Introduction:

LEA: Redlands Unified School District **Contact: Lori Rhodes, Superintendent, lori_rhodes@redlands.k12.ca.us, (909) 307-5300** **LCAP Year: 2016-17**

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. The LCAP and Annual Update Template must be completed by all LEAs each year.

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. Accordingly, in developing goals, specific actions, and expenditures, LEAs should carefully consider how to reflect the services and related expenses for their basic instructional program in relationship to the state priorities. 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 shall comply with instructions and should 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. However, the narrative response and goals and actions should demonstrate each guiding question was considered during the development of the plan. 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 and English language development 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:

Parental involvement: *efforts to seek parent input in decision making at the district and each schoolsite, 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 52060(g), 52062 and 52063 specify the minimum requirements for school districts; Education Code sections 52066(g), 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 consult with parents, pupils, school personnel, local bargaining units as applicable, and the community and how this consultation contributed to development of the LCAP or annual update. Note that the LEA's goals, actions, services and expenditures related to the state priority of parental involvement are to be described separately in Section 2. In the annual update boxes, describe the stakeholder involvement process for the review, and describe its impact on, the development of the annual update to LCAP goals, actions, services, and expenditures.

Guiding Questions:

1) How have applicable stakeholders (e.g., parents and pupils, including parents of unduplicated pupils and unduplicated pupils identified in Education Code section 42238.01; community members; local bargaining units; LEA personnel; county child welfare agencies; county office of education foster youth services programs, court-appointed special advocates, and other foster youth stakeholders; 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? How was the information made available?
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 representatives of parents and guardians of pupils identified in Education Code section 42238.01?
6) What specific actions were taken to consult with pupils to meet the requirements 5 CCR 15495(a)?
7) How has stakeholder involvement been continued and supported? How has the involvement of these stakeholders supported improved outcomes for pupils, including unduplicated pupils, related to the state priorities?

Involvement Process	**Impact on LCAP**

RUSD Vision Statement
MISSION: The Redlands Unified School District, as a unifying agent of several unique communities, rich in local history, culture, and tradition, is committed to preparing students to become productive participants in a diverse, multi-cultural, democratic society through quality education, high expectations, flexible programs and innovative partnerships. Our students will be empowered with the knowledge and commitment necessary to confront the challenges of our changing world as they become the leaders of the 21st century.
 	
Current RUSD enrollment in grades K-12 is 20,891 students (CALPADS Fall I Reporting). The District is comprised of twenty-five schools and students who generally score above the county, state and national average on standardized tests. The District's sixteen elementary schools serve transitional kindergarten through fifth grade, with four middle schools serving grades six through eight. The District includes three comprehensive high schools, a continuation high school, and alternative programs for independent and home-school study and an online school. The District consists of over 59.55% "unduplicated" students. Specifically, 9% of our overall population consists of English Learners and we are home to over 140 foster youth. Fifteen of our twenty-five schools are comprised of over 50%, Low Income, English Learners and/or Foster Youth.
 	
The Redlands Unified School District is home to California Distinguished Schools, National Blue Ribbon Schools, Title I Achieving Schools, California Achieving Schools, and California Gold Ribbon Schools. Student test scores traditionally are among the top in the county of San Bernardino and the district is ranked among the top fifty in the state of California. An analysis of demographic data for the top fifty districts in California reveals that RUSD serves the largest low income population among these, a testament to our unwavering commitment to close the achievement gap for all students.
 	
CORE VALUES:
• Academic Achievement for All Students:
  ○ All schools achieve state performance targets on accountability measures
  ○ Create an attitude of continuous improvement – move beyond acceptance of the status quo
  ○ Continue to make strides in the systems if assessment and curriculum in order to monitor, individualize, and improve student instruction
  ○ Provide students a rich, well-rounded instructional program
• Fiscal Responsibility and Well Managed Resources
  ○ Manage growth or declining enrollment well, including fiscal and facilities issues
  ○ Remain fiscally sound and continue to make wise decisions so that we are seen as a model for other districts
  ○ Successfully and strategically improve school facilities and grounds
	The culture, mission, and vision of our district are the foundation of the LCAP goals, actions, and expenditures. The students whom we serve include over 59.55% who are low income, English Learners or Foster Youth. Therefore, we crafted a plan to ensure quality daily instruction to close the achievement gap and provide ***all*** students with a quality 21st Century education. Based on the needs of our student demographics, resources in the plan are allocated to support the achievement of ***all*** students, with additional actions and services provided to English Learners, Low Income and Foster Youth.

- An Environment that Attracts and Retains High Quality Employees
    - Continue to improve recruiting efforts and strategies
    - Continue to improve staff training and professional development
    - Continue to develop support systems that create successful employees
- Provide Opportunities for Every Student to Participate Fully
    - Provide equity, parity, accessibility and opportunity for all students

RUSD 21st Century Skills:

Our goal is to ensure all graduating students will demonstrate proficiency in:

- Use of technology on a daily basis, including the advancement of technology skills.
- Skills identified as the 4Cs - Critical Thinking & Problem Solving, Communication, Collaboration and Creativity.

RUSD will develop clear assessments and work closely with teachers to develop ways to enhance the curriculum aligned to the State Standards as a vehicle for student mastery of these 21st century skills.

LCAP Workgroups Foundation and Implementation Support

Significant planning time for the implementation of LCAP programs occurred through the Workgroups established during the 2015-16 LCAP Annual Update Process. Workgroups created guidelines, implementation schedules and suggested plans to implement and monitor programs established during the 2013-14 and 2014-15 LCAP years. Newly recommended programs or programs needing additional support and guidance will require Workgroup actions during the upcoming LCAP cycle.

The information and planning provided during the Workgroup Process (2014-15) assisted district personnel in the implementation and monitoring of the following programs:

- Reading Academy Workgroup (Program 1)
- Math Academy Workgroup (Programs 2, 6)
- AVID Workgroup (Program 3)
- CTE Program of Study Workgroup (Program 4)
- English Learner Cadre Workgroup (Program 5)
- Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS)

Additional Workgroups were formed for LCAP programs initiated during the LCAP Advisory Committee meeting on March 25, 2015. (Programs were approved by the Board of Education on June 12, 2015 when the LCAP was adopted):

Academic Case Carrier Workgroup (Goal 5 Action/Service 5.7)

The Academic Case Carrier Program Workgroup was established to coordinate the implementation of the program to assist Foster Youth, EL and Low Income Students. The Program supports the LCAP Goal 5 – *Close the Achievement Gap for Underperforming*

Our LCAP goals, actions and expenditures were crafted with the goal of ensuring that ***all*** students, including students of all ethnic sub-groups, English Learners, Low Income and Foster Youth, and special education students receive a high quality education that equips them with 21st Century Skills.

LCAP Workgroups Foundation and Implementation Support

In order to ensure effective and timely monitoring and accountability, RUSD Workgroups were created to formatively monitor progress on key RUSD LCAP goals and actions. These groups monitor formative progress, and recommend adaptations as needed to the LCAP Advisory Committee for consideration during the LCAP Annual Review and Update Process.

Workgroups established in previous years created plans that detailed the process for successful implementation of the LCAP Programs. The information gathered during Workgroup Sessions guided the monitoring of the programs and also established metrics that were shared with the LCAP Advisory Committee during breakout sessions. The Workgroups continue to provide information and guidance regarding implementation and monitoring of program services. The Workgroups will continue to meet to build programs that extend through years two and three of the LCAP.

Academic Case Carrier Workgroup (Goal 5 Action/Service 5.7)

The Academic Case Carrier Workgroup contributes to the implementation and monitoring of the program. The group plans the strategies, actions and services for developing the program and for

Subgroups. The primary focus of our LCAP funded Academic Case Carrier (ACC) program is to support foster youth who face the effects of displacement from family and schools. The Academic Case Carriers concentrate on improving students' educational performance and academic achievement, as well as assisting students in making choices that lead to strong school connectedness and academic achievement. This program offers teachers, administrators and parents information to foster students' academic and emotional success. The Academic Case Carrier workgroup met four times in the Spring of 2015: 4/22/15, 4/29/15, 5/6/15, 5/13/15. During the meetings the group established the goals of the program and began planning implementation. The Workgroup developed the selection criteria for student participation and also developed the timelines to have Academic Case Carriers in place by Second Semester of the 2015-16 academic year. A final meeting was held in the Fall of the 2015-16 school year to initiate the hiring process for the Coordinator of Foster Youth and Special Services and to begin the hiring process. Composition: Director of Student Services, Counselors, Secondary Site Administrators Related Metrics: District Common Assessments, Grades and Progress toward Graduation, Student Attendance, Graduation Rates, and Discipline Reports.	assigning the metrics and other accountability measures that are used during the development of the LCAP Annual Update. During the LCAP Advisory Committee meeting, individuals involved in the planning and implementation process reported progress to the members of the committee. Information about the identification of students and of the hiring process was shared. Details regarding metrics and progress monitoring were presented and the workgroup members answered committee questions regarding the future implementation plans for the program.
Reading Intervention Workgroup (Goal 3 Action/Service 3.3) The Reading Intervention Program was developed to support the LCAP Goal 3 – *All Students will Participate in a High Quality K-12 Instructional Program Aligned to State Standards including the Common Core*. The Reading Intervention Workgroup met with two committees to select the Reading Intervention Program to be piloted at 3rd grade. September 30th the workgroup of TOAs, Teachers and Administrators attended presentations by four different companies (iRead, Study Island/Reading Eggs, iReady, and Lexia). This group narrowed the choices to two iReady and Lexia. On October 7th a second group of teachers and administrators (including Special Ed). The groups also had the opportunity to demo the programs for a week before providing their selection at the final meeting on Friday October 16th. Composition: Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Teachers on Assignment, Elementary Site Administrators, Classroom Teachers Related Metrics: Smarter Balanced ELA (Grades 3-5), Reading Level as reported on District Report Card (K-3), Lexia Learning data reports	**Reading Intervention Workgroup (Goal 3 Action/Service 3.3)** The Reading Intervention Workgroup contributed to the Annual Update process by developing the program rollout and by organizing the pilot program initiated during the 2015-16 school year. The necessary implementation steps were developed during the Workgroup time with the various committees. The documentation of progress also occurred during the Workgroup planning. The information gathered during the pilot was shared with the LCAP Advisory Committee and Workgroup members assisted in the preparation of materials that were presented to the LCAP Advisory Committee. The impact of this Workgroup on the LCAP included the recommendation to purchase the Lexia Reading Program based upon the data collected during the pilot. The Workgroup also impacted the LCAP recommended allocation of funding to fully support Reading Intervention K-5. Additionally, the Workgroup suggested valid local metrics that can be used to evaluate the program and developed a system of accountability to ensure that the program can be monitored according to the requirements established in the LCAP.
Middle School Small Class Size for EL Students (Goal 5 Action/Service 5.5) The Middle School Small Class Size for EL Students is intended to support Goal 5 – *Close the Achievement Gap for Underperforming Subgroups*. The Workgroup met to plan the	**Middle School Small Class Size for EL Students (Goal 5 Action/Service 5.5)** The Middle School Small Class Size for EL Students Workgroup

implementation of the program to ensure that the proper criteria were established for enrolling students in the course. The group also identified the professional development that would be needed to support the teachers as they work with the students in the program. The Workgroup scheduled meaningful collaboration time to support the teachers in designing lessons that follow the District ELA Scope and Sequence. Composition: Coordinator of School Improvement and Professional Development, High School EL Coordinator, Middle School Teachers Related Metrics: District Common Assessments, Grades, Reclassification Rate, CELDT Scores, Student Attendance, Graduation Rates, and Discipline Reports.	impacted the development of the LCAP by creating a strong first year plan for preparing teachers to support the targeted students. The Professional Development Plan included training on instructional strategies, lesson design, reading and writing, language acquisition and Integrated/Designated instructional supports.
Math Intervention Courses at the High School Level (Goal 6 Action/Service 6.1) The high school Workgroup met in May 2015 to review the current pilot of the parallel math support class that was implemented second semester. The primary objective of the program is to support Goal 6 – *RUSD Will Increase the Number of Students passing Math Courses and Enrolling in High Level Math Courses*. Group members recognized that given an FTE, each site will have five (5) periods of Math Support. Each site will look at incoming 8th graders and determine the need to start the year with the course, and will monitor student progress to determine the need to begin the year with a Math I support class or wait until second semester to offer the course. Group members also expressed the need to allow the development of Math and Math Support block which potentially means that not the same teacher would be teaching the parallel support class, but, instead, sites may assign a teacher to teach Integrated Math I and Math I Support. The group reviewed current Math Support teacher recommendations for curriculum and instructional practices, as well as a technology program component. Composition: Director of School Improvement and Professional Development, Coordinator of School Improvement and Professional Development, Secondary Administrators, Teachers on Assignment Related Metrics: District Common Assessments, Grades, Smarter Balanced Assessment Scores, Student Attendance, Graduation Rates, and Discipline Reports.	**Math Intervention Courses at the High School Level (Goal 6 Action/Service 6.1)** The High School Math Intervention Workgroup impacted the current LCAP through the extended evaluation of the pilot program. It was determined that an FTE (5 periods) be added at each of the high schools to implement the support program. The group also determined the criterion for identifying students for enrollment in the program.
Ongoing Community Updates on LCAP Progress Throughout the school year the superintendent, and her designees, provided regular updates to stakeholder groups. Each update presentation was systematic and thorough in providing each audience with RUSD's specific progress on the status of state and local metrics for each of the six RUSD LCAP goals and related actions and services as contained in our existing LCAP. Each update presentation provided progress on all existing LCAP metrics for each LCAP goal and action to date. These presentations were also posted on the RUSD website. Presentations were translated and presented to the DELAC. • DELAC – LCAP Updates: January 13, 2016; February 3, 2016; and April 20, 2016 and May 18, 2016	**Ongoing Community Updates on LCAP Progress** Providing stakeholder groups with regular, ongoing updates throughout the school year ensured that stakeholders throughout the organization maintained a focus on the RUSD LCAP goals, actions and services. It also ensured that stakeholders shared common points of information and understanding to contribute meaningfully to the annual LCAP update and review process. Formative quantitative and qualitative data were collected and shared with stakeholder groups throughout the year as noted. This assisted in gauging progress on our state and local LCAP metrics and supported the monitoring process throughout the implementation process. Such

• Administrative Council – LCAP Progress updates: September 14, 2015, March 7, 2016, April 4, 2016 • Associations – Negotiation Sessions, representation on LCAP Advisory Committee • General Public – Updated Power Points on RUSD website • Principal Meeting Update – LCAP Progress January 21, 2016, April 16, 2016 • Board of Education Update -- February 9, 2016 • Teacher Update – February 17, 2016 • Board of Education Breakfast with the Board – February 17, 2016 • Board of Education Workshop – April 12, 2016 In addition, the superintendent and her designees collected stakeholder input via such items as the RUSD TOA surveys collected during the months of January and February 2016, structured dialogue sessions during a principal meeting on January 22, 2016, teacher collaboration input collected in February 17, 2016, and through Workgroup feedback. Ultimately, the input collected was shared with the RUSD LCAP Advisory Committee for consideration during the review and update process. To allow sufficient time for stakeholder engagement in the LCAP process, the Redlands Unified School District, has fully engaged with the greater Redlands community to assess the District's progress with the LCAP goals and actions and to refine and develop future goals and actions. The RUSD LCAP is a result of incorporating input from all stakeholder groups including parents, students, community members, teachers, classified and certificated bargaining units, and site and district administrators.	data assisted in validating progress in key areas as well as identifying any needed amendments for the upcoming review and update.
Annual Update: **Formation and Composition of LCAP Advisory Committee** In the Fall of 2015, the Director of SIPD sent letters to 2014-15 LCAP Committee members to request confirmation regarding their continued participation. Once the returning committee members were confirmed, RUSD personnel determined which stakeholder groups would need further representation and contacted individuals to replace the vacancies. Several seats on the LCAP Advisory Committee were filled to replace members that were unable to return. Of the 39 member committee, 18 members returned from serving the previous year. The committee consists of 11 parents, 4 community members, 11 certificated personnel, 8 administrators, 2 classified personnel and 3 students. The first informational meeting for new members occurred on November 30, 2015. The meeting introduced the new members to the LCAP Guiding Principles and the LCAP Development Process. The members were also introduced to their roles as committee members. The members received information regarding the RUSD LCAP Goals, Programs, Actions/Services that are included in the 2015-16 LCAP document. The LCAP Advisory committee met six times over the course of four months to review	**Annual Update:** **Formation and Composition of LCAP Advisory Committee** The process for composing the LCAP Advisory Committee ensured representation for the interests of English Learners, Low Income, and Foster Youth as well as other stakeholders from across the community and school district. This ensured that the goals and actions that evolved were crafted to meet the specific needs of these student sub-groups. The RUSD LCAP Advisory Committee meets the requirements of the Parent Advisory Group described in California Education Code 52062. Developing a process for the LCAP Advisory Committee to work over the course of a series of six meetings ensured that they would have ample time to be thorough in completing the LCAP Annual Review and Update Process. The LCAP Advisory Committee Process ensured that members were able to review progress on each of the six existing RUSD LCAP goals and encouraged specific input and recommendations on the LCAP

information on the current year LCAP Program implementation and to offer feedback that will be used in the development of the 2016-17 LCAP. Four meetings were scheduled to inform the committee about the progress and implementation of the 2015-16 LCAP Programs. The required state metrics and local data were presented to demonstrate progress of each program. District personnel serving in each of the LCAP programs reported on the increase of services and also shared first-hand accounts of how the programs fulfilled the LCAP requirements. Committee members were asked to comment on the impacts of programs, determine whether programs were fulfilling the guiding principles of the LCAP, and evaluate whether programs should be *Expanded, Maintained, Scaled Back or Eliminated*. These recommendations were then presented to the Superintendent. In addition to the Progress Monitoring meetings, the LCAP Advisory Committee met twice with the Superintendent to discuss the needs of the district and to evaluate recommended programs for the upcoming year. The information shared at these meetings guides the development of the 2016-17 LCAP and will impact the writing of the 2015-16 Annual Update. At the meeting held on February 25, the Committee looked at the proposed LCAP programs, and provided input and direction on how to continue to serve the LCAP student populations (EL, Low-Income and Foster Youth). Potential future programs were presented to the committee. The committee was asked to sort and prioritize programs based upon district need, Board criteria and relationship to fulfilling district/state priorities. The Superintendent led several activities that guided the committee through the decision-making process. The Superintendent responded to all comments and recommendation made by the LCAP Advisory committee in writing at the March 31st LCAP Advisory Committee meeting and presented the programs that would be forwarded to the Board of Education for consideration. Further written responses were posted as PowerPoint presentations on the District Website. Each LCAP Advisory Committee meeting included reports and evaluations of programs to provide specific progress on the status of state and local metrics for each of the RUSD LCAP goals and related actions and services as contained in the existing LCAP. These presentations were also posted on the RUSD website. Presentations were translated and presented to the DELAC. The LCAP Annual Update and the writing of the 2016-17 LCAP occur during the months of April and May. The draft of the LCAP was presented to DELAC on May 18th. The Public Hearing for the 2016-17 LCAP was May 24th. **LCAP Advisory Committee Members met six times with the following focus**: **a. December 10, 2015:** Program 3 AVID and Program 5 Subgroup Success **b. January 14, 2016:** Program 1 Math Academy, Program 6 Middle School Small Math Class and Program 10 High School Math Intervention Course **c. January 28, 2016:** Program 2 Reading Academy and Program 8 Reading Intervention	Programs. The Advisory committee recommended whether to continue with each of these goals and programs in their current form or amend them. This LCAP annual review and update reflects the input gathered from the LCAP Advisory Committee with the ultimate approval of the RUSD Board of Education. The feedback from the committee was collected and was used to identify program recommendations for the 2016-17 LCAP.

