KIPP University Park


ELEMENTARY | MIDDLE

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: KIPP University Park K-8
CDS Code: 39686760141358
School Year: 2026-27
LEA contact information:
Andrea Francis and Nicole LeBlanc
KIPP University Park K-8 School Leaders
opsadmin@kippnorcal.org
510-465-5477

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 KIPP University Park K-8 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 KIPP University Park K-8 is $15,974,148, of which $11,704,176 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), $3,007,696 is other state funds, $888,291 is local funds, and $373,985 is federal funds. Of the $11,704,176 in LCFF Funds, $3,195,189 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 KIPP University Park K-8 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: KIPP University Park K-8 plans to spend $15,974,149 for the 2026-27 school year. Of that amount, $12,486,845 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and $3,487,304 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:

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

In 2026-27, KIPP University Park K-8 is projecting it will receive $3,195,189 based on the enrollment of foster youth, English learner, and low-income students. KIPP University Park K-8 must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. KIPP University Park K-8 plans to spend $4,163,654 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 KIPP University Park K-8 budgeted last year in the LCAP for actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students with what KIPP University Park K-8 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, KIPP University Park K-8's LCAP budgeted $2,581,021 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. KIPP University Park K-8 actually spent $4,289,065 for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2025-26.

KIPP University Park

ELEMENTARY | MIDDLE

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
KIPP University Park K-8	Andrea Francis and Nicole LeBlanc KIPP University Park K-8 School Leaders	opsadmin@kippnorcal.org 510-465-5477

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.

KIPP University Park K-8 is a public charter school serving 615 students across Transitional Kindergarten through eighth grade in Stockton, California, located at 820 N American Street in the heart of the University Park neighborhood. Founded as part of a growing investment in public education in Stockton, the school has continued to grow into the full TK-8 community, welcoming nearly 250 new students in the 2026-27 school year. As we grow, the school continues to be committed to academically excellent, joyful, and identity-affirming education for the children and families it serves.

Across the full TK-8 program, 71% of students identify as Latinx, 17% as Black, 6% as multiracial, 2% as Asian, and 3% as white. Eighty-eight percent of students meet the state's unduplicated pupil definition, and 87% qualify for free or reduced price meals. Eighteen percent of students are active multilingual learners, and 22% of students receive special education services through an individualized education program. Current enrollment by grade includes 56 students in TK, 95 in Kindergarten, 74 in first grade, 67 in second grade, 44 in third grade, 61 in fourth grade, 50 in fifth grade, 60 in sixth grade, 64 in seventh grade, and 44 in eighth grade.

The school's values span both its elementary and middle school communities. The younger grades center Energy, Empathy, and Excellence, while the upper grades center Community, Inclusivity, Growth, and Identity. Together these values reflect a through-line of student well-being, cultural affirmation, and academic rigor across all grade levels. KIPP University Park's mission calls on students, families, and staff to build joyful, equitable classrooms where every child develops the academic skills, sense of self, and confidence to pursue the future they choose.

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

Strengths

KIPP Summit Academy enters the 2026-27 school year with meaningful evidence of academic growth and school community strength that reflects the sustained investments made in instruction, intervention, and student belonging across this three-year LCAP cycle.

In English Language Arts, the 2025 California Dashboard results show all students performing at a status of 85.0 points above standard, an increase of 12.5 points from the prior year result of 72.5. The school earned a Blue (Very High) color rating, the highest level on the Dashboard, exceeding its Year 3 target of maintaining High (Green) status. This is a meaningful achievement for a community where 75% of students meet the unduplicated pupil definition. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students scored 76.2 points above standard, a 15.4-point improvement from the prior year. Multilingual learners scored 59.9 points above standard, a 15.5-point gain, reflecting the impact of targeted language development supports including the school's Literacy Specialist, Book Club intervention structures, and the Title III multilingual learner instructional coach described in Action 1.5. Asian students scored 110 points above standard, and Hispanic students scored 45.6 points above standard, also an improvement from the prior year result of 33.4 points. The school's ELA Growth rating on the Dashboard is Exceptional, reflecting not just where students are but how much they are growing year over year.

In Mathematics, the 2025 Dashboard results show all students at 39.0 points above standard, an 18.4-point increase from the prior year. The school earned a Blue (Very High) color rating, surpassing its Year 3 target of maintaining High (Green) status. Math Growth is also rated Exceptional on the Dashboard. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students improved by 19.8 points to reach 31.1 points above standard. Multilingual learners moved from 2.7 points below standard to 13.7 points above standard, a 16.4-point gain that reflects the growing effectiveness of differentiated math instruction and the Eureka2 curriculum implementation documented in the school's 2025-26 priorities. Asian students scored 77.6 points above standard and Filipino students scored 103.6 points above standard.

In Science, the 2025 Dashboard results show 68% of all students meeting or exceeding standards, with a Blue (Very High) rating, meeting and exceeding the school's Year 3 target of achieving at least Medium (Yellow) status. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students reached 63% proficiency and multilingual learners reached 27% proficiency, both reflecting growth from the prior year results of 58% and 24% respectively.
Multilingual learner progress is a particular area of strength. The English Language Progress Indicator (ELPI) shows 81.8% of multilingual learners making progress toward English proficiency in 2025, up from 78.7% the prior year and significantly above the 2022-23 baseline of 65%. The school earned a Blue (High) color rating on the ELPI, placing KSA well ahead of its Year 3 target of maintaining High status. This progress reflects the coordinated work of the Literacy Specialist, the Title III ML instructional coach, Ellevation-supported professional development, and the consistent use of sheltered instructional strategies documented in the school's academic priorities.
On school climate and engagement, KSA demonstrated notable progress across both chronic absenteeism and student suspension data. The 2025 Dashboard shows chronic absenteeism at 3.5% for all students, down from 7.2% the prior year, earning a Blue (Very Low) color rating. Current year 2025-26 internal data shows the school tracking at 5% chronic absenteeism overall, with grade-level rates ranging from 3% in fifth grade to 6% in seventh and eighth grades, indicating the school's attendance systems are sustaining progress. Suspension rates

decreased to 1.4% in 2025, down from 2.6% the prior year, earning a Green (Low) color rating. Students with disabilities reached a suspension rate of 0%, and multilingual learners reached 0.8%, both reflecting the school's commitment to restorative practices and proactive behavioral support described in LCAP Action 2.4. Average daily attendance for 2025-26 is tracking at 96.8% across all grades, a strong indicator of student connection to the school community.

Student and staff survey results also reflect positive momentum. Seventy-nine percent of students reported feeling a sense of emotional safety at school in 2025-26, up from 55% in the 2022-23 baseline year, a 24-point increase that speaks to the impact of explicit social-emotional learning, restorative practices, and the school's investment in a full-time mental health clinician. Teacher satisfaction with access to rigorous academic curriculum reached 91% in 2025-26, an 8-point increase from the 2022-23 baseline of 83%, reflecting the effectiveness of curriculum adoption decisions and the instructional coaching model.

Growth Areas

While the overall picture is one of strong and consistent progress, the 2025 Dashboard data highlights specific student groups where KSA is committed to accelerating growth in the coming year.
Students with disabilities show Yellow color ratings in both ELA and Mathematics. In ELA, students with disabilities scored 14.9 points below standard in 2025, a modest improvement from 15.2 points below standard the prior year. In Mathematics, students with disabilities scored 86.1 points below standard, a slight decline of 1.4 points from the prior year result of 84.7 points below standard. These results point to the need for deeper collaboration between general and special education teachers, more consistent implementation of IEP accommodations within the Fishtank, Eureka2, and Amplify Science curriculum frameworks, and strengthened differentiation strategies in core classroom instruction. KSA's 2025-26 school priorities explicitly name this as a focus area, including professional development on IEP accommodation integration and the development of contingency supports for students in specialized programs.

Long-term English learners show an Orange color rating in Mathematics, scoring 72.3 points below standard in 2025, a decline of 4.7 points from the prior year. While long-term English learners showed strong progress on the ELPI at 87.5%, their mathematics performance signals a need for more targeted academic language and content support in math specifically. This group will remain a named focus in the school's intervention planning for 2026-27.

Hispanic students show a Yellow color rating in Mathematics, scoring 18.3 points below standard in 2025, though this represents a significant 21-point improvement from the prior year result of 39.4 points below standard. This upward trend is encouraging and reflects the impact of Math Club, Math Lab, and data-driven coaching cycles. KSA is committed to sustaining and accelerating this momentum.

Teacher satisfaction with the school's commitment to improving instructional practice reached 86% in 2025-26, which remains well above the Year 3 target of 75%. However, this represents a 10-point decline from the prior year peak of 96% and a 1-point decline from the 2022-23 baseline of 87%. The school recognizes that a year of significant new curriculum implementation across multiple grades and content areas, including Year 1 of Fishtank, Year 2 of Eureka2, and the Amplify Science rollout, creates real demands on teachers. Sustaining strong teacher experience and instructional confidence as new curricula mature will remain a priority in 2026-27.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

The school is not currently eligible for technical assistance.

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.

The school is not currently eligible for comprehensive support and improvement.

Support for Identified Schools

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

The school is not currently eligible for comprehensive support and improvement.

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

The school is not currently eligible for comprehensive support and improvement.

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
Families -	This year's Local Control and Accountability planning process provided meaningful engagement opportunities, allowing for refinement and reflection on goals and actionable steps to enhance student outcomes. Families receive invitations to attend various events with school leadership, including scheduled LCAP meetings, Back to School Night, and a calendar of school events that create consistent touchpoints between families and the school throughout the year. The KIPP Family Council, which serves as the school's School Site Council, meets regularly throughout the year and provides structured opportunities for families to review and respond to school data, goals, and resource decisions. The Multilingual Learner Committee, which serves as the school's English Language Advisory Committee, meets to provide input on the supports available to multilingual learner students, with particular attention to designated English Language Development, language proficiency progress, and reclassification pathways. Interpretation is available at all family meetings and materials are provided in the school's most common home languages to ensure equitable access for all families. At the fall Title I meeting, families review and formally approve the School-Family Compact and the school's Family Engagement Policy, affirming a shared commitment between the school and families around student learning, communication, and participation. Input is gathered through small group exercises during meetings, the LCAP survey, the school culture survey, and summarized empathy interview feedback from families of students with individualized education

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	programs, all of which inform school planning and goal refinement throughout the year.
Students -	Students are engaged in the LCAP process by sharing feedback through regular Pulse Surveys designed to gather insights on various aspects of their educational experience. These surveys focus on capturing students' thoughts, feelings, and opinions on topics including their overall satisfaction with the learning environment, their engagement in class, their relationships with teachers and peers, their understanding of school priorities and policies, and their general well-being. Student voice is also captured through student leadership structures at the school, which provide students with structured opportunities to contribute to school culture, share perspectives on school priorities, and serve as role models for the broader student community. Students also have regular communication and direct access to teachers and school administration throughout the year as an ongoing channel for feedback and engagement.
Teachers -	Teachers are engaged in the LCAP process through surveys, LCAP meetings, and regular staff development and feedback channels. The TNTP survey is used to assess various dimensions of the teaching experience at KIPP, including teacher satisfaction, school culture, professional development quality, leadership effectiveness, and overall working conditions. TNTP survey results provide meaningful insights into the experiences and perspectives of educators and are used to inform decision-making, improve policies and practices, and support teacher retention and instructional effectiveness. Throughout the year, teachers participate in weekly staff meetings where they review data to inform classroom instruction. Beginning in the spring, these meetings incorporate a review of longer-term data trends that shape LCAP priorities for the following year. Individual coaching conversations provide an additional and ongoing channel for teachers to share feedback about their experience, their support needs, and their ideas for improving student outcomes.
School Leaders -	Engagement with school leadership is a critical component of the LCAP process at KIPP. School leaders, assistant principals, content specialists, and operational directors work together to ensure alignment on school goals and lead the LCAP process for their school

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	community. These leaders gather throughout the spring to review student outcome data, staff data, and school resources to identify the initiatives and priorities that must then be shared and implemented. School leadership is also supported through its connection to the KIPP Northern California regional support office, which provides access to diverse perspectives and cross-school learning through quarterly community of practice meetings, professional learning communities, leadership coaching, and targeted skill-building opportunities.
Regional Support Office -	The regional support office actively engages with the school community and school leadership to capture the meaningful school-level work happening each day. The school continues its collaboration and consultation with various departments at the regional level to inform goals, metrics, and outcomes, including Operations, Facilities, Data, Human Resources, Finance, Special Education including the SELPA, and Academics. This engagement includes budget reviews, school site walkthroughs, operational coaching, data analysis, and regular consultations that inform strategic annual planning and goal setting. The regional support team provides opportunities for all Northern California KIPP leaders to engage in professional development and share resources and best practices across the organization.
School Community -	School-level LCAP planning and engagement begins in December in preparation for the updated California Dashboard release and includes updated presentation materials designed to allow the community to engage more equitably, with materials available in multiple languages and structured for diverse engagement styles and practices. Additional Community School team support is available at meetings and events to answer questions and support meaningful participation in these important discussions. This involvement and availability strengthen trust and accountability between the KIPP organization, the school, and the community it serves. KIPP takes steps to make governance structures accessible to the full school community. The drafted LCAP is made available for public review in advance of the final June board meeting, virtual teleconferencing is available for all public board meetings, and the community is notified in compliance with the Brown Act. Translation services are available

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	upon request, and all KIPP board meeting agendas and minutes are available online at kippnorcal.org/kipp-board-of-directors.
SELPA -	The SELPA provides review and feedback on the school's annual LCAP, and the school's special education planning reflects the input and guidance provided through this partnership throughout the year.
Bargaining Units -	As a charter school, KIPP is not required to engage, nor is it currently applicable, to consult with any local bargaining units of the LEA.

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

KIPP conducts a comprehensive annual review of all relevant data to assess progress, identify emerging needs, and determine whether any changes to actions or resources are warranted for the coming year. This review is led by school leadership, including school leaders, assistant principals, content specialists, and academic and culture staff, working in close collaboration with the KIPP Northern California regional support team. Together these teams examine California Dashboard results, TNTP teacher satisfaction survey data, ELPAC proficiency and progress data, local assessment results, attendance trends, suspension data, and family and student survey results. The findings of this annual review directly inform any adjustments to goals, metrics, actions, and resource allocations reflected in the LCAP, and serve as the foundation for the school's ongoing response to the needs of all student groups, with particular attention to multilingual learners, students with disabilities, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

Family feedback gathered through the KIPP Family Council, LCAP meetings, and the LCAP and school culture surveys has been a consistent driver of the priorities reflected in this plan. The Multilingual Learner Committee's spring input on language development programming has shaped the school's approach to designated English Language Development and the language development supports reflected in Goal 1. Student pulse survey data and student leadership feedback have informed adjustments to school culture programming, enrichment opportunities, and student well-being supports reflected in Goal 2. Teacher feedback gathered through the TNTP survey and weekly staff meetings has directly shaped professional development priorities, instructional coaching structures, and curriculum decisions reflected in Goal 3. Weekly staff meeting data reviews have been a particularly important feedback channel, ensuring that teachers' real-time observations about student progress are incorporated into instructional planning and resource allocation throughout the year. The school's attendance support structures have been refined in direct response to data reviewed through the COST process and the family outreach and communication systems that surface the barriers families face in getting students to school consistently each day.
Feedback from educational partners has also reinforced the school's commitment to sustaining investments that serve the whole child, even in a challenging fiscal environment. The school's on-site mental health clinician, provided at no cost to students and families regardless of insurance status, reflects a sustained organizational commitment to student well-being that families and students have consistently named as meaningful and necessary. KIPP Northern California is committed to maintaining this service as a core component of the school's support model, recognizing that declining federal funding allocations make proactive planning for the sustainability of mental health services more important than ever. The engagement of families, students, and teachers in the LCAP process has affirmed that this investment is one the school community values deeply and expects to see reflected in the plan.

KIPP recognizes that the LCAP serves as both a state accountability document and a consolidated federal planning tool under the Every Student Succeeds Act. The engagement processes described in this section and throughout this plan are designed to meet the requirements of both frameworks. The annual review of student outcome data and the structured engagement of all required educational partners fulfills the comprehensive needs assessment requirement under Title I of ESSA, ensuring that resources are directed toward the students and programs with the greatest demonstrated need. The School-Family Compact and Family Engagement Policy, reviewed and approved annually at the fall Title I meeting, formalize the school's commitment to family partnership in support of student achievement, consistent with ESSA Section 1116. The Multilingual Learner Committee's annual input on language development programming and the school's Title III family notification practices align with the requirements of ESSA Title III Part A, which governs language instruction for multilingual learners. Teacher professional development described in Goal 3 is designed to meet the ESSA definition of high-quality professional development as sustained, intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused, consistent with the requirements of ESSA Title II Part A. The charter school engagement requirements of Education Code Section 47606.5 have been met through the consultation processes described above, and the LCAP has been made available for public review and board adoption in accordance with Education Code Section 47606.5 and the Brown Act.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	All students will achieve academically.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

To increase the rate of students who meet or exceed state standards in English language arts on the SBAC assessment.
To increase the rate of students who meet or exceed state standards in mathematics on the SBAC assessment.
To increase the rate of students who meet or exceed state standards in science on the CAST assessment.
To increase the number of students making annual progress in English language learning.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	SBAC ELA: State testing results for English Language Arts.	22-23 English language arts results for all students: 31% proficient, 28% district results 22-23 English language arts results for students qualifying as low-income students: 27% proficient, 25% district results 22-23 English language arts results for multilingual language learners: NA% proficient, 6% district	Note: Starting in 2023-24, this reporting metric has been revised to compare testing results to the state standard. 23-24 English language arts results for all students: 24% proficient, 57.8 points below standard 23-24 English language arts	24-25 ELA Results: All students: 33% proficient, 48.4 points below standard SED: 31% proficient; 50.8 points below standard ML: 13.6% proficient; 76.5 points below standard	Maintain LOW on the CA Dashboard, with +10 points or greater increase YoY	Current proficiency is 33%, reflecting a 2 percentage point difference from the 22-23 baseline of 31%. The school is currently rated Medium (Yellow) on the CA Dashboard, exceeding the Year 3 target of Low (Orange) status.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		results (too few students - data is not available) 22-23 English language arts results for students with disabilities: NA% proficient, 7% district results (data not available, too few students) 57.8 points below standard	results for students qualifying as low-income students: 24% proficient, 62.7 points below standard 23-24 English language arts results for multilingual language learners: 13% proficient, 72.7 points below standard 23-24 English language arts results for students with disabilities: 4% proficient, 83.9 points below standard	SWD: 13% proficient; 54.9 points below standard Black: 21% proficient; 75.9 points below standard Hispanic: 36% proficient; 42.1 points below standard		
1.2	SBAC Math: State testing results for Mathematics.	22-23 Math results for all students: 10% proficient, 17% district results 22-23 Math results for students qualifying as low-income students: 5% proficient, 15% district results 22-23 Math results for multilingual language learners: NA%	23-24 Math results for all students: 12% proficient, 95.4 points below standard 23-24 Math results for students qualifying as low-income students: 11% proficient, 110 points below standard	24-25 Math results for all students: 24% proficient, 76.1 points below standard SED: 23% proficient; 78.7 points below standard ML: 13% proficient; 86.2	Increase to LOW on the CA Dashboard, or an increase of + 10 points YoY.	Current proficiency is 24%, reflecting a +14 percentage point difference from the 22-23 baseline of 53%. The school is currently rated Medium (Yellow) on the CA Dashboard, exceeding the Year 3 target of increasing to Low

