading (2.c., 2.d.)	Baseline report anticipated in July 2024	Hanover Research T2 Survey Results 1) Students can identify and understand their current progress towards standard proficiency (on a proficiency scale) - 72% of students agree 2) Parents are able to interpret student progress on standards both on the report card and in the grading platform (can spot check any time to see where the student is performing) - 67% of parents agree	Goal has been discontinued	Key Indicators of Impact: 1) Students can identify and understand their current progress towards standard proficiency (on a proficiency scale) 2) Parents are able to interpret student progress on standards both on the report card and in the grading platform (can spot check any time to see where the student is performing) 3) Teachers are using student performance on	2024-25 serves as the baseline. This metric will be discountinued as Hall Middle School will shift from standards-based grading to traditional grading beginning in the 2025-26 school year.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			3) Teachers are using student performance on proficiency scales to inform Tier I interventions (small group instruction, 1:1 conferences, etc) - 91% of teachers agree 4) Teachers are giving students specific feedback relevant to the proficiency scale regarding their mastery of content. - 59% of students agree 5) Classroom work requires, and is used as evidence towards proficiency of scales - 65% of students agree 6) Classroom performance on proficiency scales will be a predictor of CAASPP performance - 45% of teachers agree		proficiency scales to inform Tier I interventions (small group instruction, 1:1 conferences, etc) 4) Teachers are giving students specific feedback relevant to the proficiency scale regarding their mastery of content. 5) Classroom work requires, and is used as evidence towards proficiency of scales 6) Classroom performance on proficiency scales will be a predictor of CAASPP performance 7) Equitable grading scales measure students' academic outcomes without factoring in their behavior or actions and weigh	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			7) Equitable grading scales measure students' academic outcomes without factoring in their behavior or actions and weigh students' final unit grades more heavily. 57% of students agree 10-year quantitative study was also conducted. There is no difference in student achievement outcomes pre/post standards-based grading implementation. However, it is important to note that the more significant variable in this 10-year span was the pandemic.		students' final unit grades more heavily.	

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.

Implementation of Goal 2 actions largely proceeded as planned, with some targeted refinements. At the middle school level, grading practices transitioned to an A–F model grounded in equity-based grading, replacing standards-based grading to improve clarity, communication, and alignment with high school expectations.

The District continued strong implementation of common assessments (iReady) and Data Learning Labs, which remain central to translating data into instructional action. A key enhancement this year was the addition of a contracted data expert, which significantly improved data extraction, organization, and timely access for staff—addressing prior capacity challenges and allowing teams to focus more on analysis and instructional response.

Stakeholder feedback from students, staff, and parents has been generally positive, particularly regarding communication and data use. Additionally, the District is actively engaged in a mixed-methods study with Hanover Research to evaluate the impact of educational technology and screen time, further informing future instructional decisions.

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.

There were no material differences between Budgeted and Estimated Actual Expenditures or Percentages of Improved Services.

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

The specific actions under Goal 2 have demonstrated strong effectiveness, particularly in strengthening data-driven instruction. In the second year of implementation of iReady and MyPath, Data Learning Labs have become more refined and impactful, supporting teacher teams in identifying student needs and adjusting instruction in real time. The addition of a contracted data expert significantly improved data extraction and organization, ensuring timely access to high-quality data and allowing staff to focus more on instructional planning rather than data management.

The District’s two-year expansion of intervention services in ELA, math, and English Learner support has yielded strong outcomes, contributing to improved student achievement and recognition such as Hall Middle School’s California Distinguished School award for closing the achievement gap. These gains reflect the strength of Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction. At the elementary level, intervention was further strengthened through dedicated “What I Need” (WIN) time, a structured block within the master schedule where students received targeted, flexible support based on current data. This allowed for timely regrouping and differentiated instruction within the school day. As this temporary increase in intervention staffing concludes, the District plans to sustain these supports by continuing WIN time structures and leveraging classroom teachers to deliver targeted intervention during the instructional day.

