

# 2023–24 Local Control and Accountability Plan Annual Update

The instructions for completing the 2023–24 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Annual Update follow the template.

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Raisin City Elementary School District	Orin Hirschhorn Superintendent	orhirschhorn@caruthers.k12.ca.us 559.495.6402

# Goals and Actions

## Goal

Goal #	Description
1	Increase academic achievement for all students, including low-income, English learners, and foster youth, promoting greater student engagement and narrowing the achievement gap for all student groups.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
California School Dashboard: ELA Distance from Standard	<p>2019: All Students – 78.7 points below (Orange) Students w/Disabilities – 131.6 points below (No color assigned) English Learners – 79.3 points below (Orange) Hispanic – 81.5 points below (Orange) Low Income – 78.5 points below (Orange)</p> <p>[*No color is assigned if the group is less than 30 students, or less than 15 for Foster Youth and Homeless]</p>	Data for this year are not available. The CA School Dashboard has not published "Distance from Standard" data since the 2019 year.	<p>All Students – 85.4 points below Students w/Disabilities – 135.9 points below English Learners – 88.6 points below Hispanic – 88.1 points below Low Income – 86.0 points below Foster Youth -- n/r Homeless -- n/r</p> <p>No data are reported if a group is less than 30 students, or less than 15 for Foster Youth and Homeless.</p> <p>[2022 California School Dashboard]</p>	<p>All Students – 94.0 points below Students w/Disabilities – 137.1 points below English Learners – 103.2 points below Hispanic – 96.4 points below White -- 73.5 points below Low Income – 99.3 points below Foster Youth -- n/r Homeless -- n/r</p> <p>[2023 California School Dashboard] [2023 California School Dashboard]</p>	<p>All Students – 65 points below Students w/Disabilities – 100 points below English Learners – 60 points below Hispanic – 65 points below Low Income – 60 points below Foster Youth -- 65 points below Homeless -- 65 points below</p> <p>No data are reported if a group is less than 30 students, or less than 15 for Foster Youth and Homeless.</p> <p>[2024 California School Dashboard]</p>
California School Dashboard: Math	2019:	Data for this year are not available. The CA	All Students – 114.0 points below	All Students – 116.3 points below	All Students – 95 points below

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Distance from Standard	All Students – 108.7 points below (Orange) Students w/Disabilities -- 146.9 points below (No color assigned) English Learners -- 108 points below (Orange) Hispanic – 106.6 points below (Orange) Low Income – 108.9 points below (Red)	School Dashboard has not published "Distance from Standard" data since the 2019 year.	Students w/Disabilities – 179.6 points below English Learners – 112.5 points below Hispanic – 115.8 points below Low Income – 114.5 points below Foster Youth -- n/r Homeless -- n/r  No data are reported if a group is less than 30 students, or less than 15 for Foster Youth and Homeless.  [2022 California School Dashboard]	Students w/Disabilities – 160.0 points below English Learners – 119.1 points below Hispanic – 120.2 points below White -- 70.2 points below Low Income – 117.8 points below Foster Youth -- n/r Homeless -- n/r  [2023 California School Dashboard]	Students w/Disabilities – 150 points below English Learners – 95 points below Hispanic – 95 points below Low Income – 95 points below Foster Youth -- 95 points below Homeless -- 95 points below  No data are reported if a group is less than 30 students, or less than 15 for Foster Youth and Homeless.  [2024 California School Dashboard]
California State Assessments: SBAC ELA  Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Standard	2019: All Students – 15.3% Students w/Disabilities – 0% English Learners – 12.7% Hispanic – 14.3% Low Income – 15.6%	2021: All Students – 12.4% Students w/Disabilities – No data reported; less than 11 scores English Learners – 8.2% Hispanic – 13.4% Low Income – 12.6%	2022: All Students – 16.2% Students w/Disabilities – 0% English Learners – 8.9% Hispanic – 16.1% Low Income – 16.1%	All Students – 16.9% Students w/Disabilities – 0% English Learners – 11.2% Hispanic – 17.0% Low Income – 15.2% White -- 23.1%  [2023 California State Assessments]	All Students – 30% Students w/Disabilities – 15% English Learners – 30% Hispanic – 30% Low Income – 30%