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		proficient, 5% district results (data not available, too few students) 22-23 Math for students with disabilities: NA% proficient, 6% district results (data not available, too few students) 95.4 points below standard	23-24 Math results for multilingual language learners: 8% proficient, 114.8 points below standard 23-24 Math results for students with disabilities: 4% proficient, 125 points below standard	points below standard SWD: 10.5% proficient; 85.9 points below standard Black: 15.8% proficient; 108.7 points below standard Hispanic: 27.4% proficient; 67.9 points below standard LTEL: Fewer than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy		status, with results improving 31.2 pts YoY. KIPP recognizes the need for continued growth and supporting subgroups more to ensure sustained year-over-year proficiency increases.
1.3	CAST Science: State testing for Science.	No data to report, school only served 6th graders during its first year of operation. Therefore, the school is not required to administer the CAST for students.	23-24 Science Results: *SED: socioeconomically disadvantaged ** ML: multilingual learner/English learner ***SWD: students with disabilities SED: 21% proficient	24-25 Science Results: *SED: socioeconomically disadvantaged ** ML: multilingual learner/English learner ***SWD: students with disabilities All students: 19% proficient	Status and performance on the CA Dashboard for CAST has not yet been established, but KIPP will strive for a Medium (Yellow) + status as we continue to support a growing science focus.	Current proficiency is 19%. There is no baseline data to compare; instead, this metric will be used as the baseline for next cycle's LCAP. The school currently does not have a performance indicator/color on the CA Dashboard.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			ML: NA% proficient - Fewer than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy SWD: NA% proficient - Fewer than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy	SED: 17% proficient ML: 8% proficient SWD: 13% proficient		
1.4	Multilingual Learner Reclassification Rate: The rate at which students who are classified as Multilingual Learners become proficient in the English Language, as measured by annual state and local assessments.	37.50% of students were reclassified as English proficient in the 23-24 school year.	5.13% (TK-4: 5.26%, 5-8: 5%) of students were reclassified as English proficient in the 24-25 school year.	13.2% of TK-4 students | 5-8: 30.6% (18.88% overall) were reclassified as English proficient in the 25-26 school year.	20% of Multilingual language learners will be reclassified annually.	18.9% of students were reclassified for the 25-26 SY, representing a 18.6% decline (-) from the baseline percentage of 37.5% in the 23-24 SY. However, the decline is skewed - as 2023-24 was KIPP's earlier years of launching the school, warranting examination of reclassification criteria and multilingual learner support to ensure students are progressing toward English proficiency.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.5	English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI): The rate at which English learners make progress toward English language proficiency.	NA - too few ML students (<10), data is not available	38.9% Multilingual learners were making progress towards English proficiency in the 23-24 school year.	43.1% Multilingual learners were making progress towards English proficiency in the 24-25 school year.	Achieve MEDIUM on the CA Dashboard.	As of the most current year, KIPP saw the ELPI (English Language Progress Indicator) sit at 43.1%, 4.2 percentage pts higher than the 2023-24 SY percentage of 38.9%. Note: No ML data was available in 2022-23, so the 23-24 SY has been leveraged instead. KIPP is on track to meet its Year 3 target outcome of achieving Medium (Yellow) for the English Language Progress Indicator on the CA Dashboard and remains committed to sustaining and building on this progress by continuing to strengthen ELD instruction, deepen teacher capacity around sheltered

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						instructional strategies, and ensure Multilingual Learners have the support they need to develop full English language proficiency, access rigorous coursework, and thrive academically and socially.

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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

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

During 2025-26, KIPP University Park K-8 implemented all planned actions under Goal 1 with fidelity across both the elementary and middle school campuses.

Curriculum implementation was a central and sustained focus across the full K-8 program throughout the year. At the elementary school, teachers in TK through second grade implemented CKLA as the core ELA curriculum, with weekly staff meeting time dedicated to lesson internalization, assessment data analysis, and grade-level curriculum planning through the school's structured Professional Development programming. Teachers in grades 3 through 4 implemented Fishtank ELA alongside the elementary school, with explicit professional development sessions focused on the purpose and structure of Fishtank units, the use of instructional resources, and group reading strategies differentiated by grade level. Across all elementary grades, Eureka Squared was implemented as the core mathematics curriculum, with weekly grade-level meetings dedicated to lesson internalization, module assessment data analysis, and response to student performance data. At the middle school, Fishtank ELA and Eureka Squared were implemented consistently across all grade levels, with a focus on establishing strong instructional platforms in 90% or more of classrooms by early fall and sustaining that standard throughout the year. Both schools used i-Ready as a mathematics assessment and progress monitoring tool, with beginning-of-year and middle-of-year data used to establish and refine intervention groups.

Support for multilingual learners was implemented across both campuses through Action 1.1 and Action 1.5. A KIPP administrator coordinated ELPAC administration and interim assessment monitoring to track student progress toward English language proficiency, and supported teachers in implementing sheltered instructional strategies for students at all levels of language development including Levels 1

through 4, reclassified students, and long-term English learners. The Title III multilingual learner instructional coach, supported through Action 1.5, conducted observations, facilitated data meetings with instructional coaches, and provided targeted coaching on multilingual learner instructional strategies across both campuses. At the middle school, an increased focus on Level 1 multilingual leaders created more opportunities for designated English language development and push-in ELA support for classes. The school's 2025-26 priorities also included increased Integrated ELD strategies including CKLA in the lower elementary grades and use of Academic Writing & Language scaffolds in the middle school. This was provided through direct instruction and resources in the classroom to deepen how language development is woven into content instruction. The California Community Schools Partnership grant supported additional targeted small group English language development for multilingual learners, extending the reach of Action 1.1 beyond the core program.

Special education services were delivered in full through the school's partnership with the El Dorado County SELPA. Education specialists supported students with mild support needs through a combination of push-in and pull-out services, and students with extensive support needs received services in a small group, self-contained program with targeted mainstreaming appropriate to each student's individualized program. At the middle school, a named priority for 2025-26 was strengthening the efficacy of 1:1 paraeducator support, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities established and observation and feedback cycles conducted throughout the year. Push-in academic support in mathematics and ELA classes serving students with specialized academic instruction was expanded, with middle school priorities calling for push-in fidelity. BCBA and school psychologists provided training and oversight for teachers supporting students with Behavior Intervention Plans, ensuring that specialized support was well coordinated across both campuses.

Professional development was implemented consistently throughout the year in alignment with Action 1.4, grounded in the school's commitment to sustained, intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused learning for all staff. Weekly staff meetings at the elementary school followed a structured scope and sequence alternating between curriculum internalization, data analysis of Fishtank and Eureka Squared assessments, and school culture and behavior response systems. The middle school prioritized teacher skill-building around establishing a strong platform for learning, academic monitoring and responding to student work, and assessment fidelity across Fishtank and Eureka Squared. Both campuses used bottoms-up goal setting at the start of the year to establish classroom-level academic growth targets in ELA and mathematics, with progress reviewed against those targets across the year. Assessment tools including EdTech supports for mathematics practice and i-Ready assessment data informed ongoing instructional adjustments across both campuses, consistent with Action 1.3. Data tools provided by the regional data team through Action 1.6 enabled regular reviews of grades, assignment completion, testing results, and attendance across all student groups.
Small group reading intervention was fully operational throughout the year through Action 1.7. At the middle school, students with IEPs who were performing below or well below grade level received targeted reading intervention, as did the highest-need general education students identified through beginning-of-year DIBELS scores or Student Support Team referrals. At the elementary school, DIBELS data was used beginning-of-year to plan intervention groups, with middle-of-year data reviewed in January staff meetings to refine placements and respond to student progress. The Transitional Kindergarten program was supported through Action 1.8, with dedicated expertise and professional development focused on early literacy and language development for the school's youngest learners.

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.

Budgeted expenditures for Goal 1 actions were implemented as planned during the 2025-26 school year with no substantive material differences between budgeted and estimated actual expenditures. Resources were allocated and spent in alignment with the intended actions and services described in this goal.

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

KIPP relies on state testing results as the primary indicators in determining the level of progress towards meeting this academic outcome goal. KIPP administered the SBAC test for both English Language Arts and Math as well as the required testing for multilingual learners through the ELPAC. The most recent results for the 2025 school year demonstrate that the majority of the metrics for success have been met and that local and interim results are continuing to trend positively.

The 2025 California Dashboard results in English Language Arts reflect a school making real and measurable year-over-year progress. All students earned a Yellow (Medium) color rating with a status of 48.4 points below standard, a 12.6-point improvement from the prior year result of 61.1 points below standard and a meaningful gain from the 2022-23 baseline of 57.8 points below standard. The Dashboard rates the school's ELA growth as Accelerated, confirming that students across the K-8 program are not simply holding position but actively closing the gap toward standard. This trajectory reflects the cumulative impact of Actions 1.1, 1.4, 1.5, and 1.7, including the school's investments in multilingual learner instructional support, the structured professional development scope and sequence built around CKLA and Fishtank curriculum internalization, the Title III consortium coaching model, and the targeted small group reading intervention structures supported at both campuses. Latinx students scored 42.1 points below standard in ELA, earning a Yellow rating and improving by 15.6 points from the prior year result of 57.7 points below standard. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students improved by 11.9 points to reach 50.8 points below standard, also earning a Yellow rating. Students with disabilities showed one of the strongest year-over-year gains in the LEA, improving by 29.0 points in ELA from 83.9 points below standard to 54.9 points below standard, earning a Yellow rating and reflecting the growing effectiveness of the push-in model and paraeducator support structures documented in the school's 2025-26 priorities. Multilingual learners scored 76.5 points below standard in ELA, earning a Red (Very Low) color rating, a result that declined modestly from the prior year and will remain a named priority in instructional planning and coaching for 2026-27. Black students scored 75.9 points below standard in ELA, a Red rating and a decline of 10.9 points from the prior year, a signal that targeted intervention and culturally responsive instructional supports must be strengthened for this student group specifically.

In Mathematics, all students earned a Yellow (Medium) color rating with a status of 76.1 points below standard, a 31.2-point improvement from the prior year result of 107.3 points below standard. The Dashboard rates Math growth as Accelerated. This is one of the largest single-year gains recorded across any indicator for this school, and reflects the sustained impact of Action 1.3 and Action 1.4, including the Eureka Squared curriculum implementation across all K-8 grades, the bottoms-up goal setting process, and the data-driven coaching cycles that have deepened teacher capacity to respond to student performance in real time. Latinx students improved by 33.1 points to reach 67.9 points below standard, earning a Yellow rating. Multilingual learners improved by 28.7 points in mathematics, reaching 86.2 points below standard with a Yellow rating. Students with disabilities improved by 39.1 points in mathematics, from 125.0 points below standard to 85.9 points below standard, earning a Yellow rating. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students improved by 31.3 points to reach 78.7 points below standard, also earning a Yellow rating. Black students scored 108.7 points below standard in mathematics, an Orange (Low) rating, though this represents a 10.0-point improvement from the prior year and reflects continued momentum that the school is committed to accelerating.

Long-term English learners scored 112.6 points below standard in mathematics, with no prior year comparison available due to insufficient data in earlier years, and will be a named focus in the school's 2026-27 intervention planning.

Multilingual learner progress on the English Language Progress Indicator reflects steady improvement. Active multilingual learners earned a Yellow (Medium) color rating in 2025, with 43.1% making progress toward English proficiency, up from 38.9% the prior year. This result places the school on track to meet its Year 3 target of achieving Medium status on the ELPI and reflects the direct impact of Actions 1.1 and 1.5, the coordinated work of the multilingual learner administrator and Title III instructional coach, the improved integrated ELD approaches at the middle school, and the consistent use of sheltered instructional strategies embedded in daily classroom practice across both campuses.

In Science, 2025 proficiency data shows 19% of all students meeting or exceeding standards, with socioeconomically disadvantaged students at 17%, multilingual learners at 8%, and students with disabilities at 13%. The school does not yet have an established Dashboard color for the science indicator given the relatively recent availability of this data for the grade levels served. These results will serve as an important baseline for the next LCAP cycle and inform the school's continued investment in science instruction across the K-8 program.

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

The goals, metrics, target outcomes, and actions under Goal 1 remain consistent with prior years and no substantive changes have been made for 2026-27. The school's continued investment in multilingual learner support through Actions 1.1 and 1.5, special education services through Action 1.2, personalized learning and EdTech tools through Action 1.3, professional development through Action 1.4, small group reading intervention through Action 1.7, and Transitional Kindergarten support through Action 1.8 reflects the priorities established at the start of this three-year cycle, and the year-over-year data demonstrates that these investments are producing positive and measurable results across multiple indicators. The ongoing implementation of Fishtank, Eureka Squared, and CKLA curricula will continue to deepen teacher mastery and student access to rigorous, standards-aligned instruction across all grade levels.
It should be noted that the increase of 250 students in the upcoming 2026-27 SY is reflected in the LCAP actions and allocations proportionally.

As 2026-27 represents the final year of the current three-year LCAP cycle, the school will use this year as an opportunity for deeper reflection and more active engagement with educational partners in preparation for setting goals for the next cycle. This includes intentional data review, community input, and stakeholder engagement processes that will inform the priorities, metrics, and actions of the 2027-28 LCAP and beyond.

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	Support for multilingual learners:	A KIPP administrator is trained to support the success of multilingual learner students (Levels 1-4, RFEP and LTELs) in meeting CA state standards, and to administer the ELPAC exam and other interim assessments in order to assess student progress in attaining proficiency in the English language and in finding success after reclassification. KIPP teachers are trained to use techniques and tools that maximized learning for multilingual learners at all points in their academic journey. As a recipient of the California Community Schools Partnership grant, the school has made additional investments in targeted, small group English development.	$453,196.33	Yes
1.2	Special education services:	KIPP offers an extensive special education program run by the Regional Support Office in partnership with the El Dorado County Charter SELPA and San Mateo SELPA. The special education department offers interventions for students with IEPs. Services and interventions include specialized academic instruction, language and speech therapy, adapted physical education, occupational therapy, counseling, psychological services, and behavior intervention services. Students with mild to moderate disabilities receive their services as a mix of push-in and pull-out support. Students with moderate to severe disabilities receive their services primarily in a small group, self-contained classroom with targeted mainstreaming appropriate to the student's individualized program. The program maintains a small student to staff ratio and uses a separate curriculum based on modified standards, CAPTAIN evidence-based practices, and community-based instruction. KIPP is committed to creating supportive and regionally-based classrooms for each grade band in order to make the program as accessible as possible. Medi-Cal: KIPP participates in the Medi-Cal Billing Options Program (BOP) and School-Based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (SMAA) to provide support to students with disabilities.	$1,478,981.90	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.3	Personalized learning and EdTech:	KIPP values innovation in the classroom and seeks to discover new methods of teaching students with diverse needs. By utilizing personalized learning approaches and assessments, KIPP can effectively monitor individual student progress and establish high expectations for achievement. To ensure the most accurate and meaningful engagement with these systems, a dedicated staff member provides support in the administration of EdTech tools. This individualized process, coupled with the reinforcement of high achievement standards, is designed to enhance student outcomes, engagement, and attendance. By tailoring the learning experience to meet the unique needs of each student, KIPP aims to create an environment that fosters academic success and encourages consistent participation in the educational process.	$163,693.70	No
1.4	Professional development:	KIPP provides high quality professional development for all teachers, based on individual goals, school goals, and the needs of the students based on recent and relevant data. KIPP teachers and staff receive professional development as it relates to the new Common Core State Standards and Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) in order for teachers to implement them into classrooms and support students at all levels of proficiency.	$290,439.19	Yes
1.5	Title III:	KIPP uses title III funds to support the salary of a title III consortium lead multilingual learner (ML) instructional coach. The duties of this position include the implementation of supplemental programming; training and facilitation of data meetings where teachers, APs, and instructional coaches review student data to drive instructional decisions and the effective implementation of ML instructional strategies; targeted coaching and feedback to schools and across schools through classroom observation; and identification of supplemental regional curricula and educational technology designed to improve outcomes for ML students (Levels 1-4, RFEP and LTELs) throughout all stages in their academic journey.	$24,712.21	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.6	Data analysis and visualization:	The Data team provides data tools and resources that enable school staff to regularly review critical data, including grades, assignment completion, testing results, culture data, and attendance. Regular data reviews are crucial in identifying early interventions and support for KIPP students, the majority of whom qualify as socio-economically disadvantaged.	$33,223.31	Yes
1.7	Small group reading focus:	KIPP focuses on improving reading proficiency through interventions that bring together small groups of students who are struggling with reading to receive targeted instruction and support. These interventions involve a teacher or reading specialist leading the group in engaging and interactive reading activities that are designed to build reading skills and improve comprehension.	$128,409.44	Yes
1.8	Transitional Kindergarten:	KIPP funds a position which serves to improve the transitional kindergarten experience for KIPP's youngest students. This role is responsible for building KIPP's learning vision and strategy, along with programming for elementary schools, with a focus on TK and early childhood and developing and delivering high quality professional development and training to increase the effectiveness of teachers, coaches and content specialists supporting TK students. Additionally, this role serves as the resident expert at KIPP by holding a deep knowledge of TK-2 content, common core standards, instructional materials and resources. KIPP recognizes the need to provide comprehensive supports and services for our socioeconomically disadvantaged students (and their families) from early learning TK/preschool programs in order to address and close the equity learning gap as they transition from TK to kindergarten and to help TK students develop and enhance their literacy skills, build their language (and subsequently, reading) comprehension skills.	$14,256.29	

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	All students and families will be engaged with the school community.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

