

§ 15497. Local Control and Accountability Plan and Annual Update Template.

Introduction:

LEA: Ross Valley School District Contact (Name, Title, Email, Phone Number): Jim Cerreta, Business Manager, jcerreta@rossvalleyschools.org, 415-451-4075 LCAP Year: 2014-2015

Local Control and Accountability Plan and Annual Update Template

The Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and annual update template shall be used to provide details regarding local educational agencies' (LEAs) actions and expenditures to support pupil outcomes and overall performance pursuant to Education Code sections 52060, 52066, 47605, 47605.5, and 47606.5.

For school districts, pursuant to Education Code section 52060, the LCAP must describe, for the school district and each school within the district, goals and specific actions to achieve those goals for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils identified in Education Code section 52052, including pupils with disabilities, for each of the state priorities and any locally identified priorities.

For county offices of education, pursuant to Education Code section 52066, the LCAP must describe, for each county office of education-operated school and program, goals and specific actions to achieve those goals for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils identified in Education Code section 52052, including pupils with disabilities, who are funded through the county office of education Local Control Funding Formula as identified in Education Code section 2574 (pupils attending juvenile court schools, on probation or parole, or mandatorily expelled) for each of the state priorities and any locally identified priorities. School districts and county offices of education may additionally coordinate and describe in their LCAPs services provided to pupils funded by a school district but attending county-operated schools and programs, including special education programs.

Charter schools, pursuant to Education Code sections 47605, 47605.5, and 47606.5, must describe goals and specific actions to achieve those goals for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils identified in Education Code section 52052, including pupils with disabilities, for each of the state priorities as applicable and any locally identified priorities. For charter schools, the inclusion and description of goals for state priorities in the LCAP may be modified to meet the grade levels served and the nature of the programs provided, including modifications to reflect only the statutory requirements explicitly applicable to charter schools in the Education Code.

The LCAP is intended to be a comprehensive planning tool. LEAs may reference and describe actions and expenditures in other plans and funded by a variety of other fund sources when detailing goals, actions, and expenditures related to the state and local priorities. LCAPs must be consistent with school plans submitted pursuant to Education Code section 64001. The information contained in the LCAP, or annual update, may be supplemented by information contained in other plans (including the LEA plan pursuant to Section 1112 of Subpart 1 of Part A of Title I of Public Law 107-110) that are incorporated or referenced as relevant in this document.

For each section of the template, LEAs should comply with instructions and use the guiding questions as prompts (but not limits) for completing the information as required by statute. Guiding questions do not require separate narrative responses. Data referenced in the LCAP must be consistent with the school accountability report card where appropriate. LEAs may resize pages or attach additional pages as necessary to facilitate completion of the LCAP.

State Priorities

The state priorities listed in Education Code sections 52060 and 52066 can be categorized as specified below for planning purposes, however, school districts and county offices of education must address each of the state priorities in their LCAP. Charter schools must address the priorities in Education Code section 52060(d) that apply to the grade levels served, or the nature of the program operated, by the charter school.

A. Conditions of Learning:

Basic: degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned pursuant to Education Code section 44258.9, and fully credentialed in the subject areas and for the pupils they are teaching; pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials pursuant to Education Code section 60119; and school facilities are maintained in good repair pursuant to Education Code section 17002(d). (Priority 1)

Implementation of State Standards: implementation of academic content and performance standards adopted by the state board for all pupils, including English learners. (Priority 2)

Course access: pupil enrollment in a broad course of study that includes all of the subject areas described in Education Code section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Section 51220, as applicable. (Priority 7)

Expelled pupils (for county offices of education only): coordination of instruction of expelled pupils pursuant to Education Code section 48926. (Priority 9)

Foster youth (for county offices of education only): coordination of services, including working with the county child welfare agency to share information, responding to the needs of the juvenile court system, and ensuring transfer of health and education records. (Priority 10)

B. Pupil Outcomes:

Pupil achievement: performance on standardized tests, score on Academic Performance Index, share of pupils that are college and career ready, share of English learners that become English proficient, English learner reclassification rate, share of pupils that pass Advanced Placement exams with 3 or higher, share of pupils determined prepared for college by the Early Assessment Program. (Priority 4)

Other pupil outcomes: pupil outcomes in the subject areas described in Education Code section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Education Code section 51220, as applicable. (Priority 8)

C. Engagement:

Parent involvement: efforts to seek parent input in decision making, promotion of parent participation in programs for unduplicated pupils and special need subgroups. (Priority 3)

Pupil engagement: school attendance rates, chronic absenteeism rates, middle school dropout rates, high school dropout rates, high school graduations rates. (Priority 5)

School climate: pupil suspension rates, pupil expulsion rates, other local measures including surveys of pupils, parents and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness. (Priority 6)

Section 1: Stakeholder Engagement

Meaningful engagement of parents, pupils, and other stakeholders, including those representing the subgroups identified in Education Code section 52052, is critical to the LCAP and budget process. Education Code sections 52062 and 52063 specify the minimum requirements for school districts; Education Code sections 52068 and 52069 specify the minimum requirements for county offices of education, and Education Code section 47606.5 specifies the minimum requirements for charter schools. In addition, Education Code section 48985 specifies the requirements for translation of documents.

Instructions: Describe the process used to engage parents, pupils, and the community and how this engagement contributed to development of the LCAP or annual update. Note that the LEA's goals related to the state priority of parental involvement are to be described separately in Section 2, and the related actions and expenditures are to be described in Section 3.

Guiding Questions:

- 1) How have parents, community members, pupils, local bargaining units, and other stakeholders (e.g., LEA personnel, county child welfare agencies, county office of education foster youth services programs, court-appointed special advocates, foster youth, foster parents, education rights holders and other foster youth stakeholders, English learner parents, community organizations representing English learners, and others as appropriate) been engaged and involved in developing, reviewing, and supporting implementation of the LCAP?
- 2) How have stakeholders been included in the LEA's process in a timely manner to allow for engagement in the development of the LCAP?
- 3) What information (e.g., quantitative and qualitative data/metrics) was made available to stakeholders related to the state priorities and used by the LEA to inform the LCAP goal setting process?