d. **February 11, 2016:** Program 4 CTE Program of Study, Program 7 Academic Case Carrier, Program 9 Middle School Small English Class for EL Students
e. **February 25, 2016:** Prioritizing LCAP Goals, Actions and Services and Recommending Possible Programs of Support
f. **March 31, 2016:** Finalizing LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback and Recommendations

LCAP Advisory Committee Meetings for Annual Review & Update Process

The LCAP Advisory Committee analyzed and reviewed each of the 2015-16 goals and considered whether the implementation of the related actions and services adhered to the plans outlined in the RUSD LCAP and whether these actions and services have had a positive impact on achievement as evidenced by the designated metrics.

Additionally, the LCAP Advisory Committee made recommendations to the Board of Education regarding future implementation of existing LCAP goals, actions, and services and they prioritized potential new actions and services using a structured process facilitated by the Superintendent. The committee utilized the RUSD Board of Education's criteria to ensure all programs discussed adhered to the goals, vision and priorities of the Board of Education.

The RUSD LCAP Advisory Committee engaged in six meetings. Four meetings were provided to ensure that adequate time was provided to thoroughly review and consider progress on each RUSD LCAP goal and the related actions, and services based on the specified state and local metrics. The four meeting series also provided sufficient time to consider RUSD's progress and data within all 8 state priority areas and to consider new prospective goals, actions, and services that could be implemented to fill any gaps related to RUSD needs on the state's 8 Priorities. Two additional meetings were held to prioritize district needs and identify additional actions and services to serve the students and staff of RUSD.

Meeting 1– Progress Monitoring & Results for RUSD LCAP Programs (December 10, 2015)

The Director of School Improvement & Professional Development (SIPD) presented information regarding the progress of two RUSD LCAP Programs that support Engagement (State Priorities: Student Engagement, School Climate, and Parent Involvement). The programs covered in this initial meeting support LCAP Goal 4 *Increase the Number of Students Successfully Ready for College and Career*, and LCAP Goal 5 – *Close the Achievement Gap for Underperforming Subgroups* The committee worked in breakout sessions to review progress of the programs and to collaborate on the information that was shared. The committee was then tasked with giving feedback on the information they received to assist with the evaluation of the LCAP Programs. Two programs were presented:

LCAP Advisory Committee Meetings for Annual Review & Update Process

Collecting anonymous survey responses ensured that all members could provide authentic input and that this input could be quantified to inform the recommendations of the LCAP Advisory Committee.

Beginning the meeting with a presentation to all LCAP Advisory Members with our progress on state and local metrics related to the RUSD LCAP goals, ensured that the committee had access to important data, specifically our progress on the metrics outlined in the current LCAP, which would be used as a foundation in the review and update process.

Providing LCAP Advisory Committee members with current RUSD data related to the 8 state priorities proved to be helpful as the committee worked to identify and prioritize potential initiatives to develop recommendations to the RUSD Board of Education.

The work of the LCAP Advisory Committee in analyzing LCAP feedback and input, and data and metric review, resulted in a synthesis of emerging priorities and recommendations for consolidating and reconfiguring programs that shaped the development of the 2016-19 LCAP.

AVID Program (Goal 4 Action/Service 4.1)

During the Breakout Session, teachers and administrators that work within the AVID Program defined the components of the AVID Program. The presenters also provided the LCAP Advisory Committee members with information that showed how the program assists in closing the achievement gap for all subgroups. Specific RUSD data and metrics regarding AVID enrollment increases, Tutor hour increases and AVID student enrollment in AP Courses were also shared.

LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback - AVID

Based upon the information shared and data collected, the LCAP Advisory Committee gave the following feedback:

- AVID Program is being Implemented according to established vision:
  - 86.36% of Committee Members Agree
  - 13.64% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- The AVID Program has been tracked/monitored by data:
  - 86.36% of Committee Members Agree
  - 13.64% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- AVID Program continues to support district goals:
  - 95.45% of Committee Members Agree
  - 4.55% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- AVID Program continues to support RUSD students:
  - 95.45% of Committee Members Agree
  - 4.55% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- The degree to which the AVID Program should be Implemented:
  - 76.19% of Committee Members recommend EXPAND
  - 23.81% of Committee Members recommend MAINTAIN

Subgroup Professional Development Program (Goal 5 Action/Service 5.1)

During the Breakout Session, teachers that attended the Subgroup Professional Development Session demonstrated a strategy that supports scaffolding of complex texts. The teachers also summarized the elements of the Professional Development and described how the teachers would imbed the strategies into first instruction to support struggling students. Data on current subgroup performance was shared to validate the need for the program and to set a baseline for future analysis of the program:

LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback- Subgroup Professional Development

Based upon the information shared and data collected, the LCAP Advisory Committee gave the following feedback:

- 43% recommended continuing the service
- 31% recommended focusing on improving the program
- 26% recommended more data be provided

Impact on Annual Update – Monitoring of AVID Program (Goal 4 Action/Service 4.1)

Presenting data assisted the committee in deciding the impact of the program on the state priorities. The monitoring of programs is a requirement of the Annual Update of LCAP Programs and Services.

The LCAP Advisory Committee Survey Results and the local and state metric data collected throughout the year, Workgroup feedback and the qualitative input gathered from AVID coordinators over the course of the year, the Board of Education approved to continue the focus on expanding & supporting high school AVID programs:

- Ensure all high schools have equally strong programs
- Continue to build the Middle School Programs to support students in current year achievement and to form a strong feeder program to draw from for the high school programs
- Strengthen the AVID Tutor Program to support student learning
- Continue to support AVID students' access to AP Courses including enrollment in Telepresence Courses
- Continue the Professional Development for new or incoming Secondary Science and Social Science teachers

Impact on Annual Update – Monitoring Subgroup Professional Development Program (Goal 5 Action/Service 5.1)

The LCAP Advisory Committee Survey Results for providing teacher training in strategies specific to sub-group success and the feedback collected from teachers were taken into consideration. The Board of Education approved that this LCAP action remain as a focus for the coming school year with adjustments to actions, services, and expenditures as follows:

- Strengthen implementation of this program
- Provide access to more sessions of "Strategies for Success" targeting SES, FY sub-groups
- Continue EL sub-group training for teachers and site leaders
- Strengthen trainer-of-trainer program to build capacity

• 43% mentioned that PD for Subgroup success is an instructional strategy that crosses multiple LCAP programs • 50% mentioned that lack of data makes it difficult to assess impact **Meeting 2 – Progress Monitoring & Results for RUSD LCAP Programs January 14, 2016** The Director of School Improvement and Professional Development presented the LCAP Advisory Committee with progress on goals, actions and services related to Student Outcomes (State Priorities: Pupil Achievement, and Other Pupil Outcomes). The RUSD LCAP Programs presented support LCAP Goal 3 – *All Students will Participate in a High Quality K-12 Instructional Program aligned to State Standards including the Common Core* and LCAP Goal 6 – *RUSD will Increase the Number of Students Passing Math Courses and Enrolling in High Level Math Courses*. The director's presentation included ongoing progress on the specific state and local metrics as indicted in our existing LCAP. The State Required Metrics Data presented included Grade Level Performance on SBAC Math, Subgroup Performance on SBAC Math, Program Pupil Performance measures (grades and attendance). **Math Academy Program (Goal 3 Action/Service 3.1 and 3.2)** The programs discussed specifically support Mathematics K-5. Presenters provided information gathered from Teacher Professional Development Surveys, Coaching Logs, Coaching Surveys, and Administrator Surveys on Program Effectiveness. • TOA coaching logs indicated a trend of increasing coaching sessions with teachers • Ninety seven percent of teachers completed the related math and reading academy sessions although state assessment data was still pending LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback – Math Academy Program Based upon the information shared and data collected, the LCAP Advisory Committee gave the following feedback: • Math Academy Program is being Implemented according to established vision: o 87.08% of Committee Members Agree o 12.92% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree • Math Academy Program has been tracked/monitored by data: o 84.62% of Committee Members Agree o 11.54% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree o 3.85% of the Committee Members Somewhat Disagree • Math Academy Program continues to support district goals: o 96.15% of Committee Members Agree o 3.85% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree • Math Academy Program continues to support RUSD students:	LCAP Advisory Committee feedback assisted the Department of School Improvement and Professional Development in preparing future data and metrics for program monitoring. Sharing the data and metrics assisted in collecting commentary from committee members that will be used in the Annual Update of programs. Sharing metrics supports RUSD ongoing effort to monitor the effectiveness of programs and services. **Impact on Annual Update – Monitoring of Math Academy Program (Goal 3 Action/Service 3.1 and 3.2)** The LCAP Advisory Committee Survey Results and the feedback collected through Math Academy session participant evaluations, Workgroup feedback and the input collected over the course of the year, the Board of Education approved that the Math Academy continue as a component of RUSD LCAP goal 3, with adjustments to actions, services, and expenditures as follows: • Repeat the full 5-day session for all new teachers • Conduct a 2-day Academy for Integrated Math II teachers • Continue utilizing Math Academy TOAs & TOA training

- 92.31% of Committee Members Agree
- 7.69% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree

- The degree to which the Math Academy Program should be Implemented:
  - 65.38% of Committee Members recommend EXPAND
  - 34.62% of Committee Members recommend MAINTAIN

Secondary Math Support Classes Program (Goal 6 Action/Service 6.1)

The Math Academy Program and Support Classes for mathematics at the secondary level were examined. The LCAP Advisory Committee participated in "World Café" discussion groups. Teachers and administrators that are involved in implementing the programs shared data, answered questions and presented clarifying information to the committee.

Further anecdotal evidence and local metrics were shared with committee members in a small group format:

- Comparison in Grades of Middle School Program Participants (Cohort Data) Increase in "A's" (16% More A's) and Decrease in "F's" (22% Fewer F's)
- Comparison in Grades of High School Program Participants (Cohort Data) Increase in "A's" (3% More A's) and Decrease in "F's" (12% Fewer F's)

<u>LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback – Secondary Math Support Classes Program</u>
Based upon the information shared and data collected, the LCAP Advisory Committee gave the following feedback:

- Secondary Math Support Classes Program is being Implemented according to established vision:
  - 89.28% of Committee Members Agree
  - 10.72% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- Secondary Math Support Classes Program has been tracked/monitored by data:
  - 71.43% of Committee Members Agree
  - 25% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
  - 3.57% of Committee Members Disagree
- Secondary Math Support Classes Program continues to support district goals:
  - 92.86% of Committee Members Agree
  - 7.14% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- Secondary Math Support Classes Program continues to support RUSD students:
  - 89.29% of Committee Members Agree
  - 10.71% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- The degree to which the Secondary Math Support Classes Program should be Implemented:
  - 60.71% of Committee Members recommend EXPAND
  - 39.29% of Committee Members recommend MAINTAIN

Impact on Annual Update – Secondary Math Support Classes Program (Goal 6 Action/Service 6.1)

The LCAP Advisory Committee Survey Results and the feedback collected through Workgroup feedback and the input collected over the course of the year, the Board of Education approved that the actions for adding support courses for mathematics at the secondary level continue with adjustments to actions, services, and expenditures as follows:

- Support the number of "small classes" for Middle School math (five periods) at each middle school
- Add Math Review Course, parallel class to Integrated Math I, at each comprehensive High School (1 FTE per High School)
- Provide curriculum for Math Review Course
- Add technology and licensures for additional FTE classrooms as determined by need
- Support teachers through collaboration and PD as necessary

Meeting 3: Progress Monitoring & Results for RUSD LCAP Programs
January 28, 2016

The Director of School Improvement and Professional Development presented a summation of the LCAP Goals and Supporting Programs to guide the discussion regarding the cycle of continual improvement. Additionally, the Director of Curriculum and Instruction presented information on two programs that focus on literacy in the Elementary Grade levels: 1) Provide Teacher Training and Support for Teaching Reading and 2) Provide Reading Intervention at Elementary Sites that Increases Proficiency. The two programs support the LCAP Goal 3 - *All Students will Participate in a High Quality K-12 Instructional Program aligned to State Standards including the Common Core*. The Reading Academy Program and the Reading Intervention Program target goals, actions and services related to Student Outcomes (State Priorities: Pupil Achievement and Other Pupil Outcomes). The State Required Metrics Data shared by the Director of School Improvement and Professional Development included Grade Level Performance on SBAC ELA, Subgroup Performance on SBAC ELA and CELDT Level Performance.

Reading Academy Program (Goal 3 Action/Service 3.1 and 3.2)
To examine the impact of the Reading Academy Program the LCAP Advisory Committee participated in "World Café" discussion groups. Teachers, Teachers on Assignment, and administrators that are involved in implementing the programs shared data, answered questions and presented clarifying information to the committee.

Further anecdotal evidence and local metrics were shared with committee members in a small group format:

- Coaching Logs
- Teacher Evaluations from CORE PD Sessions
- Artifacts (photos, student work)

LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback – Reading Academy Program
Based upon the information shared and data collected, the LCAP Advisory Committee gave the following feedback:

- The Reading Academy Program is being Implemented according to established vision:
  - 89.29% of Committee Members Agree
  - 10.71% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- The Reading Academy Program has been tracked/monitored by data:
  - 71.43% of Committee Members Agree
  - 25% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
  - 3.57% of Committee Members Disagree
- The Reading Academy Program continues to support district goals:
  - 89.29% of Committee Members Agree
  - 10.71% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree

Impact on Annual Update – Monitoring of Reading Academy Program (Goal 3 Action/Service 3.1 and 3.2)
The LCAP Advisory Committee Survey Results and the feedback collected through the Reading Academy session participant evaluations, Workgroup feedback and the input collected over the course of the year, the Board of Education approved that the Reading Academy continue with adjustments to actions, services, and expenditures as follows:

- Reduce the number of days from 5 to 3 on Guided Reading methods for teachers continuing in grades 1-3
- Repeat the full 5-day session for all kindergarten teachers and for all new teachers in grades 1-3
- Research possibility of district-wide reading level assessment tool
- Continue utilizing Teaching Reading TOAs & TOA training

- The Reading Academy Program continues to support RUSD students:
    - 82.14% of Committee Members Agree
    - 14.29% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
    - 3.57% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree
- The degree to which the Reading Academy Program should be Implemented:
    - 57.14% of Committee Members recommend EXPAND
    - 35.71% of Committee Members recommend MAINTAIN
    - 7.14% of Committee Members recommend SCALE BACK

Elementary Reading Intervention Program (Goal 3 Action/Service 3.3)
To examine the impact of the Reading Intervention Program the LCAP Advisory Committee participated in "World Café" discussion groups. Teachers, Teachers on Assignment and administrators that are involved in implementing the program shared data, answered questions and presented clarifying information to the committee. Teachers on Assignment and the Director of Curriculum and Instruction shared the data and feedback from the Lexia Pilot program. A description of the Lexia program and the Scope and Sequence of the skills was shared with the committee.