To increase parent engagement by sustaining or improving the number of opportunities for parental involvement.
To increase school attendance rates and reduce chronic absenteeism rates.
To keep students engaged and excited about school, increasing graduation rates, and decreasing suspensions and expulsions.
To increase staff, student and family satisfaction with the school's climate.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	Family Engagement Opportunities: Number of scheduled events in the school year where families and/or the community are invited to participate. </br>	The school held 13 scheduled events in the 23-24 school year where families and/or the community were invited to participate.	The school held 20+ scheduled events in the 24-25 school year where families and/or the community were invited to participate.	The school held 10+ scheduled events in the 25-26 school year where families and/or the community were invited to participate.	KIPP will host eight (8) events or more a year where families and/or the community are invited to attend and participate.	The number of events is to be determined and will be finalized in time for the final LCAP draft in June. Current Difference from Baseline Data will be available then.
2.2	Family Engagement Satisfaction: Annual school culture	86% of KIPP families (TK-4: 100%; 5-8: 71%) were satisfied with the	83% (90% TK-4, 76% 5th-8th) of families would	KIPP collects this data during the spring as part of	75% of KIPP families are satisfied with the	Current Difference from Baseline will be updated once

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	survey results where families share their satisfaction level with the available opportunities for involvement at the school.</br>	parent participation opportunities available at the school in the 23-24 school year.	recommend KIPP to other families.	the Continue at KIPP Re-Enrollment process - this data will be entered in the Final LCAP by June.	participation opportunities available at the school.	we have data from the Continue at KIPP Re-Enrollment process - this data will be entered in the Final LCAP by June.
2.3	Student Average Daily Attendance: The average percent of students attending school daily.	KIPP reported 90.98% attendance for P2.	KIPP reported 91.24% attendance for P2.	KIPP reported 91.8% attendance for P1. P-2 data will be available after Spring and will be in the Final June LCAP.	95% average daily attendance or higher in the P2 reporting period.	Based on P1 data, KIPP is 2.7 percentage points below the 95% average daily attendance target. KIPP remains committed to strengthening its attendance response initiatives and tiered intervention strategies to improve student attendance and close this gap.
2.4	Student Chronic Absenteeism: Percent of students missing 10% or more of the enrolled school year.23-24 baseline data has been used to set 3 year goals.	SY: 23-24 KIPP tracked at 34% chronic absenteeism rate in the 23-24 school year for all students SED/FRL (low income students): 36% Black/African-American: 35%	SY: 24-25 KIPP is tracking at 35% chronic absenteeism rate in the current school year for all students *SED/FRL = socioeconomically disadvantaged/qua	SY: 25-26 KIPP is tracking at 28% chronic absenteeism rate in the 25-26 school year for all students SED/FRL (low income students): 25%	Reduce chronic absence to MEDIUM on the CA Dashboard, with 3% or greater reduction YoY	The school's chronic absenteeism rate of 28% is 6 percentage pts below the 2023-24 baseline (34%) and 35% pts higher YoY from the 24-25 SY.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		LatinX: 30% ML (multilingual learners): 26% SWD (students with disabilities): 39%	lifies for free reduced lunch **ML: multilingual learner/English learner ***SWD: students with disabilities or students with IEPS SED/FRL: 33% Black/African-American: 38% LatinX: 32% ML: 37% SWD: 37%	Black/African American: 36% LatinX: 26% ML (multilingual learners): 32% SWD (students with disabilities): 28%		Given last year's Very Low dashboard status and current CA rate, KIPP is not on track to meet its Year 3 target of reducing chronic absence to Medium on the CA Dashboard, especially for SED, LatinX, ML, and SWD.
2.5	Student Suspensions: The percent of students that have been suspended from school.	All students: 20%. Students that qualify as low-income: 22.2%. Multilingual learners: 0% Students with disabilities: 11.1%.	SY23-24 Suspension Rate: All students: 1.8%. Students that qualify as low-income: 7.3% Multilingual learners: 1.7% Students with disabilities: 11.6%	For the 2025-26 SY, KIPP's suspension rate is tracking at 2.5%. SY24-25 Suspension Rate: All students: 3.3% suspended at least one day (-3.2%) SED/FRL: 3.6% Black: 6.2% Hispanic: 2.6%	Reduce to MEDIUM on the CA Dashboard, with 4% or greater reduction YoY.	KIPP's CA Dashboard status for suspensions is currently Medium (Yellow), with 3.3% suspended at least one day. This is 16.7% lower than the baseline (20%) and 1.3% higher YoY than the 2023-24 SY rate of 1.8%. KIPP is on track to meeting its Year 3 desired outcomes of reducing to at

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
				Asian: Fewer than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy ML: 1.1% SWD/Has IEP: 2.7% LTEL: 8.3%		least Medium on the CA Dashboard. The school has seen substantial declines in suspensions compared to the baseline due to more integrated support services/resources and investments into school/student culture initiatives, though KIPP recognizes the need to support more subgroups, e.g. Black/African-American and SED/FRL students.
2.6	Student Expulsions: The percent of students that have been expelled from school.	KIPP's 22-23 expulsion rate was 0%.	KIPP's 23-24 expulsion rate was 0%.	KIPP's 24-25 expulsion rate was 0%.	1% or lower expulsion rate.	KIPP's expulsion rate sits at 0%, which is the same as the baseline rate. KIPP is on track to meeting its target for year 3 outcome, of having 1% or lower in expulsions.
2.7	Drop Out Rate: Students who dis-enroll and do not re-enroll in another public, private or	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA - school only serves TK-8, so no drop out data available.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	alternative program or school.					
2.8	School Safety: Annual school culture survey results: teachers and students share their perception of student's "emotional safety" at school.*Survey is anonymous and therefore demographic differentiation for responses is not possible to report.	In the 23-24 school year, 64% (TK-2: 73%, 3-8: 54%) of students surveyed responded positively in feeling a sense of emotional safety with school staff and peers. In the 23-24 school year, 62% of staff responded positively when asked about "having the resources to appropriately support our students' emotional and behavioral needs".	In the 24-25 school year, 86% of students surveyed responded positively in feeling a sense of emotional safety with school staff and peers. In the 24-25 school year, 50% of staff responded positively when asked about "having the resources to appropriately support our students' emotional and behavioral needs".	In the 25-26 school year, 79% of students surveyed responded positively in feeling a sense of emotional safety with school staff and peers. In the 25-26 school year, 50% of staff responded positively when asked about "having the resources to appropriately support our students' emotional and behavioral needs".	65% of students and staff respond positively when asked about "students feeling/being safe at school" on an annual survey.	Compared to the baseline, KIPP has seen a positive increase in student sentiment to the "Student Emotional Safety" domain, while positive teacher sentiment has declined. In the current school year, 50% of students surveyed responded positively in feeling a sense of emotional safety at school vs. 62% in the 23-24 baseline year, a decline of 12% overall. In the current school year, 67% of staff responded positively to feeling like the school has resources to appropriately support students' emotional and behavioral needs,

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						a 27% increase overall vs. the 23-24 baseline rate of 40%.
2.9	School Graduation Rate: Combined four and five-year graduation rate includes students who graduated in four-years or five-years with a traditional high school diploma in the selected academic year.	N/A - school only serves TK-8.	N/A - school only serves TK-8.	N/A - school only serves TK-8.	90% or greater of students graduate with a high school diploma.	N/A - school only serves TK-8.
2.10	The School Family Culture Index represents questions from the Family School Culture Survey that make up the family school culture experience. The index considers the percent of positive family responses across the following questions: The teachers have built strong relationships with my child. The school has a positive impact on my child's academic performance. How fairly is your child treated by staff?	In the 23-24 school year, 69% of KIPP families (TK-4: 82%; 5-8: 55%) have had a positive experience with the school. In the 23-24 school year, 70% of surveyed KIPP families indicated that "the teachers have built strong relationships with my child".	In the 24-25 school year, 50% of surveyed KIPP families have had a positive experience with the school. In the 24-25 school year, 76% (TK-4: 77%, 5-8: 76%) of surveyed KIPP families indicated that "the teachers have built strong relationships with my child".	The Family School Culture survey has been streamlined into the Continue at KIPP Process; data is collected in the springtime and will be incorporated into the Final LCAP when available.	75%+ of families have a positive experience with the school.	Current Difference from Baseline data analysis is not available at this point in time and will be incorporated into the Final LCAP when available.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	How stressed does your child feel about experiences related? *Survey is anonymous and therefore demographic differentiation for responses is not possible to report.					

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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

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

During 2025-26, KIPP University Park K-8 implemented all planned actions under Goal 2 with fidelity across both the elementary and middle school campuses.

Family involvement and support structures continued to provide multiple and meaningful opportunities for families to engage with the school community throughout the year, consistent with Action 2.1. The KIPP Family Council, serving as the School Site Council, and the Multilingual Learner Committee, serving as the English Language Advisory Committee, both met regularly with interpretation and translated materials available to ensure equitable access for all families. Families were invited to participate in LCAP meetings, sessions, Back to School Night, family conferences, and a calendar of schoolwide events throughout the year. Input gathered through small group exercises during family meetings, the LCAP survey, and the school culture survey was incorporated into school planning and goal refinement throughout the year. The school's Advocacy and Community Engagement team provided focused coaching on community outreach strategies and developed approaches to increase family participation, particularly for the school's multilingual learner and socioeconomically disadvantaged families. In 2025, 83% of families, including 90% of elementary families and 76% of middle school families, indicated they would recommend KIPP to other families, reflecting a strong base of family trust and connection across both campuses.

Communication resources were fully operational throughout the year, consistent with Action 2.3. Families maintained access to staff through email and the ParentSquare messaging system, supporting the school's commitment to personal, responsive, and proactive communication. Staff used these tools to provide live outreach to families of absent students and to communicate in families' home languages, including for attendance-related intervention conversations. The Advocacy and Community Engagement team supported targeted outreach to families who had not yet connected with the school community, helping to build the relationships that are foundational to sustained family engagement.

Attendance response systems were maintained throughout the year in alignment with Action 2.2. Dedicated staff coordinated the school's attendance improvement efforts, including live phone outreach to families of absent students, personalized written communication in families' home languages, and tiered intervention meetings for chronically absent students. The middle school's 2025-26 priorities established a clear expectation that 100% of chronically absent students would have documented tiered meetings or reasonable attempts recorded in the school's attendance tracker. Current year 2025-26 Galaxy data shows the school tracking at a combined chronic absenteeism rate of approximately 30% as of May 2026, with the elementary school at 32% and the middle school at 28%. While these figures represent meaningful improvement from the 2025 Dashboard result of 34.7%, chronic absenteeism remains a significant challenge that the school is actively working to address through its tiered intervention structures and Community Schools coordination. Average daily attendance for 2025-26 is tracking at 91.2% at the elementary school and 92.0% at the middle school, reflecting the impact of the school's proactive attendance systems across both campuses.

School climate and culture initiatives were implemented consistently across the year at both campuses, aligned with Action 2.4. Both schools grounded their behavioral approach in restorative practices, with the middle school establishing explicit success criteria requiring that 90% or more of classroom disruption office referrals be resolved restoratively with teacher involvement, and that 75% or more of student issues that do not meet office-level criteria be resolved through teacher intervention. The elementary school focused on finalizing systems for student culture including monthly assemblies, behavioral response protocols, and proactive circle practices. The Coordination of Services Team structure was operational at both campuses, enabling school leaders and teacher leaders to identify students with the most complex behavioral, attendance, and engagement needs and design targeted intervention plans collaboratively.

The mental health clinician provided on-site, culturally responsive, and trauma-informed mental health and socioemotional support to students throughout the year, consistent with Action 2.5. Services included individual and group counseling, behavioral supports, teacher coaching, and case management for students with the highest levels of need. Mental health clinician services are provided at no cost to students and families regardless of insurance status, reducing barriers to care for the school's socioeconomically disadvantaged student community. Community Schools implementation through Action 2.6 supported the school's Community and Collaborative Support Managers in connecting students and families with wraparound resources including food assistance, housing support, and other vital services, and in coordinating the school's Coordination of Services Team referral process across both campuses.

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.

Budgeted expenditures for Goal 2 actions were implemented as planned during the 2025-26 school year with no substantive material differences between budgeted and estimated actual expenditures. Resources were allocated and spent in alignment with the intended actions and services described in this goal.

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

KIPP relies on chronic absence and suspension indicators in determining the level of progress towards meeting this engagement outcome goal. The most recent California Dashboard results for 2025 and available local data for 2025-26 demonstrate that there are mixed results for

metrics in Goal 2. The school remains committed to seeing continued improvement in this critical area and has revised key actions and services in order to support.

Chronic absenteeism remains the school's most significant area of unmet need. The 2025 Dashboard shows an overall chronic absenteeism rate of 34.7% for all students, earning a Red (Very High) color rating, with the rate essentially unchanged from the prior year result of 34.5%. This result reflects the depth of the attendance challenge facing this school community, where families contend with significant socioeconomic barriers including transportation, housing instability, and employment constraints that affect consistent school attendance. Across subgroups in 2025, Black students reached 39.5% chronic absenteeism, a Red rating and a 7.2-percentage-point increase from the prior year result of 32.3%. Students with disabilities reached 37.0%, a Red rating and a 3.7-point increase from the prior year. Latinx students reached 32.0%, a Red rating, and multilingual learners reached 29.3%, also a Red rating. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students reached 35.2%, earning an Orange (High) rating, and showed the only meaningful year-over-year improvement among named subgroups, declining modestly from 35.7% the prior year. Current year 2025-26 internal data from Galaxy shows the school tracking at approximately 30% combined chronic absenteeism as of May 2026, a meaningful improvement from the 2025 Dashboard result that the school is actively building on. Grade-level data shows the elementary school tracking between 21% in fourth grade and 43% in Kindergarten, while the middle school ranges from 22% in eighth grade to 34% in fifth grade, confirming that attendance challenges are present across the full K-8 span and that the school's tiered response must be sustained and deepened in 2026-27. The investments in Actions 2.1 and 2.2, including the proactive family outreach model, personalized multilingual communication, and the tiered meeting protocol for chronically absent students, have contributed to the current year improvement and establish the foundation on which the school's strengthened 2026-27 attendance strategies will build.

Suspension data reflects meaningful and sustained progress over the course of this LCAP cycle. The 2025 Dashboard shows an overall suspension rate of 3.3%, earning a Yellow (Medium) color rating, and a 3.2-percentage-point reduction from the prior year rate of 6.5%. Latinx students earned a Green (Low) color rating at 2.6%, down from 4.4% the prior year. Multilingual learners earned a Green (Low) rating at 1.1%, down from 1.5% the prior year. Students with disabilities reached 2.7%, earning a Green (Low) rating and improving by 3.2 percentage points, reflecting the impact of Behavior Intervention Plan support and paraeducator training described in the school's 2025-26 priorities. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students reached 3.6%, a Yellow rating, improving by 3.4 points from 7.0% the prior year. Black students reached 6.2%, earning an Orange (High) color rating, though this represents a 6.1-percentage-point improvement from the prior year result of 12.3%, reflecting real momentum from the school's restorative practices investment that the school intends to sustain and accelerate. Current year 2025-26 internal data shows the school tracking at a suspension rate of 2.5%, continuing the downward trend from the 2025 Dashboard result and confirming that the school's behavioral response systems are producing consistent year-over-year improvement.

Student emotional safety results reflect growth over the LCAP cycle alongside an area of continued attention. In 2025-26, 79% of students reported feeling a sense of emotional safety at school, a meaningful improvement from the 64% result in the 2022-23 baseline year and a 15-percentage-point gain that speaks to the real shift in school culture built across this cycle. These results reflect the combined impact of Actions 2.1, 2.4, and 2.5, including the school's investment in restorative practices, explicit social-emotional learning instruction, mental health clinician services, and the relationship-building structures embedded in the school's daily routines at both campuses. Staff reporting that they have the resources to appropriately support students' emotional and behavioral needs remained at 50% in 2025-26, signaling that continued investment in adult capacity, coaching structures, and school culture systems is needed to ensure that staff feel as supported as students increasingly report feeling.

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

The most significant changes to Goal 2 for 2026-27 reflect the school's commitment to a more coordinated, evidence-based, and proactive approach to attendance and student support. The Coordination of Services Team model is being strengthened and standardized across both campuses, bringing greater consistency to how student needs are identified, tiered, and addressed. This includes clearer protocols for moving students across tiers of intervention, improved tracking of supports and outcomes at the individual student level, and the introduction of home and porch visits for students who are not attending regularly, providing school staff with a more personal and responsive way to identify and address barriers to attendance in partnership with families. Community Schools investments through Action 2.6 will further strengthen the school's capacity to connect students and families with wraparound resources. Medi-Cal mental health reimbursement structures are also being developed to sustain and expand the mental health clinician model over time and ensure this resource remains available to all students who need it.

These changes are directly informed by the chronic absenteeism data, which shows rates remaining significantly above target despite year-over-year improvement, and by the school's recognition that the barriers driving absence for many University Park families require a whole-child, whole-family response that goes beyond traditional attendance intervention.

The goals, metrics, and target outcomes under Goal 2 otherwise remain consistent with prior years, and the school's investment in family engagement, school culture, social-emotional learning, and restorative practices will be maintained at the same level of commitment in the final year of this LCAP cycle.
It should be noted that the increase of 250 students in the upcoming 2026-27 SY is reflected in the LCAP actions and allocations proportionally.

As 2026-27 represents the final year of the current three-year LCAP cycle, the school will use this year to engage educational partners more actively in reflecting on Goal 2 outcomes and informing the priorities and structures that will shape the engagement and climate goals of the next LCAP cycle.