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
<p>California State Assessments: SBAC Math</p> <p>Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Standard</p>	<p>2019:</p> <p>All Students – 10.7%</p> <p>Students w/Disabilities – 7.4%</p> <p>English Learners – 9.4%</p> <p>Hispanic – 10.4%</p> <p>Low Income – 10.9%</p>	<p>2021:</p> <p>All Students – 2.7%</p> <p>Students w/Disabilities – No data reported; less than 11 scores</p> <p>English Learners – 1.5%</p> <p>Hispanic – 2.6%</p> <p>Low Income – 2.7%</p>	<p>2022:</p> <p>All Students – 9.3%</p> <p>Students w/Disabilities – 0%</p> <p>English Learners – 7.1%</p> <p>Hispanic – 9.1%</p> <p>Low Income – 9.6%</p>	<p>All Students – 8.4%</p> <p>Students w/Disabilities – 7.7%</p> <p>English Learners – 4.3%</p> <p>Hispanic – 7.2%</p> <p>Low Income – 7.3%</p> <p>White -- 23.1%</p> <p>[2023 California State Assessments]</p>	<p>All Students – 25%</p> <p>Students w/Disabilities – 15%</p> <p>English Learners – 25%</p> <p>Hispanic – 25%</p> <p>Low Income – 25%</p>
<p>ELPAC Summative Assessment: Rate of English Learner Students Making Progress Toward English Proficiency</p>	<p>37.5%</p> <p>Status – 2019 California School Dashboard</p>	<p>ELPAC data for 2020-21 have been provided in lieu of "English Learners Who Made Appropriate Progress" data from the Dashboard, as the latter was not reported for 2021.</p> <p>Percentages of students scoring at:</p> <p>"Well-Developed" -- 9.5%</p> <p>"Moderately Developed" -- 25.4%</p> <p>"Somewhat Developed" -- 38.3%</p> <p>"Minimally Developed" -- 26.9%</p>	<p>51.6%</p> <p>[2022 California School Dashboard]</p>	<p>40.9%</p> <p>[2023 California School Dashboard]</p>	<p>55%</p> <p>[2024 California School Dashboard]</p>

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
		[2020-21 CAASPP ELPAC Summative Results]			
Reclassification Rate of English Learners to Re-designated Fluent English Proficient (RFEP)	0% [2019-20 Data Quest]	0% [2020-21 DataQuest]	12.9% [2021-22 CALPADS Reports 8.1 and 2.16]	11.7% [2022-23 CALPADS Reports 8.1 and 2.16]	15% Data Quest
Teachers Appropriately Credentialed with No Mis-assignments or Vacancies:  Reported to the RCESD Governing Board	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  73% of teachers appropriately credentialed and assigned.  [September, 2020 Report to Board]	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  87% of teachers appropriately credentialed and assigned.  [June, 2022 Report to Board]	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  79% of teachers appropriately credentialed and assigned.  [June, 2023 Report to Board]	55.1% of teachers appropriately credentialed and assigned.  [2021-22 DataQuest]	MET -- Results Reported.  100% of teachers appropriately credentialed and assigned.  [2024 Report to Board]
Access to Standards-Aligned Materials:  Reported to the RCESD Governing Board	MET -- Results reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  100% of students had access to standards aligned curriculum materials.	MET -- Results reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  100% of students had access to standards aligned curriculum materials.	MET -- Results reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  100% of students had access to standards aligned curriculum materials.	100% of students have access to standards aligned curriculum materials.	MET – Results Reported  100% of students will have access to standards aligned curriculum materials.  [2024 Report to Board]

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	[September, 2020 Report to Board]	[June, 2022 Report to Board]	[June, 2023 Report to Board]		
<p>Access to a Broad Course of Study:</p> <p>Results of the State’s Self-Reflection Tool Reported to the RCESD Governing Board</p>	<p>MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.</p> <p>All students had access to a broad course of study.</p> <p>[September, 2020 Report to Board]</p>	<p>MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.</p> <p>All students had access to a broad course of study.</p> <p>[June, 2022 Report to Board]</p>	<p>MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.</p> <p>All students had access to a broad course of study.</p> <p>[June, 2023 Report to Board]</p>	<p>State self-reflection tool will be administered in Spring, 2024.</p> <p>All students have access to a broad curriculum.</p>	<p>MET – Results Reported</p> <p>All students will have access to a broad course of study.</p> <p>[2024 Report to Board]</p>
<p>Implementation of Standards for All Students and Enable English Learners to Access State Standards and English Language Development Standards:</p> <p>Results of the State's Self-Reflection Tool Reported to the RCESD Governing Board</p>	<p>MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.</p> <p>The state's self-reflection tool reflected an average rating of 2.7 (on a scale of 1= exploration to 5 = full implementation) for implementation of state standards in district classrooms and English Learner access to core curriculum and ELD standards.</p>	<p>MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.</p> <p>The state's self-reflection tool reflected an average rating of 2.6 (on a scale of 1= exploration to 5 = full implementation) for implementation of state standards in district classrooms and English Learner access to core curriculum and ELD standards.</p>	<p>MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.</p> <p>The state's self-reflection tool reflected an average rating of 3.2 (on a scale of 1= exploration to 5 = full implementation) for implementation of state standards in district classrooms and English Learner access to core curriculum and ELD standards.</p>	<p>State self-reflection tool will be administered in Spring, 2024.</p> <p>All classes are implementing state standards in all subject areas.</p>	<p>MET – Results Reported</p> <p>The state's self-reflection tool will reflect an average rating of 4 (on a scale of 1= exploration to 5 = full implementation) for implementation of state standards in district classrooms and English Learner access to core curriculum and ELD standards.</p> <p>[2024 Report to Board]</p>