The local metric of Grade Level Reading was shared by the Director of Curriculum and Instruction to set a baseline that will be used to measure the reading level of students each year. The students' Grade Level Reading is reported on the RUSD Elementary Report Card:

- Grade 1 – 74% of students are At or Above Grade Level
- Grade 2 - 67.01% of students are At or Above Grade Level
- Grade 3 – 58.94% of students are At or Above Grade Level

Further anecdotal evidence and local metrics were shared with committee members in a small group format:

- Pilot Summary Data (Teachers involved, students served)
- Lexia Reports
- Artifacts (photos, student work)

<u>LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback – Elementary Reading Intervention Program</u>
Based upon the information shared and data collected, the LCAP Advisory Committee gave the following feedback:

- The Elementary Reading Intervention Program is being Implemented according to established vision:
    - 82.14% of Committee Members Agree
    - 14.29% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
    - 3.57% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree
- The Elementary Reading Intervention Program has been tracked/monitored by data:
    - 64.29% of Committee Members Agree
    - 28.57% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree

Impact on Annual Update – Monitoring of Reading Intervention Program (Goal 3 Action/Service 3.3)
The LCAP Advisory Committee Survey Results and the feedback collected through Reading Intervention session participant evaluations, Workgroup feedback and the input collected over the course of the year, the Board of Education approved that the Reading Intervention Program continue as a component of RUSD LCAP Goal 3, with adjustments to actions, services, and expenditures as follows:

- Utilize information gathered during pilot to fully implement Lexia Program at all sites
- Expand the program to include Grades 4-5
- Continue to assist with implementation through the use of personnel to support the use of the intervention
- Support training and collaboration including substitute coverage for teachers

- 7.14% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree
- The Elementary Reading Intervention Program continues to support district goals:
  - 85.71% of Committee Members Agree
  - 14.29% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- The Elementary Reading Intervention Program continues to support RUSD students:
  - 85.71% of Committee Members Agree
  - 10.71% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
  - 3.57% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree
- The degree to which the Elementary Reading Intervention Program should be Implemented:
  - 71.43% of Committee Members recommend EXPAND
  - 28.57% of Committee Members recommend MAINTAIN

Meeting 4: Progress Monitoring & Results for RUSD LCAP Programs
February 11, 2016

The Director of School Improvement and Professional Development presented information on the three programs that will be reviewed during the meeting. A description of the program and information regarding the implementation schedule was described and data was shared regarding the progress of the actions and services. The programs presented support the LCAP Goal 4 -- Increase *the Number of Students Successfully Ready for College and Career*, and Goal 5 – *Close the Achievement Gap for Underperforming Subgroups*. The programs target goals, actions and services related to Conditions of Learning (State Priorities: Basic Services, Implementation of State Standards, Course Access) and Student Outcomes (State Priorities: Pupil Achievement and Other Pupil Outcomes).

Middle School ELA Class for EL Students Program (Goal 5 Action/Service 5.2)

To examine the impact of the Reading Academy Program the LCAP Advisory Committee participated in "World Café" discussion groups. Teachers and administrators that are involved in implementing the programs shared data, answered questions and presented clarifying information to the committee. The teacher gave input to the committee regarding the Professional Development that the English teachers received to support the students in the course. She emphasized that English Language Development Instruction that they incorporate into the small class size ensures best practices address the systemic barriers that create long-term English learners.

Metrics and data regarding the Long Term English Learners, CELDT Scores of Middle and High School students were also shared with the committee in a small group setting.

LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback – Middle School ELA Class for EL Students Program
Based upon the information shared and data collected, the LCAP Advisory Committee

Impact on Annual Update – Monitoring of Middle School ELA Class for EL Students Program (Goal 5 Action/Service 5.2)

The LCAP Advisory Committee Survey Results and the feedback collected from teachers, Workgroup feedback and the input collected over the course of the year, supported the Board of Education approval that the Middle School ELA Class for EL Students Program continue as a component of RUSD LCAP, with adjustments to actions, services, and expenditures as follows:

- Increase the number of students enrolled in the program
- Allow collaboration and planning time for the teachers to ensure that the rigor of the ELA Scope and Sequence is supported
- Continue to support the additional FTE at each middle school
- Track and monitor data to share regarding student reclassification, Language Acquisition and English Standards Proficiency

gave the following feedback:

- The Middle School ELA Class for EL Students Program is being Implemented according to established vision:
  - 68% of Committee Members Agree
  - 28% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
  - 4% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree
- The Elementary Reading Intervention Program has been tracked/monitored by data:
  - 56% of Committee Members Agree
  - 32% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
  - 12% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree
- The Middle School ELA Class for EL Students Program continues to support district goals:
  - 76% of Committee Members Agree
  - 24% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- The Middle School ELA Class for EL Students Program continues to support RUSD students:
  - 88% of Committee Members Agree
  - 12% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- The degree to which the Middle School ELA Class for EL Students Program should be Implemented:
  - 68% of Committee Members recommend EXPAND
  - 32% of Committee Members recommend MAINTAIN

Academic Case Carrier Program (Goal 5 Action/Service 5.7)

To examine the impact of the Academic Case Carrier Program the LCAP Advisory Committee participated in "World Café" discussion groups. Counselors, Director of Student Services, Coordinator of Foster Youth and Student Support Services, and administrators that are involved in implementing the program shared data, answered questions and presented clarifying information to the committee. The presenters gave input to the committee regarding the Professional Development that the Academic Case Carriers received to support the students. They also described how the Academic Case Carriers would provide district staff with needed information, resources, and services to support the education of foster youth.
Further anecdotal evidence and local metrics were shared with committee members in a small group format:

- Program Implementation and Progress Monitoring (Counselors involved, students served)
- Professional Development Provided
- Artifacts (photos of facilities)

<u>LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback – Academic Case Carrier Program</u>
Based upon the information shared and data collected, the LCAP Advisory Committee

- Ensure the content of professional development supports the effective implementation of the ELD state standards and reflects school, district and state priorities including the integration of digital tools and relevant technology platforms.

Impact on Annual Update – Monitoring of Academic Case Carrier Program (Goal 5 Action/Service 5.7)

The LCAP Advisory Committee Survey Results and the feedback collected through Workgroup feedback and the input collected over the course of the year, the Board of Education approved that the actions for improving and strengthening the Academic Case Carrier Program for the high schools continue with adjustments to actions, services, and expenditures as follows:

- Continue to allocate funding for Academic Case Carriers for Foster Youth and at-risk youth support
- Continue Funding Coordinator of Foster Youth and Special Services
- Coordinate actions and services: Monitor and assess student needs and academic progress and provide for the appropriate coordinated services and support to promote school stability, academic success, and overall student wellbeing, including, tutoring, counseling and guidance, academic advisory, liaison within district and with other agencies.

gave the following feedback:

- The Academic Case Carrier Program is being Implemented according to established vision:
  - 91.67% of Committee Members Agree
  - 8.33% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- The Academic Case Carrier Program has been tracked/monitored by data:
  - 68% of Committee Members Agree
  - 20% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
  - 12% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree
- The Academic Case Carrier Program continues to support district goals:
  - 83.33% of Committee Members Agree
  - 16.67% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
- The Academic Case Carrier Program continues to support RUSD students:
  - 80% of Committee Members Agree
  - 16% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
  - 4% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree
- The degree to which the Academic Case Carrier Program should be implemented:
  - 52% of Committee Members recommend EXPAND
  - 48% of Committee Members recommend MAINTAIN

CTE Programs of Study Program (Goal 4 Action/Service 4.3)
To examine the impact of the CTE Programs of Study Program the LCAP Advisory Committee participated in "World Café" discussion groups. CTE Teachers, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, and the College and Career Readiness Administrator on Assignment who are involved in implementing the programs shared data, answered questions and presented clarifying information to the committee.

The presenters gave input to the committee regarding the organization of the program and the demands of the proposed state accountability that will be tied to College and Career Readiness. The presenters also described how the CTE Programs of Study will support RUSD students in meeting state accountability. They explained that students would also receive necessary instruction in industry standard skills through the development of the CTE curriculum.

<u>LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback – CTE Programs of Study Program</u>
Based upon the information shared and data collected, the LCAP Advisory Committee gave the following feedback:

- The CTE Programs of Study Program is being Implemented according to established vision:
  - 75% of Committee Members Agree
  - 16.67% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree
  - 8.33% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree
- The CTE Programs of Study Program has been tracked/monitored by data:

- Additional targeted projects and programs responsive to specific student needs

Impact on Annual Update – Monitoring of CTE Programs of Study Program (Goal 4 Action/Service 4.3)

The LCAP Advisory Committee Survey Results and the feedback collected through Workgroup feedback and the input collected over the course of the year, the Board of Education approved that the actions for improving and strengthening Programs of Study for the high schools continue with adjustments to actions, services, and expenditures as follows:

- Implement new CTE Programs of Study at each comprehensive High Schools
- Expand/Extend opportunities for internships, certificates, externships and articulation
- Create a course during the school day for Career Express
- Provide for coherent enhanced/extended learning opportunities for CTE Programs of Study and College and Career Programs
- Allow for teacher compensation for additional courses as expansion of program extends beyond teacher five-period assignment
- Increase Program of Study course selection and all course access associated with College and Career Readiness
- Establish industry connections to Support Programs of Study

○ 60.87% of Committee Members Agree ○ 26.09% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree ○ 8.70% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree ○ 4.35% of Committee Members Disagree • The CTE Programs of Study Program continues to support district goals: ○ 62.50%of Committee Members Agree ○ 33.33% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree ○ 4.17% of Committee Members Somewhat Disagree • The CTE Programs of Study Program continues to support RUSD students: ○ 72.73%of Committee Members Agree ○ 27.27% of Committee Members Somewhat Agree • The degree to which the CTE Programs of Study Program should be Implemented: ○ 70.83%of Committee Members recommend EXPAND ○ 29.17% of Committee Members recommend MAINTAIN	• As program offerings increase over next few years, consider full-time position at each school • Encourage and support additional resources to increase course access utilizing advances in technology and other resources (e.g., Telepresence, extended day programs)
Meeting 5: Using the Layers of Impact to Prioritize New Concepts February 25, 2016 At the meeting held on February 25, 2015, the RUSD LCAP Advisory Committee was tasked with prioritizing potential new LCAP goals, actions or services to begin implementing in the 2016-2017 school year. A list of new programs was presented to the committee for consideration. The two objectives of this meeting were: 1) to provide an update on LCAP Advisory's work by reviewing the three main state priority areas; and 2) to allow committee members to participate in two activities that will provide feedback to the Board of Education on areas of need and proposed new programs. The Superintendent provided the committee with an overview of evolving LCAP legislation, the state priorities and the impact of LCAP requirements on district initiatives, and the importance of the stakeholder input in the development of the Annual Update and new LCAP. The Superintendent introduced potential new programs that would be prioritized through a series of activities. The Superintendent explained that the recommendations for the programs came from a variety of stakeholder meetings such as: District/Association negotiations and discussions; items submitted through the RUSD LCAP website link; items generated from feedback from teachers and principals; items suggested by parents (DELAC, PTA, SSC); items derived from outside requests/community groups work; and items from Budget Reduction Lists. The activities led by the RUSD Superintendent assisted the LCAP Advisory Committee in reviewing a wide variety of concepts and ideas for new (additional) LCAP programs. The Superintendent led discussions that assisted the committee in deciding the impact on at-risk students that potential new (additional) LCAP programs and services may have and guide them in prioritizing potential new (additional) LCAP programs and services. The committee used the Board of Education's criteria to determine where the initial	**Impact on Annual Update – Identifying Areas of Need, Prioritizing District Programs, Supporting Board of Education Criteria** LCAP Advisory Committee will review a wide variety of concepts and ideas for new (additional) LCAP programs. The committee was asked to decide the impact on at-risk students that potential new (additional) LCAP programs and services may have on student achievement. They were also asked to prioritize potential new (additional) LCAP programs and services using the Board of Education's criteria. The LCAP Advisory Committee Process ensured that all prospective initiatives were considered objectively, based on the degree to which each potential initiative would directly impact students in the target sub-group and its alignment to the RUSD Board Criteria. The LCAP Advisory Committee members were able to have an in-depth conversation within small group settings to consider all input regarding the information that was shared. All committee members were actively engaged in the activities and shared input across many groups. The meeting room was set in "stations" and allowed time for committee members to work with partners for collaboration time. The final activity results were shared with the Superintendent who recorded the input during the meeting. The impact of this feedback resulted in the addition of actions, which were used to refine the scope of work moving forward with the development of the 2016-17 LCAP. The LCAP Advisory Committee reviewed feedback and input that were eventually incorporated into the plan.

measureable impact that each of the 21 New Program concepts would have if implemented. The Superintendent led the committee through the first activity entitled "Stepping Stones Activity" which solicited committee feedback on how closely aligned the potential programs assist the student populations that generate funding through LCFF. The committee members rotated through two centers in which each potential program was briefly reviewed. The committee members were then assigned to a partner. Each pair received an envelope with program concept and the partners were asked which program concepts most directly will reach the stated goal. The partners shared their feedback with the larger group and the data was collected for consideration by the Superintendent and the Board of Education. The second activity led by the Superintendent required the committee members to consider the Matches & Gaps that exist in the current programs, actions and services within the 2015-16 LCAP. The objective of the activity was to engage the committee members in analyzing the areas that show an area of need that a potential program could fulfill. Committee members worked with partners to discuss the areas of need and discussed possible programs that could address the "gaps" in services. The final activity led by the Superintendent focused on relating possible new programs to the RUSD Board of Education's criteria for LCAP programs. The committee members discussed whether proposed programs were *closely aligned* or *not really aligned*. The programs that were closely aligned were put in numerical order 1 through 6. The programs that were not really aligned were assigned to the bottom 3. The LCAP Advisory Committee sorted potential program concepts using the RUSD Board of Education Criteria. The Board's Criteria was as follows: • Results of program or service are able to be tracked by data and will measurably improve student outcomes • Program of service addresses a demonstrated need(s) of RUSD's at-risk and LCAP populations, and improves Equity of Access for under-represented student populations • Results of the effort will improve climate measures including such things as: student readiness, academic preparedness, dropout and grad rates, attendance rates, and/or lower chronic absenteeism • Program or service supports the successful implementation of Common Core State Standards and the SBAC test administration, and/or strengthens College & Career Readiness Programs • Program or service supports teachers' ability to increase the level of rigor, academic challenges, and/or career connections within their instruction and/or curriculum • Program or service is in concert with the SB County Cradle-to-Career vision • Program or service has the ability to be scaled up if successful or eliminated if not	For example: ▪ Refine LCAP reporting of data for clarity and transparency ▪ Modify and adapt metrics to fully monitor program implementation ▪ Continue focus on Equity and Excellence for All Student Groups. ▪ Provide additional Elementary counselors to ensure all students engage fully in the educational process in a safe and secure environment. ▪ Continue programs that lower class size to support struggling students ▪ Enhance supports for English Learners, Foster Youth/Homeless, Students with Disabilities, advanced learners.

successful
- There is adequate, sustained, LCAP funding available

Meeting 6: Reviewing Results from LCAP Advisory Committee Feedback
March 31, 2016

The objective of this meeting was to inform the committee of the results of the feedback activities that occurred on February 25th and to clarify the recommendations, commentary and feedback that would be shared with the Board of Education regarding the work of the committee. The presentation included a review of LCAP Advisory Committee recommendations and revealed that many programs are doing very well including: 1) AVID; 2) Reading & Math Academies; 3) Math Intervention Programs (MS & HS); and 4) MS EL English Classes.

Based upon feedback from the progress monitoring meetings, the Superintendent revealed that the LCAP Committee has encouraged RUSD to focus and look harder at implementation of the following program: 1) Professional Development for Sub-Groups. Suggestions were made regarding the metrics and data collection and that the recruitment of more teachers to participate is necessary.
The Superintendent also shared that the LCAP Advisory Committee has found that our newest programs have been in planning stages and are in process of a strong first year: 1) CTE Programs of Study Program; 2) Academic Case Carrier Program; 3) Elementary Reading Intervention (K-3).

To close the meeting, the superintendent presented the LCAP Advisory Committee with the compiled results from each of the meetings and explained the outcomes of the data review process through the data analysis process that resulted in the four new program actions and services that were being recommended to the Board of Education. Certificates of appreciation were awarded to all participants in gratitude for their time and dedication to the RUSD LCAP Process.

Finally, the superintendent presented each Advisory Committee Member with a, "Ticket out the Door," which consisted of the opportunity to respond to four questions about the LCAP Advisory Committee Process:

1. Do you feel that the data demonstrates consensus across the LCAP Advisory Committee stakeholder groups?
2. What was something valuable you gained by attending these LCAP Advisory Committee meetings
3. What can we improve upon in this process next year? What considerations should be made in planning our work for next year?
4. What was your favorite part of the LCAP process?

Development and Approval of the RUSD LCAP

Based on the input collected from the LCAP Advisory Committee the superintendent presented the Board of Education with the recommended concepts for goals, actions and

Impact on Annual Update – Identifying Areas of Need, Prioritizing District Programs, Supporting Board of Education Criteria

The work of the LCAP Advisory Committee in analyzing metrics and and input resulted in a synthesis of emerging priorities and recommendations for consolidating and reconfiguring that informed and shaped the development of the
2015-18 LCAP:

Metrics:
- Adding Metrics: e.g., metric for Long-term ELs achieving proficiency in English;
- Removing certain metrics that have not been developed and adding a corresponding action to develop measures to include in the LCAP

Programs, Actions and Services
- Adding actions and services to improve student Course Access
- Include Intermediate Elementary grade levels in Reading and Intervention planning
- Ensuring that encumbered expenditures include support for teachers as they implement programs

The LCAP Advisory Committee identified the following three new program concepts that would be taken to Workgroups to further develop and refine into specific goals, actions and services for recommendation to the Board of Education:

- Writing Academy Program TK-12
- Intermediate Elementary Reading Intervention Program
- Reading Academy Program Grades 1-5
- Implement new Elementary Counselor Positions

The LCAP Advisory Committee shared concern that some metrics were not available mid-year to assist with the decision-making process. The RUSD representatives agreed to create a plan to track and monitor program data throughout the year.