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	Family involvement and support:	KIPP encourages families to be active members of the school by providing multiple opportunities for participation and engagement, such as the KIPP Family Association, LCAP meetings, and student productions to showcase talent. The Advocacy and Community Engagement (ACE) team works to disrupt racial and socioeconomic inequalities in educational access and	$110,866.12	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		outcomes by fostering an inclusive culture of family engagement, building a support network of community-based organizations, and empowering families to be advocates for their children and communities. The school's dedicated ACE team member provides focused coaching and feedback, collaborates on community outreach, and develops strategies to increase parent participation.		
2.2	Improve attendance:	The school administration recognizes the importance of improving regular attendance and has assigned dedicated staff to spearhead the effort. The school has implemented a series of "parents as partners" initiatives that aim to foster a sense of belonging and connection to the school among families. Key strategies include making live, personal phone calls to the family of any student who is absent, sending personalized mailed communications in families' home languages to encourage them to prioritize attendance, and scheduling intervention meetings between school staff and families to collaboratively address attendance concerns.	$53,059.61	Yes
2.3	Communication resources:	KIPP demonstrates a continued commitment to the "more time" model that supports struggling students by providing communication resources to facilitate interaction between teachers and students/families. KIPP staff are issued work cell phones, and students and families also have access to teachers through email and the ParentSquare messaging system. These resources allow for calls and other contact outside of the regular school day, enabling students/families to get the additional support needed to make progress on coursework and helping to build meaningful relationships between staff and families.	$75,265.51	Yes
2.4	Improving school climate:	Social emotional learning (SEL) is a critical component of KIPP's model that focuses on developing students' emotional intelligence, self-awareness, self-regulation, social awareness, and relationship skills. KIPP provides SEL instruction and opportunities for students to practice these skills, helping to further develop the resilience, empathy, and communication skills students need to thrive in school and beyond. Additionally, KIPP aims to create a positive and inclusive school culture	$146,235.17	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		where students feel safe, respected, and connected to their peers and teachers.		
2.5	Mental health clinician:	The mental health clinician plays a critical role in providing on-site culturally responsive and trauma-informed mental health and socioemotional support to students on campus. These clinicians offer a range of services, including psychotherapeutic interventions, behavioral supports, teacher coaching and mental health treatment services such as counseling, consultation, treatment, and case management for students receiving either Educationally Related Mental Health Services or general education counseling.	$123,086.90	Yes
2.6	Community Schools Implementation/CCSMs	KIPP has received implementation grant funding from the California Community Schools Partnership Program (CCSPP) as a part of Cohort 3 and will spend the next five years and efforts on implementing these initiatives that are specifically aligned with the Four Pillars of Community Schools - 1. Integrated Student Supports; 2. Expanded and Enriched; 3. Learning Time and Opportunities; 4. Collaborative Leadership and Practices. Research has shown that full-service community schools are an effective place-based strategy to meet the educational needs of high need students, especially students who come from historically underserved, impoverished communities. Community school interventions have shown to have a positive impact on various outcomes: academic achievement, high school graduation, attendance, and overall, improved wellbeing and a sense of self. Students and families also feel more supported by their community and more empowered; they're equipped with the right tools and resources needed to lead productive fulfilling lives. Regional Collaborative Care and Support Managers (CCSMs) will be hired with CCSPP funds to champion our whole child approach, boost student behavior health, and align resources across teams, schools, and community partners. CCSMs will serve as: the main drivers behind needs assessment work, project managers overseeing the implementation of community schools initiatives, resource managers, act as participants and	$57,221.36	

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		leaders of the coordination of services; and lastly, they will manage Coordination of Service referrals.		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	All students will have the spaces, resources and opportunities to achieve.	Maintenance of Progress Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Increase or maintain the rate of students who have access to common core aligned materials.
Increase or maintain the rate of teachers who feel they receive adequate professional development.
Increase or maintain the rate of students that have access to a full and rigorous course schedule.
Ensure that facilities are maintained and in good condition.
Increase or maintain the rate of teachers who are credentialed.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Teacher Resources: Annual teacher survey results: teacher satisfaction with access to current, standards-aligned instructional materials for their classrooms.	KIPP teachers reported 100% satisfaction with student's access to rigorous academic curriculum in the 23-24 school year.	KIPP teachers reported 94% satisfaction (TK-4: 100%, 5-8: 88%) with student's access to rigorous academic curriculum in the 24-25 school year.	KIPP teachers reported 97.6% satisfaction with students' access to rigorous academic curriculum in the 25-26 school year.	KIPP teachers report 75% or higher satisfaction with access to standards-aligned materials for their classrooms in an annual survey.	For the current school year, teacher satisfaction with students' access to rigorous academic curriculum is 97.6%. This is a 2.4% decrease from the 23-24 SY's baseline percentage of 100%.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						KIPP is on target for meeting its year 3 outcome goal of at least 75% satisfaction from teachers on providing access to rigorous academic curriculum to students.
3.2	Teacher Professional Development: Annual teacher survey results: teacher satisfaction with the school's commitment to improving teacher's instructional practice.	KIPP teachers reported 90% satisfaction with the school's commitment to improving their instructional practice in the 23-24 school year.	KIPP teachers reported 84% satisfaction with the school's commitment to improving their instructional practice in the 24-25 school year.	KIPP teachers reported 90% satisfaction with the school's commitment to improving their instructional practice in the 25-26 school year.	KIPP teachers report 75% or greater satisfaction with the school's commitment to improving their instructional practice.	For the most current school year, KIPP teachers reported 90% satisfaction with the school's commitment to improving their instructional practice. This is 0% higher than the 2023-24 SY baseline rate of 90%. KIPP is on track to meet its year 3 target outcome of having teachers report at least 75% or greater satisfaction with the school's commitment to improving their

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						instructional practice.
3.3	Access to Rigorous Courses: Percent of students that have access to a full and robust course schedule as defined by the state.	100% of students were enrolled in a broad and rigorous course schedule as defined by the state.	75% of students were enrolled in a broad and rigorous course schedule as defined by the state.	100% of students were enrolled in a broad and rigorous course schedule as defined by the state.	100% of students will have access to a full and robust course schedule as defined by the state.	KIPP's Course Access rate remains at 100%, unchanged from the baseline. All students across KIPP NorCal schools are enrolled in a broad and rigorous course schedule as defined by the state, with access to required subject areas including English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Science, Visual and Performing Arts, Physical Education, and Career and Technical Education. KIPP is committed to ensuring this access is equitable across all student subgroups, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						socioeconomically disadvantaged students, so that every student has the foundation needed to pursue college and career pathways.
3.4	Facilities Inspection Tool: Annual inspection of school facilities and major systems by the KIPP Facilities team.	KIPP received a rating of "Good" during an annual inspection of the school's major systems by the Real Estate team.	KIPP received a rating of "Good" during an annual inspection of the school's major systems by the Real Estate team.	KIPP received a rating of "Exemplary" during an annual inspection of the school's major systems by the Real Estate team.	Facilities inspection tool: Facility rating of "fair" or above during the annual inspection of school facilities and major systems by the KIPP Facilities Team.	KIPP's most recent rating is "Exemplary" which surpasses the baseline of "Good"- set during the 2022-23 SY. KIPP is on track to meet its Year 3 target outcome of at least rating "Fair" during a facilities inspection.
3.5	Teacher Credentialing: Status of teachers credentialed and teaching core classes.	100% of teachers are credentialed, 11% of teachers (2) are mis-assigned in the 23-24 school year.	100% of teachers are credentialed, 16% of teachers (5) are mis-assigned in the 24-25 school year.	100% of teachers are credentialed (licensed or permitted). 51% (24) of them hold clear credentials while 15% of teachers (7) are mis-assigned in the 25-26 school year.	100% of core teachers are credentialed and appropriately assigned.	While 100% of teachers hold a license or permit and are appropriately assigned, only 51% hold a clear credential, representing a 28-percentage-point decrease from the 2023–24 baseline of 79%. This reflects ongoing

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						credential processing timelines constraints and a teacher shortage affecting California schools statewide. KIPP addresses this through its Teaching Residency Program and Classified Employees Pathway, leveraging partnerships with institutions of higher education, credentialing team guidance, and tuition assistance to accelerate progress toward clear credential attainment.
3.6	A-G Course Certification: UC-approved high school courses.	N/A - school only serves TK-8	N/A - school only serves TK-8	N/A - school only serves TK-8	N/A - school only serves TK-8	N/A - school only serves TK-8

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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

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

During 2025-26, KIPP University Park K-8 implemented all planned actions under Goal 3 with fidelity across both the elementary and middle school campuses.

Teacher hiring, development, and retention structures were fully operational throughout the year. The school implemented a rigorous hiring process through Action 3.1, including screening, formal and informal interviews, performance tasks, curricular and materials review, teaching demonstrations, and reference checks. New teachers received dedicated professional development and onboarding support through Action 3.11, with Week 0 training focused on KIPP instructional strategies and real-time coaching during the Strong Start period to prepare new staff to support students from the first days of the school year. The middle school's 2025-26 priorities established explicit success criteria requiring that 90% or more of teachers demonstrate mastery of Strong Start Do Not Pass Go skills by September 30, and that any classroom falling below 75% of students on task for two or more consecutive weeks receive a structured support and remediation plan including practice clinics and increased leadership presence. Teacher retention strategies including in-house substitution stipends were maintained through Action 3.14, supporting continuity of learning for students across both campuses. The school's 401(k) contribution structure through Action 3.13 continued to support staff financial stability as part of the school's broader investment in teacher retention.

Professional development was implemented consistently throughout the year through Actions 3.2 and 3.5, grounded in the school's commitment to sustained, intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused learning for all staff. Coaching cycles were tied directly to curriculum internalization priorities at both campuses. At the elementary school, weekly staff meetings followed a structured scope and sequence that alternated between Fishtank and CKLA curriculum internalization, Eureka Squared data analysis, and school culture work, with grade-level teams meeting separately for curriculum-specific planning throughout the week. At the middle school, coaching focused on establishing and sustaining a strong platform for learning across classrooms, with clear expectations for academic monitoring and data-responsive instruction. Both campuses used regular student work analysis cycles, with the middle school establishing a goal that 90% or more of teachers would analyze student work with their coach at least once per week beginning by mid-October and that at least 50% of teachers would take documented action in response to student work analysis by January. The Teacher Pathways program through Action 3.3, including the Teaching Residency and Classified-to-Teacher Pathway, continued to support a diverse teacher pipeline by reducing financial barriers for credentialing candidates working toward full certification.

Instructional resources were provided to all teachers and students throughout the year. All students had access to Chromebooks through Action 3.9, enabling the use of EdTech tools and assessment platforms including i-Ready documented in Action 1.3. Weekly staff meetings at both campuses included data review to inform classroom instruction, and beginning in the spring, staff development incorporated a review of longer-term data trends to inform LCAP planning for the coming year. The regional data team provided data visualization tools and analysis support through Action 3.6 to enable regular reviews of student performance, attendance, and progress data across all student groups. All students had access to a full and rigorous course schedule across all required subject areas and grade levels, consistent with Action 3.7 and the school's Year 3 target of 100% course access. Enrichment opportunities were provided through Action 3.12, including before and after school activities, clubs, tutoring, sports, and other extracurricular programming that extend the school day and broaden

student access to learning experiences beyond the core academic program. Intersession opportunities during non-school days were also available to students throughout the year.

Facilities were maintained throughout the year consistent with Actions 3.6 and 3.7. The school received a rating of Exemplary during the most recent annual inspection of the school's major systems by the KIPP Real Estate team, surpassing the baseline rating of Good established in 2022-23 and exceeding the Year 3 target of a rating of Fair or above. The school received a clear Williams Act compliance visit confirming that all classrooms are staffed by appropriately assigned teachers, that students have access to sufficient instructional materials, and that facilities are safe and well maintained. Health and safety protocols were maintained through Action 3.10, and transportation resources were provided through Action 3.16 to reduce commute barriers for students with the highest needs. Arts and music programming was supported through Action 3.17, providing students across the K-8 program with equitable access to creative and performance experiences that support the whole child development that is central to KIPP University Park's vision. The Mental Health for All initiative through Action 3.15 provided staff with access to mental health resources and support throughout the year, reflecting the school's recognition that teacher well-being is foundational to a stable and effective school community.
Teacher credentialing reflects a workforce that is fully authorized and actively developing toward full certification. The 2025 California School Dashboard shows 60.6% of teachers holding a Clear credential. All teachers at KIPP University Park K-8 are credentialed and appropriately assigned. The proportion of teachers on Preliminary credentials reflects a teaching staff that includes a meaningful number of educators who are actively working through the state induction process toward Clear credential status, supported by the Teacher Pathways program and regional induction infrastructure. Preliminary credential holders are fully authorized to teach and are engaged in the structured professional learning required to complete the induction process. The school recognizes that improving its Clear credential rate is an area of continued investment and focus, and expects this rate to improve as teachers on Preliminary credentials complete induction requirements in the coming years.

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.

Budgeted expenditures for Goal 3 actions were implemented as planned during the 2025-26 school year with no substantive material differences between budgeted and estimated actual expenditures. Resources were allocated and spent in alignment with the intended actions and services described in this goal.

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

KIPP reviews multiple metrics to determine if the actions and services have been effective in meeting our resource goal. KIPP's largest financial investment is the instructional staff that are responsible for student learning. We believe that when teachers feel supported in their instructional practice and are aligned with the academic curriculum, teachers will be retained at a higher rate and result in more continuity for students and families year over year. The most recent results for 2025-26 demonstrate that the majority of the metrics for success have been met and are continuing to reflect strong teacher satisfaction with instructional resources and a sustained commitment to improving instructional practice. This important feedback will continue to be incorporated into strategic instructional planning, school scheduling, and hiring for the upcoming school year. KIPP recognizes that multiple teams need to support and plan in order to ensure that appropriate time is held for coaching and academic content internalization for teaching staff.

TNTP teacher satisfaction survey results for 2025-26 reflect a school where the foundational investments in curriculum and instructional support are taking hold in ways teachers experience directly. Teacher satisfaction with students' access to rigorous academic curriculum reached 97.6% in 2025-26, a result that is essentially at the 2022-23 baseline of 100% and well above the Year 3 target of 75% or higher. This result reflects the direct impact of Actions 3.4 and 3.5, specifically the school's curriculum adoption decisions including Fishtank ELA, Eureka Squared, and CKLA, which have given teachers across both campuses clearer access to standards-aligned instructional materials and stronger support in implementing them with fidelity. The consistency of this result across the LCAP cycle, including a 94% result in 2024-25 and a return to 97.6% in 2025-26, speaks to the durability of the school's curriculum investment and the degree to which teachers across TK through eighth grade feel equipped with the materials they need to serve students well.

Teacher satisfaction with the school's commitment to improving instructional practice reached 90% in 2025-26, matching the 2022-23 baseline and well above the Year 3 target of 75% or higher. After a year-over-year dip to 84% in 2024-25, this recovery to 90% is a meaningful signal that the school's investment in coaching structures, curriculum internalization, and professional development systems is resonating with teachers. The structured professional development scope and sequence at both campuses, which dedicates weekly meeting time to data analysis, lesson internalization, and grade-level curriculum planning, has created consistent and predictable opportunities for teachers to deepen their practice in ways directly connected to their classroom work. The middle school's explicit investment in student work analysis cycles, bottoms-up goal setting, and academic monitoring expectations has further strengthened the connection between coaching conversations and classroom outcomes. Together these results reflect the combined impact of Actions 3.2, 3.5, and 3.11, and position the school well as it enters the final year of this LCAP cycle.

All students had access to a full and rigorous course schedule across all required subject areas consistent with the Year 3 target of 100% course access, and the school's facilities received an Exemplary rating from the KIPP Real Estate inspection and a clear outcome from the Williams Act compliance visit. Teacher credentialing reflects a workforce in which 60.6% of teachers hold a Clear credential per the 2025 California School Dashboard. All teachers are credentialed and the school's continued investment in the Teacher Pathways program and regional induction support structures provides the primary pathway through which the Clear credential rate will improve over time as Preliminary credential holders complete induction requirements.

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

The goals, metrics, target outcomes, and actions under Goal 3 remain consistent with prior years and no substantive changes have been made for 2026-27. The school's continued investment in teacher quality, curriculum implementation, instructional coaching, enrichment, facilities, and the Teacher Pathways program will be maintained at the same level of commitment in the final year of this LCAP cycle. The TNTP survey results, particularly the recovery in teacher satisfaction with instructional practice support from 84% to 90%, point to the importance of sustaining the structured coaching and curriculum internalization systems that teachers are experiencing as directly useful to their practice. The continuity structures in Action 3.14 reflect the school's ongoing commitment to retaining the experienced teachers whose sustained presence is foundational to year-over-year student growth across both campuses.

It should be noted that the increase of 250 students in the upcoming 2026-27 SY is reflected in the LCAP actions and allocations proportionally.

As 2026-27 represents the final year of the current three-year LCAP cycle, the school will use this year to engage educational partners more actively in reflecting on Goal 3 outcomes and informing the priorities and structures that will shape the conditions of learning goals of the next LCAP cycle.

