# 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Golden Valley River | Jennifer Hoover<br>Executive Director | jhoover@goldenvalleycharter.org<br>(916) 542-7481 |

# 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.

Golden Valley River is a directly funded public charter school serving students in grades K-8 in Orangevale, California. The school is located at 9601 Lake Natoma Drive and is authorized through San Juan Unified School District. Golden Valley River has been an active charter school since August 27, 2007, and serves students through a traditional, in-person instructional program.

Golden Valley River provides a public Waldorf-inspired educational program designed to support the development of the whole child. The school's instructional program emphasizes developmentally appropriate academics, the arts, music, movement, environmental and experiential learning, social-emotional growth, and meaningful relationships among students, staff, and families. The school's LCAP continues to organize its work around three broad goals: providing a developmentally appropriate education, maintaining an intentional culture of care, and strengthening a vibrant learning community. These goals are aligned to state priorities and reflect the school's ongoing review of state and local data, educational partner feedback, and the needs of student groups.

During the 2026-27 LCAP year, Golden Valley River will continue to focus on improving student academic outcomes, strengthening inclusive practices, supporting safe and connected school culture, improving attendance, and ensuring that families are active partners in the school community. The plan includes continued investment in academic supports, interventions, English learner services, enrichment opportunities, professional development, student supports, school climate improvement, and family engagement.

## Reflections: Annual Performance

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

Golden Valley River reviewed the 2025 California School Dashboard, local assessment data, attendance and behavior data, school climate survey results, educational partner feedback, a needs assessment completed by the LEA, and the Annual Update to evaluate progress toward the goals in the LCAP. This review showed that the school maintained important strengths in access to the instructional program, broad course of study, school safety, and family engagement, while also identifying continued needs in academic achievement, subgroup performance, school climate, chronic absenteeism, and suspension rates.
Golden Valley River maintained strong foundational conditions for learning. The school provided all students with access to standards-aligned instructional materials, implemented academic content standards, provided English learners with access to California standards including ELD standards, and maintained access to a broad course of study. The school also maintained facilities in good repair, maintained a 0% middle school dropout rate, and maintained a 0% expulsion rate. These results demonstrate that the school continues to provide the basic conditions necessary for student learning, safety, and participation in a comprehensive Waldorf-inspired educational program.
Academic performance showed areas of growth and areas requiring continued attention. In English language arts, all students improved from 16.9 points below standard at baseline to 7 points below standard in the Year 2 outcome. Several student groups also improved, including White students, Hispanic students, and students with disabilities. However, socioeconomically disadvantaged students declined from 26.5 points below standard to 40.3 points below standard, showing a need for more targeted literacy support for low-income students.
In mathematics, the school demonstrated stronger overall progress. All students improved from 71.5 points below standard at baseline to 59.4 points below standard in the Year 2 outcome. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students improved from 81.4 points below standard to 66.2 points below standard, Hispanic students improved from 80.2 points below standard to 55.2 points below standard, students with two or more races improved from 37.8 points below standard to 21.7 points below standard, and students with disabilities improved from 150.8 points below standard to 122 points below standard. These results indicate that mathematics actions and supports contributed to improvement for several student groups, while also showing that overall mathematics performance remains below standard and will require continued attention.
Local assessment data also showed mixed results. FastBridge reading and mathematics results indicate a need for continued academic monitoring, intervention, and instructional alignment. The school will continue to use local assessment data, CAASPP results, classroom

assessments, and teacher input to identify students needing support and to refine intervention, differentiation, and progress-monitoring systems. Particular attention will be given to socioeconomically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, English learners, and students not yet meeting grade-level expectations.

Attendance and engagement showed meaningful improvement. Chronic absenteeism declined substantially across reported student groups. The all-student chronic absenteeism rate declined from 27.8% at baseline to 12.8% in the Year 2 outcome. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students declined from 33.6% to 21.7%, students with disabilities declined from 35.3% to 14.5%, Hispanic students declined from 34.8% to 13.8%, White students declined from 26.3% to 14.1%, and students with two or more races declined from 37.5% to 5.1%. These reductions reflect significant progress in student engagement and attendance. However, some student groups remain above the school's desired outcome of 10% or lower, so reducing chronic absenteeism will remain a priority.

The LEA's needs assessment confirmed that extended learning and attendance recovery are appropriate strategies to address identified student needs. Golden Valley River used Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant funds to support after school programming and attendance recovery in response to needs identified through the LEA's review of Dashboard data, local assessment results, attendance data, school climate information, educational partner feedback, and other local indicators. The after school program was designed to provide additional academic support, enrichment, connection to school, and structured opportunities for students who may benefit from extended learning time beyond the regular instructional day. Attendance recovery activities were implemented to help reengage students, reduce learning loss associated with absences, and support improved student attendance and participation. These LREBG-funded efforts are aligned with the identified needs in academic achievement, chronic absenteeism, student engagement, and school climate, and they complement the LCAP actions focused on intervention, attendance supports, school connectedness, and responsive services for students with the greatest needs.

Suspension data also showed overall improvement. The all-student suspension rate decreased from 1.9% at baseline to 1.0% in the Year 2 outcome. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students decreased from 3.5% to 2.4%, students with disabilities decreased from 5.7% to 0%, Hispanic students decreased from 1.5% to 0%, and White students decreased from 2.3% to 1.0%. Students with two or more races increased from 0% to 2.5%, which will require monitoring and targeted support. Overall, the decrease in suspensions indicates progress in strengthening student supports, school climate, and behavioral practices.

School climate results were mixed. Student climate survey results improved, indicating that students reported a stronger sense of school climate and connection. However, staff and parent climate results declined. These results suggest that while students are experiencing improvement, the school needs to continue strengthening communication, leadership coherence, staff collaboration, shared expectations, and family partnership. Educational partner feedback also identified the importance of improving adult alignment, supporting staff, and deepening shared commitment to the school's mission, vision, and values.

Educational partner engagement confirmed many of the priorities identified through data. Families, faculty, staff, students, committees, the Finance Committee, and the Governing Board provided input through meetings, climate surveys, Coffee with the Principal, schoolwide meetings, committee meetings, Board and Finance Committee meetings, and the LCAP mid-year update. Feedback emphasized the importance of continuing a developmentally appropriate Waldorf-inspired program while strengthening academic intervention, communication, attendance supports, school climate, family engagement, and inclusive practices.

Based on the annual performance review and LEA needs assessment, Golden Valley River will continue its three-goal structure focused on a developmentally appropriate education, an intentional culture of care, and a vibrant learning community. The school will continue actions related to mathematics, English language arts, intervention, English learner supports, enrichment, professional development, inclusive practices, school climate, universal meals, responsive supports for unduplicated pupils, and family engagement. The school will also strengthen monitoring systems to ensure that actions and expenditures, including LREBG-funded after school programming and attendance recovery activities, are clearly connected to identified needs and improved outcomes for students.

In 2026-27, Golden Valley River will give particular attention to improving ELA outcomes for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, sustaining and accelerating mathematics growth, continuing to reduce chronic absenteeism, maintaining low suspension and expulsion rates, improving staff and family climate survey results, and ensuring that low-income students, English learners, foster/homeless youth, students with disabilities, and other student groups demonstrating need receive targeted and effective support. The school will continue to monitor the effectiveness of after school programming, attendance recovery, academic intervention, and engagement supports through attendance data, local assessment results, participation data, stakeholder feedback, and progress toward LCAP metrics.

# Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

Not applicable.

# Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

## *Schools Identified*

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

Golden Valley River does not have any schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement for the 2026–27 LCAP year. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

### *Support for Identified Schools*

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

Not applicable. Golden Valley River has not been identified 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.

Not applicable. Golden Valley River has not been identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement. The school will continue to monitor the effectiveness of its LCAP goals, actions, and services through Dashboard indicators, local assessment data, attendance data, suspension and expulsion data, school climate survey results, educational partner feedback, and annual review of implementation and expenditures.