- 4) What changes, if any, were made in the LCAP prior to adoption as a result of written comments or other feedback received by the LEA through any of the LEA's engagement processes?
- 5) What specific actions were taken to meet statutory requirements for stakeholder engagement pursuant to Education Code sections 52062, 52068, and 47606.5, including engagement with representative parents of pupils identified in Education Code section 42238.01?
- 6) In the annual update, how has the involvement of these stakeholders supported improved outcomes for pupils related to the state priorities?

Involvement Process	Impact on LCAP
<u>Stakeholder Engagement</u> The Ross Valley School District engaged stakeholder groups, including parents, staff and community members, for the purpose of seeking input regarding LCAP goals, strategic initiatives, priorities and action plans. Many presentations were conducted at school sites and the District Office. Participants were presented information regarding the LCAP: ▶ Review of the LCAP – what is it? ▶ Video 8 from LCFF channel ▶ “Stakeholders” in RVSD – who are they? ▶ District Goals and State Priorities - connections ▶ Our Story: ◦ What we do well ◦ What we could do better ▶ Activity – provide input into “Our Story” ▶ Next Steps A copy of the presentation was provided each participant, along with an activity form. The activity consisted of participants working individually and in groups to respond to the following questions: ▶ What do we do well? ▶ What can we do better? ▶ If we achieved these goals, what would your student be doing that is different from what’s happening now at your school? Notes were taken by District staff at each meeting regarding input	The Ross Valley School District LCAP was impacted by stakeholder input. Specifically, as a result of such input, the following goals, initiatives, priorities and action plans were added or modified: <u>Differentiated instruction</u> – parents provided significant input that more opportunities for differentiated learning, both during and after the instructional day, needs to be infused into the instructional program. The intent of differentiated learning would be to provide opportunities for all students at all grade levels to improve academic performance. LCAP action plans were modified to emphasize utilization of differentiated strategies in the classroom and related professional development opportunities. Benchmarks were identified to create targets by which such strategies will be implemented in the LCAP 3 year timeframe. <u>English Learners (EL)</u> – staff members shared that significant needs exist to help improve students develop English Language proficiency. Too few students are improving their proficiency and reclassification rates are too low. As a result, additional funds are proposed that would allow expansion of services to these students and increase targets for reclassification. <u>Underperforming Students</u> – staff members also identified significant needs for underperforming students, and again additional funds have been proposed to increase services to bring more students achievement up to grade level standards. <u>School climate</u> – staff, parents and community members articulated thoughts school culture and that all students should feel

Involvement Process	Impact on LCAP
received from participants. This input was incorporated into reports presented to the Board of Trustees. Attached is a table that contains information regarding each of the stakeholder presentations, including: Date of the presentation Description of the event Stakeholder groups attending the presentation Information provided to attendees Impact on the LCAP as a result of participant input Additional input was taken from staff of the following programs: Intervention Specialists - Reading English Language Learners The input gathered from these individuals was combined with all other stakeholder input for English Learner and Low Income students and provided the basis for narrative included in sections 3B, 3C and 3D of the RVSD LCAP. <u>LCAP Task Force</u> The Ross Valley School District Superintendent formed a task force to seek input on District goals and initiatives and state priorities, by deeply exploring 15 areas of particular interest. The Task Force consisted of representatives from District Administration, school site Principals, the Ross Valley Teachers Association, the California School Employees Association, the YES Foundation and parents of children enrolled in our schools. In forming this group the District sought to gain an independent perspective on alignment of resources to our goals and initiatives, and how this might be improved. This in contrast to the LCAP presentations which were broader in scope and asked more open-ended questions of participants. In this manner, it was intended the LCAP report would be received as an authentic document that would enjoy the confidence of all readers.	safe, welcome and valued. As a result, a cultural competency training program has been proposed in which outcomes would increase awareness of self and others for all students and staff. Parental and community involvement – parents and community members provided suggestions for increasing involvement in key decision making processes including and particularly the LCAP. As a result, benchmarks were established to increase the number of parents and community members engaged in providing input into annual LCAP development.

Involvement Process	Impact on LCAP
These areas covered three broad categories; instructional programs, school climate and resource allocation. They were: Instructional programs: ◦ Common Core State Standards ◦ English Learners ◦ Intervention Programs ◦ Visual and Performing Arts ◦ Physical Education ◦ Special Needs Programs ◦ Attract and Retain Staff ◦ Course Access School Climate: ◦ School Climate ◦ Parental Involvement ◦ Student Engagement ◦ Social Emotional Learning Program Resource allocation: ◦ Technology Integration ◦ Learning Environments ◦ Finance Participants were provided a report on the status of each program, including a description of the programs link to District goals and state initiatives; how services are provided; staffing allocations, class sizes, expected student outcomes and student performance measures, if applicable; and a narrative providing deeper insight into the program. In all, 12 persons participated in this activity. They met four times for a total of 12 hours, providing input on the above topics and helping District staff gain greater perspective on where opportunities exist for improvement. This input was incorporated into reports presented to the Board of Trustees. <u>Board of Trustees Review</u> A summary of each meeting was prepared indicating the topic,	

Involvement Process	Impact on LCAP
source and description of input through March 2014. The summary was presented to the Board of Trustees at their meeting on April 1, 2014 to apprise them of the status of such input. Draft LCAP On May 13, 2014 the first draft of the LCAP was presented to the Round Table, a Superintendents Committee consisting of parents and administrators, for review and input. Comments were provided regarding various action steps and allocations. The draft LCAP was also presented to the Board of Trustees on May 13, 2014 for review and comment. Direction was provided to staff to move any proposed increased expenditure for the 2014-15 year, not already funded in the preliminary 2014-15 budget, to the 2015-16 year.	