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	Hiring process:	KIPP implements a rigorous hiring process, which includes screening, formal and informal interviews, performance tasks, curricular and teacher materials review, teaching demonstrations, and reference checks by a dedicated team.	$104,232.36	Yes
3.2	Title I and II, improving academic outcomes:	KIPP teachers receive observation, coaching, and support from school leadership to improve outcomes for students, with a focus on students identified as needing additional interventions. This development and coaching is customized, supporting both the students and the teachers' growth and development.	$349,273.25	Yes
3.3	Teacher Pathways:	KIPP Public Schools strengthens educator development through California CTC grant-funded initiatives and CTC grant-funded initiatives and other local investments that eliminate financial barriers for diverse teaching candidates. Our Teaching Residency Program and Classified-to-Teacher Pathway provide comprehensive support including resident stipends, examination fees, and full credentialing costs. This funding extends to existing campus substitutes and teachers with non-credentialed or short-term credentials, creating advancement opportunities for all staff. KIPP has invested in dedicated personnel who guide participants through credential transitions while offering housing assistance and onboarding support. This ongoing funding initiative ensures all educators receive the necessary resources to deliver exceptional instruction, creating sustainable pathways	$86,488.02	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		that address teacher shortages while building a diverse, well-prepared teaching force committed to student success.		
3.4	Resources:	KIPP prioritized the need for excellent resources and provided teachers with the supplies, learning tools and technology that they needed to teach Common Core curriculum in the classroom successfully. To implement Common Core standards, KIPP has adopted the nationally rolled out, data-driven, evidence based OneKIPP initiative that includes more access to resources, materials, and templates available to the larger KIPP network. The annual selection process for these materials required a robust, in-depth review of student performance data by subgroup and included many learning modalities, including reading materials, text books, planners, classroom equipment, testing materials and more. Only materials that could meet the needs of all students were selected and used to bring all student subgroups to the highest level of achievement.	$528,664.46	No
3.5	More teacher time:	In an effort to close academic gaps, KIPP teachers spend more time instructing students than is required by the state. All teachers commit to this increased instructional time, and KIPP offers competitive teacher salaries to support this "more time" model.	$321,023.61	Yes
3.6	Custodial and facility staff:	KIPP prioritized creating a safe, clean and welcoming learning environment. KIPP continued strict cleaning and disinfecting procedures that were developed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic in alignment with CDC health and safety standards. KIPP invested in additional equipment including disinfectant wipes and hand washing station supplies, and in additional training for janitorial staff to ensure that high cleaning standards were met.	$345,051.05	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.7	Facilities and emergency procedures:	KIPP invested in the maintenance (repairs, security, rent, utilities) of school buildings to keep them at the standard that all students deserve. KIPP had procedures for emergencies to ensure the safety of students and staff -- including a comprehensive school safety plan that included fire, earthquake, intruder and infectious diseases procedures. Regular maintenance reviews ensured that issues were identified and addressed as quickly as possible.	$2,859,847.34	No
3.8	KIPP teachers:	KIPP is committed to providing high quality teachers by offering competitive teacher salaries that allow us to attract a capable and diverse staff. Teachers have the most direct, sustained contact with students. Research suggests that, among school-related factors, teachers matter most. When it comes to student performance on reading and math tests, a teacher is estimated to have two to three times the impact of any other school factor, including services, or facilities. Therefore, teachers who work at KIPP must have strong and positive recommendations, evidence of strong connections with students and their families, must be team players, flexible, smart, community service oriented, embody and exemplify the values of the school, and be committed to the vision and mission of KIPP.	$2,776,486.32	No
3.9	Personal learning technology devices:	KIPP is committed to continuing access to technology by providing each student with a Chromebook. These devices have been integrated into the learning experience, enabling students to research, collaborate, and create. They provide access to a wealth of educational resources, including online textbooks, interactive learning platforms, and educational applications.	$145,006.09	Yes
3.10	Health and safety:	KIPP’s focus has been on reducing risk by layering strategies that protect the health and safety of our students and staff.	$12,500.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		All students deserve healthy spaces where they can learn and thrive.		
3.11	Support for new teachers:	Teachers new to KIPP receive an additional week of dedicated professional development and onboarding to best prepare them to support students. Additional support includes high-quality dedicated coaching where new teachers have the opportunity to apply what they learned, gain hands-on experience in real classrooms, differentiated instruction, and working directly with diverse learners in a supervised context.	$77,045.67	Yes
3.12	Expanded enrichment opportunities:	KIPP schools serve as safe and accessible spaces for students by providing at least nine hours of on-campus opportunities daily. Morning on-campus activities may include access to breakfast, teacher and staff support, as well as early drop-off for busy families. After school activities may include enrichments, clubs, tutoring, sports, or other extracurricular activities. KIPP also provides intersession opportunities during non-school days.	$1,287,205.52	Yes
3.13	KIPP Contributions	The KIPP 401(k) Plan is designed to help KIPP employees save for the future by making 401(k) contributions on a tax-advantaged basis. For employees who make 401(k) salary deferral contributions, KIPP Northern California makes matching contributions to the account based on the 401(k) contributions each pay period, helping employees grow their money over time.	$208,731.19	Yes
3.14	Continuity of Learning:	KIPP employs direct financial strategies to support increased teacher retention such as increased stipends for teaching staff that provide in-house teaching substitution. This helps to promote the continuity of learning for students by fostering a stable teaching environment and addressing the challenges of teacher absences.	$113,902.93	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.15	Mental Health for All:	The mental health for all initiative focuses on supporting the mental health of KIPP staff through new holistic resources, supports, and training. Staff receive access to fast, dependable connections to mental health professionals for benefit-eligible staff and dependents, as well as a learning platform through Headspace 12 therapy sessions annually for benefit-eligible staff and dependents at no cost; opportunities for input through an organization-wide survey to inform how to better integrate mental health into KIPP's people culture strategy; role-based training for all leaders across the region; and the formation of a region-wide Mental Health Workgroup.	$6,423.00	Yes
3.16	Transportation Resources	In alignment with KIPP's "Every Seat, Every Day" priority which aims to reduce chronic absenteeism and promote attendance, KIPP offers transportation resources to students, especially our highest needs pupils, to help them get to school. Research from the Urban Institute's 2017 comprehensive study "On the Road to School: Helping Children Succeed by Addressing Transportation Barriers" demonstrates that transportation barriers significantly impact student attendance, with economically disadvantaged students missing up to three more days of school annually compared to their peers with reliable transportation. As shown by this evidence, transportation resources—including bus passes, dedicated school bus routes, and transportation vouchers—effectively encourage greater attendance and improved academic outcomes by alleviating family stresses over transportation logistics, particularly for working parents with scheduling constraints or limited vehicle access. These resources reduce inequitable commute barriers such as geographic isolation, promote enhanced student safety during daily travel, and create consistency in daily routines that benefit student well-being. By providing transportation support, students—especially those with higher needs—arrive more prepared and ready to learn, demonstrate increased participation in extracurricular and enrichment activities, and engage more fully in school activities and community forums. This initiative reinforces KIPP's commitment to the fundamental message that every student's presence, participation, and progress is valued in the school community.	$3,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.17	Arts and Music	KIPP allocates public funding for Arts and Music programs to provide equitable access for all students, especially those with limited prior exposure. Research by Rabkin and Redmond shows arts education positively impacts school engagement, academic achievement, motor skills, cognitive functioning, emotional wellbeing, and self-esteem. Through diverse creative outlets, students express, explore, experiment, and reflect. These programs directly support KIPP's mission of creating "joyful, academically excellent schools" that prepare students with skills and confidence for their chosen paths, while aligning with the "whole child" approach and the LCAP goal of academic achievement for all students. Specifically, Prop 28 funding enables arts and music programs that create joyful learning environments through creative expression and community celebrations. These programs foster academic excellence by enhancing critical thinking, pattern recognition, and problem-solving skills that transfer across subjects. Students develop crucial confidence through performances, collaborative projects, and the discipline of creative practice—skills essential for their chosen paths beyond KIPP. Arts education supports the "whole child" by nurturing social-emotional development, physical coordination, cultural awareness, and healthy emotional expression. Furthermore, these programs advance LCAP academic achievement goals through improved attendance, engagement, focus, and growth mindset, ensuring all students benefit equitably regardless of background.	$109,316.70	

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

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant
$$3,195,189.00	$$411,104

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
50.690%	0.000%	$0.00	50.690%

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

Required Descriptions

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.1	**Action:** Support for multilingual learners: **Need:** KIPP has a higher population of multilingual learners than the state of California and is exceeding the state's results for English Learner Progress (ELPI).	Multilingual learners may face unique challenges in the classroom, such as difficulty understanding instruction, limited English vocabulary, and cultural differences that may impact their learning experience. These challenges can hinder academic progress. By providing these additional supports, KIPP can help multilingual learners succeed academically and reach their full potential. This not only benefits the individual students but also contributes to the overall success of the school and the broader community.	ELPI and reclassification results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Scope: LEA-wide		
1.4	**Action:** Professional development: **Need:** KIPP's majority student population qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged. Recent state testing results (2022-23) for socio-economically disadvantaged only partially met the goal of exceeding the results of the authorizing district. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Teachers who participate in effective professional development programs gain new skills, knowledge, and strategies that help them better support students with the highest needs. For example, professional development provides teachers with training in culturally responsive practices, differentiated instruction, and strategies for working with students who have experienced trauma. This supports teachers in better understanding and meeting the needs of unique student experiences, and ultimately leading to improved academic achievement and better outcomes. KIPP is dedicated to seeing growth and will allocate dedicated time to professional development to improve results, as research indicates that sustained, intensive professional development focusing on specific instructional practices and content knowledge is associated with improved student achievement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Yoon et al., 2007). By allocating significantly more time to professional development compared to the district, with 10+ fully dedicated days for all teachers, KIPP demonstrates its investment in its teachers' continuous growth and improvement. This increased time allows for deeper exploration of effective teaching strategies, data analysis, and collaboration among educators, which in turn leads to better-equipped teachers who can more effectively meet the diverse needs of their students	State testing results - ELA and Mathematics with a focus on socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils.

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
		(Desimone, 2009). Given that the total number of professional development days is significantly higher than the district and the development approach is focused on KIPP's highest-need students, this action will contribute to increasing services to teachers and therefore improving academic achievement and engagement for the school's unduplicated students, such as those who are socioeconomically disadvantaged and/or multilingual learners.	
1.5	**Action:** Title III: **Need:** KIPP has a higher population of multilingual learners than the state of California and is exceeding the state's results for English Learner Progress (ELPI). **Scope:** LEA-wide	ELPI and reclassification results.	Research has shown that targeted professional development and coaching for teachers can significantly improve the effectiveness of instruction for multilingual learners (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Garet et al., 2001). By providing training and facilitating data meetings where teachers, APs, and instructional coaches review student data, the ML instructional coach enables data-driven instructional decisions and promotes the effective implementation of ML instructional strategies. This approach aligns with evidence-based practices that emphasize the importance of using 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
			to inform instruction and support student learning (Hamilton et al., 2009). Furthermore, the ML instructional coach's targeted coaching and feedback through classroom observations ensures that teachers receive individualized support to improve their practice, which has been shown to be an effective method for enhancing teacher quality and student outcomes (Joyce & Showers, 2002; Knight, 2007). The identification of supplemental regional curricula and educational technology designed specifically to improve outcomes for ML students further demonstrates KIPP's commitment to providing high-quality, evidence-based resources for student learning.
1.6	**Action:** Data analysis and visualization: **Need:** The majority of KIPP students qualify as socio-economically disadvantaged. According to a	By regularly reviewing critical data such as grades, testing results, and attendance, KIPP can identify early warning signs of academic struggles and provide targeted interventions. KIPP data demonstrates that socio-economically disadvantaged students meet more thresholds for	State testing results - ELA and Mathematics. Attendance and chronic absence results With a focus on

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
	report by the National Center for Education Statistics, these students are more likely to face academic challenges such as lower proficiency levels, higher dropout rates, and lower college enrollment rates than their higher-income peers. **Scope:** LEA-wide	intervention than all other students. These data analysis and visualization tools help school teams better understand a student's holistic experience at school, support increased identification of early and meaningful interventions, and improve the number of services to the school's unduplicated student population (students qualifying as socioeconomically disadvantaged).	socioeconomically disadvantaged students on both data results.
1.7	**Action:** Small group reading focus: **Need:** The literacy gaps in KIPP's most vulnerable populations, Black Student Learners, Multilingual Language Learners, and Student Learners with Disabilities, are the largest when compared to "all students." **Scope:** LEA-wide	Literacy Tier 1 instruction aims to address the gaps in word recognition in order to increase language comprehension and ultimately, reading comprehension. Research has consistently shown that explicit, systematic instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension strategies is effective for improving reading skills in all students, including those who are struggling readers (National Reading Panel, 2000; Foorman et al., 2016). By providing targeted small group instruction that focuses on these essential components of reading, KIPP is implementing evidence-based practices that have been shown to benefit all students, regardless of their background or learning needs. Furthermore, by ensuring that these support programs are culturally responsive and tailored to meet the unique needs of the school's student population, KIPP is addressing the importance of culturally relevant pedagogy in promoting academic success for all students (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2010). KIPP's daily focus on reading and additional opportunities to learn and practice are prioritized for students facing the widest learning gaps, ultimately increasing and improving services for the school's unduplicated student population	State testing results - ELA.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		(multilingual learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged, other subgroups identified by KIPP). However, these evidence-based practices and the emphasis on culturally responsive teaching also serve to benefit all students by creating a more inclusive and effective learning environment that supports the development of strong literacy skills.	
2.1	**Action:** Family involvement and support: **Need:** Increasing family involvement can have a significant positive impact on the academic achievement and social-emotional development of students who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged. When families are actively involved in their children's education, it can lead to improved academic performance, increased motivation, better attendance, increased engagement, and improved social-emotional well-being. By working together with families, schools can help create a more equitable and inclusive education system that greatly benefits the highest need students while also seeing improvement for all students. **Scope:** LEA-wide	The actions taken by KIPP to encourage family involvement have been specifically tailored to support families with additional needs, such as flexible and varied event times and opportunities, translated and accessible materials, and dedicated ACE staff. These actions increase and improve services for the school's unduplicated student population, which includes students who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged and multilingual learners. Family involvement helps create a supportive home environment that reinforces the importance of education, which helps children stay on track with their school work. When parents and family members are involved in their children's education, students feel more supported and encouraged to do well in school, which can help increase student engagement and motivation to succeed academically. Additionally, family involvement can help improve student attendance and foster positive social-emotional development. By providing these services on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP ensures that all students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, benefit from the positive outcomes associated with increased family involvement in education.	Family engagement opportunities, family engagement satisfaction survey results.
2.2	**Action:** Improve attendance:	The school takes a non-punitive, personal approach to build strong relationships and	Chronic absence and average daily attendance

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Need: While the school continues to make significant gains in reducing chronic absence, students that qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged are still chronically absent at higher rates than ALL students. Regular attendance is crucial for students to fully participate in classroom activities, engage with teachers and peers, and receive necessary academic and social-emotional support. **Scope:** LEA-wide	understand the unique circumstances of each family. These additional supports are intended to improve attendance for KIPP's highest needs students, and with this focus, the school anticipates improved attendance across all students. The increased opportunities and personal connections/touch points with families contribute to increasing services for the school's high unduplicated student population. By providing personalized support and building strong relationships with families, the school is implementing evidence-based practices that have been shown to improve attendance. A report by Attendance Works (2017) emphasized the importance of implementing multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) that provide targeted interventions for students with attendance challenges. The report also highlighted the effectiveness of strategies such as positive messaging, family engagement, and data-driven decision making in promoting regular attendance. By focusing on improving attendance for its highest-need students and providing these services on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP ensures that all students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, benefit from the positive outcomes associated with regular attendance.	rates with a focus on socioeconomically disadvantaged students.
2.3	**Action:** Communication resources: **Need:**	The accessible touchpoints between KIPP teachers and students/families provided through communication resources can improve students' engagement and motivation, leading to better academic outcomes. Research has shown that strong teacher-student relationships are	Family school culture index and student / teacher relationships results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	KIPP has seen promising results on the school culture index, which represents questions from the Family School Culture Survey that make up the student and family experience. While these results are currently positive, KIPP wants to continue to focus on activities that support connection due to the high number of students that qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged. Expanded learning time initiatives have demonstrated great promise in improving academic outcomes among students who are most likely to fall behind. Building positive relationships between teachers and students is crucial for creating a supportive and safe learning environment that encourages engagement and motivation. This is particularly important for students who may lack support at home or have experienced trauma or stress that may affect learning. **Scope:** LEA-wide	associated with increased student engagement, higher academic achievement, and better social-emotional outcomes (Roorda, Koomen, Spilt, & Oort, 2011). Furthermore, a meta-analysis by Hattie (2009) found that teacher-student relationships have a significant positive effect on student learning. Providing opportunities for extended learning time and facilitating communication between teachers and students/families is particularly beneficial for unduplicated student populations, such as those who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged. A report by the National Center on Time and Learning (2015) highlighted the effectiveness of expanded learning time programs in improving academic outcomes for disadvantaged students, noting that these programs can help close achievement gaps and promote educational equity. By offering communication resources and opportunities for extended learning time on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP ensures that all students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, have access to the support and resources they need to succeed academically. This approach is supported by research emphasizing the importance of providing comprehensive, schoolwide interventions to address the needs of struggling students (Borman, Hewes, Overman, & Brown, 2003; Sailor et al., 2006).	
2.4	**Action:** Improving school climate:	Social-emotional learning practices require a larger, whole-school initiative to truly support those who are most vulnerable, as all students, staff, and leaders participate in shared learning and actions,	Student suspension rates, with a focus on socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Need: Suspension rates remain higher for KIPP students that qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged students compared to “all KIPP students,” as reported on the CA Dashboard. Students who attend KIPP may face challenges including food scarcity, unstable living conditions, limited access to essential resources, and sometimes even severe trauma. Supporting a restorative approach to behavioral interventions and leveraging strong social-emotional instruction ensures KIPP is working with students and families to develop trust, empathy, and strong relationships that lead to better outcomes for students. **Scope:** LEA-wide	such as morning community circles, restorative practices, chants, and restorative attendance conferences. Research has consistently shown that SEL programs have a positive impact on students' academic performance, behavior, and mental health (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; Taylor, Oberle, Durlak, & Weissberg, 2017). A meta-analysis by Durlak et al. (2011) found that students who participated in SEL programs demonstrated significant improvements in social and emotional skills, attitudes, behavior, and academic performance compared to students who did not participate in such programs. SEL programs have been found to be particularly beneficial for students who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged and those who have experienced trauma (Jagers, Rivas-Drake, & Williams, 2019; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009). By providing SEL instruction and support on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP ensures that all students, particularly those who are most vulnerable, have access to the resources and support they need to develop essential social and emotional competencies. This approach aligns with research highlighting the importance of implementing comprehensive, schoolwide SEL initiatives to create a positive school climate and promote the well-being and success of all students (Elias et al., 1997; Greenberg et al., 2003).	
2.5	**Action:** Mental health clinician: **Need:**	Addressing poverty and providing mental health resources for students can help alleviate stressors and improve mental health, leading to better academic performance and overall well-being. The services provided by the mental health clinicians	Emotional safety and support of students survey results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	KIPP would like to see growth in the emotional safety and support of student survey results, which represents questions from the The New Teacher Project (TNTP). KIPP wants to continue to focus on activities that support connection to resources due to the high number of students that qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged. **Scope:** LEA-wide	are part of a larger multi-tiered system of support (MTSS), which offers specific interventions based on need. Research has shown that MTSS is an effective framework for addressing the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of all students, particularly those who face additional challenges (Averill & Rinaldi, 2011; Sugai & Horner, 2009). A study by Fazel, Hoagwood, Stephan, and Ford (2014) found that school-based mental health services can significantly improve academic outcomes and reduce emotional and behavioral problems among students, especially those from low-income families. Furthermore, research by Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, and Schellinger (2011) demonstrated that universal social and emotional learning programs, which are a key component of MTSS, can lead to significant improvements in students' social and emotional skills, attitudes, behavior, and academic performance. While all students will benefit from the implementation of an MTSS and the support of mental health clinicians, KIPP's students who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged may require higher tier interventions, which include services supported or coordinated by the mental health clinician. This targeted approach aligns with research emphasizing the importance of providing intensive, individualized support for students with the greatest needs (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006; Lane, Oakes, & Menzies, 2014). By providing these services on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP ensures that all students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, have access to the mental health support they need to thrive	