In literacy, the District successfully implemented a new curriculum (EL Education) with comprehensive professional learning, including coaching cycles, learning lab days, and full-day professional development. Ongoing monitoring using defined look-fors and Goal 2 indicators has supported strong initial implementation. In parallel, the District is advancing its mathematics curriculum adoption process, with a pilot planned for the 2026–27 school year.

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.

Based on reflection and stakeholder feedback, the District implemented a transition to traditional A–F grading practices at the middle school level, grounded in equitable grading principles. This shift maintained a focus on accurate representation of student learning while improving clarity and consistency in communication with students and families.

Additionally, a new area of focus emerged this year related to the use of educational technology and student screen time. In response to concerns raised by staff and parents, the District has initiated a mixed-methods study in partnership with Hanover Research to examine the impact of educational technology use on teaching and learning. Findings from this study are expected to inform instructional practices and potential adjustments in the coming year.

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	Adopt and implement new curriculum in literacy, math, and science (2.c.)	Identify and adopt research-based curriculum for all grade levels in literacy, mathematics, and science. Grade level/department teams, including special education teachers, will be supported by internal experts and staff developers as needed. This activity is aligned to the Compliance and Improvement Monitoring Process. Funding included in Action 1.4	$0.00	No
2.2	Implement new research-based common assessments in literacy, math, and science (2.a., 2.b., 2.c., 2.d.)	Identify and implement new research-based common assessments in literacy, math, and science. These assessments will be used to monitor progress, determine next steps for instruction (including intervention groups), and communicate with students and parents. This activity is aligned to the Compliance and Improvement Monitoring Process. Funding included in Action 1.4	$0.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.3	Expand (for 2024-2026) systematic literacy and math intervention via MTSS (2.b.)	The equivalent of 3.0 FTE specialists will be hired for 2024-25 and 2025-26 to support EL, literacy, and math intervention programs. Funding included in Action 1.5	$0.00	No
2.4	Comprehensive professional development plan (2.a., 2.b., 2.c.)	Engage staff in professional development in newly adopted literacy curriculum, to be adopted science curriculum, to be adopted math curriculum, Cognitively Guided Instruction in math, social justice lessons, MTSS Tier I strategies, newly adopted research-based common assessments, equitable grading practices (standards-based learning and grading), and English Language Development, with an overlay of equity and how this translates to classroom practice. Professional development will be designed with foundational experiences for all applicable teachers, grade level/department/topic sessions with classroom experiences, and individualized coaching. Funding included in Action 1.3	$0.00	No
2.5	Engage staff in formative and summative data analysis and goal development for students (2.a., 2.b., 2.c., 2.d.)	Using newly adopted and to be adopted research-based assessments in literacy, math, and science, engage staff in regular (at least once per trimester) data analyses with their respective grade levels/departments. Use these data to generate specific next steps for students below grade level expectations and underrepresented subgroups, to indentify personlized learning pathways, and to communicate student progress. Assessment funding included in 1.4	$0.00	No
2.6	Evaluate and refine standards-based grading at Hall Middle (2.c., 2.d.)	Further professional development with Marzano Research Institute based on the recommendations from the Hanover mixed methods research study; clearly communicate student progress; identify and implement a method for students and parents to see “at a glance” current proficiency levels in each course; identify and implement ways to expose students to percent	$0.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		correct on recent assessments and assignments and how that translates to A-F for high school Funding Included in 1.3		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	A comprehensive wellness program will be maintained and improved, which includes social-emotional learning, campus and student safety, and a well rounded course of study. Subgoals: 3.a. Implement school safety improvements based on Hanover and Keenan findings and recommendations 3.b. Decrease chronic absenteeism and suspension rates 3.c. Define and expand a comprehensive wellness program 3.d. Provide a well-rounded course of study	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Physical and emotional safety are pre-requisites to learning. LCMSD is committed to maintaining and enhancing safety and wellness programming to foster an environment where ALL students and families belong and are supported. As identified in our Dashboard, both chronic absenteeism and suspensions rates were deemed in the "red" category. These will be focus areas as evidenced by our actions and metrics.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Local LCAP surveys (3.a., 3.c.)	95% staff report working in a collegial and professional environment	95% staff report they are treated with respect by administration and 91% of staff report they are treated	99% staff report they are treated with respect by administration and 94% of staff report they are treated	Maintain collegial and professional environment. Increase staff perceptions of	All items are at or above baseline except: emotional safety (Cove and NC).