# 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 |
|---|---|
| 1. Students | Students were engaged through school climate surveys and ongoing schoolwide activities. The climate survey provided students with an opportunity to share their experiences related to school safety, belonging, relationships, engagement, and support. Student feedback was reviewed alongside academic, attendance, and behavior data to identify areas of strength and areas needing improvement. |
| 2. Parents and Families | Parents and families were engaged through parent meetings, Coffee with the Principal, schoolwide meetings, committee meetings, climate surveys, and opportunities to provide input during the LCAP development and annual update process. These opportunities allowed families to share feedback on school climate, communication, academic supports, student engagement, attendance, enrichment, and family participation. |
| 3. Faculty/Certificated Staff | Faculty were engaged through faculty meetings, staff climate surveys, schoolwide meetings, committee participation, and discussions connected to the LCAP mid-year update. Teachers provided feedback on academic outcomes, intervention needs, curriculum implementation, professional development, student supports, school climate, and the effectiveness of current LCAP actions. |
| 4. Classified Staff | Classified staff were engaged through staff meetings, school climate survey opportunities, schoolwide meetings, and participation in discussions related to student support, campus operations, school climate, and implementation of LCAP actions. Their input helped identify operational and student-support needs connected to safety, engagement, communication, and schoolwide systems. |
| 5. Leadership Team Members | School administration engaged educational partners through Coffee with the Principal, parent and faculty meetings, committee meetings, schoolwide meetings, climate survey review, and presentation of the LCAP mid-year update. Administration reviewed state and local data, gathered feedback from partner groups, and used the information to refine goals, actions, metrics, and resource allocations. |
| 6. Unduplicated Pupil Educational Partners | Educational partners representing the needs of low-income students, English learners, and foster/homeless youth were engaged through parent meetings, staff meetings, schoolwide meetings, committee discussions, climate surveys, and review of academic, attendance, and engagement data. Feedback was used to identify barriers to learning, attendance, participation, and access to supports and enrichment. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 7. Students with Disabilities / Special Education Educational Partners | Families and staff connected to students with disabilities were engaged through parent and staff feedback opportunities, committee meetings, schoolwide meetings, review of local and state data, and discussions about inclusive practices and student supports. Input focused on access to instruction, academic intervention, social-emotional support, behavior support, staffing, service coordination, and inclusive practices. |
| 8. Finance Committee | The Finance Committee was engaged through public committee meetings focused on budget development, fiscal planning, expenditure review, and alignment of resources to LCAP goals and actions. Feedback from the Finance Committee informed resource allocation decisions and helped ensure that budgeted expenditures were connected to identified student needs and planned services. |
| 9. Governing Board | The Governing Board was engaged through public Board meetings, review of the LCAP mid-year update, discussion of annual update data, and consideration of the proposed LCAP. Board members reviewed educational partner feedback, student outcome data, implementation information, and budget alignment before adoption. |
| 10. Community Members / School Community | The broader school community was engaged through schoolwide meetings, community events, committee participation, Coffee with the Principal, surveys, and public meeting opportunities. These engagement structures allowed community members to provide feedback on school culture, communication, family participation, enrichment opportunities, and priorities for continued improvement. |

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

Golden Valley River engaged educational partners throughout the LCAP development and annual update process using multiple opportunities for input, discussion, and review. Engagement activities included parent and faculty meetings, schoolwide meetings, Coffee with the Principal, committee meetings, Board meetings, Finance Committee meetings, staff meetings, climate surveys for students, staff, and families, and presentation and discussion of the LCAP mid-year update. These opportunities allowed the school to gather feedback from families, students, teachers, classified staff, administrators, advisory groups, and governance groups regarding student outcomes, school climate, attendance, academic progress, family engagement, and resource allocation.

The school used both formal and informal engagement methods. Formal structures included Board and Finance Committee meetings, schoolwide meetings, committee meetings, and the LCAP mid-year update, where educational partners reviewed data, discussed implementation of current actions, and considered priorities for the coming year. Informal and relationship-based opportunities, such as Coffee with the Principal and parent/faculty meetings, provided additional space for families and staff to share concerns, ask questions, and identify needs related to academics, communication, student support, school culture, and the overall school experience.

Climate survey results from students, staff, and families were also reviewed as part of the engagement process. Survey data provided feedback on perceptions of safety, belonging, communication, relationships, school climate, and support systems. These data helped the school identify strengths, including areas where students reported improvement in their school experience, as well as areas needing continued attention, including staff and family climate, communication, adult alignment, and shared implementation of schoolwide expectations.

Educational partner feedback highlighted the importance of continuing a developmentally appropriate, Waldorf-inspired educational program while strengthening academic supports, intervention, and progress monitoring. Families and staff expressed support for maintaining a broad course of study, enrichment opportunities, specialty programming, and access to arts, movement, music, and experiential learning. At the same time, feedback and student outcome data indicated a need for continued focus on English language arts, mathematics, academic intervention, English learner supports, and inclusive instructional practices.

Feedback also emphasized the importance of maintaining a safe, caring, and connected school environment. Educational partners identified the need to continue supporting students’ social-emotional and behavioral needs through school climate work, restorative practices, the Renewal Room, positive behavior supports, and consistent adult practices. Climate survey data and meeting feedback indicated that the school should continue strengthening communication, leadership coherence, staff collaboration, and shared commitment to the school’s mission, vision, and values.

Families and staff also identified attendance, engagement, and family partnership as continuing priorities. Input from meetings, committees, and the LCAP mid-year update reinforced the need for targeted outreach, improved communication with families, and continued opportunities for families to participate in school life and leadership. These themes were especially important in relation to chronic absenteeism, student engagement, and the school’s efforts to support unduplicated pupils, students with disabilities, and students who need additional academic, behavioral, or social-emotional support.

This feedback directly influenced the 2026-27 LCAP. The school maintained its three-goal structure focused on a developmentally appropriate education, an intentional culture of care, and a vibrant learning community. Educational partner input supported the continuation of actions related to mathematics and English language arts instruction, intervention, English learner supports, enrichment opportunities, professional development, inclusive practices, class teachers, classroom materials, facility maintenance, the Renewal Room, school climate improvement, universal meals, responsive supports for student groups, and family and community engagement.

In response to educational partner feedback and outcome data, the LCAP continues to prioritize stronger implementation monitoring, more consistent use of student data, targeted academic intervention, schoolwide culture-building, family engagement, and professional development. The plan also reflects the need to strengthen staff capacity through professional learning in areas such as Universal Design for Learning, Multi-Tiered System of Supports, differentiation, restorative practices, and social-emotional learning. Through these actions, Golden Valley River will continue to use educational partner feedback as part of its continuous improvement process and will monitor whether LCAP actions are improving outcomes for all students, particularly low-income students, English learners, foster/homeless youth, students with disabilities, and other student groups demonstrating need.

# Goals and Actions

## Goal

| Goal # | Description | Type of Goal |
|---|---|---|
| Goal 1 | Developmentally Appropriate Education: All students will be provided access to a comprehensive public Waldorf-inspired curriculum that is rigorous, relevant, and engaging. | Broad |