Section 2: Goals and Progress Indicators

For school district, Education Code sections 52060 and 52061, for county offices of education, Education Code sections 52066 and 52067, and for charter schools, Education Code section 47606.5 require(s) the LCAP to include a description of the annual goals, for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils, for each state priority and any local priorities and require the annual update to include a review of progress towards the goals and describe any changes to the goals.

Instructions: Describe annual goals and expected and actual progress toward meeting goals. This section must include specifics projected for the applicable term of the LCAP, and in each annual update year, a review of progress made in the past fiscal year based on an identified metric. Charter schools may adjust the chart below to align with the term of the charter school's budget that is submitted to the school's authorizer pursuant to Education Code section 47604.33. The metrics may be quantitative or qualitative, although LEAs must, at minimum, use the specific metrics that statute explicitly references as required elements for measuring progress within a particular state priority area. Goals must address each of the state priorities and any additional local priorities; however, one goal may address multiple priorities. The LEA may identify which school sites and subgroups have the same goals, and group and describe those goals together. The LEA may also indicate those goals that are not applicable to a specific subgroup or school site. The goals must reflect outcomes for all pupils and include specific goals for school sites and specific subgroups, including pupils with disabilities, both at the LEA level and, where applicable, at the school site level. To facilitate alignment

between the LCAP and school plans, the LCAP shall identify and incorporate school-specific goals related to the state and local priorities from the school plans submitted pursuant to Education Code section 64001. Furthermore, the LCAP should be shared with, and input requested from, school site-level advisory groups (e.g., school site councils, English Learner Advisory Councils, pupil advisory groups, etc.) to facilitate alignment between school-site and district-level goals and actions. An LEA may incorporate or reference actions described in other plans that are being undertaken to meet the goal.

Guiding Questions:

- 1) What are the LEA's goal(s) to address state priorities related to "Conditions of Learning"?
- 2) What are the LEA's goal(s) to address state priorities related to "Pupil Outcomes"?
- 3) What are the LEA's goal(s) to address state priorities related to "Engagement" (e.g., pupil and parent)?
- 4) What are the LEA's goal(s) to address locally-identified priorities?
- 5) How have the unique needs of individual school sites been evaluated to inform the development of meaningful district and/or individual school site goals (e.g., input from site level advisory groups, staff, parents, community, pupils; review of school level plans; in-depth school level data analysis, etc.)?
- 6) What are the unique goals for subgroups as defined in Education Code sections 42238.01 and 52052 that are different from the LEA's goals for all pupils?
- 7) What are the specific predicted outcomes/metrics/noticeable changes associated with each of the goals annually and over the term of the LCAP?
- 8) What information (e.g., quantitative and qualitative data/metrics) was considered/reviewed to develop goals to address each state or local priority and/or to review progress toward goals in the annual update?
- 9) What information was considered/reviewed for individual school sites?
- 10) What information was considered/reviewed for subgroups identified in Education Code section 52052?
- 11) In the annual update, what changes/progress have been realized and how do these compare to changes/progress predicted? What modifications are being made to the LCAP as a result of this comparison?

Identified Need and Metric (What needs have been identified and what metrics are used to measure progress?)	Goals			Annual Update: Analysis of Progress	What will be different/improved for students? (based on identified metric)			Related State and Local Priorities (Identify specific state priority. For districts and COEs, all priorities in statute must be included and identified; each goal may be linked to more than one priority if appropriate.)
	Description of Goal	Applicable Pupil Subgroups (Identify applicable subgroups (as defined in EC 52052) or indicate "all" for all pupils.)	School(s) Affected (Indicate "all" if the goal applies to all schools in the LEA, or alternatively, all high schools, for example.)		LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17	
See LCAP Need Sheets Numbered 1-6								
Improve overall student achievement Metric: Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBAC); Technology plan	Give students what they need to excel: Improve student achievement	All	All		SBAC Benchmark; 100% of teachers and students have access to technology in classroom	SBAC Benchmark +1%	SBAC Benchmark +2%	Implement Common Core State Standards Pupil Achievement Course Access
Improve EL reclassification rate of 25% for students at RVSD at least 3 years Metric: EL rates (CELDT)	Give students what they need to excel: Improve student achievement	English Learners	All		40% reclassification rate	60% reclassification rate	80% reclassification rate	Pupil Achievement Course Access
Reduce number of students performing below grade level benchmarks in	Give students what they need to excel: Improve student achievement	All	All		Benchmark	Benchmark -10%	Benchmark -20%	Implement Common Core State Standards Pupil Achievement

Identified Need and Metric (What needs have been identified and what metrics are used to measure progress?)	Goals			Annual Update: Analysis of Progress	What will be different/improved for students? (based on identified metric)			Related State and Local Priorities (Identify specific state priority. For districts and COEs, all priorities in statute must be included and identified; each goal may be linked to more than one priority if appropriate.)
	Description of Goal	Applicable Pupil Subgroups (Identify applicable subgroups (as defined in EC 52052) or indicate "all" for all pupils.)	School(s) Affected (Indicate "all" if the goal applies to all schools in the LEA, or alternatively, all high schools, for example.)		LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17	
reading and math Metric: Grade level benchmarks								Other Pupil Outcomes
Provide staff development that supports EL, RTI, differentiated learning and Common Core strategies Metrics: Use of GLAD, differentiated strategies in classroom	Give students what they need to excel: Develop capacity of staff	All	All		GLAD, differentiated strategy utilization benchmark	Benchmark +20% teachers utilizing GLAD and differentiated strategies in classroom	Benchmark +40% teachers utilizing GLAD and differentiated strategies in classroom	Implement Common Core State Standards Pupil Achievement
Develop skills to interact effectively with people of different cultures and socio-economic backgrounds	Give students what they need to excel: Create climate that promotes student engagement and performance	All	All		Benchmark attendance, suspensions and expulsions rates; student surveys "kids feel safe"	Benchmark attendance +1, suspensions and expulsions -1, student surveys "kids feel safe" +1;	Benchmark attendance +2, suspensions and expulsions -2, student surveys "kids feel safe" +2;	School Climate Pupil Engagement