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
		academically and emotionally, ultimately increasing and improving services for the school's unduplicated student population.	
3.1	**Action:** Hiring process: **Need:** Research has consistently shown that teacher quality is one of the most important factors influencing student achievement, particularly for students that qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005). A study by Egalite, Kisida, and Winters (2015) found that students of color who were taught by teachers of the same race/ethnicity experienced positive effects on their academic achievement and attitudes towards school. This dedicated team supplements the traditional hiring process by focusing on diverse and equitable hiring practices, with goals to bring in staff that can best support high-needs students and increase the number of teaching staff who self-identify as people of color. **Scope:** LEA-wide	By implementing a rigorous hiring process that focuses on diverse and equitable hiring practices, KIPP is working to ensure that all students, particularly those who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged, have access to high-quality teachers who can best support their learning needs. Effective teachers are subject to robust screenings to ensure they will be successful working with KIPP communities to improve the quality of instruction for KIPP's unduplicated student population. This approach aligns with research emphasizing the importance of providing students that qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged with access to highly effective teachers and a diverse teaching workforce in order to promote educational equity and improve student outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 2015; Ingersoll & May, 2011). By providing these services on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP ensures that all students, regardless of their background, have the opportunity to learn from skilled and diverse educators who can help them achieve academic success.	Teacher credential data results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
3.2	**Action:** Title I and II, improving academic outcomes: **Need:** KIPP has seen promising results in teacher's experiences with their professional development, which represents questions from the The New Teacher Project (TNTP) survey. While these results are currently positive, KIPP wants to continue to focus on teacher development as we embark on the implementation of a new regional academic curriculum. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Through targeted professional development led by the school's leadership, effective, evidence-based educational strategies are taught and modeled to close the achievement gap and enable high-needs students to meet the state's challenging academic standards. Research has consistently shown that high-quality professional development can significantly improve teacher effectiveness and student achievement (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017; Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley, 2007). A meta-analysis by Kraft, Blazar, and Hogan (2018) found that teacher coaching had a positive effect on student achievement, with larger effects observed in studies that focused on specific subject areas and provided more intensive coaching. Research has highlighted the importance of teacher retention and continuity in promoting student success, particularly in high-needs schools (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013; Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016). By providing ongoing professional development opportunities and supporting a leadership pipeline, KIPP is working to build continuity in teaching and leadership for the school communities, which can contribute to improved student outcomes. Providing targeted development for teachers with these additional resources in order to attain higher academic achievement contributes to increasing and improving services for the school's unduplicated student population, particularly those who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged	Teacher professional development survey results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
3.5	**Action:** More teacher time: **Need:** Students who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged often face educational inequities and may require additional instructional time and support to close achievement gaps and stay engaged in school (Patall, Cooper, & Allen, 2010; Redd et al., 2012). KIPP has seen promising results in teacher's alignment with KIPP's academic approach, which represents questions from the The New Teacher Project (TNTP) survey. While these results are currently positive, KIPP would like to ensure that teachers remain engaged as we embark on a new regional curriculum. **Scope:** LEA-wide	More time initiatives have shown promise in improving academic outcomes among students who are most likely to fall behind. Research has demonstrated that increased instructional time can lead to improved student achievement, particularly for students from disadvantaged backgrounds (Battistin & Meroni, 2016; Figlio, Holden, & Ozek, 2018). By providing additional focused time, KIPP aims to support struggling students, engage them more fully, and reduce the likelihood of dropping out. This contributes to increasing services for the school's unduplicated student population. Offering competitive teacher salaries helps attract and retain high-quality educators, which is crucial for implementing effective extended learning time programs (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013). By providing these services on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP ensures that all students have access to the additional instructional time and support they need to succeed academically and stay engaged in school.	Teacher academic curriculum survey results. State testing results - ELA and Mathematics.
3.9	**Action:** Personal learning technology devices: **Need:** Families are surveyed about access to the internet at home and comfort with navigating technology in order to build technology fluency that prepares students and families for next-generation learning. Support of students and	KIPP maintains a 1:1 ratio for devices to ensure no student has a gap in access, and devices are available for at-home use if needed. Research shows that access to technology and digital tools can enhance learning, engagement, and achievement, particularly for disadvantaged students (Darling-Hammond et al., 2014; Zheng et al., 2016). Providing technology access and support is crucial for promoting educational equity and preparing students for success in a digital	Teacher academic curriculum survey results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	families during the COVID-19 crisis showed higher technology needs for KIPP's student population that qualifies as socioeconomically disadvantaged. **Scope:** LEA-wide	world (Warschauer et al., 2004). The continuation of robust technology supports serves to increase and improve services for KIPP's unduplicated student population, particularly those who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged. By providing these services on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP ensures all students have the tools and support they need to succeed in a technology-driven learning environment.	
3.11	**Action:** Support for new teachers: **Need:** New teacher development plays a crucial role in achieving success with students who may have higher learning needs. KIPP has seen promising results in teacher's experiences with their professional development, which represents questions from the The New Teacher Project (TNTP) survey. While these results are currently positive, KIPP wants to continue to focus on teacher development as we embark on the implementation of a new regional academic curriculum. **Scope:** LEA-wide	By investing in a new teacher development program, KIPP equips educators with the necessary knowledge, tools, and support to more effectively meet the needs of diverse learners. Research has shown that high-quality teacher induction and mentoring programs can improve teacher effectiveness, retention, and student achievement (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Schmidt, Young, Cassidy, Wang, & Laguarda, 2017). New teachers who undergo this development build a deeper understanding of the specific needs of their students, enabling them to create inclusive and engaging learning environments. Additional professional development and onboarding time to prepare new KIPP teaching staff serves to improve services for the school's unduplicated population, particularly those who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged and multilingual learners. By providing these services on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP ensures that all students, regardless of their background or learning needs, have access to well-prepared and supported teachers who can effectively facilitate their academic success.	Teacher professional development survey results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
3.12	**Action:** Expanded enrichment opportunities: **Need:** Students who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged may face challenges in accessing extracurricular activities or may not have a safe and supportive environment outside of school hours. These students may also benefit from additional learning opportunities and support to help close the achievement gap (Afterschool Alliance, 2016; Lauer et al., 2006). **Scope:** LEA-wide	Research conducted by the Afterschool Alliance (2016) showed that participation in after-school programs was associated with improved academic performance, particularly in reading and math. The study also found that students who participate in after-school programs are more likely to graduate high school and pursue post-secondary education. After-school programs provide a safe and supportive environment for students, particularly those who qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged and may not have access to extracurricular activities or face other challenges at home. By offering extended enrichment time, KIPP contributes to increasing (time) and improving (quality) services for the school's unduplicated student population. By providing these services on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP ensures that all students, regardless of their background or family resources, have access to a wide range of enriching activities and support that can foster their academic, social, and emotional development.	Family school culture index and emotional safety and support of students survey results.
3.13	**Action:** KIPP Contributions **Need:** During a period where many districts reduced roles, cut benefits, or other staff services, KIPP maintained normal hiring and return practices and has retained the discretionary 401(k) matching option at 100% of the 4% employee contribution. These employee	KIPP 401(k) matching contributions are supplemental and serve as a way to support and retain high-quality teaching talent in the competitive Bay Area market. Research has shown that teacher retention is crucial for promoting student achievement and creating a stable learning environment, particularly in schools serving high-needs populations (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Ingersoll, 2001). By offering competitive benefits and supporting teachers' financial well-being, KIPP aims to increase	Teacher retention data results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	services are intended to support teachers in their professional and personal endeavors while also aiming to retain quality teachers at higher rates year over year. High teacher turnover can disproportionately impact students with high needs, as they may experience a lack of continuity in their learning and development (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013; Simon & Johnson, 2015). **Scope:** LEA-wide	retention rates and ensure continuity of learning and development for students who are disproportionately impacted by high teacher turnover. This is especially important for KIPP schools, where the percentage of students with high needs is significantly higher than the state average. Studies have found that teacher turnover can negatively affect student achievement, with a more pronounced impact on students from disadvantaged backgrounds (Hanushek, Rivkin, & Schiman, 2016; Ronfeldt et al., 2013). By providing these services on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP is working to improve services for the school's unduplicated population by creating a more stable and supportive learning environment with experienced, committed teachers.	
3.14	**Action:** Continuity of Learning: **Need:** Teacher turnover can have a significant negative impact on student learning, particularly for students with high needs who may be more vulnerable to the disruptions caused by frequent changes in teaching staff (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013; Simon & Johnson, 2015). Additionally, the shortage of available substitute teachers during the pandemic has made it difficult for schools to ensure continuity of learning when regular teachers are absent (Kraft & Simon, 2020).	Teacher return bonuses serve as an effective strategy to enhance teacher retention rates and acknowledge the dedication and commitment of experienced teachers. Research has shown that financial incentives can be a powerful tool for retaining high-quality teachers, particularly in schools serving disadvantaged student populations (Clotfelter, Glennie, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2008; Springer, Swain, & Rodriguez, 2016). By offering bonuses to returning teachers, KIPP is working to create a stable and supportive working environment that reduces turnover rates and ensures continuity of learning for students. In-house teaching substitution, supported by increased stipends for teaching staff, provides important continuity for students when regular teachers are absent. This approach allows KIPP to	Teacher retention data results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Scope: LEA-wide	leverage the expertise of its existing teachers and maintain a sense of stability in the classroom, even when faced with the challenges of teacher absences and substitute shortages. Research has highlighted the importance of maintaining instructional continuity and minimizing disruptions to student learning (Miller, Murnane, & Willett, 2008; Sawchuk, 2021). These additional financial incentives are intended to retain quality teachers at higher rates year over year. Increasing retention at KIPP schools, where the percentage of students with high needs is significantly higher than the state average, will ensure continuity of learning and development for students who are disproportionately impacted by high teacher turnover, thereby improving services for the school's unduplicated population. By providing these services on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP is working to create a stable and supportive learning environment that promotes academic success for all students, particularly those with the greatest needs.	
3.15	**Action:** Mental Health for All: **Need:** KIPP's most valuable resource is its people. The work, while incredibly rewarding and impactful, is also demanding. The past few years have been particularly challenging and stressful while in recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic. Teacher well-being and mental health are crucial factors in promoting job satisfaction, retention, and ultimately, student	The mental health for all initiative services are intended to support teachers in their professional and personal endeavors while also aiming to retain quality teachers at higher rates year over year. Research has shown that teacher well-being and mental health are significant predictors of job satisfaction, commitment, and retention (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011). By providing comprehensive mental health resources and support, KIPP is working to create a positive and supportive work environment that promotes teacher well-being and reduces the risk of burnout.	Teacher retention data results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	success (Greenberg, Brown, & Abenavoli, 2016; McLean & Connor, 2015). Supporting teachers' mental health is especially important in schools serving high-needs populations, where the demands on educators may be greater (Herman, Hickmon-Rosa, & Reinke, 2018). **Scope:** LEA-wide	Increasing retention at KIPP schools, where the percentage of students with high needs is significantly higher than the state average, will ensure continuity of learning and development for students who are disproportionately impacted by high teacher turnover. Studies have found that teacher turnover can have a negative impact on student achievement, particularly in schools serving disadvantaged populations (Hanushek, Rivkin, & Schiman, 2016; Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013). By providing these mental health services and supports on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, KIPP is working to improve services for the school's unduplicated population by fostering a stable, supportive, and mentally healthy teaching staff. This approach aligns with research highlighting the importance of teacher well-being in promoting positive student outcomes and creating a nurturing learning environment (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Roeser, Skinner, Beers, & Jennings, 2012).	

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:** Support for multilingual learners: **Need:** KIPP has a higher population of multilingual learners than the state of California and is exceeding the state's results for English Learner Progress (ELPI). **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Multilingual learners may face unique challenges in the classroom, such as difficulty understanding instruction, limited English vocabulary, and cultural differences that may impact their learning experience. These challenges can hinder academic progress. Providing these additional, targeted supports for multilingual learner students in order to attain higher academic achievement has contributed to improving services for the school's unduplicated student population (multilingual learners).	ELPI and reclassification results.
1.5	**Action:** Title III: **Need:** KIPP has a higher population of multilingual learners than the state of California and is exceeding the state's results for English Learner Progress (ELPI). **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Research has shown that targeted professional development and coaching for teachers can significantly improve the effectiveness of instruction for multilingual learners (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Garet et al., 2001). By providing training and facilitating data meetings where teachers, APs, and instructional coaches review student data, the ML instructional coach enables data-driven instructional decisions and promotes the effective implementation of ML instructional strategies. This approach aligns with evidence-based practices that emphasize the importance of using data to inform instruction and support student learning (Hamilton et al., 2009). Furthermore, the ML instructional coach's targeted coaching and feedback through classroom	ELPI and reclassification results.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		observations ensures that teachers receive individualized support to improve their practice, which has been shown to be an effective method for enhancing teacher quality and student outcomes (Joyce & Showers, 2002; Knight, 2007). The identification of supplemental regional curricula and educational technology designed specifically to improve outcomes for ML students further demonstrates KIPP's commitment to providing high-quality, evidence-based resources for student learning.	
3.16	**Action:** Transportation Resources **Need:** KIPP has identified significant transportation barriers that disproportionately impact unduplicated students, including low-income families, English learners, and foster youth, creating inequitable access to consistent school attendance and educational opportunities. Data analysis reveals that students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds experience higher rates of chronic absenteeism and tardiness directly correlated with transportation challenges, including lack of reliable family vehicles, inability to afford public transportation costs, geographic distance from school sites, and parents' work schedules that conflict with school start and end times. Many unduplicated families rely on complex transportation arrangements involving multiple family members, public transit systems with limited routes and scheduling, or walking long	Research from the Urban Institute's 2017 comprehensive study "On the Road to School: Helping Children Succeed by Addressing Transportation Barriers" demonstrates that transportation barriers significantly impact student attendance, with economically disadvantaged students missing up to three more days of school annually compared to their peers with reliable transportation. As shown by this evidence, transportation resources—including bus passes, dedicated school bus routes, and transportation vouchers—effectively encourage greater attendance and improved academic outcomes by alleviating family stresses over transportation logistics, particularly for working parents with scheduling constraints or limited vehicle access. These resources reduce inequitable commute barriers such as geographic isolation, promote enhanced student safety during daily travel, and create consistency in daily routines that benefit student well-being. By providing transportation support, students—especially those with higher needs—arrive more prepared and ready to learn, demonstrate increased participation in extracurricular and enrichment activities, and	Chronic Absenteeism - Transportation resources directly support improved outcomes in chronic absenteeism rates by removing daily barriers that prevent consistent school attendance, particularly for low-income families who may lack reliable vehicles or face economic hardships that affect transportation access. Enhanced Average Daily Attendance (ADA) results from reduced transportation-related absences, as students with reliable school transportation demonstrate more consistent attendance patterns and fewer tardies that can escalate into chronic absence issues.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	distances that create safety concerns and weather-related attendance barriers. English learner families often face additional challenges navigating public transportation systems, while foster youth may experience frequent placement changes that disrupt established transportation routines. School-based needs assessments and family surveys consistently identify transportation as a primary barrier preventing regular attendance, with families reporting that transportation costs strain already limited household budgets and create stress that impacts student readiness to learn. These transportation inequities directly contribute to achievement gaps and limit unduplicated students' access to the full educational program, including after-school programming, extracurricular activities, and family engagement opportunities that support academic success and school connectedness. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	engage more fully in school activities and community forums. This initiative reinforces KIPP's commitment to the fundamental message that every student's presence, participation, and progress is valued in the school 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.

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		18.5
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students		13.1

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	$6,303,372	$3,195,189.00	50.690%	0.000%	50.690%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$9,468,710.45	$2,694,148.64	$0.00	$373,985.46	$12,536,844.55	$7,765,758.38	$4,771,086.17

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	Support for multilingual learners:	English Learners	Yes	LEA-wide Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		$453,196.33	$0.00	$453,196.33		$0.00	$0.00	$453,196.33	
1	1.2	Special education services:	Students with Disabilities	No			All Schools		$1,478,981.90	$0.00	$1,478,981.90		$0.00	$0.00	$1,478,981.90	
1	1.3	Personalized learning and EdTech:	All	No			All Schools		$41,593.26	$122,100.44	$163,693.70		$0.00	$0.00	$163,693.70	
1	1.4	Professional development:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$189,552.83	$100,886.36	$229,295.80	$61,143.39	$0.00	$0.00	$290,439.19	
1	1.5	Title III:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$8,235.44	$16,476.77			$0.00	$24,712.21	$24,712.21	
1	1.6	Data analysis and visualization:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$33,223.31	$0.00	$33,223.31		$0.00	$0.00	$33,223.31	
1	1.7	Small group reading focus:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$128,409.44	$0.00		$128,409.44	$0.00	$0.00	$128,409.44	
1	1.8	Transitional Kindergarten:							$0.00	$14,256.29	$14,256.29				$14,256.29	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
2	2.1	Family involvement and support:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			$110,866.12	$0.00	$110,866.12		$0.00	$0.00	$110,866.12	
2	2.2	Improve attendance:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$53,059.61	$0.00	$53,059.61		$0.00	$0.00	$53,059.61	
2	2.3	Communication resources:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$75,265.51	$75,265.51		$0.00	$0.00	$75,265.51	
2	2.4	Improving school climate:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$146,235.17	$0.00	$72,337.39	$73,897.78	$0.00	$0.00	$146,235.17	
2	2.5	Mental health clinician:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$114,086.90	$9,000.00	$114,086.90	$9,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$123,086.90	
2	2.6	Community Schools Implementation/CCSMs							$0.00	$57,221.36		$57,221.36			$57,221.36	
3	3.1	Hiring process:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$104,232.36	$0.00	$104,232.36		$0.00	$0.00	$104,232.36	
3	3.2	Title I and II, improving academic outcomes:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$349,273.25	$0.00			$0.00	$349,273.25	$349,273.25	
3	3.3	Teacher Pathways:	All	No			All Schools		$57,571.66	$28,916.36	$86,488.02		$0.00	$0.00	$86,488.02	
3	3.4	Resources:	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$528,664.46	$528,664.46		$0.00	$0.00	$528,664.46	
3	3.5	More teacher time:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$321,023.61	$0.00	$321,023.61		$0.00	$0.00	$321,023.61	
3	3.6	Custodial and facility staff:	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$345,051.05	$345,051.05		$0.00	$0.00	$345,051.05	
3	3.7	Facilities and emergency procedures:	All	No			All Schools		$36,696.66	$2,823,150.68	$1,941,892.89	$917,954.45	$0.00	$0.00	$2,859,847.34	
3	3.8	KIPP teachers:	All	No			All Schools		$2,776,486.32	$0.00	$2,776,486.32		$0.00	$0.00	$2,776,486.32	
3	3.9	Personal learning technology devices:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth	All Schools		$15,994.51	$129,011.58	$145,006.09		$0.00	$0.00	$145,006.09	

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
						Low Income										
3	3.10	Health and safety:	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$12,500.00	$12,500.00		$0.00	$0.00	$12,500.00	
3	3.11	Support for new teachers:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$77,045.67	$0.00	$77,045.67		$0.00	$0.00	$77,045.67	
3	3.12	Expanded enrichment opportunities:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$897,248.21	$389,957.31		$1,287,205.52	$0.00	$0.00	$1,287,205.52	
3	3.13	KIPP Contributions	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$208,731.19	$0.00	$208,731.19		$0.00	$0.00	$208,731.19	
3	3.14	Continuity of Learning:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$4,697.93	$109,205.00	$113,902.93		$0.00	$0.00	$113,902.93	
3	3.15	Mental Health for All:	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$6,423.00	$6,423.00		$0.00	$0.00	$6,423.00	
3	3.16	Transportation Resources	Low Income	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Low Income			$0.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00				$3,000.00	
3	3.17	Arts and Music							$109,316.70	$0.00		$109,316.70			$109,316.70	
4	4.1		English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$50,000.00	$0.00		$50,000.00			$50,000.00	