Impact on Annual Update

Providing the results to the Advisory Committee provided them with a great sense of accomplishment and shared ownership for the goals,

services and they were formally established. For new initiatives, workgroups were immediately initiated to begin developing and refining further details as needed. The DRAFT RUSD LCAP Annual Update and Review Document was then updated and revised accordingly. The draft was presented to the RUSD DELAC on May 18, 2016. Based on the comments at the DELAC meeting, the superintendent developed a written response which was shared with all DELAC members. The draft LCAP was presented for public hearing at the May 26, 2016 Board meeting. Based on the feedback at public hearing, the superintendent developed a written response. On June 16, 2016, the RUSD Board of Education formally approved the RUSD LCAP and it was submitted to the San Bernardino County Office of Education.	actions, and expenditures included in the LCAP. In addition, the "Ticket out the Door," provided positive feedback and validated that Advisory Committee members felt that the outcomes honored their input and were initiatives of value for the students whom we serve.

Section 2: Goals, Actions, Expenditures, and Progress Indicators
Instructions:

All LEAs must complete the LCAP and Annual Update Template each year. The LCAP is a three-year plan for the upcoming school year and the two years that follow. In this way, the program and goals contained in the LCAP align with the term of a school district and county office of education budget and multiyear budget projections. The Annual Update section of the template reviews progress made for each stated goal in the school year that is coming to a close, assesses the effectiveness of actions and services provided, and describes the changes made in the LCAP for the next three years that are based on this review and assessment.

Charter schools may adjust the table 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.

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(s) the LCAP to include a description of the annual goals, for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils, to be achieved for each state priority as defined in 5 CCR 15495(i) and any local priorities; a description of the specific actions an LEA will take to meet the identified goals; a description of the expenditures required to implement the specific actions; and an annual update to include a review of progress towards the goals and describe any changes to the goals.

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, schoolsite-level advisory groups, as applicable (e.g., schoolsite 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.

Using the following instructions and guiding questions, complete a goal table (see below) for each of the LEA's goals. Duplicate and expand the fields as necessary.

Goal: Describe the goal:

When completing the goal tables, include goals for all pupils and specific goals for schoolsites and specific subgroups, including pupils with disabilities, both at the LEA level and, where applicable, at the schoolsite level. The LEA may identify which schoolsites 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 schoolsite.

Related State and/or Local Priorities: Identify the state and/or local priorities addressed by the goal by placing a check mark next to the applicable priority or priorities. The LCAP must include goals that address each of the state priorities, as defined in 5 CCR 15495(i), and any additional local priorities; however, one goal may address multiple priorities.

Identified Need: Describe the need(s) identified by the LEA that this goal addresses, including a description of the supporting data used to identify the need(s).

Schools: Identify the schoolsites to which the goal applies. LEAs may indicate "all" for all schools, specify an individual school or a subset of schools, or specify grade spans (e.g., all high schools or grades K-5).

Applicable Pupil Subgroups: Identify the pupil subgroups as defined in Education Code section 52052 to which the goal applies, or indicate "all" for all pupils.

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes: For each LCAP year, identify and describe specific expected measurable outcomes for all pupils using, at minimum, the applicable required metrics for the related state priorities. Where applicable, include descriptions of specific expected measurable outcomes for schoolsites and specific subgroups, including pupils with disabilities, both at the LEA level and at the schoolsite level.

The metrics used to describe the expected measurable outcomes may be quantitative or qualitative, although the goal tables must address all required metrics for every state priority in each LCAP year. The required metrics are the specified measures and objectives for each state priority as set forth in Education Code sections 52060(d) and 52066(d). For the pupil engagement priority metrics, LEAs must calculate the rates specified in Education Code sections 52060(d)(5)(B), (C), (D) and (E) as described in the Local Control Accountability Plan and Annual Update Template Appendix, sections (a) through (d).

Actions/Services: For each LCAP year, identify all annual actions to be performed and services provided to meet the described goal. Actions may describe a group of services that are implemented to achieve the identified goal.

Scope of Service: Describe the scope of each action/service by identifying the schoolsites covered. LEAs may indicate "all" for all schools, specify an individual school or a subset of schools, or specify grade spans (e.g., all high schools or grades K-5). If supplemental and concentration funds are used to support the action/service, the LEA must identify if the scope of service is districtwide, schoolwide, countywide, or charterwide.

Pupils to be served within identified scope of service: For each action/service, identify the pupils to be served within the identified scope of service. If the action to be performed or the service to be provided is for all pupils, place a check mark next to "ALL."

> For each action and/or service to be provided above what is being provided for all pupils, place a check mark next to the applicable unduplicated pupil subgroup(s) and/or other pupil subgroup(s) that will benefit from the additional action, and/or will receive the additional service. Identify, as applicable, additional actions and services for unduplicated pupil subgroup(s) as defined in Education Code section 42238.01, pupils redesignated fluent English proficient, and/or pupils subgroup(s) as defined in Education Code section 52052.

Budgeted Expenditures: For each action/service, list and describe budgeted expenditures for each school year to implement these actions, including where those expenditures can be found in the LEA's budget. The LEA must reference all fund sources for each proposed expenditure. 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 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 parent and pupil "Engagement" (e.g., parent involvement, pupil engagement, and school climate)?
4) What are the LEA's goal(s) to address any locally-identified priorities?
5) How have the unique needs of individual schoolsites been evaluated to inform the development of meaningful district and/or individual schoolsite 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 unduplicated pupils as defined in Education Code sections 42238.01 and subgroups as defined in section 52052 that are different from the LEA's goals for all pupils?
7) What are the specific expected measurable outcomes 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?
9) What information was considered/reviewed for individual schoolsites?
10) What information was considered/reviewed for subgroups identified in Education Code section 52052?
11) What actions/services will be provided to all pupils, to subgroups of pupils identified pursuant to Education Code section 52052, to specific schoolsites, to English learners, to low-income pupils, and/or to foster youth to achieve goals identified in the LCAP?
12) How do these actions/services link to identified goals and expected measurable outcomes?
13) 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?

GOAL: 1	**Continue existing efforts to foster student academic success by creating a cohesive focused, base program for all students.**	**Related State and/or Local Priorities:** 1 X 2 3 X 4 5 6 7 8 COE only: 9 10 Local : Specify

Identified Need:	1. All students, including English Learners, Foster Youth, and low-income students achieve at higher levels when taught by highly qualified teachers. Therefore, RUSD will continue to recruit and retain highly qualified staff to serve all students. 2. All students, including English Learners, Foster Youth, and low-income students must have access to standards-based materials to achieve academic success. Therefore, RUSD will continue to ensure that 100% of students have access to core content materials. 3. Student academic success has been linked to school climate; therefore, school facilities and parent involvement will be expanded to include all schools in good repair and all parents receiving access to parent portal. An analysis of school data indicate that most are well maintained and inviting, but there are areas of need that must be continually monitored and addressed.
Goal Applies to:	Schools: LEA-wide
	Applicable Pupil Subgroups: All

LCAP Year 1: 2016 – 2017

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. RUSD will maintain 100% high quality appropriately assigned teachers and leaders** State metric: Rate of Teacher Misassignment • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 94.55% • Increased in 2014-15 to 98.22% • Increase in 2015-16 to 98.93% **2. 100% of RUSD facilities will achieve a rating of "good" or "exemplary" on our local facilities rating tool** State metric: Facilities in good repair • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 96% (5/25 Exemplary; 19/25 Good; 1/25 Poor) • Increased in 2014-15 to 100**%** (5/25 Exemplary; 20/25 Good) **3. 100% of all RUSD students will have access to core instructional materials aligned to state standards including the Common Core** State metric: Student access to standards-aligned instructional materials • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 100% • Maintained in 2014-15 at 100% • Maintained in 2015-16 at 100% **4. Access to a web-based parent portal will be provided to 100% of RUSD Parents** State Metric: Promotion of Parent Participation • Baseline set with tracking parent accounts in 2013 at 47% Parent Participation (9962 accounts) • Increased in 2014 to 50% (10,579 accounts) • Decreased in 2015 to 42% (9039 accounts)

Actions/Services	Scope of	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures

	Service		
1.1 Provide high quality appropriately assigned teachers, counselors, administrators, and teacher coaches **a.** Recruit, hire and retain fully credentialed and highly qualified teachers **b.** Ensure site Master Schedules/teacher assignments reflect appropriate placement of teachers	ALL	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $79.25 million LCFF** 1100 ($63.4 million), 3000 ($15.85 million) **b. $5.75 million LCFF** 1100 ($4.6 million), 3000 ($1.15 million)
1.2 Provide safe and clean facilities **a.** Routine restricted maintenance **b.** M & O work order operational costs **c.** M & O supervisor, (William's) **d.** M & O Foreman, (Williams) **e.** M & O Equipment and Supplies **f.** M & O Facilities Monitoring and Support (PLC)	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $900,000 LCFF** 2200 ($185,000), 3000 ($40,000), 4300 ($275,000), 5600 ($400,000) **b. $15,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $120,000 LCFF** 2300 ($96,000), 3000 ($24,000) **d. $100,000 LCFF** 2200 ($82,000), 3000 ($18,000) **e. $40,000 LCFF** 4300 ($20,000), 4400 ($20,000) **f. $15,000 LCFF** 1300 ($12,000); 3000 ($3,000)
1.3 Provide standards based instructional materials for all students **a.** Purchase all necessary CCSS instructional materials to effectively support student achievement **b.** Develop and implement web-based K-12 scope and sequence aligned state standards including the Common Core **c.** Revise Scope and Sequence **d.** Purchase a typing program so students develop strong keyboarding skills to succeed on computer based assessments **e.** Purchase a Common Assessment Item Bank to support district-wide local assessments **f.** Provide Destiny Resource Management Program for district textbook inventory maintenance **g.** iBoss Internet Filtering	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $3,000,000 LCFF** 4300 ($1,900,000), 4100 ($500,000), 5800 ($600,000) **b. $115,000 LCFF** 1100 ($65,000), 3000 ($25,000), 5800 ($25,000) **c. $90,000** LCFF 1100 ($65,000); 3000 ($25,000) **d. $8,200 LCFF** 5800 **e. $82,000 LCFF** 5800 **f. $65,000 LCFF** 5800 **g. $55,000 LCFF** 5800
1.4 As allocated in previous years, provide instructional support services to all schools **a.** Provide site funding resources for student intervention supports before, during and after school **b.** Provide personnel and materials needed to effectively	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth	**a. $2,300,000 LCFF** 1100 ($555,000), 1200 ($885,000), 1900 ($400,000) 3000 ($460,000) **b. $800,000 LCFF** 1100

support the Continual School Improvement Model		__Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	($645,000), 3000 ($130,000), 4300 ($25,000)
1.5 Provide operational support services and classified support personnel to all schools as needed **a.** Provide personnel and materials needed to effectively support the basic operations of the district and school sites	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $21,994,000 LCFF** 2100 ($300,000), 2200 ($5,100,000), 2400 ($9,050,000), 2900 ($921,000), 3000 ($6,178,000), 4300 ($445,000)
1.6 Provide support staff personnel to all schools as needed **a.** 15 FTEs for grades TK-3 to maintain staffing ratios	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $1,680,000 LCFF** 1100 ($1,344,000), 3000 ($336,000)
1.7 Parent & Community Engagement **a.** Technology Platform for Parent Communication **b.** Community Engagement Technician **c.** Community Engagement equipment, materials, supplies **d.** Website Design consultation	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $100,000 LCFF** 5800 **b. $100,000 LCFF** 2900 ($82,000), 3000 ($18,000) **c. $10,000 LCFF** 4300 ($5000), 4400 ($2,000), 5800 ($3,000) **d. $40,000 LCFF** 5800
1.8 Increase Visual & Performing Arts to expand course of study through a 4-8 Instrumental Music Program **a.** Provide 1 FTE (teacher) to expand elementary strings program **b.** Provide hourly paraprofessional support **c.** Program operating expenses **d.** Materials and equipment **e.** Transportation	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $150,000 LCFF** 1100 ($124,000),3000 ($26,000) **b. $20,000 LCFF** 2100 ($17,000), 3000 ($3,000) **c. $25,000 LCFF** 4300 ($10,000) 5800 ($15,000) **d. $7,000 LCFF** 4300 **e. $25,000 LCFF** 5800
1.9 Beginning Teacher Support **a.** BTSA Support **b.** Recording Technician to record training to create Digital PD Library	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $135,000 Educator Effectiveness Funds** 1100 ($108,000), 3000 ($27,000) **b. $20,000 LCFF** 2100 ($16,000), 3000 ($4000)
1.10 Increase support to School Improvement and Professional Development **a.** LCAP Coordinator **b.** Program supplies and support materials	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners	**a. $160,000 LCFF** 1300 ($130,000), 3000 ($30,000) **b. $1000 LCFF** 4300

		__Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	

LCAP Year 2: 2017 - 2018

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:

1. RUSD will maintain 100% high quality appropriately assigned teachers and leaders
State metric: Rate of Teacher Misassignment
- Increase in 2015-16 to 98.93%
- Target 100%

2. 100% of RUSD facilities will achieve a rating of "good" or "exemplary" on our local facilities rating tool
State metric: Facilities in good repair
- Increased in 2014-15 to 100**%** (5/25 Exemplary; 20/25 Good)
- Target 100%

3. 100% of all RUSD students will have access to core instructional materials aligned to state standards including the Common Core
State metric: Student access to standards-aligned instructional materials
- Maintained in 2015-16 at 100%
- Target 100%

4. Access to a web-based parent portal will be provided to 100% of RUSD Parents
State Metric: Promotion of Parent Participation
- Decreased 2015 to 42% (9039 accounts)
- Target 100%

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
1.1 Provide high quality appropriately assigned teachers, counselors, administrators, and teacher coaches **a.** Recruit, hire and retain fully credentialed and highly qualified teachers **b.** Ensure site Master Schedules/teacher assignments reflect appropriate placement of teachers	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $79.25 million LCFF** 1100 ($63.4 million), 3000 ($15.85 million) **b. $5.75 million LCFF** 1100 ($4.6 million), 3000 ($1.15 million)
1.2 Provide safe and clean facilities **a.** Routine restricted maintenance **b.** M & O work order operational costs **c.** M & O supervisor, (William's) **d.** M & O Foreman, (Williams) **e.** M & O Equipment and Supplies **f.** M & O Facilities Monitoring and Support (PLC)	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $900,000 LCFF** 2200 ($185,000), 3000 ($40,000), 4300 ($275,000), 5600 **($400,000)** **b. $15,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $120,000 LCFF** 2300 ($96,000), 3000 ($24,000) **d. $100,000 LCFF** 2200 ($82,000), 3000 ($18,000) **e. $40,000 LCFF** 4300 ($20,000), 4400 ($20,000) **f. $15,000 LCFF** 1300 ($12,000);

			3000 ($3,000)
1.3 Provide standards based instructional materials for all students **a.** Purchase all necessary CCSS instructional materials to effectively support student achievement **b.** Develop and implement web-based K-12 scope and sequence aligned state standards including the Common Core **c.** Revise Scope and Sequence **d.** Purchase a typing program so students develop strong keyboarding skills to succeed on computer based assessments **e.** Purchase a Common Assessment Item Bank to support district-wide local assessments **f.** Provide Destiny Resource Management Program for district textbook inventory maintenance **g.** iBoss Internet Filtering	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $3,000,000 LCFF** 4300 ($1,900,000), 4100 ($500,000), 5800 ($600,000) **b. $115,000 LCFF** 1100 ($65,000), 3000 ($25,000), 5800 ($25,000) **c. $90,000** LCFF 1100 ($65,000); 3000 ($25,000) **d. $8,200 LCFF** 5800 **e. $82,000 LCFF** 5800 **f. $65,000 LCFF** 5800 **g. $55,000 LCFF** 5800
1.4 As allocated in previous years, provide instructional support services to all schools **a.** Provide site funding resources for student intervention supports before, during and after school **b.** Provide personnel and materials needed to effectively support the Continual School Improvement Model	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $2,300,000 LCFF** 1100 ($555,000), 1200 ($885,000), 1900 ($400,000) 3000 ($460,000) **b. $800,000 LCFF** 1100 ($645,000), 3000 ($130,000), 4300 ($25,000)
1.5 Provide operational support services and classified support personnel to all schools as needed **a.** Provide personnel and materials needed to effectively support the basic operations of the district and school sites	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $21,994,000 LCFF** 2100 ($300,000), 2200 ($5,100,000), 2400 ($9,050,000), 2900 ($921,000), 3000 ($6,178,000), 4300 ($445,000)
1.6 Provide support staff personnel to all schools as needed **a.** 15 FTEs for grades TK-3 to maintain staffing ratios	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $1,680,000 LCFF** 1100 ($1,344,000), 3000 ($336,000)
1.7 Parent & Community Engagement **a.** Technology Platform for Parent Communication **b.** Community Engagement Technician **c.** Community Engagement equipment, materials,	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners	**a. $100,000 LCFF** 5800 **b. $100,000 LCFF** 2900 ($82,000), 3000 ($18,000) **c. $10,000 LCFF** 4300 ($5000),

supplies **d.** Website Design consultation		__Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	4400 ($2,000), 5800 ($3,000) **d. $40,000 LCFF** 5800
1.8 Increase Visual & Performing Arts to expand course of study through a 4-8 Instrumental Music Program **a.** Provide 1 FTE (teacher) to expand elementary strings program **b.** Provide hourly paraprofessional support **c.** Program operating expenses **d.** Transportation	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $130,000 LCFF** 1100 ($104,000), 3000 ($26,000) **b. $15,000 LCFF** 2100 ($12,000), 3000 ($3,000) **c. $27,000 LCFF** 4300 ($10,000) 5800 ($17,000) **d. $25,000 LCFF** 5800
1.9 Beginning Teacher Support **a.** BTSA Support **b.** Recording Technician to record training to create Digital PD Library	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $135,000 Educator Effectiveness Funds** 1100 ($108,000), 3000 ($27,000) **b. $20,000 LCFF** 2100 ($16,000), 3000 ($4,000)
1.10 Increase support to School Improvement and Professional Development **a.** LCAP Coordinator **b.** Program supplies and support materials	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $150,000-LCFF** 1300 ($120,000), 3000 ($30,000) **b. $1000-LCFF** 4300