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

1, 2, 4, 7, 8

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

In an effort to align with the LEA's continuous improvement work the LEA in conjunction with educational partners in response to state and local Dashboard data areas, and are reflective of the shared interests across educational partner groups. The goal, metrics, and actions have been strategically groups together based on careful analysis of quantitative and qualitative data to identify underlying causes contributing to the Dashboard results. Analysis of data consisted of careful review of state and local data, educational partner voice, and research with a focus on increasing student outcomes, experiences, and access to opportunities. Performance will be measured using the multiple metrics under the Measuring and Reporting Results section of the goal. To achieve each goal, actions and expenditures will be implemented and updated on an annual basis and will reflect educational partner input and state and local data.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Appropriately Assigned Teachers (Percentage of "Clear" FTE as measured on the Teacher Assignment Monitoring Outcomes report) | 89.3% of teachers are clear out of the 14.7 FTE teachers. | 86.2% of teachers are clear out of the 14.5 FTE teachers. | 93.6% of teachers are clear out of the 15 FTE teachers. | 85% of teachers or higher will be clear out of the FTE teachers. | The percentage of clear teachers increased 4.3% from the baseline. |
| 2 | Access to Instructional Materials (Percentage of students with access to standards aligned instructional materials-SARC) | 100% of students have access to standards aligned instructional materials. | 100% of students have access to standards aligned instructional materials. | 100% of students have access to standards aligned instructional materials. | 100% of students have access to standards aligned instructional materials. | Maintained 100% of students have access to standards aligned instructional materials. |
| 3 | Implementation of Academic Content Standards (Local Indicator Priority 2 Self-Reflection Tool) | Full Implementation in all areas | Full Implementation in all areas. | Full Implementation in all areas. | Full Implementation in all areas | Maintained Full Implementation in all areas. |
| 4 | EL Access to CA Standards including ELD standards | Full Implementation | Full Implementation | Full Implementation | Full Implementation | Maintained Full Implementation |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (Local Indicator Priority 2 Self-Reflection Tool) | | | | | |
| 5 | Pupil Achievement on Statewide Assessments (ELA Academic Indicator: Distance from Standard (DFS)) | All students 16.9 points below standard; socioeconomically disadvantaged students 26.5 points below standard; white students 16.5 points below standard; hispanic students 20.6 below standard; students with disabilities 65.6 points below standard | All students 19 points below standard; socioeconomically disadvantaged students 41.2 points below standard; white students 26.3 points below standard; hispanic students 29.8 below standard; student with two or more races 10.4 points above standard; students with disabilities 65.9 points below standard. | All students 7 points below standard; socioeconomically disadvantaged students 40.3 points below standard; white students 8.1 points below standard; Hispanic students 7.7 below standard; student with two or more races 9.3 points above standard; students with disabilities 58.4 points below standard. | Each student group listed will score at or above the following distance from standard: All students 10 points below standard; socioeconomically disadvantaged students 20 points below standard; white students 13 points below standard; hispanic students 16 below standard; students with disabilities 60 points below standard. | All students group scores increased 9.9 points; socioeconomically disadvantaged students scores decreased 13.8 points; white students scores increased 8.4 points; Hispanic students scores increased 12.9 points; students with disabilities scores increased 7.2 points. |
| 6 | Pupil Achievement on Statewide Assessments (Mathematics Academic Indicator: Distance from Standard (DFS)) | All students 71.5 points below standard; socioeconomically disadvantaged students 81.4 points below standard; white students 68.2 points below standard; hispanic students 80.2 below standard; students with disabilities 150.8 points below standard. | All students 59.9 points below standard; socioeconomically disadvantaged students 88.6 points below standard; white students 61.9 points below standard; hispanic students 76.2 below standard; student with two or more races 37.8 points below standard; students with disabilities 122.7 points below standard. | All students 59.4 points below standard; socioeconomically disadvantaged students 66.2 points below standard; white students 67.6 points below standard; Hispanic students 55.2 below standard; student with two or more races 21.7 points below standard; students with disabilities 122 points below standard. | Each student group listed will score at or above the following distance from standard: All students 65 points below standard; socioeconomically disadvantaged students 76 points below standard; white students 63 points below standard; hispanic students 75 below standard; students with disabilities 145 points below standard. | All students group scores increased 12.1 points; socioeconomically disadvantaged students scores increased 15.2 points; white students scores increased 0.6 points; Hispanic students scores increased 25 points; students with disabilities scores increased 28.8 points. |
| 7 | Pupil Achievement on Statewide Assessments (CAST Percent Met/Exceeded) | 27.17% students met or exceeded standard for science. | 24.14% met or exceeded standard for science. Starting on the 2024 Dashboard, CAST scores are posted for schools (2024 for informational purposes only). The dashboard uses the distance from standard metric. For 2024 CAST scores GVRS performed as follows: All students 18.2 points below standard, hispanic | 24.07% of students met or exceeded standards for science; 50.7 points on CA School Dashboard (an increase of 4.4 points),socioeconomically disadvantaged students 47.7 points (increase of 9.8 points), and white 50.1 points (an increase of 4.4 points). The Dashboard changed the metric for science from 2024 dashboard to the 2025 | 30% students met or exceeded standard for science. | The percentage of students that met or exceeded standards for science declined by 3.1% from baseline scores. Starting on the 2024 Dashboard, CAST scores are posted for schools. For 2025 CAST scores GVRS performed as follows: All students increased 4.4 points, socioeconomically disadvantaged students increased 9.8 points, and |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | students 17.7 points below standard, socioeconomically disadvantaged students 26.5 points below standard, and white 18.9 points below standard. | dashboard and no longer uses a DFS metric, but uses points. | | white students increased 4.4 points. |
| 8 | A broad course of study including courses described under EC Sections 51210 and 51220 as applicable (Local Indicator Priority 7 Self-Reflection Tool) | In 2022-23, all students had access to a broad course of study that included all subject areas. | All students had access to a broad course of study that included all subject areas. | All students had access to a broad course of study that included all subject areas. | All students will have access to a broad course of study that included all subject areas. | Maintained baseline of all students having access to a broad course of study that included all subject areas. |
| 9 | Other Pupil Outcomes (Fastbridge aReading percent of students at or above grade level) | 61.5% of students at or above grade level on the Fastbridge aReading assessment. | 57.2% of students in grade 3-8 are at or above grade level on the aReading assessment. | 66.7% of students in grade 3-8 are at or above grade level on the aReading assessment. | 63% of students at or above grade level on the Fastbridge aReading assessment. | The percentage of students in grade 3-8 are at or above grade level on the aReading assessment increased by 5.2% |
| 10 | Other Pupil Outcomes (Fastbridge AUTOreading percent of students at or above grade level ) | 55.8% of students at or above grade level on the Fastbridge AUTOreading assessment. | 53.7% of students in grade 4-8 are at or above grade level on the AUTOread assessment. | 59.3% of students in grade 4-8 are at or above grade level on the AUTOread assessment. | 57% of students at or above grade level on the Fastbridge AUTOreading assessment. | The percent of students in grade 4-8 are at or above grade level on the AUTOread assessment declined by 3.5%. |
| 11 | Other Pupil Outcomes (Fastbridge aMath percent of students at or above grade level) | 47.9% of students at or above grade level on the Fastbridge aMath assessment. | 47.9% of students in grade 3-8 are at or above grade level on the aMath assessment. | 51.9% of students in grade 3-8 are at or above grade level on the aMath assessment. | 51% of students at or above grade level on the Fastbridge aMath assessment. | The percent of students in grade 3-8 are at or above grade level on the aMath assessment increased 4%. |
| 12 | Other Pupil Outcomes (Fastbridge CBM Math percent of students at or above grade level) | 55.8% of students at or above grade level on the Fastbridge CBM Math Automaticity assessment. | 68.9% of students in grade 3-8 are at or above grade level on the Math Automaticity assessment. | 54.6% of students at or above grade level on the Fastbridge CBM Math Automaticity assessment. | 57% of students at or above grade level on the Fastbridge CBM Math Automaticity assessment. | The percent of students in grade 3-8 are at or above grade level on the Math Automaticity assessment decreased by 1.2%. |

## Goal Analysis for 2026-27

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

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

Goal 1 was implemented substantially as planned. Golden Valley River continued to provide students with access to a comprehensive public Waldorf-inspired curriculum, including mathematics, English language arts, intervention, English learner supports, enrichment opportunities, professional development, specialty classes, supports and services for students with exceptional needs, class teachers, and classroom materials. The school also maintained key conditions for learning, including 100% access to standards-aligned instructional materials, full implementation of academic content standards, full implementation of English learner access to California standards including ELD standards, and access to a broad course of study.

Implementation differences were primarily related to staffing, program participation, and actual service costs. Specialty classes were implemented, but actual expenditures were lower than planned. Professional development was also lower than planned, reflecting lower-than-anticipated participation in some training activities. In contrast, enrichment opportunities, supports and services for students with exceptional needs, class teachers, central office system supports, and classroom materials exceeded planned expenditures. These differences did not prevent the school from implementing the planned actions, but they did affect the level and distribution of expenditures across the goal.

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.

Goal 1 had several material differences between budgeted and estimated actual expenditures. Math was budgeted at $9,619 and had estimated actual expenditures of $5,847.93. English Language Arts was budgeted at $9,619 and had estimated actual expenditures of $5,139.37. Intervention was budgeted at $109,619 and had estimated actual expenditures of $70,654.05. Professional Development was budgeted at $36,759 and had estimated actual expenditures of $15,717.81. Specialty Classes were budgeted at $242,855 and had estimated actual expenditures of $235,106.70. These variances reflect lower actual costs for some materials, staffing, and professional learning activities than originally projected.

Several Goal 1 actions exceeded their budgeted amounts. Enrichment Opportunities were budgeted at $117,402 and had estimated actual expenditures of $206,255.17. Central Office System Supports were budgeted at $328,023 and had estimated actual expenditures of $384,563.98. Supports and Services for Students with Exceptional Needs were budgeted at $320,272 and had estimated actual expenditures of $365,183.54. Class Teachers were budgeted at $958,109 and had estimated actual expenditures of $1,097,001.09. Classroom Materials were budgeted at $32,500 and had estimated actual expenditures of $39,691.26. These increases were associated with additional staffing costs, increased service needs, higher benefit costs, and additional classroom/program needs.

For Goal 1 contributing actions, the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table shows that the estimated actual level of increased or improved services was generally higher than planned for several major actions. Intervention decreased from 2.40% planned to 2.00% estimated actual. Academic Supports for EL Students remained essentially consistent at 1.48% planned and 1.48% estimated actual. Enrichment Opportunities increased from 3.85% planned to 6.77% estimated actual. Professional Development decreased from 1.00% planned to 0.52% estimated actual. Supports and Services for Students with Exceptional Needs increased from 5.25% planned to 6.72% estimated actual. Class Teachers increased from 31.44% planned to 36.00% estimated actual. Math, English Language Arts, and Title I Supports remained at 0.00% planned and 0.00% estimated actual because no LCFF contributing expenditures or percentage of improved services were reported for those actions.

An explanation of how effective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal.

Goal 1 actions were partially effective in making progress toward the goal of providing all students with access to a comprehensive, rigorous, relevant, engaging, and developmentally appropriate Waldorf-inspired education. The school maintained important foundational conditions for learning, including access to standards-aligned instructional materials, full implementation of academic content standards, full implementation of English learner access to standards including ELD standards, and access to a broad course of study. These results indicate that the school successfully maintained the core instructional conditions necessary to implement the educational program.