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Staff report LCMSD provides a broad course of study: Cove: 82% NC: 68% Hall: 55% 85% of staff report that LCMSD provides a safe environment for students Parents report their child is connected to adults in their classroom: Cove: 95% NC: 90% Hall: 89% Parents report their child is connected to adults on campus: Cove: 94% NC: 83% Hall: 73% Parents rate LCMSD's emergency preparedness as good/excellent: Cove: 84% NC: 79% Hall: 87%	with respect by colleagues Staff report LCMSD provides a broad course of study: Cove: 100% NC: 100% Hall: 50% 100% of staff report that LCMSD provides a safe environment for students Parents report their child is connected to adults in their classroom: Cove: 92% NC: 97% Hall: 94% Parents rate LCMSD's emergency preparedness as good/excellent: Cove: 88% NC: 86% Hall: 82% Parents report their child is	with respect by colleagues Staff report LCMSD provides a broad course of study: Cove: 100% NC: 94% Hall: 79% 86-95% of staff report that LCMSD provides a safe environment for students Parents rate LCMSD's emergency preparedness as good/excellent: Cove: 91% NC: 91% Hall: 90% Parents report their child is emotionally safe at school: Elementary: 80% Hall: 89% 95% of elementary and 77% of middle school students report that their	student access to a broad course of study to 85%+. Increase safety perceptions to 90%+. Increase relationship data points to 90%+.	The last two items regarding grown-ups telling students they do a good job and grown-ups believe in them are California Healthy Kids Survey questions.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Parents report their child is emotionally safe at school: Cove: 86% NC: 87% Hall: 90% 94% of elementary and 76-82% of middle school students (by department) report their teachers know them well Students report positive relationships with peers Cove: 89% NC: 84% Hall: 86% 72% of elementary and 76% of middle school students report that teachers/grown-ups tell them when they do a good job 90% of elementary and 92% of middle school students report that teachers/adults at their school believe they can do a good job	emotionally safe at school: Cove: 80% NC: 93% Hall: 85% 95% of elementary and 82% of middle school students report their teachers know them well Students report positive relationships with peers Cove: 92% NC: 91% Hall: 88%	teachers know them well Students report positive relationships with peers Elementary: 96% Hall: 96%		
3.2	Universal mental health screeners (3.c.)	Implemented for grades 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8	Implemented for grades 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8	Maintained for grades 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8	Expand, as appropriate, to other grade levels	Implemented for grades 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			Participation for the Fall and Spring assessments: Cove: 55, 55 Neil Cummins: 94, 84 Hall: 249, 272	Participation for the Fall and Spring assessments: Cove: 61%, 54% Neil Cummins: 59%, 58% Hall: 97%, 97%, 97%		
3.3	California Health Kids Survey (3.c.)	2023-2024 Elementary Results 88% report feeling connected to their school 83% report support for social emotional learning 96% report positive behaviors for self 92% feeling safe at school 2023-24 results for Hall Middle 72% report feeling connected to their school 77% feeling safe at school 0% report lifetime illicit alcohol or other drug use to get high 0% report having used vape products	California Health Kids Survey will be implemented in Year 2	California Health Kids Survey data not yet available as of June 5, 2026	Increase connectedness data points to 90%+.	California Health Kids Survey will be implemented in Year 2