LCAP Year 3: 2018 - 2019

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. RUSD will maintain 100% high quality appropriately assigned teachers and leaders** State metric: Rate of Teacher Misassignment **2. 100% of RUSD facilities will achieve a rating of "good" or "exemplary" on our local facilities rating tool** State metric: Facilities in good repair • Increased in 2014-15 to 100**%** (5/25 Exemplary; 20/25 Good) • Target 100% **3. 100% of all RUSD students will have access to core instructional materials aligned to state standards including the Common Core** State metric: Student access to standards-aligned instructional materials • Decreased 2015 to 42% (9039 accounts) • Target 100% **4. Access to a web-based parent portal will be provided to 100% of RUSD Parents** State Metric: Promotion of Parent Participation • Decreased 2015 to 42% (9039 accounts) • Target 100%

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
1.1 Provide high quality appropriately assigned teachers, counselors, administrators, and teacher coaches **a.** Recruit, hire and retain fully credentialed and **b.** highly qualified teachers **c.** Ensure site Master Schedules/teacher assignments reflect appropriate placement of teachers	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $79.25 million LCFF** 1100 ($63.4 million), 3000 ($15.85 million) **b. $5.75 million LCFF** 1100 ($4.6 million), 3000 ($1.15 million)
1.2 Provide safe and clean facilities **a.** Routine restricted maintenance **b.** M & O work order operational costs **c.** M & O supervisor, (William's) **d.** M & O Foreman, (Williams) **e.** M & O Equipment and Supplies **f.** M & O Facilities Monitoring and Support (PLC)	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $900,000 LCFF** 2200 ($185,000), 3000 ($40,000), 4300 ($275,000), 5600 ($400,000) **b. $15,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $120,000 LCFF** 2300 ($96,000), 3000 ($24,000) **d. $100,000 LCFF** 2200 ($82,000), 3000 ($18,000) **e. $40,000 LCFF** 4300 ($20,000), 4400 ($20,000) **f. $15,000 LCFF** 1300 ($12,000); 3000 ($3,000)
1.3 Provide standards based instructional materials for all students **a.** Purchase all necessary CCSS instructional materials to effectively support student achievement **b.** Develop and implement web-based K-12 scope and sequence aligned state standards including the Common Core **c.** Revise Scope and Sequence **d.** Purchase a typing program so students develop strong keyboarding skills to succeed on computer based assessments **e.** Purchase a Common Assessment Item Bank to support district-wide local assessments **f.** Provide Destiny Resource Management Program for district textbook inventory maintenance **g.** iBoss Internet Filtering	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $3,000,000 LCFF** 4300 ($1,900,000), 4100 ($500,000), 5800 ($600,000) **b. $115,000 LCFF** 1100 ($65,000), 3000 ($25,000), 5800 ($25,000) **c. $90,000** LCFF 1100 ($65,000); 3000 ($25,000) **d. $8,200 LCFF** 5800 **e. $82,000 LCFF** 5800 **f. $65,000 LCFF** 5800 **g. $55,000 LCFF** 5800
1.4 As allocated in previous years, provide instructional	All	_X_ ALL	**a. $2,300,000 LCFF** 1100

support services to all schools **a.** Provide site funding resources for student intervention supports before, during and after school **b.** Provide personnel and materials needed to effectively support the Continual School Improvement Model		OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	($555,000), 1200 ($885,000), 1900 ($400,000) 3000 ($460,000) **b. $800,000 LCFF** 1100 ($645,000), 3000 ($130,000), 4300 ($25,000)
1.5 Provide operational support services and classified support personnel to all schools as needed **a.** Provide personnel and materials needed to effectively support the basic operations of the district and school sites	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $21,994,000 LCFF** 2100 ($300,000), 2200 ($5,100,000), 2400 ($9,050,000), 2900 ($921,000), 3000 ($6,178,000), 4300 ($445,000)
1.6 Provide support staff personnel to all schools as needed **a.** 15 FTEs for grades TK-3 to maintain staffing ratios	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $1,680,000 LCFF** 1100 ($1,344,000), 3000 ($336,000)
1.7 Parent & Community Engagement **a.** Technology Platform for Parent Communication **b.** Community Engagement Technician **c.** Community Engagement equipment, materials, supplies **d.** Website Design consultation	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $100,000 LCFF** 5800 **b. $100,000 LCFF** 2900 ($82,000), 3000 ($18,000) **c. $10,000 LCFF** 4300 ($5000), 4400 ($2,000), 5800 ($3,000) **d. $40,000 LCFF** 5800
1.8 Increase Visual & Performing Arts to expand course of study through a 4-8 Instrumental Music Program **a.** Provide 1 FTE (teacher) to expand elementary strings program **b.** Provide hourly paraprofessional support **c.** Program operating expenses **d.** Transportation	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $130,000 LCFF** 1100 ($104,000), 3000 ($26,000) **b. $15,000 LCFF** 2100 2,000), 3000 ($3,000) **c. $27,000 LCFF** 4300 ($10,000) 4400 ($17,000) **d. $25,000 LCFF** 5800
1.9 Beginning Teacher Support **a.** BTSA Support Personnel **b.** Recording Technician to record training to create Digital PD Library	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $135,000 LCFF** 1100 ($108,000), 3000 ($27,000) **b. $20,000 LCFF** 2100 ($16,000), 3000 ($4,000)

1.10 Increase support to School Improvement and Professional Development **a.** LCAP Coordinator **b.** Program supplies and support materials	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $150,000-LCFF** 1300 ($120,000), 3000 ($30,000) **b. $1000-LCFF** 4300

GOAL: 2	**Continue existing efforts to foster positive school environments to effectively support student learning.**	Related State and/or Local Priorities: 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5_X_ 6_X_ 7__ 8__ COE only: 9__ 10__ Local : Specify _____

Identified Need :	1. Increase current high school graduation rate (91.2%) by providing structures for increased engagement through social skills development, group counseling and positive behavioral interventions to promote a positive school environment. 2. The suspension rate for the state of California is 4.4 and is 6.0 for the county of San Bernardino while RUSDs' suspension rate is 4.8, demonstrating a need to decrease suspensions through positive behavior interventions and character education programs to develop a sense of student connectedness with school and community.
Goal Applies to:	Schools: LEA-wide Applicable Pupil Subgroups: All

LCAP Year 1: 2016 - 2017

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:

1. Average daily attendance will increase to 96%

State metric: school/district student attendance rates

- Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 96.04%
- Decreased in 2014-15 to 95.80%
- Decreased in 2015-16 to 95.17%

2. Suspension and expulsion rates will decrease by 1%

State metric: student suspension & expulsion rates

- Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 5.2% Suspension Rate and .4% Expulsion Rate
- Decreased in 2014-15 to 4.8% Suspension Rate and .2% Expulsion Rate
- Decreased in 2015-16 to 3.7% Suspension Rate and Maintained at .2% Expulsion Rate

3. Dropout rate will decrease by .25%

State Metric: Dropout Rate			**Performance**
2013-14 Middle School	Dropout (2012-13)	.06%	
2014-15 Middle School	Dropout (2013-14)	.14%	Increase
2015-16 Middle School	Dropout (2014-15)	.06%	Decrease
2013-14 High School	Dropout (2012-13)	4.8%	
2014-15 High School	Dropout (2013-14)	4.8%	Maintain
2015-16 High School	Dropout (2014-15)	5.7%	Increase

4. Pupil, and teacher survey will provide school community perception baseline data

Local metric: school/community perception data

- Survey not submitted

5. Graduation rate will increase by .2%

State metric: High school graduation rate

- Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 90.4%
- Increased in 2014-15 to 91.2%
- Decreased in 2015-16 to 90.6%

6. Chronic Absenteeism rate will decrease by .1%

State metric: Chronic Absenteeism rate

Year	District Student Population	Number of Students 10%+ Days Absent	Chronic Absenteeism Rate
2015-2016	21,496 students	1,740 students	8% of the total

7. Promotion of Parent Participation in District Events increase Site Participation by 10% annually and increase participants completing evaluations by 10% annually

Local Metric State Priority 3: Promotion of Parent Participation and Feedback in *Parent-By-Parent Conference*, *Power of Education* and *Multicultural Fair* (Number of Sites Represented on Sign-In Sheets and number of Feedback Forms/Surveys Received by Parents at Event)

- Baseline established in 2015-16 at Parent-by-Parent Conference Multicultural Fair: 75% Site Participation (18 Schools Participating); 48% Feedback Evaluation Forms collected (63 Evaluation forms collected/130 participants)

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
2.1 Provide individual and group counseling opportunities as well as social skills classes to students to promote positive school climate. **a.** Increase Positive Behavior Intervention Support program to 4 additional school sites (Year 1) **b.** Continue to Support current Positive Behavior Support program to 6 schools (Year 2) **c.** Provide Elementary Counselors to increase social and emotional support to elementary students **d.** Startup expenses (furniture, equip, computers) for new counselors **e.** Materials & Supplies **f.** Counselor Training **g.** Unanticipated expenses for new counselor program	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $50,000 - LCFF** 5800 **b. $75,000 - LCFF** 5800 **c. $710,000** LCFF1200 ($568,000), 3000 ($142,000) **d. $150,000** LCFF 4300 ($30,000); 4400 ($50,000); 6400 ($70,000) **e. $25,000** LCFF 4300 **f. $30,000** LCFF 5800 **g. $200,000** LCFF 5800
***2.2* Provide student drug testing program and interventions to students in grades 6-12 to foster school safety and student academic success.** **a.** Contract student drug testing services **b.** Provide IST Site Leader stipends to assist in identifying student needs that affect performance	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $50,000 - LCFF** 5800 **b. $40,000 LCFF** 1100 ($36,000), 3000 ($4,000)

2.3 Provide staff training on Positive Behavioral Interventions to reduce student suspensions and expulsions **a.** Provide necessary training for positive behavioral interventions	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $20,000 LCFF** 1100 ($8,000), 3000 ($2000), 5800 ($10,000)
2.4 Develop sense of student connectedness through character education programs, staff training, mentoring, positive student recognition **a.** Support character education with appropriate funding and training (Site Allocation $10,000 for each site)	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $265,000 LCFF** 1100 ($160,000), 3000 ($30,000), 4300 ($25,000) 5800 ($50,000)
2.5 Increased parent and community outreach regarding available resources and parent involvement opportunities **a.** Support parent and community outreach programs with appropriate funding and training	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $40,000 - LCFF** 1100 ($8.000), 2200 ($5,000), 3000 ($2,000), 4300 ($10,000), 5800 ($15,000)

LCAP Year 2: 2017 - 2018

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:

1. Average daily attendance will increase to 96%

State metric: school/district student attendance rates

- Decreased in 2015-16 to 95.17%
- Target 96%

2. Suspension and expulsion rates will decrease by 1%

State metric: student suspension & expulsion rates

- Decreased in 2015-16 to 3.7% Suspension Rate and Maintained at .2% Expulsion Rate
- Target 2.7% Suspension Rate and .0% Expulsion Rate

3. Dropout rate will decrease by .25%

State Metric: Dropout Rate			**Target**
2015-16 Middle School	Dropout (2014-15)	.06%	---
2015-16 High School	Dropout (2014-15)	5.7%	4.55%

4. Pupil, and teacher survey will provide school community perception baseline data

Local metric: school/community perception data

- Survey not submitted

5. Graduation rate will increase by .2%

State metric: High school graduation rate

- Decreased in 2015-16 to 90.6%
- Target 90.4%

6. Chronic Absenteeism rate will decrease by .2%

State metric: Chronic Absenteeism rate

Year	Chronic Absenteeism Rate Target
2016-17	7.8% of the total population

7. Parent Participation in District Events will increase with Site Participation by 5% annually and increase participants completing evaluations by 5% annually

Local Metric: Promotion of Parent Participation in *Parent-By-Parent Conference*, *Power of Education* and *Multicultural Fair* (Number of Sites Represented on Sign-In Sheets and number of Feedback Forms/Surveys Received by Parents at Event)

- 2017-18 Target 80% Site Participation; 53% Feedback Evaluation Forms collected

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
2.1 Provide individual and group counseling opportunities as well as social skills classes to students to promote positive school climate. **a.** Increase Positive Behavior Intervention Support program to 4 additional school sites (Year 1) **b.** Continue to Support current Positive Behavior Support program to 4 schools (Year 2) **c.** Continue to Support current Positive Behavior Support program to 6 schools (Year 3) **d.** Provide Elementary Counselors to increase social and emotional support to elementary students **e.** Materials & Supplies	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $50,000 - LCFF** 5800 **b. $50,000 - LCFF** 5800 **c. $75,000 - LCFF** 5800 **d. $710,000 LCFF**1100 ($568,000), 3000 ($142,000) **e. $25,000 LCFF** 4300
2.2 **Provide student drug testing program and interventions to students in grades 6-12 to foster school safety and student academic success.** **a.** Contract student drug testing services **b.** Provide IST Site Leader stipends to assist in identifying student needs that affect performance	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $50,000 - LCFF** 5800 **b. $40,000 LCFF** 1100 ($36,000), 3000 ($4,000)
2.3 Provide staff training on Positive Behavioral Interventions to reduce student suspensions and expulsions **a.** Provide necessary training for positive behavioral interventions	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $20,000 LCFF** 1100 ($8,000), 3000 ($2000), 5800 ($10,000)
2.4 Develop sense of student connectedness through character education programs, staff training, mentoring, positive student recognition **a.** Support character education with appropriate funding and training	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other	**a. $50,000 LCFF** 1100 ($15,000), 3000 ($3000), 4300 ($25,000) 5800 ($7,000)

		Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
2.5 Increased parent and community outreach regarding available resources and parent involvement opportunities **a.** Support parent and community outreach programs with appropriate funding and training	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $40,000 - LCFF** 1100 ($8.000), 2200 ($5,000), 3000 ($2,000), 4300 ($10,000), 5800 ($15,000)

LCAP Year 3: 2018 - 2019

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:

1. Average daily attendance will increase to 96%

State metric: school/district student attendance rates

- Decreased in 2015-16 to 95.17%
- Target 96%

2. Suspension and expulsion rates will decrease by 1%

State metric: student suspension & expulsion rates

- Decreased in 2015-16 to 3.7% Suspension Rate and Maintained at .2% Expulsion Rate
- Target 1.7% Suspension Rate and .0% Expulsion Rate

3. Dropout rate will decrease by .25%

State Metric: Dropout Rate			Target
2015-16 Middle School	Dropout (2014-15)	.06%	
2015-16 High School	Dropout (2014-15)	5.7%	4.3%

4. Pupil, and teacher survey will provide school community perception baseline data

Local metric: school/community perception data

- Survey not submitted

5. Graduation rate will increase by .2%

State metric: High school graduation rate

- Decreased in 2015-16 to 90.6%
- Target 90.2%

6. Chronic Absenteeism rate will decrease by .2%

State metric: Chronic Absenteeism rate

Year	Chronic Absenteeism Rate Target
2017-18	7.6% of the total population

7. Parent Participation in District Events will increase with Site Participation by 5% annually and increase participants completing evaluations by 5% annually

Local Metric: Promotion of Parent Participation in *Parent-By-Parent Conference*, *Power of Education* and *Multicultural Fair* (Number of Sites Represented on Sign-In Sheets and number of Feedback Forms/Surveys Received by Parents at Event)

- 2018-19 Target 85% Site Participation; 53% Feedback Evaluation Forms collected

Actions/Services	Scope of	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures

	Service		
2.1 Provide individual and group counseling opportunities as well as social skills classes to students to promote positive school climate. **a.** Increase Positive Behavior Intervention Support program to 4 additional school sites (Year 1) **b.** Continue to Support current Positive Behavior Support program to 4 schools (Year 2) **c.** Continue to Support current Positive Behavior Support program to 4 schools (Year 3) **d.** Continue to Support current Positive Behavior Support program to 6 schools (Year 4) **e.** Provide Elementary Counselors to increase social and emotional support to elementary students **f.** Materials & Supplies	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $50,000 - LCFF** 5800 **b. $50,000 - LCFF** 5800 **c. $50,000 - LCFF** 5800 **d. $75,000 - LCFF** 5800 **e. $710,000 LCFF** 1100 ($568,000), 3000 ($142,000) **f. $25,000 LCFF** 4300
2.2 **Provide student drug testing program and interventions to students in grades 6-12 to foster school safety and student academic success.** **a.** Contract student drug testing services **b.** Provide IST Site Leader stipends to assist in identifying student needs that affect performance	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $50,000 - LCFF** 5800 **b. $40,000 LCFF** 1100 ($36,000), 3000 ($4,000)
2.3 Provide staff training on Positive Behavioral Interventions to reduce student suspensions and expulsions a. Provide necessary training for positive behavioral interventions	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $20,000 LCFF** 1100 ($8,000), 3000 ($2000), 5800 ($10,000)
2.4 Develop sense of student connectedness through character education programs, staff training, mentoring, positive student recognition a. Support character education with appropriate funding and training	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $50,000 LCFF** 1100 ($15,000), 3000 ($3000), 4300 ($25,000) 5800 ($7,000)
2.5 Increased parent and community outreach regarding available resources and parent involvement opportunities a. Support parent and community outreach programs with appropriate funding and training	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $40,000 - LCFF** 1100 ($8.000), 2200 ($5,000), 3000 ($2,000), 4300 ($10,000), 5800 ($15,000

GOAL: 3	**All students will participate in a high quality K-12 instructional program aligned to State Standards including the Common Core.**	**Related State and/or Local Priorities:** 1__ 2__ 3__ 4_X_ 5__ 6__ 7__ 8_X_ COE only: 9__ 10__ Local : Specify _____

Identified Need :

1. Research from the National Staff Development Council confirms that, "Sustained & intensive professional development for teachers is related to student achievement gains…and teachers typically need substantial professional development in a given area (at least 50 hours)" to demonstrate an increase in student achievement. Research supports the need for continual follow up and coaching support to more readily transfer professional learning into classroom practice.
2. State Standardized Test results for the initial SBAC administration show that RUSD students are outperforming both State and County. However, all students are still not Exceeding or Meeting expected mastery of the standards. Additionally, a gap still remains between the performance of subgroups and White subgroup performance. Therefore, RUSD recognizes the need to continually support strong first instruction through Professional Development and support of teachers through Instructional Coaching.
3. Local metrics indicate a continued support of Reading and Writing across the curriculum to strengthen the implementation of the Common Core Literacy Standards. RUSD recognizes the need to strengthen student performance in the areas of Reading and Writing in the implementation of all content areas including Math, ELA, Science and Social Science.
4. Numerous metrics indicate a need to close the achievement gap for all underperforming student groups and assure that all students are achieving. Our metrics indicate that a persistent gap exists among our student groups.