Academic outcomes showed growth in several areas, while also identifying continued needs. In English language arts, all students improved from 16.9 points below standard at baseline to 7 points below standard in the Year 2 outcome, a 9.9-point improvement. White students improved by 8.4 points, Hispanic students improved by 12.9 points, and students with disabilities improved by 7.2 points. However, socioeconomically disadvantaged students declined from 26.5 points below standard to 40.3 points below standard, showing that additional support is needed for this student group.

In mathematics, all students improved from 71.5 points below standard at baseline to 59.4 points below standard in the Year 2 outcome. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students improved from 81.4 points below standard to 66.2 points below standard, Hispanic students improved from 80.2 points below standard to 55.2 points below standard, students with two or more races improved from 37.8 points below standard to 21.7 points below standard, and students with disabilities improved from 150.8 points below standard to 122 points below standard. White students declined from 68.2 points below standard to 67.6 points below standard, which is a small decline relative to the baseline. Overall, mathematics data suggest that Goal 1 actions contributed to stronger progress in mathematics than in ELA for socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

Overall, Goal 1 actions were effective in maintaining access to the instructional program and supporting academic improvement in several student groups, particularly in mathematics. However, the ELA decline for socioeconomically disadvantaged students and continued performance gaps for students with disabilities indicate that the school should continue strengthening academic intervention, differentiated instruction, progress monitoring, and data-based instructional planning.

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

Based on reflection on implementation, expenditures, educational partner feedback, and student outcome data, Golden Valley River will continue Goal 1 with a stronger emphasis on instructional coherence, targeted academic intervention, and consistent monitoring of student progress. The school will continue to prioritize mathematics and English language arts instruction, intervention, English learner supports, enrichment opportunities, professional development, inclusive practices, class teachers, and classroom materials. Educational partner input and outcome data also support continued focus on stronger implementation monitoring, more consistent use of student data, targeted academic intervention, and professional development.

For the coming year, the school will strengthen staff capacity through professional learning in areas such as Multi-Tiered System of Supports, Universal Design for Learning, differentiation, restorative practices, and social-emotional learning. The school will also continue to monitor contributing actions and expenditures to ensure that resources are clearly connected to improved outcomes for low-income students, English learners, foster/homeless youth, students with disabilities, and other student groups demonstrating need.

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Action #1 | Math | Support teachers in creating classrooms with rich-academic language, engaging tasks, and targeted assessment. Strategies and materials to incorporate real-world problem-solving situations, and equitable access to learning for all students. | $5,000.00 | Yes |
| Action #2 | English Language Arts | Support teachers in creating classrooms with rich academic language, engaging tasks, and targeted assessment in English Language Arts. Teachers will be supported to participate in meaningful professional learning around increasing rigor and depth of knowledge with literacy-related lessons and activities as well as how to adjust instruction to ensure the instruction and content is meeting the needs of all students. This includes materials. | $5,000.00 | Yes |
| Action #3 | Intervention | Support implementation of tiered interventions using relevant data to target instruction and monitor literacy and math. Students that are identified and Title I and Unduplicated Pupils will be prioritized for receiving interventions; Staff to provide instructional and support services for all students; ensure that there are research-based materials and technology needed to perform interventions that meet the needs of all students. | $37,759.00 | Yes |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Action #4 | Academic Supports for EL Students | Provide support for implementation of English Language Development (ELD) and content standards to support teachers in meeting the needs of English Language Learners (ELs). This includes support staff to provide professional learning focused on data analysis, strategies for designated ELD instruction, and strategies for integrated ELD instruction. | $750.00 | Yes |
| Action #5 | Title I Supports | Provide support to school focused on meeting the needs of Title I students focused on academic and social emotional learning. | $0.00 | Yes |
| Action #6 | After School Program | Golden Valley River will implement after school academic support, enrichment, and attendance recovery opportunities to address needs identified through the LEA's needs assessment, including local assessment results, CAASPP data, chronic absenteeism data, student engagement data, school climate survey results, and educational partner feedback. This is an LREBG-supported action. Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant funds will be used to support after school programming and attendance recovery activities that provide students with additional learning time, targeted academic support, enrichment, and structured opportunities to recover instructional time lost due to absences.<br><br>This action is intended to support students who are not yet meeting grade-level standards, students with inconsistent attendance, and student groups demonstrating need, including socioeconomically disadvantaged students, English learners, foster/homeless youth, students with disabilities, and other students identified through local data. The after school program will provide additional time for academic reinforcement, skill development, student engagement, and connection to | $200,821.00 | Yes |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | school. Attendance recovery activities will support reengagement, help reduce the impact of missed instructional time, and promote improved attendance habits.<br><br>Research supports the use of expanded learning time and well-designed after school programs as a strategy for improving student academic outcomes, engagement, and school connectedness when programs are intentionally aligned to student needs, include academic support and enrichment, and provide consistent adult support. Research on attendance interventions also supports early identification, family outreach, reengagement strategies, and structured opportunities to recover learning time as part of a comprehensive approach to reducing chronic absenteeism. Because the LEA's needs assessment identified ongoing needs in academic achievement, chronic absenteeism, and student engagement, this action is aligned to the demonstrated needs of students and is expected to contribute to improved academic performance, increased participation, and reduced absenteeism.<br><br>The LEA will monitor the effectiveness of this LREBG action using the following metrics: CAASPP English language arts results, CAASPP mathematics results, FastBridge reading and mathematics assessment results, chronic absenteeism rate, student attendance rate, participation in after school programming, attendance recovery participation/completion data, school climate survey results, and progress for student groups, including socioeconomically disadvantaged students, English learners, foster/homeless youth, and | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | students with disabilities.<br><br>Amount of LREBG funds supporting this action: $100,821<br><br>This action is connected to the Annual Performance reflection because the LEA's review identified continued needs in academic achievement, subgroup performance, chronic absenteeism, school climate, and student engagement, while also noting that LREBG funds are being used for after school programming and attendance recovery based on the LEA's needs assessment. | | |
| Action #7 | Professional Development | Provide support and training to new and veteran teachers in a system of professional growth; trainings in Waldorf pedagogy; curriculum development and support. | $20,928.00 | Yes |
| Action #8 | Specialty Classes | Students will receive instruction related to arts, music, world languages, physical education, etc. to support the education of the whole child; and materials to support instruction in specialty classes. | $325,000.00 | No |
| Action #9 | Central Office System Supports for Continuous Improvement | Support to school from central office staff to support continuous improvement principles and practices with educational partners with a focus on increasing and improving services and supports for targeted student groups. This includes staff, professional learning, and supplies. | $319,415.00 | No |
| Action #10 | Supports and Services for Students with Exceptional Needs | Support for implementing inclusive practices for students with exceptional needs. This includes staff, professional development opportunities, and materials. | $428,285.00 | Yes |
| Action #11 | Class Teachers | Appropriately assigned and credentialed class teachers to provide instruction in grades TK-8. | $1,323,487.74 | Yes |
| Action #12 | Classroom Materials | All classroom materials will be provided for all students. | $60,000.00 | No |

## Goal

| Goal # | Description | Type of Goal |
|---|---|---|
| Goal 2 | Intentional Culture of Care: The school will promote the complete education, both academically and socially, to ensure the success and safety of all students. | Broad |

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

1, 5, 6

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

In an effort to align with the LEA's continuous improvement work the LEA in conjunction with educational partners in response to state and local Dashboard data areas, and are reflective of the shared interests across educational partner groups. The goal, metrics, and actions have been strategically groups together based on careful analysis of quantitative and qualitative data to identify underlying causes contributing to the Dashboard results. Analysis of data consisted of careful review of state and local data, educational partner voice, and research with a focus on increasing student outcomes, experiences, and access to opportunities. Performance will be measured using the multiple metrics under the Measuring and Reporting Results section of the goal. To achieve each goal, actions and expenditures will be implemented and updated on an annual basis and will reflect educational partner input and state and local data.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Safe, Clean & Functional School Facility (SARC) | Instances Where Facilities Do Not Meet The "Good Repair" Standard: 0 | Instances Where Facilities Do Not Meet The "Good Repair" Standard: 0 | Instances Where Facilities Do Not Meet The "Good Repair" Standard: 0 | Instances Where Facilities Do Not Meet The "Good Repair" Standard: 0 | Maintained baseline level of no instances where facilities did not meet the "Good Repair" standard. |
| 2 | School Attendance Rate (Local: Aeries-SIS) | 94.3% | 94.2% (attendance months 1-10) | 95.7% (attendance months 1-9) | >95% | The attendance rate increased 1.4% from baseline. |
| 3 | Middle School Dropout Rate (CALPADS) | 0% | 0% | 0% | Maintain 0% | Maintained a dropout rate of 0% |
| 4 | Local School Climate Survey (ASSC School Climate Assessment Instrument) | Overall School Climate: 4.27 (staff); 4.18 (parents); 3.64 (students) | Overall School Climate: 3.54 (staff); 3.99 (parents); 3.78 (students) | TBD waiting on ASSC report | Overall: 4.27(staff); 4.18(parents); 3.85(students) | TBD |

## Goal Analysis for 2026-27

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

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

Goal 2 was implemented substantially as planned. Golden Valley River continued to maintain a safe and clean facility, provide students with access to the Renewal Room for social-emotional learning and behavioral supports, implement school climate improvement efforts, and provide universal meals. The school maintained zero instances in which facilities did not meet the “good repair” standard and maintained a 0% middle school dropout rate.