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	[September, 2020 Report to Board]	[June, 2022 Report to Board]	[June, 2023 Report to Board]		
Percentages in Healthy Fitness Zone in Grade 5 and 7	<p>Grade 5:  Aerobic Cap – 18.2%  Body Comp – 60.6%  Ab Strength – 69.7%  Trunk Ex – 90.9%  Upper Body – 36.4%  Flexibility – 54.5%</p> <p>Grade 7:  Aerobic Cap – 58.3%  Body Comp – 83.3%  Ab Strength – 66.7%  Trunk Ex – 100%  Upper Body – 33.3%  Flexibility -- 58.3%</p> <p>2018-19 California Physical Fitness Report</p>	Due to the pandemic, the state has not posted PFT results since 2018-19.	The state has not posted PFT results since 2018-19.	The state has not posted PFT results since 2018-19.	<p>Grade 5:  Aerobic Cap – 35%  Body Comp – 70%  Ab Strength – 80%  Trunk Ex – 100%  Upper Body – 50%  Flexibility – 70%</p> <p>Grade 7:  Aerobic Cap – 70%  Body Comp – 90%  Ab Strength – 80%  Trunk Ex – 100%  Upper Body – 50%  Flexibility -- 70%</p> <p>California Physical Fitness Report</p>
iReady Reading	<p>Overall placement, Fall, 2021:   To Be Determined -- This is a new assessment for the District, and the initial administration will establish a baseline.</p>	<p>iReady Reading</p> <p>Mid/Above Gr. Level -- 2%  Early On Gr Level -- 11%  1 Gr Level Below -- 29%  2 Gr Levels Below -- 23%  3+ Gr Levels Below -- 35%</p>	<p>iReady Reading</p> <p>Mid/Above Gr. Level -- 6%  Early On Gr Level -- 16%  1 Gr Level Below -- 32%  2 Gr Levels Below -- 16%  3+ Gr Levels Below -- 30%</p>	<p>iReady Reading</p> <p>Mid/Above Gr. Level -- 5%  Early On Gr Level -- 13%  1 Gr Level Below -- 32%  2 Gr Levels Below -- 14%  3+ Gr Levels Below -- 35%</p>	<p>iReady Reading</p> <p>Mid/Above Gr. Level -- 25%  Early On Gr Level -- 25%  1 Gr Level Below -- 25%  2 Gr Levels Below -- 15%  3+ Gr Levels Below -- 10%</p>

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
		[2021-22 Local Data]	[2022-23 Local Data]	[2024 Diagnostic 2 Local Data]	[2023-24 Local Data]
iReady Math	Overall placement, Fall, 2021:  To Be Determined -- This is a new assessment for the District, and the initial administration will establish a baseline.	iReady Math  Mid/Above Gr. Level -- 2% Early On Gr Level -- 3% 1 Gr Level Below -- 40% 2 Gr Levels Below -- 23% 3+ Gr Levels Below -- 31%  [2021-22 Local Data]	iReady Math  Mid/Above Gr. Level -- 4% Early On Gr Level -- 11% 1 Gr Level Below -- 43% 2 Gr Levels Below -- 18% 3+ Gr Levels Below -- 24%  [2022-23 Local Data]	iReady Math  Mid/Above Gr. Level -- 5% Early On Gr Level -- 8% 1 Gr Level Below -- 46% 2 Gr Levels Below -- 16% 3+ Gr Levels Below -- 25%  [2024 Diagnostic 2 Local Data]	iReady Math  Mid/Above Gr. Level -- 25% Early On Gr Level -- 25% 1 Gr Level Below -- 25% 2 Gr Levels Below -- 15% 3+ Gr Levels Below -- 10%  [2023-24 Local Data]

## Goal Analysis

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.

The implementation of Action 1.1 was partially successful, implemented generally as planned. The exploration of the necessary conditions to implement, with integrity, a Dual Immersion program continued. A current challenge to meeting those conditions is that California law requires that dual-immersion teachers, since they will provide initial instruction in Spanish, hold a BCLAD credential, which severely limits what the District is able to offer at this time. Orton Gillingham and Reading Dynamics were used, as needed, by Reading Corps intervention staff funded by Title I; Reflex Math was used by Math Corps teachers for students struggling with math concepts. All students participated in the Renaissance Reading Program. Feedback from teacher educational partners showed continued enthusiasm for the iReady program in both ELA and math. The Student Study Team met regularly to identify at-risk students and provide suggestions for interventions.

Action 1.2 was successfully implemented, as the District was able to fill all positions for this school year. Changes in the state's definition of "credentialed" teacher that no longer allow interns to be classified as such have affected the percentage of "appropriately credentialed" teachers. The District successfully provided a Special Education resource specialist teacher, a part-time psychologist, and a part-time speech



pathologist. The action will be continued into the next school year, building upon the success of increasing the percentage of appropriately credentialed and assigned teachers to reach our desired outcome of 100%.