Identified Need and Metric (What needs have been identified and what metrics are used to measure progress?)	Goals			Annual Update: Analysis of Progress	What will be different/improved for students? (based on identified metric)			Related State and Local Priorities (Identify specific state priority. For districts and COEs, all priorities in statute must be included and identified; each goal may be linked to more than one priority if appropriate.)
	Description of Goal	Applicable Pupil Subgroups (Identify applicable subgroups (as defined in EC 52052) or indicate "all" for all pupils.)	School(s) Affected (Indicate "all" if the goal applies to all schools in the LEA, or alternatively, all high schools, for example.)		LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17	
Metrics: Attendance, suspension, expulsion rates; Student surveys; Cultural competency trainings						25% of staff trained in cultural competency	50% of staff trained in cultural competency	
Increase engagement of key stakeholders in partnerships and key decision making processes Metric: Participation in LCAP input process	Strengthen school, family and community engagement; Cultivate productive partnerships with the community	All	All		Benchmark	Benchmark +20%	Benchmark +40%	Parental Involvement
Provide dedicated space for all programs Metric: Facilities Master Plan	Create and align systems and structures to achieve student success: Provide facilities and resources for 21 st	All	All		Dedicated space for all programs at White Hill and Brookside Schools	Dedicated space for all programs at Manor, Hidden Valley and Wade Thomas	Dedicated space for all programs at all schools	Basic Services

Identified Need and Metric (What needs have been identified and what metrics are used to measure progress?)	Goals			Annual Update: Analysis of Progress	What will be different/improved for students? (based on identified metric)			Related State and Local Priorities (Identify specific state priority. For districts and COEs, all priorities in statute must be included and identified; each goal may be linked to more than one priority if appropriate.)
	Description of Goal	Applicable Pupil Subgroups (Identify applicable subgroups (as defined in EC 52052) or indicate "all" for all pupils.)	School(s) Affected (Indicate "all" if the goal applies to all schools in the LEA, or alternatively, all high schools, for example.)		LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17	
	Century learning environments					Schools		
Maintain fiscal solvency Metric: District budgeted reserves	Create and Align systems and structures to achieve student success: Maintain fiscal solvency while meeting goals	All	All		At least 10% reserved in budget for state/locally defined needs	10%+ reserved in budget for state/locally defined needs	10%+ reserved in budget for state/locally defined needs	Basic Services

Section 3: Actions, Services, and Expenditures

For school districts, Education Code sections 52060 and 52061, for county offices of education, Education Code sections 52066 and 52067, and for charter schools, Education Code section 47606.5 require the LCAP to include a description of the specific actions an LEA will take to meet the goals identified. Additionally Education Code section 52604 requires a listing and description of the expenditures required to implement the specific actions.

Instructions: Identify annual actions to be performed to meet the goals described in Section 2, and describe expenditures to implement each action, and where these expenditures can be found in the LEA's budget. Actions may describe a group of services that are implemented to achieve identified goals. The actions and expenditures must reflect details within a goal for the specific subgroups identified in Education Code section 52052, including pupils with disabilities, and for specific school sites as applicable. In describing the actions and expenditures that will serve low-income, English learner, and/or foster youth pupils as defined in Education Code section 42238.01, the LEA must identify whether supplemental and concentration funds are used in a districtwide, schoolwide, countywide, or charterwide manner. In the annual update, the LEA must describe any changes to actions as a result of a review of progress. The LEA must reference all fund sources used to support actions and services. Expenditures must be classified using the California School Accounting Manual as required by Education Code sections 52061, 52067, and 47606.5.

Guiding Questions:

1. What actions/services will be provided to all pupils, to subgroups of pupils identified pursuant to Education Code section 52052, to specific school sites, to English learners, to low-income pupils, and/or to foster youth to achieve goals identified in the LCAP?
2. How do these actions/services link to identified goals and performance indicators?
3. What expenditures support changes to actions/services as a result of the goal identified? Where can these expenditures be found in the LEA's budget?
4. In the annual update, how have the actions/services addressed the needs of all pupils and did the provisions of those services result in the desired outcomes?
5. In the annual update, how have the actions/services addressed the needs of all subgroups of pupils identified pursuant to Education Code section 52052, including, but not limited to, English learners, low-income pupils, and foster youth; and did the provision of those actions/services result in the desired outcomes?
6. In the annual update, how have the actions/services addressed the identified needs and goals of specific school sites and did the provision of those actions/services result in the desired outcomes?
7. In the annual update, what changes in actions, services, and expenditures have been made as a result of reviewing past progress and/or changes to goals?

What annual actions, and the LEA may include any services that support these actions, are to be performed to meet the goals described in Section 2 for ALL pupils and the goals specifically for subgroups of pupils identified in Education Code section 52052 but not listed in Table 3B below (e.g., Ethnic subgroups and pupils with disabilities)? List and describe expenditures for each fiscal year implementing these actions, including where these expenditures can be found in the LEA's budget.