Goal Applies to:

Schools: LEA-wide

Applicable Pupil Subgroups: All

LCAP Year 1: 2016-2017

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:

1. Proficiency rate on District ELA and Math common assessments will increase by 1% for all subgroups

Local Metric: Student Proficiency Rates on District Common Assessments

2014-15 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)		
K-3	ELA	65% Proficient
K-3	Math	66% Proficient
Gr 4-5	ELA	21% Proficient
Gr 4-5	Math	31% Proficient
Gr 6-8	ELA	20% Proficient
Gr 6-8	Math	20% Proficient
Gr 9-12	ELA	28% Proficient
Gr 9-12	Math	30% Proficient

2015-16 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)

K-3	ELA	74% Meet/Exceed
K-3	Math	69% Meet/Exceed
Gr 4-5	ELA	41% Meet/Exceed
Gr 4-5	Math	45% Meet/Exceed
Gr 6-8	ELA	55% Meet/Exceed
Gr 6-8	Math	49% Meet/Exceed
Gr 9-12	ELA	60% Meet/Exceed
Gr 9-12	Math	74% Meet/Exceed

2. Proficiency rate on District reading benchmarks will increase by 2% for students grades 1-3
Local Metric: Student Proficiency Rates on District Reading Benchmarks

- Grade Level Equivalency Rate 2015-16 is 66.55%
- Target 68.55%

3. Student proficiency on state assessments (SBAC, CELDT, CAHSEE) will increase overall by 1%
State Metrics: Performance on standardized tests, EL Reclassification rates

- SBAC:
  - Baseline established with the released scores: 2014-15 SBAC ELA 53% of Students Exceed or Meet Standard
  - Baseline established with the released scored: 2014-15 SBAC Math 40% of Students Exceed or Meet Standard
- CELDT:
  - Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 48% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced
  - Decrease in 2014-15 47% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced
  - Decrease in 2015-16 46% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced
- Reclassification:
  - Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 with 3% of students reclassified
  - Increase 2014-15 13% of students reclassified
  - Increase 2015-16 15% of students reclassified

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
3.1 Provide extensive professional development around the new state standards including math and ELA Common Core curriculum and pedagogy **Math Academy** **a.** 5 day academy training for new K-10 teachers **b.** 3 day academy training Year 2 K-10 Teachers **c.** 2 day academy training Integrated Math III **d.** Site-based Guided Collaboration Days **e.** Additional afterschool Instructional Strategy Training hourly pay for training **f.** Equipment & supplies **g.** Summer Training **Reading Academy**	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$80,000 LCFF** 1100 ($17,000), 3000 ($3000), 5800 ($60,000) **b.** **$45,000 LCFF** 1100 ($13,000), 3000 ($2000), 5800 ($30,000) **c.** **$15,000 LCFF** 1100 ($4000), 3000 ($1000), 5800 ($10,000) **d.** **$120,000 LCFF** 1100 ($92,000), 3000 ($8000), 4300 ($20,000) **e.** **$25,000 LCFF** 1100

h. 3 day Reading Methods training for Kindergarten & Grades 4-5 teachers **i.** 5 days new teacher training for K-3 teachers **j.** 3 days Site based guided collaboration for Gr. 1-3 teachers			($20,000), 3000 ($5000) **f.** **$25,000 LCFF** 4300 **g.** **$65,000 LCFF** 5800 **h.** **$145,000 LCFF** 1100 ($32,000), 3000 ($10,000), 4300 ($8000), 5800 ($95,000) **i.** **$30,000 LCFF** 1100 ($8500), 3000 ($1500), 4300 ($5000), 5800 ($15,000) **j.** **$70,000 LCFF** 1100 ($45,000), 3000 ($5000), 4300 ($20,000)
3.2 Increase onsite support for Math and ELA teachers K-12 **a.** 15 Math and Reading Coaches **b.** PD TOA to facilitate custom professional learning opportunities district-wide **c.** TOA Training **d.** Materials, supplies for TOA Professional Development **e.** Site Licenses **f.** TOA 10 Summer Days Prep	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$1,770,012 LCFF** 1900 ($1,430,012), 3000 ($340,000) **b.** **$94,988 LCFF** 1100 ($69,988), 3000 ($25,000) **c.** **$30,000 LCFF** 5800 **d.** **$18,000 LCFF** 5800 **e.** **$40,000 LCFF** 5800 **f.** **$50,000 LCFF** 1100 ($40,000), 3000 ($10,000)
3.3 Develop/provide reading intervention at all elementary school sites to increase student proficiency **a.** District-wide reading assessment tool to monitor student progress and identify student needs for extra support **b.** Purchase supplemental reading intervention curriculum K-5 to increase effectively assess and guide reading instruction to increase student proficiency in reading and language arts **c.** Intervention Support Personnel	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$115,000 LCFF** 5800 **b.** **$20,000 LCFF** 5800 **c.** **$47,000 LCFF** 1100 ($29,000), 2400 ($8,000), 3000 ($10,000)
3.4 Implementation of state standards including the Common Core **a.** Teacher training on adopted high school ELA curriculum (My Perspectives) **b.** TOA & Admin training on adopted high school ELA curriculum (My Perspectives) **c.** ELA Scope & Sequence Development & teacher Collaboration **d.** On-site support for ELA teachers for implementation of	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$51,000 LCFF** 1100 ($21,600), 3000 ($3,469), 5800 ($25,931) **b.** **$13,000 LCFF**1100 ($11,200); 3000 ($1,800) **c.** **$20,000 LCFF**1100 ($17,200), 3000 ($2,800) **d.** **$310,000** LCFF 1100 (230,000); 3000 ($80,000)

new curriculum (3 FTE) **e.** Next Generation Science Standards Training and Collaboration			**e. $59,000 LCFF** 1100 ($22,000); 3000 ($7000), 5800 ($30,000)
3.5 Develop comprehensive Writing Program K-12 at all school sites to increase student proficiency in CCSS Genres and Literacy Standards across all content areas **a.** TOAs to support site implementation **b.** Provide writing training to support CCSS Writing Genre standards **c.** TOA Training to support implementation **d.** Summer Prep and Implementation Planning **e.** Design district-wide writing benchmarks which include calibration, assessment rubrics to monitor student progress, and resources to provide meaningful feedback to students for revision and editing	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $1,250,000 Million LCFF** 1900 ($1,000,000), 3000 ($250,000) **b. $286,000 LCFF** 1900 ($120,000); 3000 ($40,000); 5200 $126,000 **c. $15,000 LCFF** 5800 **d. $30,000 LCFF** 1900 ($26,000), 3000 ($4,000) **e. $25,000 LCFF** 1900 ($21,000), 3000 ($4,000)

LCAP Year 2: 2017 - 2018

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:

1. Proficiency rate on District ELA and Math common assessments will increase by 1%

Local Metric: Student Proficiency Rates on District Common Assessments

2015-16 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)			
K-3	ELA	74% Meet/Exceed	Target 75%
K-3	Math	69% Meet/Exceed	Target 70%
Gr 4-5	ELA	41% Meet/Exceed	Target 42%
Gr 4-5	Math	45% Meet/Exceed	Target 46%
Gr 6-8	ELA	55% Meet/Exceed	Target 56%
Gr 6-8	Math	49% Meet/Exceed	Target 50%
Gr 9-12	ELA	60% Meet/Exceed	Target 61%
Gr 9-12	Math	74% Meet/Exceed	Target 75%

2. Proficiency rate on District reading benchmarks will increase by 2% for students grades 1-3

Local Metric: Student Proficiency Rates on District Reading Benchmarks

- Grade Level Equivalency Rate 2015-16 is 66.55%
- Target 70.55%

3. Student proficiency on state assessments (SBAC, CELDT, CAHSEE) will increase overall by 1%

State Metrics: Performance on standardized tests, EL Reclassification rates

- SBAC:
  - Baseline established with the released scores: 2014-15 SBAC ELA 53% of Students Exceed or Meet Standard
  - Baseline established with the released scored: 2014-15 SBAC Math 40% of Students Exceed or Meet Standard
  - Target ELA 54% and Target Mat 41%
- CELDT:
  - Decrease in 2015-16 46% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced
  - Target 49%
- Reclassification:

	○ 2015-16 15% of students reclassified ○ Target 16%

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
3.1 Provide extensive professional development around the new state standards including math and ELA Common Core curriculum and pedagogy **Math Academy** **a.** 5 day academy training for new K-10 teachers **b.** 3 day academy training Year 2 K-10 Teachers **c.** 2 day academy training Integrated Math III **d.** Site-based Guided Collaboration Days **e.** Additional afterschool Instructional Strategy Training hourly pay for training **f.** Equipment & supplies **g.** Summer Training **Reading Academy** **h.** 3 day Reading Methods training for Kindergarten & Grades 4-5 teachers **i.** 5 days new teacher training for K-3 teachers **j.** 3 days Site based guided collaboration for Gr. 1-3 teachers	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $80,000 LCFF** 1100 ($17,000), 3000 ($3000), 5800 ($60,000) **b. $45,000 LCFF** 1100 ($13,000), 3000 ($2000), 5800 ($30,000) **c. $15,000 LCFF** 1100 ($4000), 3000 ($1000), 5800 ($10,000) **d. $120,000 LCFF** 1100 ($92,000), 3000 ($8000), 4300 ($20,000) **e. $25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($20,000), 3000 ($5000) **f. $25,000 LCFF** 4300 **g. $65,000 LCFF** 5800 **h. $145,000 LCFF** 1100 ($32,000), 3000 ($10,000), 4300 ($8000), 5800 ($95,000) **i. $30,000 LCFF** 1100 ($8500), 3000 ($1500), 4300 ($5000), 5800 ($15,000) **j. $70,000 LCFF** 1100 ($45,000), 3000 ($5000), 4300 ($20,000)
3.2 Increase onsite support for Math and ELA teachers K-12 **a.** 15 Math and Reading Coaches **b.** PD TOA to facilitate custom professional learning opportunities district-wide **c.** TOA Training **d.** Materials, supplies for TOA Professional Development **e.** Site Licenses **f.** TOA 10 Summer Days Prep	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $1,770,012 LCFF** 1900 ($1,430,012), 3000 ($340,000) **b. $94,988 LCFF** 1100 ($69,988), 3000 ($25,000) **c. $30,000 LCFF** 5800 **d. $18,000 LCFF** 5800 **e. $40,000 LCFF** 5800 **f. $50,000 LCFF** 1100

			($40,000), 3000 ($10,000)
3.3 Develop/provide reading intervention at all elementary school sites to increase student proficiency **a.** District-wide reading assessment tool to monitor student progress and identify student needs for extra support **b.** Purchase supplemental reading intervention curriculum K-5 to increase effectively assess and guide reading instruction to increase student proficiency in reading and language arts **c.** Intervention Support Personnel	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $115,000 LCFF** 5800 **b. $20,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $47,000 LCFF** 1100 ($29,000), 2400 ($8,000), 3000 ($10,000)
3.4 Implementation of state standards including the Common Core **a.** Teacher training on adopted high school ELA curriculum (My Perspectives) **b.** TOA & Admin training on adopted high school ELA curriculum (My Perspectives) **c.** ELA Scope & Sequence Development & teacher Collaboration **d.** On-site support for ELA teachers for implementation of new curriculum (3 FTE) **e.** Next Generation Science Standards Training and Collaboration	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $51,000 LCFF** 1100 ($21,600), 3000 ($3,469), 5800 ($25,931) **b. $13,000 LCFF**1100 ($11,200); 3000 ($1,800) **c. $20,000 LCFF**1100 ($17,200), 3000 ($2,800) **d. $310,000** LCFF 1100 (230,000); 3000 ($80,000) **e. $59,000 LCFF** 1100 ($22,000); 3000 ($7000), 5800 ($30,000)
3.5 Develop comprehensive Writing Program K-12 at all school sites to increase student proficiency in CCSS Genres and Literacy Standards across all content areas **a.** TOAs to support site implementation **b.** Provide writing training to support CCSS Writing Genre standards **c.** TOA Training to support implementation **d.** Summer Prep and Implementation Planning **e.** Design district-wide writing benchmarks which include calibration, assessment rubrics to monitor student progress, and resources to provide meaningful feedback to students for revision and editing	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $1,250,000 LCFF** 1100 ($1.0 million), 3000 ($250,000) **b. $286,000 LCFF** 1100 ($120,000); 3000 ($40,000); 5200 $126,000 **c. $15,000 LCFF** 5800 **d. $30,000 LCFF** 1100 ($26,000), 3000 ($4,000) **e. $25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($21,000), 3000 ($4,000)

LCAP Year 3: 2018 -2019

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:

1. Proficiency rate on District ELA and Math common assessments will increase by 1%

Local Metric: Student Proficiency Rates on District Common Assessments

2015-16 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)			
K-3	ELA	74% Meet/Exceed	Target 76%
K-3	Math	69% Meet/Exceed	Target 71%
Gr 4-5	ELA	41% Meet/Exceed	Target 43%
Gr 4-5	Math	45% Meet/Exceed	Target 47%
Gr 6-8	ELA	55% Meet/Exceed	Target 57%
Gr 6-8	Math	49% Meet/Exceed	Target 51%
Gr 9-12	ELA	60% Meet/Exceed	Target 62%
Gr 9-12	Math	74% Meet/Exceed	Target 76%

2. Proficiency rate on District reading benchmarks will increase by 2% for students grades 1-3

Local Metric: Student Proficiency Rates on District Reading Benchmarks

- Grade Level Equivalency Rate 2015-16 is 66.55%
- Target 70.55%

3. Student proficiency on state assessments (SBAC, CELDT, CAHSEE) will increase overall by 1%

State Metrics: Performance on standardized tests:

- SBAC:
  - Baseline established with the released scores: 2014-15 SBAC ELA 53% of Students Exceed or Meet Standard
  - Baseline established with the released scored: 2014-15 SBAC Math 40% of Students Exceed or Meet Standard
  - Target ELA 55% and Target Mat 42%
- CELDT:
  - Decrease in 2015-16 46% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced
  - Target 50%
- Reclassification:
  - 2015-16 15% of students reclassified
  - Target 17%