Action 1.3 was successfully implemented. The District provided supplemental materials and access to technology in addition to Special Education services that those Low-Income and English Learner students received. The full-time RSP teacher provided professional development and support for teachers in supporting English Learner students who are identified as students with exceptional needs. The two paraprofessionals supported greater success in the core curriculum by providing additional assistance in excess of special education services.

The District was more successful in implementation of all aspects of Action 1.4, but continued to experience challenges. Implementation of designated and integrated ELD in every classroom is increasing, and has not yet reached full implementation. Difficulty in providing sufficient release time has limited the amount of professional development that is provided. We have been successful in providing English Learner intervention support from certificated staff, including supplemental services offered after school. Support materials have been purchased and used. The After School Program includes enrichment and physical activities for the English Learner Students. The use of English Learner folders to chart progress and review the effectiveness of supports and interventions that have been provided was limited. Every teacher now has access to their EL students' ELPAC data; however, more training is necessary on the effective use of those data. Individual ELPAC scores are reviewed with parent, and the District data shared with the ELAC and DELAC.

Staff professional development as described in Action 1.5 was provided to the degree possible, but, as noted above, the ability to provide release time was limited by availability of substitutes. Contracted teacher induction services were available for new teachers, as were mentors to support them. Teachers participated in Kagan Coaching, ELA and ELD math training, iReady training, SBAC assessment training, and training on using state interim assessments, mostly prior to the start of school. Maintaining training and coaching during the school year was a challenge, with the exception of monthly one-on-one math coaching. Supplemental materials to implement practices were purchased as needed. As described above, the Principal and Leadership Team continued to collaborate in instituting new procedures to track the progress of English Learners, and were successful in expanding the use of those procedures, but were challenged in implementing them school-wide.

All students had access to instructional materials including a new math core adoption, so Action 1.6 was successfully implemented.

All of our students were successfully provided access to a broad course of study. However, limits on access to transportation affected participation in the standards-aligned enrichment activities, which challenged and prevented some grade levels from completing the full implementation of Action 1.7.

Action 1.8 was successfully continued in the area of leadership guidance and support for the Principal, who was provided mentoring and coaching from the CUSD Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent, other CUSD instructional support staff, and an outside consultant. The Leadership Team continues to enhance its capacity, with members becoming more comfortable their roles in representing and supporting their peers in implementation of supports for Low-Income and English Learner students.

The Illuminate program was used, benchmark and other local assessments were administered, and the data collected from interim assessments was discussed by teachers. The PARSEC displays were helpful in presenting data to staff and parents. Teacher collaboration continued around student data that were used to make instructional decisions. However, there were challenges in providing training in using the data for planning, as described in other actions, as there were challenges in carving out time for staff to collaborate on common formative assessments and rubrics.

There was a collaborative relationship between the District and preschool, successfully implementing Action 1.10.

Action 1.11 was implemented to a large degree by the FCSS. All intersession classes were held during the summer, and all students who wished to participate in expanded learning were able to do so.

The additional TK-K teacher and paraprofessional added with Action 1.12 were with us full-time this year, a definite success. However, this action was not implemented as planned, as we were not able to hire a certificated staff member, and additional paraprofessional FTE for K-2 academic assistance.

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

There were several significant differences because state and federal monies the District received were used to fund many of the budgeted LCFF contributing actions. Specific material differences were:

1.1 -- Over Budget: The Title I expenditure for Reading Corps intervention support was greater than originally anticipated.

1.2 -- Over Budget: The District did not budget the correct amount of salaries in this action at the time the LCAP was written but had the resources to pay the higher amount.

1.3 -- Over Budget: Salaries for the teacher and the paraprofessionals were greater than budgeted. The District used Federal funds to purchase more supplemental materials than budgeted to make-up for expenditures not made in the prior year.

1.4 -- Under Budget: Difficulty in providing sufficient release time has continued to limit the amount of professional development that was provided. Some of the professional development expenses were included in the cost of the supplemental programs.

1.5 -- Under Budget: Difficulty in providing sufficient release time has limited the amount of professional development that was provided. Some of the professional development expenses were included in the cost of the supplemental programs.

1.6 -- Under Budget: The District did not spend as much as anticipated, as declining enrollment did not require as many core texts and materials as budgeted.

1.7 -- Under Budget: Limits on access to transportation affected participation in the standards-aligned enrichment activities, and prevented the full implementation of the action.

1.8 -- Under Budget: District used federal funds for expenditures and did not utilize funds set aside in the supplemental/concentration budget. As noted above, limited availability of substitutes constrained the time that the Leadership Team could spend in professional development activities.

1.9 -- Under Budget: The District was not able to provide the expected training in using data for planning, as described in other actions. Additionally, we were not able to provide the budgeted amount of release time for staff to collaborate on common formative assessments and rubrics. Some of the professional development expenses were included in the cost of the supplemental programs.