The main implementation difference was related to the Renewal Room. The action was implemented, and students continued to have access to a physical space and staff support for social-emotional and behavioral needs; however, actual staffing, materials, and extra hours differed from the original plan. School Climate Improvement was implemented at a slightly lower cost than planned, while Facility and Universal Meals were implemented close to or at planned amounts.

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.

Goal 2 expenditures were generally close to planned amounts. Facility was budgeted at $345,222 and had estimated actual expenditures of $345,222. Renewal Room was budgeted at $50,000 and had estimated actual expenditures of $52,401.49. School Climate Improvement was budgeted at $2,000 and had estimated actual expenditures of $1,500. Universal Meals was budgeted at $170,000 and had estimated actual expenditures of $169,903.48.

For Goal 2 contributing actions, School Climate Improvement decreased from 0.07% planned to 0.05% estimated actual, reflecting the lower estimated actual LCFF contributing expenditure for that action.

An explanation of how effective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal.

Goal 2 actions were moderately effective in supporting an intentional culture of care. The school maintained safe and functional facilities, as shown by zero instances in which facilities did not meet the “good repair” standard. The school also maintained a 0% middle school dropout rate and continued to provide universal meals and Renewal Room supports, which contributed to stable conditions for student safety, well-being, and access to learning.

Attendance improved from the baseline. The attendance rate increased from 94.3% at baseline to 95.7% in the Year 2 outcome, exceeding the target of greater than 95%. This indicates that the school’s culture-of-care actions, combined with broader attendance and engagement efforts, supported improved student participation in school.

Overall, Goal 2 actions helped maintain safe and supportive conditions, improved attendance, and supported student climate. Continued attention is needed to strengthen staff cohesion, parent communication, leadership coherence, and consistent implementation of restorative, behavior systems, and social-emotional supports.

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

Based on reflection on Goal 2 results, Golden Valley River will continue this goal with a stronger emphasis on leadership, communication, adult alignment, and consistent implementation of schoolwide culture-building practices. Climate survey data and meeting feedback indicated a need to strengthen communication, leadership coherence, staff collaboration, and shared commitment to the school’s mission, vision, and values.

The school will continue facility maintenance, Renewal Room supports, school climate improvement, restorative practices, PBIS, social-emotional learning, and universal meals. For the coming year, implementation will focus on sustaining improved attendance and student climate while improving staff and family climate indicators.

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Action #1 | Facility | Students and staff will have a safe and clean school to support the instructional program. | $364,681.00 | No |
| Action #2 | Renewal Room | Students will have access to a physical space and staff to help with social-emotional learning and behavioral supports. | $45,000.00 | No |
| Action #3 | School Climate Improvement | Build and create culturally responsive, psychologically, socially, emotionally, and academically safe environments by providing professional development to support the school with student engagement, alternative practices to suspensions (Restorative Practice, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and social-emotional learning). | $1,500.00 | Yes |
| Action #4 | Universal Meals | Students will have access to two meals each day at no cost each instructional day. | $140,000.00 | Yes |

# Goal

| Goal # | Description | Type of Goal |
|---|---|---|
| Goal 3 | Vibrant Learning Community: The school will build relationships to connect students and families with programs and resources to help foster healthy learning opportunities for all students. | Broad |

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

3, 6, 7

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

In an effort to align with the LEA's continuous improvement work the LEA in conjunction with educational partners in response to state and local Dashboard data areas, and are reflective of the shared interests across educational partner groups. The goal, metrics, and actions have been strategically groups together based on careful analysis of quantitative and qualitative data to identify underlying causes contributing to the Dashboard results. Analysis of data consisted of careful review of state and local data, educational partner voice, and research with a focus on increasing student outcomes, experiences, and access to opportunities. Performance will be measured using the multiple metrics under the Measuring and Reporting Results section of the goal. To achieve each goal, actions and expenditures will be implemented and updated on an annual basis and will reflect educational partner input and state and local data.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Promote parental participation in programs (Local Indicator Priority 3 Self-Reflection Tool) | Full Implementation in all areas | Full Implementation in all areas | Full Implementation in all areas | Full Implementation in all areas | Maintained Full Implementation in all areas from baseline. |
| 2 | Chronic Absenteeism Rate (CA School Dashboard) | All Students: 27.8%<br>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 33.6%<br>Students with Disabilities: 35.3%<br>Hispanic: 34.8%<br>White: 26.3%<br>Two or More Races: 37.5% | All: 15.1%<br>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 25.7%<br>White: 16%<br>Hispanic: 14.9%<br>Two or more races: 10.7%<br>Students with Disabilities: 22.6% | All: 12.8%<br>SED: 21.7%<br>White: 14.1%<br>Hispanic: 13.8%<br>Two or more races: 5.1%<br>SWD: 14.5% | All: 10%<br>SED: 15%<br>White: 12%<br>Hispanic: 10%<br>Two or more races: 4%<br>SWD: 12% | All: declined 15%<br>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: declined 11.9%<br>White: declined 12.2%<br>Hispanic: declined 21%<br>Two or more races: declined 32.4%<br>Students with Disabilities: declined 20.8% |
| 3 | Pupil Suspension Rates (CA School Dashboard) | All Students: 1.9%<br>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 3.5%<br>Students with Disabilities: 5.7%<br>Hispanic: 1.5%<br>White: 2.3%<br>Two or More Races: 0% | All Students: 0.9%<br>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 1.8%<br>Students with Disabilities: 1.9%<br>Hispanic: 1.5%<br>White: 0.5%<br>Two or More Races: 0% | All Students: 1%<br>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 2.4%<br>Students with Disabilities: 0%<br>Hispanic: 0%<br>White: 1%<br>Two or More Races: 2.5% | Maintain 1% or lower | All Students: decreased 0.9%<br>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: decreased 1.1%<br>Students with Disabilities: decreased 5.7%<br>Hispanic: decreased 1.5%<br>White: decreased 1.3%<br>Two or More Races: increased 2.5% |
| 4 | Pupil Expulsion Rates (DataQuest Expulsion Rate) | 0% | 0% | 0% | Maintain 0% | GVRS maintained an expulsion rate of 0% from the baseline year. |

## Goal Analysis for 2026-27

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

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

Goal 3 was implemented substantially as planned. Golden Valley River continued to provide responsive programs, curriculum, and instruction for students with exceptional needs; responsive programs, curriculum, and instruction for unduplicated pupils; and family and community engagement opportunities. The school also maintained full implementation of parent participation expectations under the Priority 3 local indicator.

There were no major programmatic differences in implementation. However, estimated actual expenditures exceeded planned amounts for each Goal 3 action, indicating that the actual cost of providing responsive supports and family/community engagement was higher than originally budgeted. These differences should continue to be monitored so that planned expenditures accurately reflect the level of service and support needed for students and families.

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.

Goal 3 had material expenditure differences across all three actions. Accessible and Responsive Schools for Students with Exceptional Needs was budgeted at $51,661 and had estimated actual expenditures of $66,522.34. Accessible and Responsive Schools for Unduplicated Pupils was budgeted at $51,661 and had estimated actual expenditures of $66,522.34. Family and Community Engagement was budgeted at $16,391 and had estimated actual expenditures of $20,691.47.

For contributing actions, Goal 3 Action 2, Accessible and Responsive Schools for Unduplicated Pupils, had $51,661 in planned LCFF contributing expenditures and $66,522.34 in estimated actual LCFF contributing expenditures. Goal 3 Action 3, Family and Community Engagement, had $16,391 in planned LCFF contributing expenditures and $20,691.47 in estimated actual LCFF contributing expenditures.

An explanation of how effective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal.

Goal 3 actions were effective in strengthening student engagement, family connection, and school-community partnership. The school maintained full implementation of parent participation expectations, indicating continued attention to family engagement and partnership. Educational partner feedback also emphasized attendance, engagement, family partnership, targeted outreach, improved communication with families, and continued opportunities for families to participate in school life and leadership.

Chronic absenteeism improved substantially. The all-student chronic absenteeism rate declined from 27.8% at baseline to 12.8% in the Year 2 outcome. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students declined from 33.6% to 21.7%, students with disabilities declined from 35.3% to 14.5%, Hispanic students declined from 34.8% to 13.8%, White students declined from 26.3% to 14.1%, and students with two or more races declined from 37.5% to 5.1%. Although some student groups remain above the final target, the data show meaningful progress in improving attendance and engagement.