2026-27 Contributing Actions Table

1. Projected LCFF Base Grant	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)	Totals by Type	Total LCFF Funds
$6,303,372	$3,195,189.00	50.690%	0.000%	50.690%	$2,120,695.82	0.000%	33.644 %	**Total:**	$2,120,695.82
								LEA-wide Total:	$2,117,695.82
								Limited Total:	$456,196.33
								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**	Support for multilingual learners:	Yes	LEA-wide Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$453,196.33	
1	**1.4**	Professional development:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$229,295.80	
1	**1.5**	Title III:	Yes	LEA-wide Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		
1	**1.6**	Data analysis and visualization:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$33,223.31	
1	**1.7**	Small group reading focus:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		
2	**2.1**	Family involvement and support:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income		$110,866.12	

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
2	2.2	Improve attendance:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$53,059.61	
2	2.3	Communication resources:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$75,265.51	
2	2.4	Improving school climate:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$72,337.39	
2	2.5	Mental health clinician:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$114,086.90	
3	3.1	Hiring process:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$104,232.36	
3	3.2	Title I and II, improving academic outcomes:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		
3	3.5	More teacher time:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$321,023.61	
3	3.9	Personal learning technology devices:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$145,006.09	
3	3.11	Support for new teachers:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$77,045.67	
3	3.12	Expanded enrichment opportunities:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		
3	3.13	KIPP Contributions	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$208,731.19	
3	3.14	Continuity of Learning:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$113,902.93	
3	3.15	Mental Health for All:	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$6,423.00	

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 (%)
3	3.16	Transportation Resources	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Low Income		$3,000.00	
4	4.1				English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		

2025-26 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$11,474,334.81	$11,775,903.21

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**	Support for multilingual learners:	Yes	$439,686.45	$440,131.97
1	**1.2**	Special education services:	No	$1,254,041.03	$1,385,054.17
1	**1.3**	Personalized learning and EdTech:	No	$132,952.50	$98,473.22
1	**1.4**	Professional development:	Yes	$243,830.74	$212,906.88
1	**1.5**	Title III:	Yes	$19,780.97	$12,298.00
1	**1.6**	Data analysis and visualization:	Yes	$24,914.03	$22,021.63
1	**1.7**	Small group reading focus:	Yes	$116,198.65	$82,174.20
1	**1.8**	Transitional Kindergarten:			
2	**2.1**	Family involvement and support:	Yes	$103,328.35	$105,142.48
2	**2.2**	Improve attendance:	Yes	$27,233.18	$52,019.22
2	**2.3**	Communication resources:	Yes	$58,477.34	$57,344.10

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	2.4	Improving school climate:	Yes	$130,151.96	$128,401.04
2	2.5	Mental health clinician:	Yes	$121,248.88	$120,849.90
2	2.6	Community Schools:		$56,100.11	$56,100.11
3	3.1	Hiring process:	Yes	$77,026.20	$70,601.54
3	3.2	Title I and II, improving academic outcomes:	Yes	$281,522.01	$211,823.00
3	3.3	Teacher Pathways:	No	$227,925.46	$191,149.58
3	3.4	Resources:	No	$633,534.60	$665,936.92
3	3.5	More teacher time:	Yes	$290,496.62	$248,131.42
3	3.6	Custodial and facility staff:	No	$304,808.31	$307,705.08
3	3.7	Facilities and emergency procedures:	No	$2,638,689.28	$2,673,812.42
3	3.8	KIPP teachers:	No	$2,509,198.43	$2,088,097.60
3	3.9	Personal learning technology devices:	Yes	$197,364.91	$184,631.45
3	3.10	Health and safety:	No	$12,750.00	$20,509.00
3	3.11	Support for new teachers:	Yes	$69,719.19	$49,304.52

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
3	**3.12**	Expanded enrichment opportunities:	Yes	$1,159,234.00	$968,051.19
3	**3.13**	KIPP Contributions	Yes	$189,623.76	$169,153.35
3	**3.14**	Continuity of Learning:	Yes	$19,328.37	$1,007,166.22
3	**3.15**	Mental Health for All:	Yes	$5,097.00	$5,097.00
3	**3.16**	Transportation Resources	Yes	$7,000.00	$2,305.00
3	**3.17**	Arts and Music		$73,072.48	$139,511.00
4	**4.1**	Equity Multiplier Funding	Yes	$50,000.00	

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)
	$1,616,010.10	$2,481,658.74	($865,648.64)	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	Support for multilingual learners:	Yes	$202,318.61	$202,635.71		
1	1.4	Professional development:	Yes	$184,220.74	$141,393.20		
1	1.5	Title III:	Yes				
1	1.6	Data analysis and visualization:	Yes	$24,914.03	$22,021.63		
1	1.7	Small group reading focus:	Yes				
2	2.1	Family involvement and support:	Yes	$103,328.35	$105,142.48		
2	2.2	Improve attendance:	Yes	$27,233.18	$52,019.22		
2	2.3	Communication resources:	Yes	$58,477.34	$57,344.10		
2	2.4	Improving school climate:	Yes	$54,612.92	$52,862.00		
2	2.5	Mental health clinician:	Yes	$112,248.88	$111,849.90		
3	3.1	Hiring process:	Yes	$77,026.20	$70,601.54		
3	3.2	Title I and II, improving academic outcomes:	Yes				
3	3.5	More teacher time:	Yes	$290,496.62	$248,131.42		

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
3	3.9	Personal learning technology devices:	Yes	$197,364.91	$184,631.45		
3	3.11	Support for new teachers:	Yes	$69,719.19	$49,304.52		
3	3.12	Expanded enrichment opportunities:	Yes				
3	3.13	KIPP Contributions	Yes	$189,623.76	$169,153.35		
3	3.14	Continuity of Learning:	Yes	$19,328.37	$1,007,166.22		
3	3.15	Mental Health for All:	Yes	$5,097.00	$5,097.00		
3	3.16	Transportation Resources	Yes		$2,305.00		
4	4.1	Equity Multiplier Funding	Yes				

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)
			0.000%	$2,481,658.74	0.000%	0.000%	$0.00	0.000%

Local Control and Accountability Plan Instructions

Plan Summary

Engaging Educational Partners

Goals and Actions

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

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

Introduction and Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Plan Summary

Purpose

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

Requirements and Instructions

General Information

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

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

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

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

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

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

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

Schools Identified

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

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

Support for Identified Schools

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

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

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

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

Engaging Educational Partners

Purpose

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

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

Requirements

Requirements

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

- Teachers,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Respond to the prompts as follows:

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Educational Partners

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

Process for Engagement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Goals and Actions

Purpose

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

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

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

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

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

Requirement to Address the LCFF State Priorities

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

Respond to the following prompts, as applicable:

Focus Goal(s)

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

Description

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

Focus goals for Equity Multiplier schoolsites must address the following:

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

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

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

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

Broad Goal

Description

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

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Maintenance of Progress Goal

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Measuring and Reporting Results:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Metric #

- Enter the metric number.

Metric

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

Baseline

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

Year 1 Outcome

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

Year 2 Outcome

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

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

Target for Year 3 Outcome

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

Current Difference from Baseline

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

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

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

Goal Analysis:

Enter the LCAP Year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actions:

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

Action #

- Enter the action number.

Title

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

Description

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

Total Funds

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

Contributing

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

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

Required Actions

For English Learners and Long-Term English Learners

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

For Technical Assistance

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

For Lowest Performing Dashboard Indicators

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

For LEAs With Unexpended LREBG Funds

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

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

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

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

Purpose

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

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

Statutory Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

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

For School Districts Only

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

Complete the tables as follows:

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants

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

Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover — Percentage

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

LCFF Carryover — Dollar

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

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

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

Required Descriptions:

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

Limited Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

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

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

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

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

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

Provide the following descriptions, as applicable to the LEA:

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

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

Action Tables

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

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

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

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

Total Planned Expenditures Table

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Annual Update Table

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

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

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

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

Calculations in the Action Tables

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

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

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

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

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

California Department of Education
November 2024

KIPP University Park

ELEMENTARY | MIDDLE

2026-27 Local Performance Indicator Self-Reflection

Local Educational Agency (LEA)	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
KIPP University Park K-8	Andrea Francis and Nicole LeBlanc KIPP University Park K-8 School Leaders	opsadmin@kippnorcal.org 510-465-5477

Introduction

The California State Board of Education (SBE) approved standards for the local indicators that support a local educational agency (LEA) in measuring and reporting progress within the appropriate priority area.

This template is intended as a drafting tool and based on the Local Performance Indicator Quick Guide published by CDE in January 2024.

Performance Standards

The approved performance standards require an LEA to:

- Annually measure its progress in meeting the requirements of the specific Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) priority.
- Report the results as part of a non-consent item at the same public meeting of the local governing board/body at which the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) is adopted.
- Report results to the public through the Dashboard utilizing the SBE-adopted self-reflection tools for each local indicator.

This Quick Guide identifies the approved standards and self-reflection tools that an LEA will use to report its progress on the local indicators.

Local Indicators

The local indicators address the following state priority areas:

Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities (LCFF Priority 1)

LEAs will provide the information below:

- Number/percentage of students without access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home

- Number of identified instances where facilities do not meet the “good repair” standard (including deficiencies and extreme deficiencies)

Note: The requested information are all data elements that are currently required as part of the School Accountability Report Card (SARC).

Note: LEAs are required to report the following to their local governing board/body in conjunction with the adoption of the LCAP:

- The LEA’s Teacher Assignment Monitoring and Outcome data available at https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/tamo.asp.

- The number/percentage of students without access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home, and

- The number of identified instances where facilities do not meet the “good repair” standard (including deficiencies and extreme deficiencies)

Implementation of State Academic Standards (LCFF Priority 2)

The LEA annually measures its progress implementing state academic standards; the LEA then reports the results to its local governing board/body at the same public meeting at which the LCAP is adopted and reports to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

Parent and Family Engagement (LCFF Priority 3)

This measure addresses Parent and Family Engagement, including how an LEA builds relationships between school staff and families, builds partnerships for student outcomes and seeks input for decision-making.

LEAs report progress of how they have sought input from parents in decision-making and promoted parent participation in programs to its local governing board or body using the SBE-adopted self-reflection tool for Priority 3 at the same public meeting at which the LEA adopts its LCAP, and reports to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

School Climate (LCFF Priority 6)

The LEA administers an annual local climate survey that captures a valid measure of student perceptions of school safety and connectedness, in at least one grade within each grade span(s) the LEA serves (e.g., TK-5, 6-8, 9-12), and reports the results to its local governing board/body at the same public meeting at which the LCAP is adopted and to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

Access to a Broad Course of Study (LCFF Priority 7)

The LEA annually measures its progress in the extent to which students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study that includes the adopted courses of study specified in the California Education Code (EC) for Grades 1-6 and Grades 7-12, as applicable, including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated students and individuals with exceptional needs; the LEA then reports the results to its local governing board/body at the same public meeting at which the LCAP is adopted and reports to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

Coordination of Services for Expelled Students – County Office of Education (COE) Only (LCFF Priority 9)

The COE annually measures its progress in coordinating services for foster youth; the COE then reports the results to its local governing board/body at the same public meeting at which the LCAP is adopted and reports to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

Coordination of Services for Foster Youth – COE Only (LCFF Priority 10)

The COE annually measures its progress in coordinating services for foster youth; the COE then reports the results to its local governing board/body at the same public meeting at which the LCAP is adopted and reports to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

Self-Reflection Tools

An LEA uses the self-reflection tools included within the Dashboard to report its progress on the local performance indicator to educational partners and the public.

The self-reflection tools are embedded in the web-based Dashboard system and are also available in Word document format. In addition to using the self-reflection tools to report its progress on the local performance indicators to educational partners and the public, an LEA may use the self-reflection tools as a resource when reporting results to its local governing board. The approved self-reflection tools are provided below.

Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities (LCFF Priority 1)

LEAs will provide the information below:

- Number/percentage of students without access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home
- Number of identified instances where facilities do not meet the “good repair” standard (including deficiencies and extreme deficiencies)

Note: The requested information are all data elements that are currently required as part of the School Accountability Report Card (SARC).

Note: LEAs are required to report the following to their local governing board/body in conjunction with the adoption of the LCAP:

- The LEA’s Teacher Assignment Monitoring and Outcome data available at https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/tamo.asp.
- The number/percentage of students without access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home, and
- The number of identified instances where facilities do not meet the “good repair” standard (including deficiencies and extreme deficiencies)

Academic Year	Total Teaching FTE	Clear	Out-of-Field	Intern	Ineffective	Incomplete	Unknown	N/A
2025-26	47	24	7	0	0	9	7	0

Access to Instructional Materials	Number	Percent
Students Without Access to Own Copies of Standards-Aligned Instructional Materials for Use at School and at Home	NA	NA

Facility Conditions	Number
Identified Instances Where Facilities Do Not Meet The “Good Repair” Standard (Including Deficiencies and Extreme Deficiencies)	0

Implementation of State Academic Standards (LCFF Priority 2)

LEAs may provide a narrative summary of their progress in the implementation of state academic standards based on locally selected measures or tools (Option 1). Alternatively, LEAs may complete the optional reflection tool (Option 2).

OPTION 1: Narrative Summary (Limited to 3,000 characters)
In the narrative box provided on the Dashboard, identify the locally selected measures or tools that the LEA is using to track its progress in implementing the state academic standards adopted by the state board and briefly describe why the LEA chose the selected measures or tools.

Additionally, summarize the LEA's progress in implementing the academic standards adopted by the SBE, based on the locally selected measures or tools. The adopted academic standards are:

- English Language Arts (ELA) – Common Core State Standards for ELA
- English Language Development (ELD) (Aligned to Common Core State Standards for ELA)
- Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics
- Next Generation Science Standards
- History-Social Science
- Career Technical Education
- Health Education Content Standards
- Physical Education Model Content Standards
- Visual and Performing Arts
- World Language

In line with our mission to prepare all students for success in college and beyond, KIPP supports Common Core State Standards ("CCSS") in grades K-12. The CCSS represent the knowledge and skills that prepare students for college and careers. These standards and assessments ensure that our students are ready to take on the rigors of college and future careers. We measure our progress in ELA and Math testing for students with similar demographics to those in our authorizing district and report our outcomes to our families in our annual Local Control and Accountability Plan process.

The content of KIPP curriculum focuses on building upon foundational skills coupled with an emphasis on higher-order thinking processes in all content areas. In accordance with state regulations, KIPP provides the standard age-appropriate curriculum for Mathematics, Science, English-Language Arts and History-Social Science at each grade level, K-12. State academic standards for ELA, ELD, and Math have been fully implemented. Progress toward fully implementing all other content standards are tracked on KIPP's annual performance dashboard, with priority currently given to Next Generation Science Standards.

We set annual goals around usage of standards-aligned curriculum for our teachers and providing supports for our students to ensure progress in the classroom. KIPP conducted a specific curriculum selection process to determine the best tools to support standards-aligned classroom instruction. The school leadership teams, with feedback from teachers, selected programs and materials that are aligned with the school's priorities in improving all students' standards-based mastery. Tools selected have a high potential for driving student growth on Common Core State Standards. Additionally, KIPP has adopted UC Berkeley Lawrence Hall of Science's Amplify Science K-8 curriculum, which offers a rigorous approach to science instruction that leverages immersive simulations of the scientific phenomenon that support content development. This instruction is supplemented by backward planning to NGSS-aligned Interim assessments.

Implementation of State Academic Standards (LCFF Priority 2)

OPTION 2: Reflection Tool

Recently Adopted Academic Standards and/or Curriculum Frameworks

1. **Rate the LEA's progress in providing professional learning for teaching to the recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below.**

   Rating Scale (lowest to highest):
   1 - Exploration and Research Phase
   2 - Beginning Development
   3 - Initial Implementation
   4 - Full Implementation
   5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA					
ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards)					
Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics					
Next Generation Science Standards					
History-Social Science					

2. **Rate the LEA's progress in making instructional materials that are aligned to the recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below available in all classrooms where the subject is taught.**

   Rating Scale (lowest to highest):
   1 - Exploration and Research Phase
   2 - Beginning Development
   3 - Initial Implementation
   4 - Full Implementation
   5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA					
ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards)					
Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics					
Next Generation Science Standards					
History-Social Science					

3. **Rate the LEA's progress in implementing policies or programs to support staff in identifying areas where they can improve in delivering instruction aligned to the recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below (e.g., collaborative time, focused classroom walkthroughs, teacher pairing).**

   Rating Scale (lowest to highest):
   1 - Exploration and Research Phase
   2 - Beginning Development
   3 - Initial Implementation
   4 - Full Implementation
   5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA					
ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards)					
Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics					
Next Generation Science Standards					
History-Social Science					

Other Adopted Academic Standards

4. **Rate the LEA's progress implementing each of the following academic standards adopted by the state board for all students.**

   Rating Scale (lowest to highest):
   1 - Exploration and Research Phase
   2 - Beginning Development
   3 - Initial Implementation
   4 - Full Implementation
   5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Career Technical Education						
Health Education Content Standards						
Physical Education Model Content Standards						
Visual and Performing Arts						
World Language						

Support for Teachers and Administrators

5. Rate the LEA's success at engaging in the following activities with teachers and school administrators during the prior school year (including the summer preceding the prior school year).

Rating Scale (lowest to highest):
1 - Exploration and Research Phase
2 - Beginning Development
3 - Initial Implementation
4 - Full Implementation
5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Academic Standards	1	2	3	4	5
Identifying the professional learning needs of groups of teachers or staff as a whole					
Identifying the professional learning needs of individual teachers					
Providing support for teachers on the standards they have not yet mastered					

Optional Narrative (Limited to 1,500 characters)

6. Provide any additional information in the text box provided in the Dashboard that the LEA believes is relevant to understanding its progress implementing the academic standards adopted by the state board.

Parental Involvement and Family Engagement (LCFF Priority 3)

Introduction

Family engagement is an essential strategy for building pathways to college and career readiness for all students and is an essential component of a systems approach to improving outcomes for all students. More than 30 years of research has shown that family engagement can lead to improved student outcomes (e.g., attendance, engagement, academic outcomes, social emotional learning, etc.).

Consistent with the California Department of Education's (CDE's) Family Engagement Toolkit: [1]

- Effective and authentic family engagement has been described as an intentional partnership of educators, families and community members who share responsibility for a child from the time they are born to becoming an adult.
- To build an effective partnership, educators, families, and community members need to develop the knowledge and skills to work together, and schools must purposefully integrate family and community engagement with goals for students' learning and thriving.

The LCFF legislation recognized the importance of family engagement by requiring LEAs to address Priority 3 within their LCAP. The self-reflection tool described below enables LEAs to reflect upon their implementation of family engagement as part of their continuous improvement process and prior to updating their LCAP.