1.10 -- Over Budget:

1.12 -- Under Budget:

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

The 2023 state assessment data indicate that Action 1.1 has not been able to sustain some of the improvements from the prior year. On the 2023 California School Dashboard, Distance from Standard, Overall performance level, and those for Low-Income students, English Learners, and Hispanic students were all in the "Very Low" level in both ELA and math. As a result, specific actions to address those areas for those groups will be included in the LCAP. In both subject areas, inequalities are evident when Low-income students and English Learners are compared to All Students. The 2023 SBAC data also showed that the percentages of students meeting/exceeding standard reflected the same changes as the "Distance from Standard" in Math. In ELA, with the exception of a notable increase of English Learners meeting/exceeding standard, there were no significant changes from the prior year. As with the "Distance from Standard" results, in both subject areas, inequalities are evident when Low-income students and English Learners are compared to All Students. The inequalities are magnified when comparing Low-income students and English Learners to Non Low-Income students.

The District was effective in hiring teachers, as all teaching positions were filled for the entire year. We credit the District's Action 1.2 as the cause of this result

Students with Disabilities showed improvements in math "Distance from Standard" and math "Percentages Meeting/Exceeding Standard". This group also had the least decline in "Distance from Standard" in ELA. One-hundred percent of these students were Low-Income, English Learner, or both. We believe that the additional supports from Action 1.3 were effective in achieving this positive outcome.

Action 1.4 had shown promising improvements in 2022. Unfortunately, the District did not sustain those improvements in in English Learner Progress rates in 2023. The 2023 percentage of English Learners making a year or more progress in acquiring English language skills was 40.9%, a decline 10.6% from the prior year, resulting in a "Very Low" performance level on the California School Dashboard. On the other

hand, though there was a slight dip in the Raisin City Elementary School reclassification rate to 11.7%, it continues to be in double digits and far above the baseline of 0%. We will continue to build upon the actions to provide extra support for English Learners, especially 1.4, to sustain the increases in reclassification through 2024-25 and beyond.

Educational partners have praised the efforts to expand the library offerings, that it is an improvement from the past, and that students now love reading there. Continued efforts to enhance the library would be welcomed.

Due to limits on the release time that could be provided for staff training, Action 1.5 was not as effective as expected based on ELA, Math, and ELD data. Supplemental materials to implement practices were purchased as needed, but may not have been implemented as effectively as they might have been with more staff development. As described above, the Principal and Leadership Team collaborated in continuing procedures to track the progress of English Learners, evidence that Action 1.8 continues to be effective.

Action 1.6 was effective in ensuring access to sufficient standards-aligned materials. Teachers rated the implementation of state standards at 3.7, up from 3.2 in 2023. Concerns remain about materials and professional development in science and social studies.

All students had access to a broad course of study. However, Action 1.7 was not as effective as planned, due to challenges with providing the standards-aligned educational enrichment activities to most grades. We believe that the full implementation of these activities will have the expected positive impacts of decreasing the distance below standard in ELA and Math for Low-Income students and English Learners, and accelerating English language development.

The state assessment data do not indicate that Action 1.9 was as effective as anticipated, though prior year's data indicated positive results. The District's teacher educational partners had praise for incorporating local assessments and the trainings that have been provided, and confirmed that they are needed and steps in the right direction.

The positive relationship between the District and the preschool, and continuing improved reading results for our Kindergarten students suggest that Action 1.10 has been effective.

The academic data cited above indicates that Action 1.11, designed to provide extra supports to our students, did not have the expected impact. Educational partners have suggested that Saturday school offerings could be expanded, and that better communication with parents of struggling students would be helpful.

iReady data for Kindergarten indicates that Action 1.12, reducing class size by adding an additional teacher and paraprofessional to provide more individualized attention, has been very effective. Those assessment results improved from 2023:

2024 ELA	Change from 2023	2024 Math	Change from 2023
% On or Above Grade Level --	37.8%	8.2% increase	18.9% 8.2% increase

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.

Action 1.1: To address the lack of progress by Low-Income students and English Learners in ELA and Math, the District will add contracting with AmeriCorps for intervention for reading to provide struggling readers the support to move from decoding levels to learning to read, and for intervention for math to provide students struggling with mathematical skills and foundational building blocks to this action.

Action 1.4: To address the concerns with progress for English Learner students in English Language acquisition, the District will add contracting with the Fresno County Superintendent of Schools for consultants who will provide professional learning, instructional coaching, data analysis support, and leadership coaching in ELD and implementation of the additional elements of this action. Educational partners have been pleased with additions to the library. Based on that feedback, and to support the access to rich, culturally-responsive literature in a welcoming environment, the District will use concentration add-on funds to hire a part-time library aide.

Action 1.5: To enhance the impact of professional development activities on the academic progress for Low-Income students and English Learners in ELA and Math, the District will add contracting with the Fresno County Superintendent of Schools to provide feedback and recommendations in maximizing the impact of professional learning activities with the challenges of limited release time opportunities.

Action 1.11: To address the lack of progress by Low-Income students and English Learners in ELA and Math, and incorporating suggestions from our Educational Partners, the District will add Saturday School to this action and explore the possibility of increasing the offerings during those hours. The progress of students participating in expanded learning programs will be more closely followed through data collection (Action 1.9) and review, and concerns with students' progress shared promptly with parents, along with suggestions for help at home. Students who participate in the program will be recognized for their progress toward standards in ELA, math, and English language acquisition.