Suspension outcomes also improved overall. The all-student suspension rate decreased from 1.9% at baseline to 1.0% in the Year 2 outcome. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students decreased from 3.5% to 2.4%, students with disabilities decreased from 5.7% to 0%, Hispanic students decreased from 1.5% to 0%, and White students decreased from 2.3% to 1.0%. Students with two or more races increased from 0% to 2.5%, which will require continued monitoring and targeted support. The school maintained a 0% expulsion rate.

Overall, Goal 3 actions were effective in improving chronic absenteeism, reducing suspensions for most reported student groups, maintaining a 0% expulsion rate, and sustaining family participation systems. Continued work is needed to further reduce chronic absenteeism for socioeconomically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities, monitor the suspension rate for students with two or more races, and connect family engagement and responsive supports to improved academic outcomes.

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

Golden Valley River will continue Goal 3 with a focus on strengthening relationships among students, families, staff, and community partners. Families and staff identified attendance, engagement, and family partnership as continuing priorities, and input from meetings, committees, and the LCAP mid-year update reinforced the need for targeted outreach, improved communication with families, and continued opportunities for families to participate in school life and leadership.

For the coming year, the school will continue responsive supports for students with exceptional needs, responsive programs for unduplicated pupils, and family and community engagement actions. The school will strengthen monitoring of attendance, suspension, participation, family engagement, and academic data so that supports can be adjusted quickly and tied more directly to improved outcomes for unduplicated pupils and other student groups demonstrating need.

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Action #1 | Accessible and Responsive Schools for Students with Exceptional Needs | Provide responsive programs, curriculum, and instruction to support the needs of students with exceptional needs. | $51,661.00 | No |
| Action #2 | Accessible and Responsive Schools for Unduplicated Pupils | Provide responsive programs, curriculum, and instruction to support unduplicated pupils (students identified and socioeconomically disadvantaged, foster/homeless youth, and English Language Learners). | $51,661.00 | Yes |
| Action #3 | Family and Community Engagement | Provide avenues where families are valued as active participants in building and fostering strong school and community relationships and connections. Provide information to families on how to support the efforts of the school at home. Build capacity with families to take leadership roles that address specific school needs. | $16,391.00 | Yes |

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

| Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants | Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant |
|---|---|
| $206,195.00 | $0.00 |

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5.41% | 0.00% | $0.00 | 5.41% |

**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 #(s) | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Goal 1 Action 1 | Low-income students need increased access to rigorous mathematics instruction, academic language, real-world problem-solving, and targeted assessment practices. Current mathematics data show continued need, particularly for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, who performed 88.6 points below standard, compared with all students at 59.9 points below standard. | This action strengthens mathematics instruction through rich academic language, engaging tasks, targeted assessment, and real-world problem-solving. It is provided LEA-wide because low-income students are enrolled across grade levels and classrooms, and mathematics improvement requires consistent instructional practices across the school. The action is principally directed toward low-income students because it addresses the specific mathematics performance gap demonstrated by socioeconomically disadvantaged students, while also improving the quality of mathematics instruction available to all students. | CAASPP Mathematics Distance from Standard for all students and socioeconomically disadvantaged students; FastBridge aMath; FastBridge CBM Math Automaticity; classroom assessment data; progress-monitoring data; participation in targeted mathematics supports. |
| Goal 1 Action 2 | Low-income students need improved access to rigorous literacy instruction, academic language development, and targeted assessment in English language arts. ELA data show that all students performed 19 points below standard, while socioeconomically disadvantaged students performed 41.2 points below standard, reflecting a larger performance gap for low-income students. Local reading data also show continued need, with FastBridge aReading and AUTOreading results below desired levels. | This action strengthens English language arts instruction through academic language development, engaging literacy tasks, targeted assessment, professional learning, and adjustment of instruction based on student need. It is provided LEA-wide because low-income students are enrolled throughout the school, and consistent literacy practices across classrooms are necessary to improve access to grade-level standards. The action is principally directed toward low-income students by improving teacher capacity to provide responsive literacy instruction, academic language support, and targeted assessment for students not yet meeting grade-level expectations. | CAASPP ELA Distance from Standard for all students and socioeconomically disadvantaged students; FastBridge aReading; FastBridge AUTOreading; classroom assessment data; progress-monitoring data; student participation in literacy supports. |
| Goal 1 Action 3 | Low-income students, English learners, foster/homeless youth, and Title I-identified students need additional targeted academic support in literacy and mathematics. Dashboard and local assessment data show continued academic need, including socioeconomically disadvantaged students performing 41.2 points below standard in ELA and 88.6 points below standard in mathematics. The Annual Update also identifies the need for stronger monitoring and more targeted supports. | This action provides tiered academic intervention using student performance data to target instruction and monitor progress in literacy and mathematics. Title I students and unduplicated pupils will be prioritized for intervention services. The action is provided LEA-wide because students needing intervention are enrolled across grade levels and classrooms, and a schoolwide tiered intervention system allows the school to identify students early, provide flexible support, and monitor progress consistently. The action is principally directed toward unduplicated pupils because low-income students, English learners, and foster/homeless youth are prioritized for intervention access, progress monitoring, research-based | CAASPP ELA and Mathematics Distance from Standard by student group; FastBridge aReading; FastBridge AUTOreading; FastBridge aMath; FastBridge CBM Math Automaticity; intervention participation data; intervention progress-monitoring data; teacher referral and classroom assessment data. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | materials, technology, and instructional support. | |
| Goal 1 Action 5 | Low-income students, English learners, foster/homeless youth, and students identified for Title I support need additional academic and social-emotional supports to access grade-level learning and participate successfully in the school program. Academic data show continued gaps for socioeconomically disadvantaged students in ELA and mathematics, and attendance data show that socioeconomically disadvantaged students continue to have a chronic absenteeism rate above the schoolwide target. | This action provides school support focused on the academic and social-emotional needs of Title I students and unduplicated pupils. It is provided LEA-wide because Title I and unduplicated students are enrolled across the school, and schoolwide systems are needed to identify needs, coordinate supports, and reduce barriers to learning. The action is principally directed toward low-income students, English learners, foster/homeless youth, and Title I students by focusing support systems on students who demonstrate academic, attendance, or social-emotional need. | CAASPP ELA and Mathematics Distance from Standard by student group; FastBridge academic assessments; chronic absenteeism rate for socioeconomically disadvantaged students and other unduplicated groups; attendance rate; school climate survey results; participation in Title I or targeted support services. |
| Goal 1 Action 6 | Unduplicated pupils may have fewer opportunities to access enrichment, extended learning, physical activity, arts, and other learning opportunities outside the regular instructional day. The school also continues to address engagement and attendance needs, including a chronic absenteeism rate of 25.7% for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, above the target of 10% or less for all student groups. | This action provides after-school, intersession, and summer enrichment programs, with priority for unduplicated pupils. These programs extend learning beyond the instructional day and provide academic, physical, and artistic activities. The action is provided LEA-wide because enrichment opportunities contribute to a connected and inclusive school culture, and unduplicated pupils are served across grade levels. It is principally directed toward unduplicated pupils through prioritized access, outreach, and materials that reduce barriers to participation. | Enrichment participation by student group; chronic absenteeism rate by student group; attendance rate; school climate survey results; CAASPP ELA and Mathematics; FastBridge academic assessments; student and family feedback. |
| Goal 1 Action 7 | Unduplicated pupils may have fewer opportunities to access enrichment, extended learning, physical activity, arts, and other learning opportunities outside the regular instructional day. The school also continues to address engagement and attendance needs, including a chronic absenteeism rate of 25.7% for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, which remains above the school’s target of 10% or less for all student groups. | This action provides after-school, intersession, and summer enrichment programs, with priority for unduplicated pupils. These programs extend learning beyond the instructional day and provide academic, physical, and artistic activities that support student engagement and connection to school. The action is provided LEA-wide because enrichment opportunities contribute to a connected and inclusive school culture, and unduplicated pupils are served across grade levels. It is principally directed toward low-income students, English learners, and foster/homeless youth through prioritized access, targeted outreach, and materials or supports that reduce barriers to participation. | After-school and enrichment participation by student group; chronic absenteeism rate by student group; attendance rate; school climate survey results; CAASPP ELA and Mathematics; FastBridge academic assessments; student and family feedback. |
| Goal 1 Action 10 | Some unduplicated pupils also have exceptional learning needs and require inclusive practices, coordinated supports, and accessible | This action supports inclusive practices, staff training, coordinated supports, and instructional materials that improve access to learning. It is | CAASPP ELA and Mathematics Distance from Standard by student group; FastBridge academic assessments; chronic absenteeism |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | instruction to fully participate in grade-level learning. Academic, attendance, and school climate data indicate a continued need to strengthen inclusive instructional practices and improve access for students who need additional academic, behavioral, or social-emotional support. | provided LEA-wide because inclusive practices require consistent adult capacity, shared instructional systems, and coordinated supports across classrooms and grade levels. The action is principally directed toward low-income students, English learners, and foster/homeless youth when they also require additional support to access instruction, participate in the school program, and make progress academically, socially, and behaviorally. While students with exceptional needs are not an LCFF unduplicated pupil group by themselves, this action increases or improves services for unduplicated pupils by expanding inclusive practices and access supports for low-income students, English learners, and foster/homeless youth who need additional academic, behavioral, or social-emotional support. | rate; suspension rate; school climate survey results; progress-monitoring data; participation in inclusive supports; implementation evidence for UDL, MTSS, and inclusive practices. |
| Goal 1 Action 11 | Low-income students and other unduplicated pupils need stable, appropriately assigned, credentialed teachers who can provide consistent instruction, build strong relationships, use student data, and deliver differentiated support across grade levels. Academic data show persistent gaps for socioeconomically disadvantaged students in ELA and mathematics, and local assessment data show a need for continued instructional improvement in reading and math. | This action provides appropriately assigned and credentialed class teachers for grades TK-8. It is provided LEA-wide because unduplicated pupils are enrolled throughout the school and benefit from consistent, qualified classroom instruction across all grade levels. The action is principally directed toward low-income students, English learners, and foster/homeless youth through teacher use of data, targeted grouping, differentiated instruction, relationship-based classroom practices, family communication, and coordination with intervention and support staff. By strengthening the consistency and quality of classroom instruction across the school, the action is intended to improve academic access and outcomes for unduplicated pupils while also benefiting all students. | Teacher Assignment Monitoring Outcomes; CAASPP ELA and Mathematics Distance from Standard by student group; FastBridge academic assessments; classroom assessment data; progress-monitoring data; attendance rate; chronic absenteeism rate; school climate survey results. |
| Goal 2 Action 3 | Low-income students, English learners, and foster/homeless youth need safe, connected, culturally responsive, and supportive learning environments that reduce barriers to attendance, engagement, and positive behavior. Chronic absenteeism remains above the schoolwide target for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and suspension data show a need for continued attention to student groups whose suspension rates remain above the all-student rate. | This action provides schoolwide support for culturally responsive, psychologically safe, socially and emotionally supportive practices, including student engagement, restorative practices, PBIS, and social-emotional learning. It is provided LEA-wide because school climate improvement requires consistent adult practices, shared expectations, common systems, and coordinated implementation across the campus. The action is principally directed toward unduplicated pupils by addressing the school climate, attendance, engagement, and | Chronic absenteeism rate by student group; attendance rate; suspension rate by student group; school climate survey results for students, families, and staff; behavior referral data if available; participation in restorative, behavior, SEL, and student support services. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | behavior conditions that can disproportionately affect students facing greater barriers to school participation. | |
| Goal 2 Action 4 | Low-income students need consistent access to meals during the school day so that basic needs do not interfere with attendance, engagement, behavior, and learning. Providing meals at no cost reduces stigma and removes participation barriers for students and families who may otherwise experience food insecurity or difficulty accessing meals. | This action provides universal meals to all students at no cost. It is provided LEA-wide because a universal model reduces stigma, simplifies access, increases participation, and ensures that low-income students receive the service without being singled out. The action is principally directed toward low-income students by addressing a basic need that directly affects readiness to learn, attendance, engagement, and school connectedness. Although all students may access meals, the universal design is intended to improve outcomes for low-income students by ensuring reliable, dignified, and barrier-free access to nutrition during the school day. | Meal participation data; participation by low-income students where available; attendance rate; chronic absenteeism rate for socioeconomically disadvantaged students; school climate survey results; student engagement data; family feedback. |
| Goal 3 Action 3 | Families of low-income students may experience barriers to full participation in school programs, communication, leadership, and home-school partnership. Attendance, engagement, and academic data indicate a need for stronger family partnership and targeted outreach, particularly for students and families who may face barriers to consistent participation in school life. Educational partner feedback also emphasized attendance, engagement, communication, family partnership, and opportunities for families to participate in school life and leadership. | This action provides avenues for families to be valued as active participants in building strong school and community relationships. It includes communication, family engagement opportunities, family capacity-building, and opportunities for families to participate in leadership and school improvement efforts. It is provided LEA-wide because a strong family-school partnership benefits the broader school community, while targeted outreach and communication are principally directed toward low-income families and other families facing barriers to participation. The action is intended to improve outcomes for low-income students by strengthening home-school connection, increasing family understanding of available supports, and improving attendance, engagement, and access to services. | Priority 3 local indicator; family participation data; attendance rate; chronic absenteeism rate by student group; school climate survey results; family survey results; participation in advisory groups, school events, conferences, Coffee with the Principal, committee meetings, and family engagement opportunities. |