Goal (Include and identify all goals from Section 2)	Related State and Local Priorities (from Section 2)	Actions and Services	Level of Service (Indicate if school-wide or LEA-wide)	Annual Update: Review of actions/ services	What actions are performed or services provided in each year (and are projected to be provided in years 2 and 3)? What are the anticipated expenditures for each action (including funding source)?		
					LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17
Give students what they need to excel: Improve student achievement	Implement Common Core State Standards Pupil Achievement Course Access	Provide educational programs with progression towards alignment with Common Core standards; the District will leverage models, technology and resources for the greatest impact and learning gains by all of our students	All schools		Provide regular instruction at board approved class sizes; offer extra-curricular and elective options; provide services to special need students as required by their IEP; \$17.9m (All IEP; Goals 1110 through 6999)	Provide regular instruction at board approved class sizes; offer extra-curricular and elective options; provide services to special need students as required by their IEP; \$18.4m (All IEP; Goals 1110 through 6999)	Provide regular instruction at board approved class sizes; offer extra-curricular and elective options; provide services to special need students as required by their IEP; \$18.9m (All IEP; Goals 1110 through 6999)
Give students what they need to excel: Improve student achievement	Implement Common Core State Standards Pupil Achievement	Improve reclassification rate of English Learners and academic achievement of underperforming	All schools		\$325,796 (LCFF and categorical programs Goals 1433, 1484)	\$379,510 (LCFF and categorical programs Goals 1433, 1484)	\$403,989 (LCFF and categorical programs Goals 1433, 1484)

Goal (Include and identify all goals from Section 2)	Related State and Local Priorities (from Section 2)	Actions and Services	Level of Service (Indicate if school-wide or LEA-wide)	Annual Update: Review of actions/ services	What actions are performed or services provided in each year (and are projected to be provided in years 2 and 3)? What are the anticipated expenditures for each action (including funding source)?		
					LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17
	Course Access	students by increasing services					
Give students what they need to excel: Develop capacity of staff	Implement Common Core State Standards	Professional development will be conducted reflecting the priorities and topics which support the implementation of District goals, including Common Core State Standards, GLAD, technology implementation and cultural competency	All schools		\$199,371 (LCFF, restricted categorical funds) \$350,000 (Common Core State Grant carryover to be allocated after books are closed)	\$199,371 (LCFF, restricted categorical funds)	\$199,371 (LCFF, restricted categorical funds)
Give students what they need to excel: Create climate that promotes student engagement and performance	Student Engagement	Create safe, orderly, healthy and respectful learning environments that value diversity and collaboration and develop the skills to interact	All schools		Included in above allocations	Included in above allocations	Included in above allocations

Goal (Include and identify all goals from Section 2)	Related State and Local Priorities (from Section 2)	Actions and Services	Level of Service (Indicate if school-wide or LEA-wide)	Annual Update: Review of actions/services	What actions are performed or services provided in each year (and are projected to be provided in years 2 and 3)? What are the anticipated expenditures for each action (including funding source)?		
					LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17
		effectively with people of different cultures and socio-economic backgrounds, i.e., cultural competency					
Strengthen school, family and community engagement: Cultivate productive partnerships with the community	Parental Involvement	Engage families, community and other key stakeholders in collaborative partnerships and key decision making processes	All schools		Included in above allocations	Included in above allocations	Included in above allocations
Create and align systems and structures to achieve student success: Provide facilities and resources for 21 st Century	Basic Services	Implement the Districts Facility Master Plan and Technology Plan at all elementary schools	K-5 schools		Technology implementation at all elementary schools \$173k, General Fund/Brookside classroom construction \$2+ million, Bond Fund 22	Technology implementation at all elementary schools \$173k, General Fund/Manor, Happy Valley and Wade Thomas classroom construction \$5+	Technology implementation at all elementary schools \$173k, General Fund

Goal (Include and identify all goals from Section 2)	Related State and Local Priorities (from Section 2)	Actions and Services	Level of Service (Indicate if school-wide or LEA-wide)	Annual Update: Review of actions/services	What actions are performed or services provided in each year (and are projected to be provided in years 2 and 3)? What are the anticipated expenditures for each action (including funding source)?		
					LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17
learning environments						million Bond Fund 22	
Create and Align systems and structures to achieve student success: provide support services	Basic Services	Provide support systems that allow all of the above services to happen	All schools		\$3.8m (LCFF)	\$3.9m (LCFF) (increase of 1.0 fte custodial support)	\$4.0m (LCFF)
Create and Align systems and structures to achieve student success: Maintain fiscal solvency while meeting goals	Basic Services	Maintain fiscal solvency while allocating human, fiscal, and material resources to meet goals and initiatives as outlined in the Strategic Plan	All schools		Maintain 3% state reserve/at least 5% Board Policy 3100 reserve/Reserves for specified risks	Eliminate structural budget deficit of about \$370k (General Fund); Maintain 3% state reserve/at least 5% Board Policy 3100 reserve/Reserves for specified risks	Maintain 3% state reserve/at least 5% Board Policy 3100 reserve/Reserves for specified risks

- A. Identify additional annual actions, and the LEA may include any services that support these actions, above what is provided for all pupils that will serve low-income, English learner, and/or foster youth pupils as defined in Education Code section 42238.01 and pupils redesignated as fluent English proficient. The identified actions must include, but are not limited to, those actions that are to be performed to meet the targeted goals described in Section 2 for low-income pupils, English learners, foster youth and/or pupils redesignated as fluent English proficient (e.g., not listed in Table 3A above). List and describe expenditures for each fiscal year implementing these actions, including where those expenditures can be found in the LEA's budget.

Goal (Include and identify all goals from Section 2, if applicable)	Related State and Local Priorities (from Section 2)	Actions and Services	Level of Service (Indicate if school-wide or LEA-wide)	Annual Update: Review of actions/services	What actions are performed or services provided in each year (and are projected to be provided in years 2 and 3)? What are the anticipated expenditures for each action (including funding source)?		
					LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17
Give students what they need to excel: Improve student achievement	Implement Common Core State Standards Pupil Achievement Course Access	For low income pupils: a) Enhance intervention strategies at all elementary schools b) Utilize uniform intervention materials and systems across all elementary schools	K-5 schools, targeted to students performing below grade level in reading and math		Provide after-school and summer intervention programs \$15,000 (LCFF Supplemental)	Provide after-school and summer intervention programs \$15,000 (LCFF Supplemental)	Provide after-school and summer intervention programs \$15,000 (LCFF Supplemental)