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.4	Chronic absenteeism (3.b.)	California Dashboard 2023 District, Cove, and Hall data received a "red" designation for the following groups: Hispanic, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities. In addition, white students at Hall were designed "red." 2023-24 P2 attendance rate was 95.47%	California Dashboard 2024 "Red" Designations Cove - none Hispanic: Hall Two or More Races: Hall White: Hall Students with Disabilities: District, Hall Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: District, Neil Cummins 2024-25 P1 attendance rate was 96.29%	California Dashboard 2025 "Green" - District; goal met "Blue" - Neil Cummins; goal met "Red" Designations Hall and Neil Cummins - none Hispanic: none Two or More Races: none White: Cove Students with Disabilities: Cove Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: Cove 2025-26 P1 attendance rate was 96.17%	All student groups are designated at least "green" on the California Dashboard Continue gradually increasing attendance rate and maintain a rate no less than 95%.	Red designations remain persistent, with some growth in Year 1 Neil Cummins has met this goal
3.5	Discipline, including suspension and expulsion (3.b.)	District data received a "red" designation for the Hispanic group	California Dashboard 2024	California Dashboard 2025	All student groups are designated at least "green" on	"Red" designations are persistent

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			District and Neil Cummins data received a "red" designation for the students with disabilities group	Neil Cummins received a "blue" designation overall District, Cove, and Hall received a "green" designation overall "Red" designation for English Learners and socioeconomically disadvantaged (District, Neil Cummins); students with disabilities (Cove).	the California Dashboard	
3.6	Facilities/maintenance (3.a.)	Met goal in 2023-24 Zero Williams complaints	Met "good" rating on the FIT Zero Williams complaints	Met "good" rating on the FIT Zero Williams complaints	Maintain "good" rating on the FIT Maintain zero Williams complaints	Met "good" rating on the FIT Zero Williams complaints
3.7	Credentialed teachers (3.d.)	0 misalignments 7 board authorizations 0 GLAP	2 misassignments 7 board authorizations 0 GLAP	0 misassignments 4 board authorizations 1 GLAP	0 misassignments maintain board authorizations and GLAP	Goal met
3.8	Master schedule - course offerings (3.c., 3.d.)	Elementary: art, music, STEM lab, and physical education are supported by a specialist teacher. All students (including special education, English Learner, and socioeconomically	Expanded elementary course offerings Maintained middle school broad course of study with at least one	Maintained elementary course offerings Maintained middle school broad course of study with at least one	Maintain elementary course offerings Maintain middle school broad course of study with at least one	No difference, maintained broad course of study.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		disadvantaged) have access to these programs, as measured by grades entered on progress reports. Middle: students have a broad course of study that includes electives (music, art, technology, leadership, world languages, executive functioning/ organization) and pathways for math advancement. All students (including special education, English Learner, and socioeconomically disadvantaged) have access to these programs, as measured by master schedule.	elective choice per student Expanded visual and performing arts through the use of Prop 28 funding (elementary musical theater) All students (including special education, English Learner, and socioeconomically disadvantaged) have 100% access to a broad course of study.	elective choice per student Maintained visual and performing arts through the use of Prop 28 funding (elementary musical theater) All students (including special education, English Learner, and socioeconomically disadvantaged) have 100% access to a broad course of study.	elective choice per student Expand visual and performing arts through the use of Prop 28 funding All students (including special education, English Learner, and socioeconomically disadvantaged) will have 100% access to a broad course of study.	
3.9	Every pupil has sufficient access to standards-aligned instructional materials (3.d.)	Maintain access	Maintained access	Maintained access	Maintain access	Maintained access
3.10	Middle school dropout rate	Maintain zero dropouts	Maintained zero dropouts	Maintained zero dropouts	Maintain zero dropouts	Maintained zero dropouts

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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

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

In 2024–25, LCMSD continued to strengthen implementation of Goal 3, with wellness centers now fully established at each school site and supported by school counselors, as well as marriage and family therapy interns and associates. These supports have contributed to strong overall school climate data, including high levels of student connection to peers and adults and positive staff relationships. While the majority of students report feeling safe and connected, approximately 80% of elementary students report feeling emotionally safe, indicating a need to further examine and address the experiences of the remaining students.