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
3.1 Provide extensive professional development around the new state standards including math and ELA Common Core curriculum and pedagogy **Math Academy** **a.** 3 days of training for *all continuing* K-11 teachers to extend learning on CCSS math **b.** 5 days of training for all teachers *new* to the district	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $40,000 LCFF** 1100 ($17,000), 3000 ($3,000), 5800 ($20,000) **b. $25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($12,000), 3000 ($3000), 5800 ($10,000) **c. $100,000 LCFF** 1100

c. Site-based Guided Collaboration Days **d.** Additional afterschool Instructional Strategy Training hourly pay for training **e.** Materials & supplies **Reading Academy** **f.** 3 days of ongoing reading collaboration for *all* teachers in grades K-3 **g.** 5 days Reading Academy training for *new K-3* **h.** Training materials			($70,000), 3000 ($20,000), 4300 ($10,000) **d.** **$15,000 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **e.** **$10,000 LCFF** 4300 **f.** **$80,000 LCFF** 1100 ($50,000), 3000 ($20,000), 4300 ($15,000) **g.** **$25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($12,000), 3000 ($3000), 5800 ($10000) **h.** **$10,000 LCFF** 4300
3.2 Increase onsite support for Math and ELA teachers K-12 **a.** 15 Math and Reading Coaches **b.** PD TOA to facilitate custom professional learning opportunities district-wide **c.** TOA Training **d.** Materials, supplies for TOA Professional Development **e.** Site Licenses **f.** TOA 10 Summer Days Prep	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$1,770,012 LCFF** 1900 ($1,430,012), 3000 ($340,000) **b.** **$94,988 LCFF** 1100 ($69,988), 3000 ($25,000) **c.** **$30,000 LCFF** 5800 **d.** **$18,000 LCFF** 5800 **e.** **$40,000 LCFF** 5800 **f.** **$50,000 LCFF** 1100 ($40,000), 3000 ($10,000)
3.3 Develop/provide reading intervention at all elementary school sites to increase student proficiency **a.** District-wide reading assessment tool to monitor student progress and identify student needs for extra support **b.** Purchase supplemental reading intervention curriculum K-5 to increase effectively assess and guide reading instruction to increase student proficiency in reading and language arts **c.** Intervention Support Personnel	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$115,000 LCFF** 5800 **b.** **$20,000 LCFF** 5800 **c.** **$47,000 LCFF** 1100 ($29,000), 2400 ($8,000), 3000 ($10,000)
3.4 Implementation of state standards including the Common Core **a.** Teacher training on adopted high school ELA curriculum (My Perspectives) **b.** TOA & Admin training on adopted high school ELA curriculum (My Perspectives) **c.** ELA Scope & Sequence Development & teacher Collaboration **d.** On-site support for ELA teachers for implementation of new curriculum (3 FTE) **e.** Next Generation Science Standards Training and	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$51,000 LCFF** 1100 ($21,600), 3000 ($3,469), 5800 ($25,931) **b.** **$13,000 LCFF**1100 ($11,200); 3000 ($1,800) **c.** **$20,000 LCFF**1100 ($17,200), 3000 ($2,800) **d.** **$310,000 LCFF** 1100 (230,000); 3000 ($80,000) **e.** **$59,000 LCFF** 1100 ($22,000); 3000 ($7000),

Collaboration			5800 ($30,000)
3.5 Develop comprehensive Writing Program K-12 at all school sites to increase student proficiency in CCSS Genres and Literacy Standards across all content areas **a.** TOAs to support site implementation **b.** Provide writing training to support CCSS Writing Genre standards **c.** TOA Training to support implementation **d.** Summer Prep and Implementation Planning **e.** Design district-wide writing benchmarks which include calibration, assessment rubrics to monitor student progress, and resources to provide meaningful feedback to students for revision /editing	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $1,250,000 LCFF** 1100 ($1,000,000), 3000 ($250,000) **b. $286,000 LCFF** 1100 ($120,000); 3000 ($40,000); 5200 $126,000 **c. $15,000 LCFF** 5800 **d. $30,000 LCFF** 1100 ($26,000), 3000 ($4,000) **e. $25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($21,000), 3000 ($4,000)

GOAL: 4	**Increase the number of students successfully ready for college and career.**	**Related State and/or Local Priorities:** 1__ 2__ 3__ 4_X_ 5__ 6__ 7_X_ 8__ COE only: 9__ 10__ Local : Specify _____

Identified Need :	**1.** An analysis of student data confirms that enrollment and success in Advanced Placement coursework increases as students engage with strategies promoted in the AVID Program. **2.** In order to prepare all students for college and career, there is a continuing need to expand Programs of Study (CTE) across all high schools in RUSD. **3.** To promote the new focus on College and Career Readiness, RUSD must ensure that all students or student groups have equitable access to or success in rigorous and broad coursework. Analysis of data indicates that some students and student groups have not completed a course sequence that prepare them for college and career, or have not participated fully in enhanced, enriched, or advanced learning opportunities.
Goal Applies to:	Schools: All District High Schools Applicable Pupil Subgroups: All

LCAP Year 1: 2016-17

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. AVID program enrollment will increase by 2%** Local metric: Student Enrollment Rates within the AVID Program • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 with 523 students enrolled • 2014-15 620 students enrolled (18.5% increase) • 2015-16 710 students enrolled (14.5% increase) **2. AVID student state and district assessment data will increase by 2%** Local metric: AVID student achievement scores on state and district assessments • 2014-15 ELA District Common Assessment 41% Proficient • 2014-15 Math District Common Assessment 30% Proficient • 2015-16 ELA District Common Assessment 63% Exceed or Met Standard

- 2016-16 Math District Common Assessment 44% Exceed or Met Standard
- SBAC ELA 59.3% Exceed or Meet Standard
- SBAC Math 40.05% Exceed or Meet Standard

3. AVID AP course enrollment will increase by 1%.

Local metric: AVID AP course enrollment

- Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 with 23% of AVID students enrolled in AP
- 2014-15 Increase to 25% of AVID students enrolled in AP
- 2015-16 Decrease to 24% of AVID students enrolled in AP

4. AVID student-tutor ratio will match the AVID program requirements

Local metric: AVID tutor hours

- Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 with 2713 Tutor Hours
- 2014-15 increase to 5245 Tutor Hours
- 2015-16 increase to 7043 Tutor Hours

5. AVID student A-G course completion rate will increase by 2%

Local metric: AVID student A-G course completion rate

- Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 with 100% of AVID ca-g course completion rate
- 2014-15 Maintain 100% of AVID ca-g course completion rate
- 2015-16 Maintain 100% of AVID ca-g course completion rate

6. 80% of targeted teachers will complete AVID engagement strategy training

Local metric: Percent of teachers who have completed AVID training

- 2014-15 94% of Social Science Teachers have completed AVID Strategy Training
- 2015-16 Maintain 91% Science Teachers have completed AVID Strategy Training

7. Student registration for CTE/ROP courses will increase by 1%

State metric: Percent of students completing CTE Programs of Study

- 2014-15 32% of students have completed CTE course of study
- 2015-16 Decrease to 18% of students have completed CTE course of study

8. Student opportunity to pursue one Program of Study (CTE) baseline data will be established

State metric: Percent of students enrolled CTE Programs of Study

- 2014-15 32.91% of students have enrolled in CTE course of study
- 2015-16 Increase to 33.48% of students have enrolled in CTE course of study

9. Share of students that pass Advanced Placement exams with 3 or higher will increase by 1%

State metric: Percent of students Passing Advanced Placement Tests

- Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2012-13 with 78%
- Decrease in 2013-14 70%
- Maintain 2014-15 70% Target 71%

10. Percentage of students that are Ready for College based upon EAP exams will increase by 1%

State metric: EAP Test Results

- Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013 with ELA 87.4% and Math 63.9%
- Target Met in 2014 with increase in ELA 89.1% and increase in Math 65.6%
- Target reported as Participation Rate in 2015

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
4.1 Provide training and collaboration time to establish equitable AVID programs at all high schools and middle schools **a.** Summer institute & Site Team Conference Training Expenses Substitutes, daily stipends for summer training, hourly pay for non-contract day training **b.** Membership fees to AVID Consortium **c.** 3 FTE (1 for each comprehensive HS) to coordinate program and teach 4 AVID electives **d.** Provide AVID tutoring and support at all high schools and middle schools **e.** Provide 3 extra periods for four middle schools to offer AVID classes **f.** AVID Library for Beattie & Cope **g.** Instructional Support Materials **h.** Extra Period at Orangewood	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$137,000 LCFF** 5200 **b.** **$18,000 LCFF** 5300 **c.** **$350,000 –LCFF** 1100 ($268,396), 3000 ($81,604) **d.** **$85,000 -LCFF** 2900 ($74,824), 3000 ($10,176) **e.** **$250,000 LCFF** 1100 ($188,906), 3000 ($61,094) **f.** **$200,000 LCFF** 4400 **g.** **$12,000 LCFF** 4300 **h.** **$8,000 LCFF** 1100 ($6,500), 3000 ($1,500)
4.2 Provide CCSS aligned AVID strategy training for all high school teachers **a.** Training for Middle School Social Science teachers, teachers, Secondary Elective teachers **b.** Substitutes and/or hourly pay for non-contract day training	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$150,000 LCFF** 5800 **b.** **$39,000 LCFF** 1100 ($32,000), 3000 ($7,000)
4.3 Develop Program of Study (CTE) for each comprehensive high school **a.** Provide a stipend for Program Coordinator (lead teacher) at each high school **b.** Program Administrative Support **c.** Purchase needed materials and supplies for each Program of Study at all high schools **d.** Increase Program of Study course sections at high schools **e.** Subs for site visits with Program of Study team (PD) **f.** Purchase Equipment for Program of Study Courses **g.** Establish industry connections to support Programs of Study **h.** Continue CRYOP coordination/ partnership **i.** Provide for coherent enhanced/extended learning	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$15,000 LCFF** 1100 ($12,000), 3000 ($3,000) **b.** **$150,000 LCFF** 1100 ($120,000), 3000 ($30,000) **c.** **$685,000 LCFF** 4300 ($85,000), 4400 ($300,000), 6400 ($300,000) **d.** **$615,000 LCFF** 1100 ($245,000), 3000 ($65,000), 4300 ($105,000), 4400 ($200,000) **e.** **$5,000 LCFF** 1100

opportunities including Industry Sector Competitions			($4000), 3000 ($1000) **f. $700,000 LCFF** 4400 **g./h.** No Cost **i. $50,000 LCFF** 4300 ($10,000), 5200 ($30,000), 5800 ($10,000)
4.4 Strengthen College Readiness program through additional actions and services to increase course access and use of industry standard equipment and materials **a.** Provide Advanced Placement and Program of Study Courses through Telepresence courses linked to all high schools (2 FTE) **b.** Ensure site access to courses provided on Telepresence through equipment upgrade **c.** Offer Dual Enrollment Program through partnerships with Community College District **d.** Personnel support for Dual Enrollment Program **e.** Provide funding for AP Testing **f.** Provide funding for SAT Testing **g.** Establish Guarantee Enrollment Agreement with California State University **h.** Provide updated instructional materials for AP courses	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $197,600 LCFF** 1100 ($150,300), 3000 ($47,300) **b. $400,000 LCFF** 4300 **c. $340,000 LCFF** 5800 **d. $52,400 LCFF** 2200 ($40,400), 3000 ($12,000) **e. $550,000 LCFF** 4300 ($250,000), 5800 ($300,000) **f. $160,000 LCFF** 4400 ($100,000), 5800 ($60,000) **g. $10,000 LCFF** 5800 **h. $300,000 LCFF** 4200 ($200,000), 4400 ($100,000)

LCAP Year 2: 2017 - 2018

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. AVID program enrollment will increase by 2%** Local metric: Student Enrollment Rates within the AVID Program • 2015-16 710 students enrolled (14.5% increase) • Target 17.5% increase **2. AVID student state and district assessment data will increase by 2%** Local metric: AVID student achievement scores on state and district assessments • 2015-16 ELA District Common Assessment 63% Exceed or Met Standard Target 65% • 2016-16 Math District Common Assessment 44% Exceed or Met Standard Target 45% • SBAC ELA 59.3% Exceed or Meet Standard Target 61% • SBAC Math 40.05% Exceed or Meet Standard Target 41% **3. AVID AP course enrollment will increase by 1%.** Local metric: AVID AP course enrollment • 2015-16 Decrease to 24% of AVID students enrolled in AP • Target Increase to 25% of AVID students enroll in AP **4. AVID student-tutor ratio will match the AVID program requirements** Local metric: AVID tutor hours • 2015-16 increase to 7043 Tutor Hours

	5. AVID student A-G course completion rate will increase by 2% Local metric: AVID student A-G course completion rate • Target Maintain 100% **6. 80% of targeted teachers will complete AVID engagement strategy training** Local metric: Percent of teachers who have completed AVID training • Target Maintain 90% **7. Student registration for CTE/ROP courses will increase by 1%** State metric: Percent of students completing CTE Programs of Study • Target Increase to 33% of students will complete CTE course of study **8. Student opportunity to pursue one Program of Study (CTE) baseline data will be established** State metric: Percent of students enrolled CTE Programs of Study • 2015-16 Increase to 33.48% of students have enrolled in CTE course of study **9. Share of students that pass Advanced Placement exams with 3 or higher will increase by 1%** • 2014-15 70% Target 72% **10. Percentage of students that are Ready for College based upon EAP exams will increase by 1%** State metric: EAP Test Results • Target set for 2016 in ELA 90.1% and increase in Math 66.6%

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
4.1 Provide training and collaboration time to establish equitable AVID programs at all high schools and middle schools **a.** Summer institute & Site Team Conference Training Expenses Substitutes, daily stipends for summer training, hourly pay for non-contract day training **b.** Membership fees to AVID Consortium **c.** 3 FTE (1 for each comprehensive HS) to coordinate program and teach 4 AVID electives **d.** Provide AVID tutoring and support at all high schools and middle schools **e.** Provide 3 extra periods for four middle schools to offer AVID classes **f.** Instructional Support Materials **g.** Extra Period at Orangewood	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $137,000 LCFF** 5200 **b. $32,000 LCFF** 5300 **c. $350,000 –LCFF** 1100 ($268,396), 3000 ($81,604) **d. $85,000 -LCFF** 2900 ($74,824), 3000 ($10,176) **e. $250,000 LCFF** 1100 ($188,906), 3000 ($61,094) **f. $12,000 LCFF** 4400 **g. $8,000 LCFF** 1100 ($6,500), 3000 ($1,500)
4.2 Provide CCSS aligned AVID strategy training for all high school teachers **a.** Training for Secondary teachers **b.** Substitutes and/or hourly pay for non-contract day training	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $150,000 LCFF** 5800 **b. $39,000 LCFF** 1100 ($32,000), 3000 ($7,000)

4.3 Develop Program of Study (CTE) for each comprehensive high school **a.** Provide a stipend for Program Coordinator (lead teacher) at each high school **b.** Program Administrative Support **c.** Purchase needed materials and supplies for each Program of Study at all high schools **d.** Increase Program of Study course sections at high schools **e.** Subs for site visits with Program of Study team (PD) **f.** Purchase Equipment for Program of Study Courses **g.** Establish industry connections to support Programs of Study **h.** Continue CRYOP coordination/ partnership **i.** Provide for coherent enhanced/extended learning opportunities including Industry Sector Competitions	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $15,000 LCFF** 1100 ($12,000), 3000 ($3,000) **b. $150,000 LCFF** 1100 ($120,000), 3000 ($30,000) **c. $685,000 LCFF** 4300 ($85,000), 4400 ($300,000), 6400 ($300,000) **d. $615,000 LCFF** 1100 ($245,000), 3000 ($65,000), 4300 ($105,000), 4400 ($200,000) **e. $5,000 LCFF** 1100 ($4000), 3000 ($1000) **f. $700,000 LCFF** 4400 **g./h. No Cost** **i. $50,000 LCFF** 4300 ($10,000), 5200 ($30,000), 5800 ($10,000)
4.4 Strengthen College Readiness program through additional actions and services to increase course access and use of industry standard equipment and materials **a.** Provide Advanced Placement and Program of Study Courses through Telepresence courses linked to all high schools (2 FTE) **b.** Ensure site access to courses provided on Telepresence through equipment upgrade **c.** Offer Dual Enrollment Program through partnerships with Community College District **d.** Personnel support for Dual Enrollment Program **e.** Provide funding for AP Testing **f.** Provide funding for SAT Testing **g.** Establish Guarantee Enrollment Agreement with California State University **h.** Provide updated instructional materials for AP courses	All	_X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $197,600 LCFF** 1100 ($150,300), 3000 ($47,300) **b. $400,000 LCFF** 4300 **c. $340,000 LCFF** 5800 **d. $52,400 LCFF** 2200 ($40,400), 3000 ($12,000) **e. $550,000 LCFF** 4300 ($250,000), 5800 ($300,000) **f. $160,000 LCFF** 4400 ($100,000), 5800 ($60,000) **g. $10,000 LCFF** 5800 **h. $300,000 LCFF** 4200 ($200,000), 4400 ($100,000)

LCAP Year 3: 2018 - 2019	
Expected Annual Measurable	**1. AVID program enrollment will increase by 2%** Local metric: Student Enrollment Rates within the AVID Program

Outcomes:	• 2015-16 710 students enrolled (14.5% increase) • Target 19.5% increase **2. AVID student state and district assessment data will increase by 2%** Local metric: AVID student achievement scores on state and district assessments • 2015-16 ELA District Common Assessment 63% Exceed or Met Standard Target 67% • 2016-16 Math District Common Assessment 44% Exceed or Met Standard Target 47% • SBAC ELA 59.3% Exceed or Meet Standard Target 63% • SBAC Math 40.05% Exceed or Meet Standard Target 43% **3. AVID AP course enrollment will increase by 1%.** Local metric: AVID AP course enrollment • 2015-16 Decrease to 24% of AVID students enrolled in AP • Target Increase to 26% of AVID students enroll in AP **4. AVID student-tutor ratio will match the AVID program requirements** Local metric: AVID tutor hours • 2015-16 increase to 7043 Tutor Hours **5. AVID student A-G course completion rate will increase by 2%** Local metric: AVID student A-G course completion rate • Target Maintain 100% **6. 80% of targeted teachers will complete AVID engagement strategy training** Local metric: Percent of teachers who have completed AVID training • Target Maintain 90% **7. Student registration for CTE/ROP courses will increase by 1%** State metric: Percent of students completing CTE Programs of Study • Target Increase to 34% of students will complete CTE course of study **8. Student opportunity to pursue one Program of Study (CTE) baseline data will be established** State metric: Percent of students enrolled CTE Programs of Study • 2015-16 Increase to 33.48% of students have enrolled in CTE course of study **9. Share of students that pass Advanced Placement exams with 3 or higher will increase by 1%** • 2014-15 70% Target 73% **10. Percentage of students that are Ready for College based upon EAP exams will increase by 2%** State metric: EAP Test Results Target set for 2016 in ELA 92.1% and increase in Math 67.6%