Goal (Include and identify all goals from Section 2, if applicable)	Related State and Local Priorities (from Section 2)	Actions and Services	Level of Service (Indicate if school-wide or LEA-wide)	Annual Update: Review of actions/services	What actions are performed or services provided in each year (and are projected to be provided in years 2 and 3)? What are the anticipated expenditures for each action (including funding source)?		
					LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17
Give students what they need to excel: Improve student achievement	Implement Common Core State Standards Pupil Achievement Course Access	For English learners:	All schools, targeted to students identified as English Learners		GLAD training \$12,000 (Title II)	GLAD training \$12,000 (Title II)	GLAD training \$12,000 (Title II)
		a) Provide GLAD training for all new teachers					
		b) Develop instructional materials and activities that allow EL staff to provide relevant instruction that is connected to activities conducted in the students regular classroom			Develop instructional materials \$10,000 (LCFF Supplemental) Form master schedule study committee	Implement instructional materials \$10,000 (LCFF Supplemental) Pilot master schedule	Implement master schedule \$10,000 (LCFF Supplemental)
		c) Support teacher					

Goal (Include and identify all goals from Section 2, if applicable)	Related State and Local Priorities (from Section 2)	Actions and Services	Level of Service (Indicate if school-wide or LEA-wide)	Annual Update: Review of actions/ services	What actions are performed or services provided in each year (and are projected to be provided in years 2 and 3)? What are the anticipated expenditures for each action (including funding source)?		
					LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17
		application and utilization of GLAD strategies d) Integrate EL and Intervention Program strategies as many of the same students receive services in both programs e) Implement master schedule at every school to ensure all students have access					

Goal (Include and identify all goals from Section 2, if applicable)	Related State and Local Priorities (from Section 2)	Actions and Services	Level of Service (Indicate if school-wide or LEA-wide)	Annual Update: Review of actions/ services	What actions are performed or services provided in each year (and are projected to be provided in years 2 and 3)? What are the anticipated expenditures for each action (including funding source)?		
					LCAP YEAR Year 1: 2014-15	Year 2: 2015-16	Year 3: 2016-17
		to entire core and elective curriculum					
		For foster youth: See information re: Low income pupils			Not a numerically significant subgroup		
		For redesignated fluent English proficient pupils: a) Conduct study to identify best practices to support redesignated EL students	All schools, targeted to redesignated English Learners				
					Form committee to study best practices to support redesignated English Learners \$1,000 (LCFF Supplemental)	Pilot recommendations of committee (funding amount to be determined)	Implement recommendations of committee (funding amount to be determined)

- B. Describe the LEA's increase in funds in the LCAP year calculated on the basis of the number and concentration of low income, foster youth, and English learner pupils as determined pursuant to 5 CCR 15496(a)(5). Describe how the LEA is expending these funds in the LCAP year. Include a description of, and justification for, the use of any funds in a districtwide, schoolwide, countywide, or charterwide manner as specified in 5 CCR 15496. For school districts with below 55 percent of enrollment of unduplicated pupils in the district or below 40 percent of enrollment of unduplicated pupils at a school site in the LCAP year, when using supplemental and concentration funds in a districtwide or schoolwide manner, the school district must additionally describe how the services provided are the most effective use of funds to meet the district's goals for unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas. (See 5 CCR 15496(b) for guidance.)

The Ross Valley School District's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) calculation, prepared using the FCMAT LCFF calculator, indicates that the District will receive \$225,452 of additional funds for the 2014-15 fiscal year generated on the basis of the number and concentration of low income, foster youth, and English Learner (EL) pupils.

The District will provide services funded via LCFF supplemental dollars in the 2014-15 year to meet the needs of these pupils as follows:

English Learner (EL) Program (Goal 1484) – All Schools, Grades K-5

- 1.0 FTE EL Coordinator/Teacher
- Translation services and newsletters for EL parents, including DELAC committee meetings
- Align EL practices by utilizing standardized assessment kits at all schools
- Monitoring for two years for all students redesignated as English Proficient
- Study best practices for supporting redesignated EL pupils

English Learner (EL) Program (Goal 1484) – White Hill Middle School, Grades 6-8

- Monitoring for two years for all students redesignated as English Proficient
- Study best practices for supporting redesignated EL pupils

Intervention Services Program (Goal 1433) – Manor School, Grades K-5

- 1.0 FTE Instructional Support and Intervention Specialist Teacher
- Volunteer support from the Marin County Office of Education
- After school tutors
- Summer reading camps

Intervention Services Program (Goal 1433) – All Schools, Grades K-8

- After school tutors
- Summer reading camps

All services and materials will be targeted to individual students identified as low income and/or English Learner and their parents; activities will not be conducted on a school-wide or district-wide basis.

- C. Consistent with the requirements of 5 CCR 15496, demonstrate how the services provided in the LCAP year for low income pupils, foster youth, and English learners provide for increased or improved services for these pupils in proportion to the increase in funding provided for such pupils in that year as calculated pursuant to 5 CCR 15496(a)(7). Identify the percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all pupils in the LCAP year as calculated pursuant to 5 CCR 15496(a). An LEA shall describe how the proportionality percentage is met using a quantitative and/or qualitative description of the increased and/or improved services for unduplicated pupils as compared to the services provided to all pupils.

The Ross Valley School District provides increased services to low income pupils, foster youth, and English learners in proportion to the increase in funding provided for such pupils.

English Learners

Students who come to the Ross Valley School District may be identified as English Learners through their performance on the California English Language Development Test, or CELDT. Learners are identified as achieving at one of five levels:

- 1 – Beginning
- 2 – Early Intermediate
- 3 – Intermediate
- 4 – Early Advanced
- 5 - Advanced

Some English Learners come to school with limited or no English language proficiency, i.e. levels 1-3. These students are provided EL program services that are designed to help them achieve proficiency in English, upon which time they are exited from the program.

In recent years the EL program has undergone revisions and is considered a work in progress. A summary of the changes in program services follows:

- In the 2011-12 school year, a certificated EL teacher (professional expert) provided services to Hidden Valley school and a classified EL aide served the rest of the schools (Manor, Wade Thomas, Brookside and White Hill). The following school year, (2012-13), a certificated EL teacher served Manor school, while a classified EL aide served all other schools in the district. Beginning and Early Intermediate students were served an average of 2 times a week at each school. Curriculum for the English Language Learner program varied by site and teacher.