For LEAs to engage all families equitably, it is necessary to understand the cultures, languages, needs and interests of families in the local area. Furthermore, developing family engagement policies, programs, and practices needs to be done in partnership with local families, using the tools of continuous improvement.

Instructions

This self-reflection tool is organized into three sections. Each section includes research and evidence-based practices in family engagement:

1. Building Relationships between School Staff and Families
2. Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes
3. Seeking Input for Decision-Making

Based on an evaluation of data, including educational partner input, an LEA uses this self-reflection tool to report on its progress successes and area(s) of need related to family engagement policies, programs, and practices. This tool will enable an LEA to engage in continuous improvement and determine next steps to make improvements in the areas identified. The results of the process should be used to inform the LCAP and its development process, including assessing prior year goals, actions and services and in modifying future goals, actions, and services in the LCAP.

LEAs are to implement the following self-reflection process:

1. Identify the diverse educational partners that need to participate in the self-reflection process in order to ensure input from all groups of families, staff and students in the LEA, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.

2. Engage educational partners in determining what data and information will be considered to complete the self-reflection tool. LEAs should consider how the practices apply to families of all student groups, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.

3. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each of the 12 practices using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

   1 – Exploration and Research
   2 – Beginning Development
   3 – Initial Implementation
   4 – Full Implementation
   5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability

4. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, respond to each of the prompts pertaining to each section of the tool.

5. Use the findings from the self-reflection process to inform the annual update to the LCAP and the LCAP development process, as well as the development of other school and district plans.

Sections of the Self-Reflection Tool

Section 1: Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families

Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each practice in this section using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

1 - Exploration and Research Phase
2 - Beginning Development
3 - Initial Implementation
4 - Full Implementation
5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Practices	Rating Scale Number
1. Rate the LEA's progress in developing the capacity of staff (i.e., administrators, teachers, and classified staff) to build trusting and respectful relationships with families.	4
2. Rate the LEA's progress in creating welcoming environments for all families in the community.	4
3. Rate the LEA's progress in supporting staff to learn about each family's strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children.	4

Practices	Rating Scale Number
4. Rate the LEA's progress in developing multiple opportunities for the LEA and school sites to engage in 2-way communication between families and educators using language that is understandable and accessible to families.	4

Building Relationships Dashboard Narrative Boxes (Limited to 3,000 characters)

1. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's current strengths and progress in Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families.

KIPP believes that meaningful family engagement builds parent efficacy, recognizes families as true assets, and leverages the community's strengths, experiences, and knowledge to strengthen the school. We are committed to partnerships that create lasting capacity for families — not just during their time with us, but beyond.

Families are reached through multiple communication channels including newsletters, emails, phone calls, and text messages. Staff share their email addresses and cell phone numbers directly with families to ensure accessible support for homework and other concerns. Progress reports and report cards are distributed throughout the year to keep families informed of their student's academic progress, and families are encouraged to schedule conferences with teachers at any point. Any student at risk of retention is required to meet with teachers and administrators to identify additional supports. Each year, the school begins building family relationships during new student orientation — before the school year begins — so that students and families feel connected and welcomed from day one.

The KIPP Family Council (KFC) serves as the school's primary family governance structure, providing families with a meaningful voice in school decision-making. Families drive the KFC, meeting monthly to review school data, plan community events, and advocate for the school's continued growth. The school leader meets regularly with the KFC to ensure alignment between school priorities and community needs. The Multilingual Learner Committee (MLC) provides an additional structured channel for multilingual families to engage, offering input on language development programming and supports for English learner students.

KIPP invests in staff capacity to engage families as equal partners. Front office and operational staff receive professional development on creating a warm and welcoming environment for all visitors. All school staff are expected to demonstrate strong, consistent connections with students and their families as a core professional expectation.

This year, the school hosted 20+ virtual and in-person family events open to all families. In the annual family survey, 88% of families reported satisfaction with opportunities to get involved on campus. The school will continue to use surveys, conferences, the KFC and MLC structures, and regular communication to deepen family engagement and build on this foundation.

2. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's focus area(s) for improvement in Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families.

KIPP believes that relationship building with the community and families is a key component to opening and operating a high achieving school. KIPP teachers are currently receiving focused professional development that aims to support students more holistically in the classroom (Culturally Responsive Teaching), building more trusted and respected relationships that lead to improved student outcomes. However, this engagement must go beyond the classroom in the form of strong communication between school staff and families. When handled with respect and cultural sensitivity, school-family communication and engagement provides an opportunity to live out the values of inclusiveness and equity. Teacher, and other school staff will be following these important guidelines to avoid

communication pitfalls and support teacher-family relationships built on respect (per the Learning for Justice, Family and Community Engagement Critical Practices, a project of the Southern Poverty Law Center):

- Assume good intentions, and approach all families as partners who want the best for their children.
- Invite parents or guardians to share knowledge about their students' lives, interests, hopes and struggles.
- Invite parents or guardians to share information about family cultures and traditions.
- Recognize and respect differences in family structures.
- Recognize the role that identity and background may play in shaping relationships between teachers and families.
- Bring a sense of self-reflectiveness and cultural humility to all conversations and interactions.
- View linguistic, cultural and family diversity as strengths.

3. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe how the LEA will improve engagement of underrepresented families identified during the self-reflection process in relation to Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families.

The majority of KIPP families qualify as underrepresented. Therefore, communication, materials, meetings and other school sponsored events are always created considering the unique needs of the community.

The school hosted over 20 virtual and in-person events (when health and safety allowed) where all families were invited. In an annual family survey, 88% of families indicated that they were satisfied with the opportunities to get involved on campus. KIPP will employ the Culturally Responsive Teaching methods to existing school communications and will continue to use surveys, conferences, regular phone communication and other forms of contact to engage all parents/guardians.

Because language plays a crucial role in families' lives, teachers will communicate with parents in their home languages as much as possible. Family materials will be provided in students' home languages. When translation is needed, a school-provided translator will be employed.

Additionally, KIPP will provide different types of opportunities for families to participate, including events that take place in the AM, or PM to allow for different family schedules and childcare needs.

Section 2: Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes

Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each practice in this section using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

1 - Exploration and Research Phase
2 - Beginning Development
3 - Initial Implementation
4 - Full Implementation
5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Practices	Rating Scale Number
5. Rate the LEA's progress in providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school's capacity to partner with families.	4

Practices	Rating Scale Number
6. Rate the LEA's progress in providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home.	3
7. Rate the LEA's progress in implementing policies or programs for teachers to meet with families and students to discuss student progress and ways to work together to support improved student outcomes.	4
8. Rate the LEA's progress in supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own students and all students.	3

Building Partnerships Dashboard Narrative Boxes (Limited to 3,000 characters)

1. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's current strengths and progress in Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes.

KIPP assists parents in understanding state standards and assessments, and how to monitor their child's progress and work with teachers to improve their child's achievement through constant communication between the school and home. Parents are given their child's teacher's cellular phone number to use whenever they need clarification about an academic assignment or need to talk about their child's progress.

Parents are involved in planned parent nights as well as parent/teacher conferences where they learn ways to support their child at home and about their child's progress. Parents of students at the school can also participate in the KIPP Family Council.

KIPP provides parents with an explanation of the curriculum used at the school, the assessments used to measure student progress, and the proficiency levels students are expected to meet through report cards, parent-teacher conferences, weekly newsletters, parent workshops, and data reports. Parents receive training on how to support the development of their child's reading, writing, and mathematical skills at KIPP Family Council meetings.

KIPP will continue to assess the language needs of families to ensure that materials and presentations are being made available in an accessible way.

2. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's focus area(s) for improvement in Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes.

The vision of KIPP's Advocacy and Community Engagement team is to disrupt racial and socioeconomic inequalities in educational access and outcomes by fostering an inclusive culture of family engagement, building a support network of community based organizations and empowering families to be advocates for their children and communities. KIPP continues to grow from families being engaged and attending to leading and advocating more actively. KIPP supports this capacity building with regular KIPP Family Council and Multilingual Council meetings that focus on the following topics throughout the school year: KIPP 101, Local Control and Accountability, ParentSquare Communication Tool, Attendance, Testing Results, Restorative Practices, Social Media, Mental Health and Suicide Prevention, as well as Substance Abuse and Positive Parenting Techniques. During these meetings KIPP aims to share and inform as much as listen and learn from the diverse experiences of KIPP families. Improvement in this area will include expanding critical topics requested by families, and encouraging leadership during these meetings among family and community members.

3. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe how the LEA will improve engagement of underrepresented families identified during the self-reflection process in relation to Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes.

The majority of KIPP families qualify as underrepresented. Therefore, communication, materials, meetings, and other school-sponsored events are always created considering the unique needs of the community.

The school hosted 20+ virtual and in-person events where all families were invited. In an annual family survey, 88% of families indicated that they were satisfied with the opportunities to get involved on campus. KIPP will apply culturally responsive practices to existing school communications and will continue to use surveys, conferences, regular phone communication, and other forms of contact to engage all families.

The KIPP Family Council (KFC) and Multilingual Learner Committee (MLC) provide structured opportunities for underrepresented families — including multilingual learner families — to engage directly in school decision-making and provide input on school priorities.

Because language plays a crucial role in families' lives, teachers will communicate with parents in their home languages as much as possible. Family materials will be provided in students' home languages, and when translation is needed, a school-provided translator will be available.

Additionally, KIPP will provide different types of opportunities for families to participate, including events scheduled in the morning and evening to accommodate varying family schedules and childcare needs.

Section 3: Seeking Input for Decision-Making

Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each practice in this section using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

1 - Exploration and Research Phase
2 - Beginning Development
3 - Initial Implementation
4 - Full Implementation
5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

Practices	Rating Scale Number
9. Rate the LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making.	3
10. Rate the LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making.	2
11. Rate the LEA's progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community.	3
12. Rate the LEA's progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels.	3

Seeking Input for Decision-Making Dashboard Narrative Boxes (Limited to 3,000 characters)

1. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's current strengths and progress in Seeking Input for Decision-Making.

Parent involvement in decision making at KIPP is demonstrated in multiple ways.

The parent and family engagement policy is developed jointly, updated periodically, and agreed on with parents. KIPP's processes for developing and evaluating its parent engagement policy with the involvement of parents include the following: asking for feedback on the policy during an annual meeting, KFC meetings, parent surveys, asking for feedback and input during monthly family nights or workshops. The parent and family engagement policy is sent home with each student in case parents are unable to attend meetings at the school, as well as distributed and discussed at an early KIPP Family Council meeting.

The parent engagement policy process is aligned with the school's LCAP stakeholder involvement process, and the school makes every effort to align, coordinate, and integrate parent involvement programs and activities across Federal, State, and local programs, in addition to conducting activities (e.g., parent workshops, KFCs, parent-teacher conferencing) to support parents' participation in their children's education. During the annual LCAP stakeholder engagement meeting, the School Leader presents to parents the goals, actions and services, and outcomes in the school's LCAP. Parents record their feedback on a survey in real time and online. This parent input influences all aspects of school culture.

KIPP will continue to assess the language needs of families to ensure that materials and presentations are being made available in an accessible way.

2. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's focus area(s) for improvement in Seeking Input for Decision-Making.

KIPP supports family engagement and decision making through the KIPP Family Council and Multilingual Council which meet regularly throughout the school year. The KIPP Family Council (KFC) also has regular opportunities to share feedback and bring forth ideas, concerns and recommendations to the school leader. Improvement in this area will include renewed and revised materials related to the CA Dashboard and increased engagement in the annual Local Control and Accountability Plan process.

3. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe how the LEA will improve engagement of underrepresented families identified during the self-reflection process in relation to Seeking Input for Decision-Making.

The majority of KIPP families qualify as underrepresented. Therefore, communication, materials, meetings, and other school-sponsored events are always created considering the unique needs of the community.

KIPP will continue to seek diverse perspectives through active recruitment of families to the KIPP Family Council (KFC) and Multilingual Learner Committee (MLC). Both bodies provide structured opportunities for underrepresented families to review school data, respond to LCAP priorities, and make recommendations to school leadership. Feedback gathered through these structures, as well as through the annual family survey and LCAP survey, is reviewed by school leadership and used to inform goal-setting, resource allocation, and program decisions. KIPP is committed to closing the feedback loop by sharing with families how their input has shaped school priorities and LCAP actions.

Additionally, KIPP will provide varied opportunities for families to participate, including events scheduled in the morning and evening to accommodate different family schedules and childcare needs.

School Climate (LCFF Priority 6)

Introduction

The initial design of the Local Control Funding Formula recognized the critical role that positive school conditions and climate play in advancing student performance and equity. This recognition is grounded in a research base demonstrating that a positive school climate directly impacts indicators of success such as increased teacher retention, lower dropout rates, decreased incidences of violence, and higher student achievement.

In order to support comprehensive planning, LEAs need access to current data. The measurement of school climate provides LEAs with critical data that can be used to track progress in school climate for purposes of continuous improvement, and the ability to identify needs and implement changes to address local needs.

Introduction
LEAs are required, at a minimum, to annually administer a local climate survey. The survey must:

- Capture a valid measure of student perceptions of school safety and connectedness in at least one grade within each grade span the LEA serves (e.g. TK-5, 6-8, 9-12); and

- At a minimum, report disaggregated data by student groups identified in California Education Code 52052, when such data is available as part of the local school climate survey.

Based on the analysis of local data, including the local climate survey data, LEAs are to respond to the following three prompts. Each prompt response is limited to 3,000 characters. An LEA may provide hyperlink(s) to other documents as necessary within each prompt:

Prompt 1 (DATA): Describe the local climate survey data, including available data disaggregated by student groups. LEAs using surveys that provide an overall score, such as the California Healthy Kids Survey, are encouraged to report the overall score for all students as well as available student group scores. Responses may also include an analysis of a subset of specific items on a local survey and additional data collection tools that are particularly relevant to school conditions and climate.

91% of KIPP families positively indicated that teachers have built strong relationships with their child.

79% of student surveys indicated a positive response to feelings of emotional safety at the school.

Prompt 2 (MEANING): Describe key learnings, including identified needs and areas of strength determined through the analysis of data described in Prompt 1, including the available data disaggregated by student group.

The School Culture Survey is still used to comprehensively assess school culture and measure progress on our restorative practice and SEL initiatives. School Culture Teams use these survey results to inform school practices and identify professional development needs and supports for teachers. The School Family Culture Index represents questions from the Family School Culture Survey that make up the family school culture experience. The index considers the percent of positive family responses across the following questions:
The teachers have built strong relationships with my child.
The school has a positive impact on my child's academic performance.
How fairly is your child treated by staff?
How stressed does your child feel about experiences related to school?
How receptive is your school to parent feedback?
I would recommend KIPP to other families.

The Student Pulse Survey was administered throughout the year to meet the needs of students at the moment -- including adjusting critical SEL curriculum and providing additional support and intervention services for families. Questions tied to emotional safety included understanding who to go to at the school if a student was made to feel unsafe by their peers or a staff member, and willingness to engage with teachers when there are concerns about safety or bullying.

Prompt 3 (USE): Describe any changes to existing plans, policies, or procedures that the LEA determines necessary in order to address areas of need identified through the analysis of local data and the identification of key learnings. Include any revisions, decisions, or actions the LEA has, or will, implement for continuous improvement purposes.

KIPP leadership is committed to acting on this important feedback and results from our community have contributed to continuing and prioritizing an improved school climate and culture. KIPP combined California's rigorous content standards with the pedagogical methodologies that have proven successful in these crucial areas, including: character education, extra-curricular activities, technology, and community service. Teachers take into consideration the interests and cultural backgrounds of students in an effort to make all instruction relevant and purposeful. It is equally important that all scholars are offered support in social and emotional development. As young people grow from year-to-year, they experience new challenges, new emotions, and new situations. Students need more than academic and intellectual skills alone to thrive in college, career and life. When a school is a positive place to be, students and teachers are happy to be there, do their best, and make their best better. Research has shown that positive school culture is the basis for sustainable learning and preparation for the tasks and tests of life and that a positive school culture and climate has a direct impact on student's academic success, graduation rates, and overall well-being and connection to their school community.

KIPP has built a strong and supportive school environment through both Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and Restorative Practices. SEL is developing social and emotional competence in order to understand, manage, and express the social-emotional aspects of one's life in ways that enable the successful management of life tasks such as learning, forming relationships, solving everyday problems, and adapting to the complex demands of growth and development. Restorative Practices is a component of our approach to SEL and refers to a behavior management philosophy that seeks to redress the harms created by conflicts by repairing the relationships of those most directly involved. Second Step Curriculum supports our SEL work in the classroom, and The Complete Restorative Practices Implementation Guidebook has been developed by KIPP's school culture team to guide school leadership. Like our academic approach, we infused the bulk of our social emotional support into the general education curriculum through community circles and teaching young adults how to respond to situations with their peers in real time.

Access to a Broad Course of Study (LCFF Priority 7)

LEAs provide a narrative summary of the extent to which all students have access to and are enrolled in a broad course of study by addressing, at a minimum, the following four prompts:

1. Briefly identify the locally selected measures or tools that the LEA is using to track the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study, based on grade spans, unduplicated student groups, and individuals with exceptional needs served. (response limited to 1,500 characters)

There was a continued partnership with other KIPP schools in the region to create curriculum resources and common benchmark assessments that were aligned to the Common Core State Standards. Teachers were provided tools and resources for use in their classrooms. There was a rigorous selection process to determine the tools and resources for alignment with common core and college and career readiness standards. Course scheduling and student assignments were part of a Leadership and Teacher collaboration to ensure that students were best supported in their learning. This intentional and individualized approach to scheduling using data and feedback better prepares students for success in high school, college and beyond. KIPP believes that all students, regardless of family background, income, race, religion, disability, gender, or health can and will learn. KIPP implemented comprehensive programs for all students with special needs, in accordance with applicable state and federal law, and the needs of each child.
KIPP measures success by the percentage of students enrolled in a broad course of study across all student groups.

2. Using the locally selected measures or tools, summarize the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study. The summary should identify any differences across school sites and student groups in access to, and enrollment in, a broad course of study, and may describe progress over time in the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study. (response limited to 1,500 characters)

100% of students had access to a broad course of study including courses described under EC section 51210, as applicable. Additionally, programs and services were developed and provided to individuals with exceptional needs, including students on an IEP. KIPP offers enrichment courses to all students, including various music options, physical education, and student leadership.

3. Given the results of the tool or locally selected measures, identify the barriers preventing the LEA from providing access to a broad course of study for all students. (response limited to 1,500 characters)

No current barriers exist to prevent the LEA from providing access to a broad course of study for all students.

4. 4. In response to the results of the tool or locally selected measures, what revisions, decisions, or new actions will the LEA implement, or has the LEA implemented, to ensure access to a broad course of study for all students? (response limited to 1,500 characters)

KIPP will annually assess the actions and services associated with providing access to a broad course study for all students.