The District maintained a broad course of study for all students and made significant progress in staffing and credentialing. Through focused recruitment and retention efforts, along with a memorandum of understanding supporting additional authorizations, G-LAPs, and testing (e.g., CSET), the District achieved zero misassignments—an important milestone that strengthened program continuity and instructional capacity.

Partnerships with the Marin County Office of Education (MCOE) remained strong, particularly in addressing chronic absenteeism and increasing stakeholder engagement. As a result, the District has seen improvements in attendance, especially at Neil Cummins and Hall Middle School, reflecting the impact of targeted interventions and coordinated support systems.

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.

For Goal 3, the SEL curriculum adoption is in progress and has not yet occurred in the 2024–25 school year. Additionally, an MFT intern (E.B.) has been added at a cost of $4,000 per month. Implementation of the Facilities Strategic Plan is continuing as planned, with consideration of future fencing needs that may require additional capital investment. New investments include the installation of the Verkada Intercom System, replacement of gates and fencing, and funding support for AP HB to provide counseling and advocacy services for Title I students.

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

The actions implemented to support Goal 3 have been effective in advancing wellness, safety, and student engagement. Wellness centers are now fully operational at all sites and, along with universal mental health screeners, provide a systematic and proactive approach to identifying and supporting student needs. Continued implementation of PBIS, along with dedicated site-based teams monitoring behavior and chronic absenteeism, has contributed to improved attendance and positive school climate trends.

Access to a broad course of study has improved at the middle school level, with the addition of art sections in 2025–26 resulting in increased positive feedback from staff and students. Building on this progress, the District plans to expand elective access further through a band/Spanish wheel model for grades 7–8, providing students with consistent exposure to both programs and strengthening overall course offerings.

The District has also continued to expand safety efforts through PBIS and restorative practices training, as well as physical safety improvements. Grant applications, including the STOP grant, were submitted to support these efforts, and community engagement was conducted to inform future fencing and campus safety enhancements aligned to a proposed bond measure.

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.

Based on reflections from the 2025–26 implementation, no significant changes were made to Goal 3 actions or metrics for the coming year, as current strategies have demonstrated strong effectiveness. The District will continue implementation of wellness centers, PBIS, restorative practices, and attendance interventions, with ongoing refinement based on site-level data and student needs.

While LCAP survey tools remain largely consistent following prior revisions, the District will continue to monitor emerging areas of focus. In particular, the ongoing mixed-methods study on educational technology and screen time may provide insights into the intersection of student wellness and technology use, which could inform future adjustments to Goal 3 actions and services.

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	Social-emotional learning (SEL) curriculum adoption (3.c., 3.d)	Identify, adopt, and implement K-8 SEL curriculum.	$75,000.00	No
3.2	Create wellness centers at each school site (3.c.)	Identify spaces and personnel to create a wellness center at each school site. This might include an expansion of marriage and family therapist intern program	$65,200.00	No
3.3	Positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) (3.b.)	Further PBIS implementation through professional development, behaviorist trained staff intervention (classroom and individual student), clear communications to reduce suspensions and increase positive school behaviors.	$110,810.93	No
3.4	Further implementation of comprehensive	Refine and adjust attendance program to address chronic absenteeism and improve overall student attendance. Have clear reinforcers, as well as a systematic and timely response plan for absenteeism.	$0.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
	attendance promotion and intervention program (3.b.)	No additional costs are associated with this action..		
3.5	Apply for the 2025-2027 STOP School Violence Federal Grant (3.a.)	Apply for the 2025-27 STOP School Violence Federal Grant to support PBIS and safety efforts; create and grant fund a Director of Wellness. No additional costs are associated with this action.	$0.00	No
3.6	Refine the viable and guaranteed counseling program K-8 (3.c.)	Defined classroom-based lessons, involvement in class placement, small group/individual counseling support, executive functioning, drug/alcohol/nicotine education, suicide awareness and prevention, conflict resolution, growth mindset, self regulation, habits of learning. No additional costs are associated with this action.	$0.00	No
3.7	Implement Facilities Strategic Plan (3.a.)	This plan is focused on ongoing maintenance and improvement of safety measures	$1,037,975.05	No
3.8	Advance school safety efforts (3.a.)	Implement school safety recommendations provided in the Hanover and Keenan research reports	$9,489.00	No
3.9	Increase opportunities for school connectedness (3.a., 3.c.)	Continue expanding opportunities such as DELAC Leadership, ELCCs, and parent coffee chats. Examine lunch, recess, and social safety practices, as well as student survey data, to make informed action steps for identified gap areas. No additional costs are associated with this action.	$4,213.57	No
3.10	Technical Assistance	Collaborate with Marin County Office of Education on technical assistance to address and implement actions related to reducing chronic absenteeism and suspension rates.	$50,872.81	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing

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

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant
$$295,734	$

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
2.340%	0.000%	$0.00	2.340%

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

Required Descriptions

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.2	**Action:** Increase targeted outreach, parent education, and community connectedness (1.a., 1.c.) **Need:** There are district and school wide meetings and committees that are not representative of our student groups. **Scope:**	This targeted communication is aimed towards our goal of having representative parent attendance and voice at all district parent meetings. This action is principally directed to the English learner, socioeconomically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and special education student groups. By implementing this action, the expected outcome is to have increased parent participation, a representative parent voice, and stronger partnerships with all members of the learning community.	Parent participation and volunteerism Parent satisfaction (LCAP Survey) with communication

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		
1.3	**Action:** Approach all professional development offerings with an equity lens **Need:** Equity should be the lens in developing school policies, practices, procedures, and instructional design. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Equity isn't approached in isolation. It is our overlay to all functions of the school district; this includes professional development. This action is principally directed to the English learner, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and BIPOC student groups. By implementing this action, the expected outcome is to foster school environments where all members of our learning community belong and feel safe. Additionally, this action aims to eliminate all instances of problematic behaviors specifically involving race, ethnicity, housing status, and socioeconomic status. It is anticipated that we will see a decrease in suspension rates and chronic absenteeism.	Student achievement (CAASPP) Common assessments Equity audits LCAP survey California Healthy Kids Surveys Suspension rates Chronic absenteeism rates
1.4	**Action:** Engage staff in formative and summative data analysis and goal development for students (1.b.) **Need:** New common core aligned assessments require additional training to support targeted intervention. English learner, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and BIPOC student groups tend to perform lower than other students. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Data analysis directly informs teaching and intervention practices. This action is principally directed to the English learner, socioeconomically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and special education student groups. By implementing this action, the expected outcome is to increase student achievement through targeted and timely intervention which will result in increased learning and performance.	Student achievement (CAASPP) Common assessments Equity audits Suspension rates Chronic absenteeism rates
1.5	**Action:**	To address the achievement gap; this action is principally directed to the English learner student	Pre/post intervention data.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Increase systematic intervention for English Learners, ELA, and mathematics. (1.b.) **Need:** Student achievement gaps persist. **Scope:** LEA-wide	group. By implementing this action, the expected outcome is to increase student achievement through targeted and timely intervention. Interventions include Do the Math and Heggerty. While all students will benefit from this, we anticipate it will significantly improve the achievement for English learner, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and BIPOC student groups.	

Limited Actions

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

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.1	**Action:** Increase availability of translation services (1.a.) **Need:** There is a gap in EL parent participation **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	They will increase access and engagement. Parent participation and volunteerism Parent satisfaction (LCAP Survey) with communication Increasing translation services, specifically, during meetings, increases parent access. Communications home are automatically translated; however, the greatest need is during on-site meetings (conferences, back to school night, PTA/O, open house). This action is principally directed to the English learner student group. By implementing this action, the expected outcome is to have increased parent participation, a representative parent voice, and stronger	Parent engagement surveys

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		partnerships with all members of the learning community.	