After conducting an internal compliance review, we identified and revised services for our students.

- In the 2013-14 year a different model was implemented to provide a certificated EL teacher for all schools. This teacher provides small group EL services to students at the beginning, early intermediate and intermediate levels at all elementary schools. Students are served 1-3 times a week, depending on need, for 30-40 minutes a day. Curriculum is inconsistent from site to site, and some is still being piloted.
- Students who are redesignated as English Proficient no longer take the CELDST test and receive monitoring for two years thereafter.
- What data do we have and what does it tell us?

Overall CELDT Test Scores of 40 students with RVSD 2010-11 - 2012-13
(Students enrolled in RVSD for a minimum of 3 years):

- 26 students showed an increase in their CELDT levels over the 3 year period, or 65%
- 6 students remained at the same CELDT levels over the 3 years, or 15%
- 8 students decreased in their CELDT levels over the 3 years, or 20%

We strive to achieve 100% improvement, thus we need to strive to improve services and student performance on the CELDT test.

Of the 60 or so students enrolled in the EL program levels 1-5 in any given year, about 15 per year are reclassified as English Proficient for a success rate of about 25%. We expect to experience a significant improvement in this exit rate as the new program is implemented.

We also need to consider the needs of redesignated learners such that their performance does not deteriorate after exiting the program. Strategies include monitoring for two years after exit, but they need to be enhanced to assure their status as proficient in the English language, in particular at White Hill Middle School.

Regarding performance on state standardized testing, EL students performed below District standards in general, and some did not improve their performance.

CST ELA 2010-11 - 2012-13
Students enrolled in RVSD for a minimum of 3 years

School	Total Students	Proficient or Above				Below Proficient			
		Prof to Prof <u>no change</u>	Prof to Prof <u>Increase</u>	Prof to Prof <u>Decrease</u>	Below Prof to Prof	Prof to Below Prof	Below Prof to Below Prof <u>no change</u>	Below Prof to Below Prof <u>Increase</u>	Below Prof to Below Prof <u>Decrease</u>
WH	37	6	6	8	2	7	3	2	3
WT	6		3	1	2				
MN	10			2	1			4	3
HV & BKS	6	5			1				
District Totals	59	11	9	11	6	7	3	6	6

Of the 59 students that attended school in RVSD over the 3 year period, **21 students showed an increase** in their ELA CST scores. (Prof to Prof Increase, Below Prof to Below Prof Increase, or Below Prof to Prof). Of these same students, **24 showed a decrease** in their ELA CST scores (Prof to Prof decrease, Prof to Below Prof, or Below Prof to Below Prof Decrease). The remaining 14 students showed no significant change in their CST ELA scores.

CST Math 2010-11 - 2012-13
Students enrolled for a minimum of 3 years

School	Total Students	Proficient or Above				Below Proficient			
		Prof to Prof <u>no change</u>	Prof to Prof <u>Increase</u>	Prof to Prof <u>Decrease</u>	Below Prof to Prof	Below Prof to Below Prof <u>no change</u>	Below Prof to Below Prof <u>Increase</u>	Below Prof to Below Prof <u>Decrease</u>	
WH	9	1	1	2		2	2	1	
WT	1					1			
MN	5	1	1			3			
HV & BKS	0								
District Totals	15	2	2	2	0	6	2	1	

Of the 15 students that attended school in RVSD over the 3 year period, **4 students showed an increase** in their math CST scores. (Prof to Prof Increase, Below Prof to Below Prof Increase, or Below Prof to Prof). Of these same students, **3 showed a decrease** in their math CST scores (Prof to Prof decrease, Prof to Below Prof, or Below Prof to Below Prof Decrease). The remaining 8 students showed no significant change in their CST math scores.

As state testing changes to the Smarter Balanced program we will turn our attention to the results of this system to evaluate student performance.

Regarding the program offered we provide the following information.

- What intervention materials and strategies do we use across the curriculum and grades?
 - Materials used to support EL have been inconsistent throughout the school sites, but those used include Frames for Fluency, Lucy Calkins, guided reading and comprehension around leveled books
- What professional development have we provided for all teachers:
 - 2012-13 Year I - All credentialed teachers K-8 were provided Guided Language Acquisition by Design training (GLAD); Total of 110 teachers
 - 2013-14 Year II - All teachers new to the district K-5 were provided GLAD; a total of 11 teachers

a) EL levels: 47 students are currently receiving services; the majority of the students score at the intermediate level overall.

Brookside: 6

Hidden Valley: 7

Manor: 19

Wade Thomas:15

Strategies to help improve performance on state testing and exit rates include:

- b) Provide additional certificated EL instruction to improve exit rates and support redesignated learners
- c) Develop instructional materials and activities that allow EL staff to provide relevant instruction that is connected to activities conducted in the students regular classroom
- d) Support teacher application and utilization of GLAD strategies
- e) Integrate EL and Intervention Program strategies as many of the same students receive services in both programs

Intervention Program – Low Income Students

Additional services provided to low income underperforming students in RVSD have been funded by federal funds (Title I) and the General Fund.

Title I and General Fund intervention services have been directed to Manor School as a result of its Program Improvement status identified per standards of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act federal law.

A full time certificated Intervention Specialist position was funded in the 2012-13 year with General Fund resources and assigned to Manor School to compliment instructional assistants at the site funded via Title I funds. Together they implement strategies designed to improve student performance in reading and math.

Students identified as reading below grade level benchmarks are provided direct instruction on either a push-in or pull-out basis on a weekly basis, preferably with curriculum that matches instruction provided in the regular classroom. Instruction is supplemented with support provided by volunteers from the Marin County Office of Education.

Services of instructional aides are also provided on a pull-out and push-in basis at Wade Thomas School as a result of student eligibility for Title I funds.