**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.**

# Goals and Actions

## Goal

Goal #	Description
2	Maintain safe and healthy, high-quality learning facilities and safe school environments while providing opportunities that develop positive character.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT):  School facilities maintained in good repair based on Annual Williams Act Facilities Review	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  Facilities were rated good, but a few classrooms on the exterior require some maintenance.  [2020-2021 Annual Williams Act Facilities Review]	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  Facilities were rated fair.  [2021-2022 Annual Williams Act Facilities Review reported to Governing Board]	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  Facilities were rated good.  [2022-23 Annual Williams Act Facilities Review reported to Governing Board]	Facilities were rated good.  [Fall, 2024, FIT]	MET -- Results Reported  Facilities will be rated in good repair.  Annual Williams Act Facilities Review
Expulsion Rate	0%  [DataQuest, 2019-20 Expulsion Rate]	0%  [DataQuest, 2020-21 Expulsion Rate]	0%  [DataQuest, 2021-22 Expulsion Rate]	0% expulsions this year.	0%  DataQuest Expulsion Rate
Suspension Rate	Overall -- 3.2% Hispanic -- 3.0%	Overall -- 0% Hispanic -- 0%	Overall -- 3.4% Hispanic -- 3.5%	Overall -- 3.8% Hispanic -- 3.1%	Overall -- 1.5% Hispanic -- 1.5%

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	White -- 15.4% Low Income -- 3.4% English Learners -- 2.3% Students w/Disabilities -- 0%  [DataQuest, 2019-20 Suspension Rate]	White -- 0% Low Income -- 0% English Learners -- 0% Students w/Disabilities -- 0%  [DataQuest, 2020-21 Suspension Rate]	White -- 7.1% Low Income -- 3.5% English Learners -- 3.0% Students w/Disabilities -- 11.1%  [2022 CA School Dashboard]	White -- 18.8% Low Income -- 4.2% English Learners -- 4.3% Students w/Disabilities -- 0%  [2023 CA School Dashboard]	White -- 3.0% Low Income -- 1.5% English Learners -- 1.5% Students w/Disabilities -- 1.5%  [2024 CA School Dashboard]
Attendance Rate	Attendance rate is 95%  [2019-2020 District Data]	Attendance rates are: Overall 88.7%.  [2021-22 AERIES Summary Report]	Attendance rate is 95.2%  [2022-23 AERIES Summary Report]	Attendance rate is 96.3%  [8/9/23-1/10/24 AERIES Summary Report]	Attendance rate is 95%  District Data
Chronic Absenteeism Rate	10%  [2019-20 CALPADS]	Overall -- 20.7% Low-Income -- 20.8% English Learners -- 16.3% Students w/ Disabilities -- 27.6% Hispanic -- 19.8% White -- 18.2%  [DataQuest 2020-21 Chronic Absenteeism Report]	Overall -- 50.0% English Learners -- 46.0% Low-Income -- 49.1% Foster Youth -- n/d Homeless -- n/d Students w/ Disabilities -- 44.4% Hispanic -- 48.8% White -- 57.1% Two or More Races -- 33.3%  [2022 CA School Dashboard]	Overall -- 14.2% English Learners -- 14.8% Low-Income -- 14.3% Foster Youth -- n/d Homeless -- 27.3% Students w/ Disabilities -- 10.7% Hispanic -- 14.3% White -- 6.7% Two or More Races -- n/d  [2023 CA School Dashboard]	Overall -- 10% English Learners -- 10% Low-Income -- 10% Foster Youth -- 10% Homeless -- 10% Students w/ Disabilities -- 10% Hispanic -- 10% White -- 10% Two or More Races -- 10%  [2024 CA School Dashboard]
Middle School Dropout Rate	0%	0%	0%	0% dropouts during the current year.	0%

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	[2019-20 CALPADS]	[2020-21 CALPADS]	[2021-22 CALPADS]		CALPADS
School Climate Survey: % of Students Feeling Connected to School	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  62% of students responding felt connected to their school(s)  [September, 2021 Report to Board]	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  48.7% of students responding felt connected to their school(s)  [June, 2022 Report to Board]	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  73.1% of students responding felt connected to their school(s)  [June, 2023 Report to Board]	Survey will be conducted in Spring, 2024.	MET – Results Reported  90% of students responding will feel connected to their school(s)  [2024 Report to Board]
School Climate Survey: % of Students Feeling Safe at School	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  65% of students responding felt safe at their school(s)  [September, 2021 Report to Board]	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  44.3% of students responding felt safe at their school(s)  [June, 2022 Report to Board]	MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.  69.9% of students responding felt safe at their school(s)  [June, 2023 Report to Board]	Survey will be conducted in Spring, 2024.	MET – Results Reported  90% of students responding will feel safe at their school(s)  [2024 Report to Board]
School Climate Survey: % of Parents Feeling their Child Feels Safe at School % of Parents Feeling Connected to School	Baseline established in 2021-22 school year.	82.4% of parents responding indicated that their child feels safe at their school.  86.7% of parents responding felt	93% of parents responding indicated that their child feels safe at their school.  90% of parents responding felt	Survey will be conducted in Spring, 2024.	90% of parents responding indicate that their child feels safe at their school.  90% of parents responding feel



Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
		welcome at their school.	welcome at their school.		welcome at their school.
School Climate Survey: % of Teachers Feeling Safe at School % of Teachers Feeling Connected to School	Baseline established in 2021-22 school year.	Not surveyed in 2021-22.	93% of teachers reported feeling safe at school. 93% of teachers reported feeling connected to school.	Survey will be conducted in Spring, 2024.	100% of teachers reported feeling safe at school. 100% of teachers reported feeling connected to school.

## Goal Analysis

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.

Overall implementation for actions 2.1 was successful. Facilities and grounds were continuously monitored and maintained. Projects that have been delayed were completed.

Action 2.2 was also successfully implemented, as the District maintained sufficient office support staff and leadership to provide services and support to students, families, and the instructional staff.

Though not implemented as planned, the implementation of Action 2.3 was generally successful, with the continued implementation of PBIS and maintaining a mental health professional to provide behavior intervention and support, and a full-time counselor to provide social-emotional supports to students. Staff were increasingly teaching and modeling social-emotional skills that support a safe and positive climate for learning. Efforts to expand the playground area as well as increasing access to additional play equipment were completed with the expansion of the basketball courts. Finding sufficient release time to provide staff development remained a challenge, and collaborative time was more focused on academic curriculum rather than SEL instructional training. The counselor will continue to develop and train peer group leaders and conduct peer group sessions to promote Low-Income students, English Learners, and Foster Youth support for each other.

In another challenge, our transportation provider was again not able to set-up all of the planned additional routes due to a shortage of bus drivers, so Action 2.4 was not implemented as planned.

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.

2.1 -- Over Budget: Projects that have been delayed were completed.

2.3 -- Under Budget: Due to shortages in substitute teachers we were not able to find sufficient release time to provide planned staff development. Work on playground expansion was not as expensive as budgeted.

2.4 -- Under Budget: Southwest was not able to set up all of the planned additional routes for 2023-2024 due to a lack of available drivers.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

Action 2.1 was effective based on 90% of parents and 100% of staff agreeing or strongly agreeing that the school facilities are clean and well-maintained.

In addition to maintaining staff to provide necessary services, the effectiveness of Action 2.2 is demonstrated in the parent survey results that showed 92% of parents responding agreed that the school provides a welcoming environment, and 84% responding that school staff are interested in each family's strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children.

Partner feedback has been very positive about the expanded play areas and access, including remarks such as "outdoor environment looks amazing," and "school [grounds] are...upgraded". The on-site therapist, school counselor, and psychologist continue to report that students' behavior and attitudes are improving.

We believe that this current survey data (March, 2024) is a strong indicator that Action 2.3 has had a positive effect that has manifested itself in lower Chronic Absenteeism and increased attendance. Overall Chronic Absenteeism rates and those for Low-Income students declined by more than 35%. The rate for English Learners declined by 31.2%. Our efforts to identify and intervene with students at risk of chronic absenteeism, along with recognizing students for excellent attendance have been very effective in lowering chronic absenteeism rates. Additionally, the overall attendance rate increased by 1.1% from 2022 to 2023.

Another strong indicator that Action 2.3 has had a positive effect is that the percentages of surveyed students who responded they feel safe at school increased to 74.4%; those responding that they feel connected to school maintained at 73.1%. Parents overwhelmingly felt that their children feel safe at school, with 95.7% agreeing or strongly agreeing. Also, 100% of teachers feel safe at and connected to school. These high marks for safety and connectedness we attribute to implementation of PBIS. Staff were generally positive about PBIS and commented on hoping for full implementation.

The lack of implementation of Action 2.4 did not appear to have a negative impact on Chronic Absenteeism rates. However, Low-Income students and English Learners are still Chronically Absent at rates greater than Overall, so we will continue to attempt implementation of this action in the future.

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.

Action 2.3: The section reading " Expanding the playground area as well as increasing access to additional play equipment. Our low-income students live in the surrounding rural farming areas and do not have access to community parks or playgrounds. As our low-income students have limited access to playgrounds or equipment outside schools, this will allow more students to participate in play activities without having to rotate or take turns as often when using equipment during school hours and provide them with access to play equipment during the after school program. Expanded and inviting school playgrounds/fields will encourage students to become engaged and increase the feelings of school connectedness that are lacking among our Low-income students through increased..." deleted from this action, as the playground expansion has been completed for now. Revised language now reads, "Caring adults such as coaches, teachers, aids, and community volunteers will support opportunities to practice to learning how to play with others through compromise, conflict resolution and sharing, social skills such as taking turns and peer communication, interactions with caring adults, and increased recreation. Increasing engagement will allow students to stay connected with the educational setting and increase students' opportunity to receive additional services and supports that are needed."