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

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

n/a

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

2026-27 Total Planned Expenditures Table

LCAP Year	1. Projected LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Input Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)
Totals	$12,638,207.00	$295,734	2.340%	0.000%	2.340%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$693,140.27	$176,010.93	$1,448,912.74	$55,086.38	$2,373,150.32	$0.00	$2,373,150.32

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	Increase availability of translation services (1.a.)	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		$0.00	$22,462.00	$22,462.00				$22,462.00	
1	1.2	Increase targeted outreach, parent education, and community connectedness (1.a., 1.c.)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$39,533.10	$39,533.10				$39,533.10	
1	1.3	Approach all professional development offerings with an equity lens	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			$0.00	$583,478.38	$182,029.69		$401,448.69		$583,478.38	
1	1.4	Engage staff in formative and summative data analysis and goal development for students (1.b.)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			$0.00	$106,931.45	$106,931.45				$106,931.45	
1	1.5	Increase systematic intervention for English Learners, ELA, and mathematics. (1.b.)	English Learners	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners			$0.00	$267,184.03	$267,184.03				$267,184.03	
2	2.1	Adopt and implement new curriculum in literacy, math, and science (2.c.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
2	2.2	Implement new research-based common assessments in literacy, math, and science (2.a., 2.b., 2.c., 2.d.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
2	2.3	Expand (for 2024-2026) systematic literacy and math intervention via MTSS (2.b.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
2	2.4	Comprehensive professional development plan (2.a., 2.b., 2.c.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
2	2.5	Engage staff in formative and summative data analysis and goal	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
		development for students (2.a., 2.b., 2.c., 2.d.)														
2	2.6	Evaluate and refine standards-based grading at Hall Middle (2.c., 2.d.)	All	No			Specific Schools: Hall Middle School 6-8		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
3	3.1	Social-emotional learning (SEL) curriculum adoption (3.c., 3.d)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$75,000.00	$75,000.00				$75,000.00	
3	3.2	Create wellness centers at each school site (3.c.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$65,200.00		$65,200.00			$65,200.00	
3	3.3	Positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) (3.b.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$110,810.93		$110,810.93			$110,810.93	
3	3.4	Further implementation of comprehensive attendance promotion and intervention program (3.b.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
3	3.5	Apply for the 2025-2027 STOP School Violence Federal Grant (3.a.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
3	3.6	Refine the viable and guaranteed counseling program K-8 (3.c.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
3	3.7	Implement Facilities Strategic Plan (3.a.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$1,037,975.05			$1,037,975.05		$1,037,975.05	
3	3.8	Advance school safety efforts (3.a.)	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$9,489.00			$9,489.00		$9,489.00	
3	3.9	Increase opportunities for school connectedness (3.a., 3.c.)	English Learners, Foster Youth, Low Income, Special Education, BIPOC	No			All Schools		$0.00	$4,213.57	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$4,213.57	$4,213.57	
3	3.10	Technical Assistance	English Learners, Foster Youth, Low Income, Special Education, BIPOC	No			All Schools		$0.00	$50,872.81	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$50,872.81	$50,872.81	

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
$12,638,207.00	$295,734	2.340%	0.000%	2.340%	$618,140.27	0.000%	4.891 %	**Total:**	$618,140.27
								LEA-wide Total:	$595,678.27
								Limited Total:	$22,462.00
								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**	Increase availability of translation services (1.a.)	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$22,462.00	
1	**1.2**	Increase targeted outreach, parent education, and community connectedness (1.a., 1.c.)	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$39,533.10	
1	**1.3**	Approach all professional development offerings with an equity lens	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income		$182,029.69	
1	**1.4**	Engage staff in formative and summative data analysis and goal development for students (1.b.)	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income		$106,931.45	
1	**1.5**	Increase systematic intervention for English Learners, ELA, and mathematics. (1.b.)	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners		$267,184.03	