Intervention strategies provided at all schools in the District include a 6-8 week remediation course utilizing the Aleks (reading) and Lexia (math) intervention programs at K-5 schools and JamesTown (reading) at White Hill Middle School. Additional licenses are necessary to assure students have access to the Aleks and Lexia programs as needed.

Standardized testing results of students identified as low income as presented on the following pages. Their scores lag that of the Ross Valley School District as a whole, and as noted above additional services are provided to respond to their specific needs. Still, the achievement of this subgroup warrants additional attention as the gap in their performance remains.

CST ELA 2010-11 - 2012-13: Students enrolled for a minimum of 3 years

School	Total Students	Proficient or Above					Below Proficient				
		Prof to Prof no change	Prof to Prof Increase	Prof to Prof Decrease	Below Prof to Prof	Prof to Below Prof	Below Prof to Below Prof no change	Below Prof to Below Prof Increase	Below Prof to Below Prof Decrease		
WH	89	36	9	16	8	8	9	1	2		
WT	6	4	1		1						
MN	9	3	1		1		2	2			
HV	8	4	3	1							
BKS	4	3	1								
District Totals	116	50	15	17	10	8	11	3	2		

CST Math 2010-11 - 2012-13: Students enrolled for a minimum of 3 years

School	Total Students	Proficient or Above					Below Proficient			
		Prof to Prof no change	Prof to Prof Increase	Prof to Prof Decrease	Below Prof to Prof	Prof to Below Prof	Below Prof to Below Prof no change	Below Prof to Below Prof Increase	Below Prof to Below Prof Decrease	
WH	88	26	3	18	2	22	13	4		
WT	7	4	1			1	1			
MN	11	2	1		2	2	3		1	
HV	8	4	1	1	1		1			
BKS	4	4								
District Totals	118	40	6	19	5	25	18	4	1	

Strategies to improve performance of students in need of intervention include:

- Provide afterschool intervention services to students identified as needing increased support in reading and math
- Provide summer “Welcome Back” reading and math camps one week prior to the beginning of school

All Programs

The percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all pupils in the LCAP year as calculated pursuant to 5 CCR 15496(a) is 1.56%. Actual increased services provided to unduplicated students is 2.24%, when comparing full-time equivalent allocations of services provided to these students to such services provided to all students.

Calculations to support these percentages are attached to this report.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 42238.07 and 52064, Education Code. Reference: Sections 2574, 2575, 42238.01, 42238.02, 42238.03, 42238.07, 47605, 47605.5, 47606.5, 48926, 52052, 52060-52077, and 64001, Education Code; 20 U.S.C. Section 6312.

ROSS VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
4th Preliminary Budget 2014-15
Services to Unduplicated Students
("Minimum Proportionality Percentage")

Services to Students expressed in Full-Time Equivalents (FTE) (1)					
	All Students:	Unduplicated Students:			
	Regular & Special Education	English Language Learners	Socio-economically Disadvantaged Students (2)	Sub-Total	Total
Instructional Staff:					
Teachers	128.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	128.46
Instructional Assistants	25.71	0.00	1.28	1.28	26.99
PE Specialists	3.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.71
After School/Summer Programs	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.20	0.20
Support Staff:					
Psychologists	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Counselors	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Counseling Coordinator	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Behavior Specialist	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
English Learner Specialist	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Intervention Specialist	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Technology Coach	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Nurses	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Library Specialists	5.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.06
Noon-Time & Campus Supv	3.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.63
Translators	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.20	0.20
Tutors	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.20	0.20
Total	173.57	1.20	2.68	3.88	177.45
				%	FTE
Services to Unduplicated Students as compared to All Students				2.24%	3.88
Required Minimum Proportionality				1.56%	2.71
Services to Unduplicated Pupils Above Required Minimum Proportionality				0.68%	1.17
Required Increase or Improvement to Services				Not applicable	Not applicable
(1) Employees and Professional Experts on contract included in these calculations					
(2) Eligible for Free or Reduced Price Meal Program					

Ross Valley Elementary - Ross Valley School District Adopted 2014-15					5/15/14
Minimum Proportionality Percentage (MPP): Summary Supplemental & Concentration Grant					
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16**	2016-17**	
1. LCFF Target Supplemental & Concentration Grant Funding <i>from Calculator tab</i>		375,713	383,666	391,897	
2. Prior Year (estimated) Expenditures for Unduplicated Pupils above what was spent on services for all pupils		166,872	225,452	279,166	
Prior Year EIA expenditures 2014-15 py exp (2013-14 exp) must >= 2012-13 EIA exp	40,646 TRUE				
3. Difference [1] less [2]		208,841	158,214	112,731	
4. Increase in Estimated Supplemental & Concentration Grant Funding [3] * GAP funding rate		58,580	53,714	24,429	
GAP funding rate		28.05%	33.95%	21.67%	
5. Estimated Supplemental and Concentration Grant Funding [2] plus [4] (unless [3]<0 then [1])		225,452	279,166	303,595	
6. Base Funding LCFF Phase-In Entitlement less [5]		14,478,590	15,433,020	15,887,647	
LCFF Phase-In Entitlement		14,822,415	15,830,559	16,309,615	
7/8. Minimum Proportionality Percentage* [5] / [6]		1.56%	1.81%	1.91%	
*percentage by which services for unduplicated students must be increased or improved over services provided for all students in the LCAP year. If Step 3a <=0, then calculate the minimum proportionality percentage at Estimated Supplemental & Concentration Grant Funding, step 5. **Regulations only require an LEA to demonstrate how it is meeting the proportionality percentage in the LCAP year, not across all three years.					
SUMMARY SUPPLEMENTAL & CONCENTRATION GRANT & MPP					
		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	
Current year estimated supplemental and concentration grant funding in the LCAP year	\$	225,452	\$ 279,166	\$ 303,595	
Current year Minimum Proportionality Percentage (MPP)		1.56%	1.81%	1.91%	