## 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 #(s) | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|---|---|---|---|
| Goal 1 Action 4 | English learners have unique language acquisition needs and require access to both designated and integrated English Language Development instruction in order to access grade-level academic | This action is limited to English learners because the identified need is specific to English language development and access to academic content through language-supportive instruction. Golden Valley | ELPAC progress; English learner reclassification rate; English learner access to California standards, including ELD standards; CAASPP ELA and mathematics outcomes for English learners where available; |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | content. The school identified the need to support implementation of ELD and content standards, strengthen teacher use of designated and integrated ELD strategies, and monitor English learner progress using student data. | River will provide academic supports for English learners through staff support, professional learning, data analysis, designated ELD instruction, integrated ELD strategies, and implementation of ELD and content standards. These services are designed to increase English learners' access to grade-level instruction, improve academic language development, and support progress toward English language proficiency and reclassification. | classroom assessment data; teacher implementation evidence; participation in designated and integrated ELD supports. |
| Goal 3 Action 2 | Unduplicated pupils, including low-income students, English learners, and foster/homeless youth, need responsive programs, curriculum, instruction, and supports that address barriers to academic achievement, attendance, engagement, and full participation in the school program. Student outcome data show continued need for targeted support, including academic gaps for socioeconomically disadvantaged students and continued chronic absenteeism above the desired outcome for some student groups. | This action is limited to unduplicated pupils because it is specifically designed to increase and improve services for low-income students, English learners, and foster/homeless youth. Golden Valley River will provide responsive programs, curriculum, instruction, and supports based on student data and educational partner feedback. Services may include targeted outreach, academic and social-emotional supports, improved access to programs and materials, and coordination of services to reduce barriers to learning and participation. The action is designed to improve student engagement, attendance, academic progress, and access to the full school program for unduplicated pupils. | CAASPP ELA and mathematics outcomes for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, English learners where available, and other unduplicated pupil groups; FastBridge academic assessments; chronic absenteeism rate by student group; attendance rate; suspension rate by student group; school climate survey results; participation in targeted supports; progress-monitoring data; family engagement and outreach participation. |

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 limited actions associated with a planned percentage of improved services, Golden Valley River calculated the contribution by estimating the proportion of staff time, services, materials, professional learning, and implementation activities that are specifically directed toward the identified unduplicated pupil group. The estimate is based on the intended scope of service, the student group served, the staff and program time allocated to the action, and the expected level of increased or improved service beyond the base program. The school will monitor implementation and effectiveness using the metrics listed for each action, including English learner progress, reclassification, CAASPP outcomes, FastBridge data, chronic absenteeism, suspension, attendance, school climate data, and participation in targeted supports.

## *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.

Not applicable. Golden Valley River is not projecting additional 15 percent LCFF concentration grant add-on funding for the 2026-27 LCAP year. Therefore, no additional concentration grant add-on funding is available to increase the number of staff providing direct services to students at schools with an unduplicated pupil concentration above 55 percent.

| **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 | 1 to 13.21 | N/A |
| Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students | 1 to 21.33 | N/A |