2025-26 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$2,442,032.00	$2,435,617.31

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**	Increase availability of translation services (1.a.)	Yes	$28,239.00	$22,462.00
1	**1.2**	Increase targeted outreach, parent education, and community connectedness (1.a., 1.c.)	Yes	$15,850.00	$39,533.10
1	**1.3**	Approach all professional development offerings with an equity lens	Yes	$265,383.00	$546,390.50
1	**1.4**	Engage staff in formative and summative data analysis and goal development for students (1.b.)	Yes	$475,000.00	$277,192.09
1	**1.5**	Increase systematic intervention for English Learners, ELA, and mathematics. (1.b.)	Yes	$524,565.00	$250,641.21
2	**2.1**	Adopt and implement new curriculum in literacy, math, and science (2.c.)	No	$0.00	$0.00
2	**2.2**	Implement new research-based common assessments in literacy, math, and science (2.a., 2.b., 2.c., 2.d.)	No	$0.00	$0.00
2	**2.3**	Expand (for 2024-2026) systematic literacy and math intervention via MTSS (2.b.)	No	$0.00	$0.00
2	**2.4**	Comprehensive professional development plan (2.a., 2.b., 2.c.)	No	$0.00	$0.00
2	**2.5**	Engage staff in formative and summative data analysis and goal development for students (2.a., 2.b., 2.c., 2.d.)	No	$0.00	$0.00

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
2	2.6	Evaluate and refine standards-based grading at Hall Middle (2.c., 2.d.)	No	$0.00	$0.00
3	3.1	Social-emotional learning (SEL) curriculum adoption (3.c., 3.d)	No	$75,000.00	$0.00
3	3.2	Create wellness centers at each school site (3.c.)	No	$99,000.00	$65,200
3	3.3	Positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) (3.b.)	No	$81,976.00	$110,810.93
3	3.4	Further implementation of comprehensive attendance promotion and intervention program (3.b.)	No	$0.00	$0.00
3	3.5	Apply for the 2025-2027 STOP School Violence Federal Grant (3.a.)	No	$0.00	$17,064.86
3	3.6	Refine the viable and guaranteed counseling program K-8 (3.c.)	No	$0.00	$0.00
3	3.7	Implement Facilities Strategic Plan (3.a.)	No	$650,000.00	$1,037,975.05
3	3.8	Advance school safety efforts (3.a.)	No	$200,000.00	$16,411.00
3	3.9	Increase opportunities for school connectedness (3.a., 3.c.)	No Yes	$0.00	$4,213.57
3	3.10	Technical Assistance	No Yes	$27,019.00	$47,723.00

2025-26 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

6. Estimated LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	7. Total Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	8. Total Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)
$290039	$777,323.00	$831,393.18	($54,070.18)	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	Increase availability of translation services (1.a.)	Yes	$12,205.00	$22,462.00		
1	1.2	Increase targeted outreach, parent education, and community connectedness (1.a., 1.c.)	Yes	$15,850.00	$39,533.10		
1	1.3	Approach all professional development offerings with an equity lens	Yes	$158,090.00	$189,628.21		
1	1.4	Engage staff in formative and summative data analysis and goal development for students (1.b.)	Yes	$66,613.00	$277,192.09		
1	1.5	Increase systematic intervention for English Learners, ELA, and mathematics. (1.b.)	Yes	$524,565.00	$250,641.21		
3	3.9	Increase opportunities for school connectedness (3.a., 3.c.)	Yes	$0.00	$4,213.57		
3	3.10	Technical Assistance	Yes	$0.00	$47,723.00		

2025-26 LCFF Carryover Table

9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 + Carryover %)	7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)	11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)	12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)	13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)
$12,512,487.00	$290039	0	2.318%	$831,393.18	0.000%	6.645%	$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