**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.**

# Goals and Actions

## Goal

Goal #	Description
3	The District will promote parent engagement and communication.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Parent Engagement: Results of the State's Self-Reflection Tool Reported to the RCESD Governing Board	<p>MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.</p> <p>The state's self-reflection tool reflected an average rating of 3.7 for parent and family engagement.</p> <p>Report to the RCESD Governing Board</p>	<p>MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.</p> <p>The state's self-reflection tool reflected an average rating of 3.9 for parent and family engagement.</p> <p>Report to the RCESD Governing Board</p>	<p>MET -- Results were reported at the Board meeting at which the LCAP was adopted.</p> <p>The state's self-reflection tool reflected an average rating of 4.2 for parent and family engagement.</p> <p>[June, 2023 Report to the RCESD Governing Board]</p>	The state's self-reflection tool will be administered in Spring, 2024.	<p>MET</p> <p>The state's self-reflection tool will reflect an average rating of 4.0 for parent and family engagement.</p> <p>Report to the RCESD Governing Board</p>

## Goal Analysis

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.

Action 3.1 was successfully implemented as planned. Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE) was a success, with 19 parents participating. The activities organized by PIQE were praised by parents. Literacy Night had over 55 families attend. There was an enormous turnout for parent conferences, and the holiday concert was well-attended as well as the pre-school/early education workshop. During conferences, teachers reviewed how parents can use their phones to access their child's grades on AERIES. GED and ESL classes for

families were again held, with attendance averaging from 5-8 participants. Translation services for communications at family events was provided.

Welcoming environments were maintained at our school.

Information was available for families for accessing a variety of school and community resources to support family health and wellness and enhance behavioral and academic success for students. How to support their children was also a primary topic of a preschool workshop where families were provided activities they could do at home for academics and SEL. Books to read at home to children were distributed in the language chosen by the recipient.

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.

Under Budget: The District provided opportunities for family engagement but the costs were less than anticipated, as the ESL and GED classes were provided by the Community College district. Again this year, Federal funds were also used for some parent engagement costs (PIQE) so they could be expended before they expired.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

The attendance at Literacy Night and other activities, and the results of parent surveys indicate that this action has been effective in promoting parent engagement and communication. The feedback from families described in the "Educational Partners" section of this plan shows that they are pleased with the communication efforts and the improvements made in the school. Parent surveys show that 95.8% of parents responding feel connected to school.

- 88% responded that the school staff create a welcoming environment.
- 90% of respondents agreed that the school engages in 2-way communication with families.
- 82% of parents felt that RCESD provides all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community.
- 96% responded that the school promotes academic success for all students.
- 92% responded that the school has clean and well-maintained facilities.

The Parent Engagement: Results of the State's Self-Reflection Tool Reported to the RCESD Governing Board showed an increase in the rating from 4.2 in 2023 to 4.4 in 2024. The rating has increased from the baseline (2019) rating of 3.7.

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.

Parent feedback included examples of tragic events that have struck members of the community, and that parent workshops that dealt with how to share difficult information with their children or how to look for signs of emotional distress from their children would be helpful. This would be parent workshops on social emotional awareness and understanding the signs of suicide/depression. In response, a specific "Emotional Awareness" workshop will be added to the parent workshops listed in Action 3.1.

While parent input was generally positive about communication, and 90% of respondents agreed that the school engages in 2-way communication with families, timeliness was a concern that arose with some families. To provide more timely communication, the use of Parent Square will be added to Action 3.1. Teacher Educational Partner input suggested that trainings for the most effective implementation of Parent Square would be helpful, so that will be added as well.

**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.**

**Instructions**

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](mailto:lcff@cde.ca.gov).

Complete the prompts as instructed for each goal included in the 2023–24 LCAP. Duplicate the tables as needed. The 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update must be included with the 2024–25 LCAP.

**Goals and Actions**

**Goal(s)**

**Description:**

Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

**Measuring and Reporting Results**

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

**Metric:**

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

**Baseline:**

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

**Year 1 Outcome:**

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

**Year 2 Outcome:**

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

**Year 3 Outcome:**

- When completing the 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies.

**Desired Outcome for 2023–24:**

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Timeline for completing the “**Measuring and Reporting Results**” part of the Goal.

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for Year 3 (2023–24)
Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Enter information in this box when completing the 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

**Goal Analysis**

Using actual annual measurable outcome data, including data from the Dashboard, analyze whether the planned actions were effective in achieving the goal. Respond to the prompts as instructed.

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

- Describe the overall implementation of the actions to achieve the articulated goal. Include a discussion of relevant challenges and successes experienced with the implementation process. This 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.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

- Describe the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle. “Effectiveness” means the degree to which the actions were successful in producing the desired result and “ineffectiveness” means that the actions did not produce any significant or desired 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, desired 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.

California Department of Education  
November 2023