## 2026-27 Total Planned Expenditures Table

| LCAP Year | 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 (Input Percentage from Prior Year) | Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2026-27 | $3,808,205.00 | $206,195.00 | 5.41% | 0.00% | 5.41% |

| Totals | LCFF Funds | Other State Funds | Local Funds | Federal Funds | Total Funds | Total Personnel | Total Non-Personnel |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Totals | $3,050,546.74 | $262,106.00 | $0.00 | $84,687.00 | $3,397,339.74 | $2,218,973.44 | $1,178,366.30 |

| Goal # | Action # | Action Title | Student Group(s) | Contributing to Increased or Improved Services? | Scope | Unduplicated Student Group(s) | Location | Time Span |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | Math | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 1 | 2 | English Language Arts | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 1 | 3 | Intervention | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 1 | 4 | Academic Supports for EL Students | EL | Yes | Limited | EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 1 | 5 | Title I Supports | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 1 | 6 | After School Program | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 1 | 7 | Professional Development | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 1 | 8 | Specialty Classes | All | No | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 1 | 9 | Central Office System Supports for Continuous Improvement | All | No | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 1 | 10 | Supports and Services for Students with | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and | All Schools | Ongoing |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Exceptional Needs | | | | Foster Youth, EL | | |
| 1 | 11 | Class Teachers | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 1 | 12 | Classroom Materials | All | No | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 2 | 1 | Facility | All | No | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 2 | 2 | Renewal Room | All | No | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 2 | 3 | School Climate Improvement | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 2 | 4 | Universal Meals | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 3 | 1 | Accessible and Responsive Schools for Students with Exceptional Needs | Students with Disabilities | No | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 3 | 2 | Accessible and Responsive Schools for Unduplicated Pupils | Unduplicated Pupils | Yes | Limited | Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing |
| 3 | 3 | Family and Community Engagement | All | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing |

| Goal # | Action # | Total Personnel | Total Non-personnel | LCFF Funds | Other State Funds | Local Funds | Federal Funds | Total Funds | Planned Percentage of Improved Services |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | $0.00 | $5,000.00 | $5,000.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $5,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 2 | $0.00 | $5,000.00 | $5,000.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $5,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 3 | $0.00 | $37,759.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $37,759.00 | $37,759.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 4 | $750.00 | $0.00 | $750.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $750.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 5 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 6 | $150,000.00 | $50,821.00 | $100,000.00 | $100,821.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $200,821.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 7 | $0.00 | $20,928.00 | $16,000.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $4,928.00 | $20,928.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 8 | $293,223.38 | $31,776.62 | $325,000.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $325,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 9 | $0.00 | $319,415.00 | $319,415.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $319,415.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 10 | $308,190.32 | $120,094.68 | $225,000.00 | $161,285.00 | $0.00 | $42,000.00 | $428,285.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 11 | $1,323,487.74 | $0.00 | $1,323,487.74 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $1,323,487.74 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 12 | $0.00 | $60,000.00 | $60,000.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $60,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 2 | 1 | $0.00 | $364,681.00 | $364,681.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $364,681.00 | 0.00% |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | $40,000.00 | $5,000.00 | $45,000.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $45,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 2 | 3 | $0.00 | $1,500.00 | $1,500.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $1,500.00 | 0.00% |
| 2 | 4 | $0.00 | $140,000.00 | $140,000.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $140,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 3 | 1 | $51,661.00 | $0.00 | $51,661.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $51,661.00 | 0.00% |
| 3 | 2 | $51,661.00 | $0.00 | $51,661.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $51,661.00 | 0.00% |
| 3 | 3 | $0.00 | $16,391.00 | $16,391.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $16,391.00 | 0.00% |

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $3,808,205.00 | $206,195.00 | 5.41% | 0.00% | 5.41% | $1,884,789.74 | 0.00% | 49.49% |

| Totals by Type | Total LCFF Funds |
|---|---|
| **Total:** | $1,884,789.74 |
| **LEA-wide Total:** | $2,998,135.74 |
| **Limited Total:** | $52,411.00 |
| **Schoolwide Total:** | $0.00 |

| Goal # | Action # | Action Title | Contributing to Increased or Improved Services? | Scope | Unduplicated Student Group(s) | Location | Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) | Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | Math | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income | All Schools | $5,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 2 | English Language Arts | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income | All Schools | $5,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 3 | Intervention | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income | All Schools | $0.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 4 | Academic Supports for EL Students | Yes | Limited | EL | All Schools | $750.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 5 | Title I Supports | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | $0.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 6 | After School Program | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | $100,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 7 | Professional Development | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | $16,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 1 | 10 | Supports and Services for Students with | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | $225,000.00 | 0.00% |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Exceptional Needs | | | | | | |
| 1 | 11 | Class Teachers | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | $1,323,487.74 | 0.00% |
| 2 | 3 | School Climate Improvement | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income, Homeless and Foster Youth, EL | All Schools | $1,500.00 | 0.00% |
| 2 | 4 | Universal Meals | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income | All Schools | $140,000.00 | 0.00% |
| 3 | 2 | Accessible and Responsive Schools for Unduplicated Pupils | Yes | Limited | Low Income | All Schools | $51,661.00 | 0.00% |
| 3 | 3 | Family and Community Engagement | Yes | LEA-Wide | Low Income | All Schools | $16,391.00 | 0.00% |

## 2025-26 Annual Update Table

| Totals | Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds) | Total Estimated Actual Expenditures (Total Funds) |
|---|---|---|
| Totals | $2,896,712.00 | $3,193,141.91 |

| Last Year's Goal # | Last Year's Action # | Action Title | Contributed to Increased or Improved Services? | Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds) | Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | Math | Yes | $9,619.00 | $5,847.93 |
| 1 | 2 | English Language Arts | Yes | $9,619.00 | $5,139.37 |
| 1 | 3 | Intervention | Yes | $109,619.00 | $70,654.05 |
| 1 | 4 | Academic Supports for EL Students | Yes | $45,000.00 | $45,217.89 |
| 1 | 5 | Title I Supports | Yes | $0.00 | $0.00 |
| 1 | 6 | Enrichment Opportunities | Yes | $117,402.00 | $206,255.17 |
| 1 | 7 | Professional Development | Yes | $36,759.00 | $15,717.81 |
| 1 | 8 | Specialty Classes | No | $242,855.00 | $235,106.70 |
| 1 | 9 | Central Office System Supports for Continuous Improvement | No | $328,023.00 | $384,563.98 |
| 1 | 10 | Supports and Services for Students with Exceptional Needs | Yes | $320,272.00 | $365,183.54 |
| 1 | 11 | Class Teachers | Yes | $958,109.00 | $1,097,001.09 |
| 1 | 12 | Classroom Materials | No | $32,500.00 | $39,691.26 |
| 2 | 1 | Facility | No | $345,222.00 | $345,222.00 |
| 2 | 2 | Renewal Room | No | $50,000.00 | $52,401.49 |
| 2 | 3 | School Climate Improvement | Yes | $2,000.00 | $1,500.00 |
| 2 | 4 | Universal Meals | No | $170,000.00 | $169,903.48 |
| 3 | 1 | Accessible and Responsive Schools for | No | $51,661.00 | $66,522.34 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Students with Exceptional Needs | | | |
| 3 | 2 | Accessible and Responsive Schools for Unduplicated Pupils | Yes | $51,661.00 | $66,522.34 |
| 3 | 3 | Family and Community Engagement | Yes | $16,391.00 | $20,691.47 |

## 2025-26 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

| Totals | 6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount) | 4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds) | 7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) | Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4) | 5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%) | 8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%) | Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Totals | $196,965.00 | $1,454,182.00 | $1,718,852.36 | ($264,670.36) | 47.73% | 56.40% | 8.67% |

| Last Year's Goal # | Last Year's Action # | Action Title | Contributed to Increased or Improved Services? | Last Year's Total 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 | Math | Yes | $0.00 | $0.00 | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| 1 | 2 | English Language Arts | Yes | $0.00 | $0.00 | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| 1 | 3 | Intervention | Yes | $73,019.00 | $61,035.05 | 2.40% | 2.00% |
| 1 | 4 | Academic Supports for EL Students | Yes | $45,000.00 | $45,217.89 | 1.48% | 1.48% |
| 1 | 5 | Title I Supports | Yes | $0.00 | $0.00 | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| 1 | 6 | Enrichment Opportunities | Yes | $117,402.00 | $206,255.17 | 3.85% | 6.77% |
| 1 | 7 | Professional Development | Yes | $30,600.00 | $15,717.81 | 1.00% | 0.52% |
| 1 | 10 | Supports and Services for Students with Exceptional Needs | Yes | $160,000.00 | $204,911.54 | 5.25% | 6.72% |
| 1 | 11 | Class Teachers | Yes | $958,109.00 | $1,097,001.09 | 31.44% | 36.00% |
| 2 | 3 | School Climate Improvement | Yes | $2,000.00 | $1,500.00 | 0.07% | 0.05% |
| 3 | 2 | Accessible and Responsive Schools for Unduplicated Pupils | Yes | $51,661.00 | $66,522.34 | 1.70% | 2.18% |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 | Family and Community Engagement | Yes | $16,391.00 | $20,691.47 | 0.54% | 0.68% |

## 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 (Input Percentage from Prior Year) | 10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 plus 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $3,047,100.00 | $196,965.00 | 0.00% | 6.46% | $1,718,852.36 | 56.40% | 112.81% | $0.00 - No Carryover | 0.00% - No Carryover |

# 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.

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.
- 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.

## 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*

**School districts and COEs:** *EC* sections 52060(g) (California Legislative Information) and 52066(g) (California Legislative Information) 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) (California Legislative Information) 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 (California Legislative Information);

- **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 (California Legislative Information); and

- For charter schools, see Education Code Section 47606.5 (California Legislative Information).

- **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) (California Legislative Information) 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.

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** | Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2024–** | Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2025–26**. | Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2026–27**. | Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2024–25** | Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2025–26** |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| or when adding a new metric. | **25** or when adding a new metric. | Leave blank until then. | Leave blank until then. | or when adding a new metric. | 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*

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

# 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 of 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).