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
4.1 Provide training and collaboration time to establish equitable AVID programs at all high schools and middle schools **a.** Summer institute & Site Team Conference Training Expenses Substitutes, daily stipends for summer	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other	**a. $137,000 LCFF** 5200 **b. $32,000 LCFF** 5300 **c. $350,000 –LCFF** 1100 ($268,396), 3000 ($81,604)

training, hourly pay for non-contract day training **b.** Membership fees to AVID Consortium **c.** 3 FTE (1 for each comprehensive HS) to coordinate program and teach 4 AVID electives **d.** Provide AVID tutoring and support at all high schools and middle schools **e.** Provide 3 extra periods for four middle schools to offer AVID classes **f.** Instructional Support Materials **g.** Extra Period at Orangewood		Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**d.** **$85,000 -LCFF** 2900 ($74,824), 3000 ($10,176) **e.** **$250,000 LCFF** 1100 ($188,906), 3000 ($61,094) **f.** **$12,000 LCFF** 4400 **g.** **$8,000 LCFF** 1100 ($6,500), 3000 ($1,500)
4.2 Provide CCSS aligned AVID strategy training for all high school teachers **a.** Training for Secondary teachers **b.** Substitutes and/or hourly pay for non-contract day training	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$150,000 LCFF** 5800 **b.** **$39,000 LCFF** 1100 ($32,000), 3000 ($7,000)
4.3 Develop Program of Study (CTE) for each comprehensive high school **a.** Provide a stipend for Program Coordinator (lead teacher) at each high school **b.** Program Administrative Support **c.** Purchase needed materials and supplies for each Program of Study at all high schools **d.** Increase Program of Study course sections at high schools **e.** Subs for site visits with Program of Study team (PD) **f.** Purchase Equipment for Program of Study Courses **g.** Establish industry connections to support Programs of Study **h.** Continue CRYOP coordination/ partnership **i.** Provide for coherent enhanced/extended learning opportunities including Industry Sector Competitions	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$15,000 LCFF** 1100 ($12,000), 3000 ($3,000) **b.** **$150,000 LCFF** 1100 ($120,000), 3000 ($30,000) **c.** **$120,000 LCFF** 4300 **d.** **$615,000 LCFF** 1100 ($245,000), 3000 ($65,000), 4300 ($105,000), 4400 ($200,000) **e.** **$5,000 LCFF** 1100 ($4000), 3000 ($1000) **f.** **$682,000 LCFF** 4400 **g./h. No Cost** **i.** **$15,000 LCFF** 4400
4.4 Strengthen College Readiness program through additional actions and services to increase course access and use of industry standard equipment and materials **a.** Provide Advanced Placement and Program of Study Courses through Telepresence courses linked to all high schools (2 FTE) **b.** Ensure site access to courses provided on	All	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a.** **$197,600 LCFF** 1100 ($150,300), 3000 ($47,300) **b.** **$400,000 LCFF** 4300 **c.** **$340,000 LCFF** 5800 **d.** **$52,400 LCFF** 2200 ($40,400), 3000

Telepresence through equipment upgrade **c.** Offer Dual Enrollment Program through partnerships with Community College District **d.** Personnel support for Dual Enrollment Program **e.** Provide funding for AP Testing **f.** Provide funding for SAT Testing **g.** Establish Guarantee Enrollment Agreement with California State University **h.** Provide updated instructional materials for AP courses			($12,000) **e.** **$550,000 LCFF** 4300 ($250,000), 5800 ($300,000) **f.** **$160,000 LCFF** 4400 ($100,000), 5800 ($60,000) **g.** **$10,000 LCFF** 5800 **h.** **$300,000 LCFF** 4200 ($200,000), 4400 ($100,000)

GOAL: 5	**Close the achievement gap for underperforming subgroups.**	**Related State and/or Local Priorities:** 1__ 2_X_ 3__ 4_X_ 5_X_ 6__ 7__ 8_X_ COE only: 9__ 10__ Local : Specify _____

Identified Need:

1. Based upon the data for Redlands Unified School District, the trend has shown a gap in the high school graduation rates of students from diverse populations.
2. While RUSD has achieved AMAO 1, 2a, & 2b for English Learners (EL) for the past five years, ELs continue to require support to reach proficiency on state and district exams. AMAO 3 data shows a continual need
3. All students, including English Learners, Foster Youth, and low-income students demonstrate significant needs for support to increase regular school attendance and improved academic outcomes.

Goal Applies to:

Schools: LEA-wide

Applicable Pupil Subgroups: EL, LI, FY, RFEP

LCAP Year 1: 2016 -2017

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:

1. **Proficiency rate on district and state assessments in math and English will increase by 2% for English Learners and Limited income students**

State metric: Share of English Learners that become English Proficient/EL Reclassification Rates

State Proficiency Rate

- 2015-16 62% -- Decrease 2% from Baseline on State Proficiency rate
- 2016-17 Target 64%

Reclassification Rate

- 2015-16 15% -- Increase 2% on State Reclassification rate
- 2016-17 Target 17%

2. **Proficiency rates on the final district common assessments in math and English will increase by 1% for English Learners, Low-Income, and Foster Youth**

State metric: Target subgroup students will increase academic proficiency rates on state assessments

Subgroup SBAC Data				
2014-15	SBAC ELA	English Learners	Meet/Exceeds 17%	Target 18%
2014-15	SBAC ELA	Low Income	Meet/Exceeds 41%	Target 42%
2014-15	SBAC ELA	Foster Youth	Meet/Exceeds 53%	Target 54%
2014-15	SBAC Math	English Learners	Meet/Exceeds 15%	Target 16%

2014-15	SBAC Math	Low Income	Meet/Exceeds 15%	Target 30%
2014-15	SBAC Math	Foster Youth	Meet/Exceeds 18%	Target 19%

Local metric: Target subgroup students will increase academic proficiency rates on district and state assessments

2015 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)		
EL	ELA	2% Advanced/Proficient
EL	Math	12% Advanced/Proficient
Low Income	ELA	16% Advanced/Proficient
Low Income	Math	19% Advanced/Proficient
Foster Youth	ELA	18% Advanced/Proficient
Foster Youth	Math	22% Advanced/Proficient

2016 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)		
EL	ELA	28% Meets/Exceeds
EL	Math	25% Meets/Exceeds
Low Income	ELA	48% Meets/Exceeds
Low Income	Math	41% Meets/Exceeds
Foster Youth	ELA	22% Meets/Exceeds
Foster Youth	Math	24% Meets/Exceeds

3. All Middle School English Learners will receive daily ELD instruction aligned to CCSS and the new ELD/ELA Frameworks

Local metric: All Middle School English Learners will receive ELA/ELD aligned instruction

- 2014-15 Levels 1-3 100%
- 2014-15 Levels 4-5 98%

4. 100% of Foster Youth will receive support services from Academic Case Carriers

Local metric: Foster Youth attendance rates and grades

- 2014-15 Implementation Year Foster Youth Identified/Assigned through Analytic`

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
5.1 Provide teacher training on strategies specific to subgroup success **a.** Provide optional three (3) days of training in "Strategies for success," training to target the needs of students in low income and foster youth subgroups **b.** Substitute costs **c.** Training of Trainers program development **d.** Training materials **e.** Outside Training (e.g. QTEL)	All Students grades TK-12	__ALL OR: _X_Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $63,000 LCFF** 5200 **b. $98,000-LCFF** 1100 ($84,417), 3000 ($13,583) **c. $10,000-LCFF** 1100 ($8,614), 3000 ($1,386) **d. $10,000LCFF** 4300 **e. $50,000 LCFF** 5200
5.2 Increase EL teacher staffing at all middle schools to	All Middle	__ALL	**a. $420,000 LCFF** 1100

provide coordinated ELA/ELD instruction aligned to adopted CCSS Core materials **a.** Provide (4) ELA FTE one (1) to each middle school. **b.** Collaboration, including subs/hourly pay **c.** ELA/ELD Leadership Team Meetings	School Students	OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	($318,468), 3000 ($101,532) **b. $2,500 LCFF** 1100 ($2,154), 3000 ($346) **c. $6,700** 1100 ($2,000), 3000 ($1,200); 4200 ($3,500)
5.3 Increase EL translation services **a.** Bilingual stipend for translation by existing staff **b.** Language Line to be purchased and available to all school sites **c.** Hourly compensation for EL translators	All students grades TK-12	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($9,500), 2400 ($11,000), 3000 ($4,500) **b. $10,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $10,000 LCFF** 1100 ($3,750), 2400 ($4,575), 3000 ($1,675)
5.4 Provide targeted instructional program to support long-term English Learners in grades 6-10 **a.** Purchase English 3D Program Instructional materials **b.** Utilize the School Improvement Coordinator to effectively manage the EL Program from the district level to ensure effective communication and translation services, parent training, and outreach	All Middle School & High School Students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $10,000- LCFF** 4300 **b. No Cost**
5.5 Provide additional services to increase monitoring and support of re-designated English Proficient pupils **a.** EL site coordinator stipend for support beyond the contract day providing mentoring and support services for grades 3-11 **b.** Increase collaboration time for EL teachers to provide quarterly meetings to review EL student progress and refine support for students **c.** Support a District Language Assessment Center for identification, reclassification, and progress monitoring **d.** Contract extra hours for support personnel to assist with the reclassification monitoring process	All Middle School & High School Students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($20,000), 3000 ($5,000) **b. $10,000 LCFF** 1100 ($7,500), 3000 ($2,500) **c. $170,000 LCFF** 2400 ($130,000), 3000 ($40,000) **d. $50,000 LCFF** 2900 ($46,000), 3000 ($4,000)
5.6 Update Policies and Data Infrastructure to Support	All High	__ALL	**a – b No cost will use**

Foster Youth **a.** Refine protocol for immediate enrollment and develop professional development for school office and administrative staff to implement the protocol **b.** Develop procedures for "Credit Capture" to ensure all Foster Youth receive proper partial credits **c.** Purchase data system to establish infrastructure to capture: attendance rates, credit completion rates, percent of students remaining at school of origin, GPA, suspensions for FY	School Students	OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners _X_Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**existing personnel and resources** **c. $11,000 LCFF** 5800
5.7 Coordinate Services to increase support to Foster Youth, and selected ELs and Low Income students, through Academic Case Carriers (ACCs) who provide targeted support beyond the scope of school counselors **a.** Personnel cost of Academic Case Carriers to provide support above and beyond the regular counselor for Foster Youth and selected at risk English Learners and Low Income students **b.** Program Coordinator **c.** Professional Development and collaboration **d.** Classified Support Staff **e.** Support materials and supplies **f.** Training **g.** Unanticipated related expenses **h.** Provide centralized counselor for at-risk youth focused on services for Foster Youth and Homeless students **i.** Support low income students with Tutoring and Academic Support **j.** Mileage	All High School Students	__ALL OR: _X_Low Income pupils _X_English Learners _X_Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	**a. $1,035,000 LCFF** 1200 ($840,000) 3000 ($195,000) **b. $140,000 LCFF** 1300 ($117,000), 3000 ($23,000) **c. $10,000 LCFF** 5200 **d. $142,000 LCFF** 1900 ($22,000), 2400 ($91,000), 2200 ($10,000), 3000 ($19,000) **e. $15,000 LCFF** 4300 **f. $10,000 LCFF** 5800 **g. $68,000 LCFF** 1200 ($21,900), 3000 ($32,000), 4300 ($5,000), 5800 ($9,100) **h. $110,000 LCFF** 1200 ($88,000), 3000 ($22,000) **i. $80,000 LCFF** 5800 **j. $12,000 LCFF** 5200

LCAP Year 2: 2017 -2018

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. Proficiency rate on district and state assessments in math and English will increase by 2% for English Learners and Limited income students** State metric: Share of English Learners that become English Proficient/EL Reclassification Rates

State Proficiency Rate

- 2015-16 64% -- Decrease 2% from Baseline on State Proficiency rate
- Target 64%

Reclassification Rate

- 2015-16 15% -- Increase 2% on State Reclassification rate
- Target 19%

2. Proficiency rates on the final district common assessments in math and English will increase by 1% for English Learners, Low-Income, and Foster Youth

State metric: Target subgroup students will increase academic proficiency rates on state assessments

Subgroup SBAC Data				
2014-15	SBAC ELA	English Learners	Meet/Exceeds 17%	Target 18%
2014-15	SBAC ELA	Low Income	Meet/Exceeds 41%	Target 42%
2014-15	SBAC ELA	Foster Youth	Meet/Exceeds 53%	Target 54%
2014-15	SBAC Math	English Learners	Meet/Exceeds 15%	Target 16%
2014-15	SBAC Math	Low Income	Meet/Exceeds 15%	Target 30%
2014-15	SBAC Math	Foster Youth	Meet/Exceeds 18%	Target 19%

Local metric: Target subgroup students will increase academic proficiency rates on district and state assessments

2016 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)			
EL	ELA	28% Meet/Exceeds	Target 29%
EL	Math	25% Meet/Exceeds	Target 26%
Low Income	ELA	48% Meet/Exceeds	Target 49%
Low Income	Math	41% Meet/Exceeds	Target 42%
Foster Youth	ELA	22% Meet/Exceeds	Target 23%
Foster Youth	Math	24% Meet/Exceeds	Target 25%

3. All Middle School English Learners will receive daily ELD instruction aligned to CCSS and the new ELD/ELA Frameworks

Local metric: All Middle School English Learners will receive ELA/ELD aligned instruction

- 2014-15 Levels 1-3 100%
- 2014-15 Levels 4-5 98%

4. 100% of Foster Youth will receive support services from Academic Case Carriers

Local metric: Foster Youth attendance rates and grades

- 2014-15 Implementation Year Foster Youth Identified/Assigned through Analytic

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
5.1 Provide teacher training on strategies specific to subgroup success **a.** Provide optional three (3) days of training in "Strategies for success," training to target the needs of students in low income and foster youth subgroups **b.** Substitute costs **c.** Training of Trainers program development **d.** Training materials	All students grades TK-12	__ALL OR: _X_Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups☹Specify)_____	**a. $63,000 LCFF** 5200 **b. $98,000-LCFF** 1100 ($85,000), 3000 ($15,000) **c. $10,000-LCFF** 1100 ($8,614), 3000 ($1,386) **d. $10,000LCFF** 4300 **e. $30,000 LCFF** 5200

e. Outside Training (e.g. QTEL)			
5.2 Increase EL teacher staffing at all middle schools to provide coordinated ELA/ELD instruction aligned to adopted CCSS Core materials **a.** Provide (4) ELA FTE one (1) to each middle school. **b.** Collaboration, including subs/hourly pay **c.** ELA/ELD Leadership Team Meetings	All Middle School Students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups Specify)_____	**a. $420,000 LCFF** 1100 ($318,468), 3000 ($101,532) **b. $2,500 LCFF** 1100 ($2,154), 3000 ($346) **c. $6,700** 1100 ($2,000), 3000 ($1,200); 4200 ($3,500)
5.3 Increase EL translation services **a.** Bilingual stipend for translation by existing staff **b.** Language Line to be purchased and available to all school sites **c.** Hourly compensation for EL translators	All students grades TK-12	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups Specify)_____	**a. $25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($9,500), 2400 ($11,000), 3000 ($4,500) **b. $10,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $10,000 LCFF** 1100 ($3,750), 2400 ($4,575), 3000 ($1,675)
5.4 Provide targeted instructional program to support long-term English Learners in grades 6-10 **a.** Purchase English 3D Program Instructional materials **b.** Utilize the School Improvement Coordinator to effectively manage the EL Program from the district level to ensure effective communication and translation services, parent training, and outreach	All Middle School & High School students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups Specify)_____	**a. $6,700 LCFF** 4300 **b.** No Cost
5.5 Provide additional services to increase monitoring and support of re-designated English Proficient pupils **a.** EL site coordinator stipend for support beyond the contract day providing mentoring and support services for grades 3-11 **b.** Increase collaboration time for EL teachers to provide quarterly meetings to review EL student progress and refine support for students **c.** Support a District Language Assessment Center for identification, reclassification, and progress monitoring **d.** Contract extra hours for support personnel to assist with the reclassification monitoring process	All Middle School & High School students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups Specify)_____	**a. $25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($20,000), 3000 ($5,000) **b. $10,000 LCFF** 1100 ($7,500), 3000 ($2,500) **c. $170,000 LCFF** 2400 ($130,000), 3000 ($40,000) **d. $50,000 LCFF** 2900 ($46,000), 3000 ($4,000)
5.6 Update Policies and Data Infrastructure to Support Foster Youth **a.** Refine protocol for immediate enrollment and develop professional development for school office and administrative staff to implement the	All High School students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils ___English Learners _X_Foster Youth	**a – b No cost will use existing personnel and resources** **c. $11,000 LCFF** 5800

protocol **b.** Develop procedures for "Credit Capture" to ensure all Foster Youth receive proper partial credits **c.** Purchase data system to establish infrastructure to capture: attendance rates, credit completion rates, percent of students remaining at school of origin, GPA, suspensions for FY		___Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups Specify)_____	
5.7 Coordinate Services to increase support to Foster Youth, and selected ELs and Low Income students, through Academic Case Carriers (ACCs) who provide targeted support beyond the scope of school counselors **a.** Personnel cost of Academic Case Carriers to provide support above and beyond the regular counselor for Foster Youth and selected at risk English Learners and Low Income students **b.** Program Coordinator **c.** Professional Development and collaboration **d.** Classified Support Staff **e.** Support materials and supplies **f.** Conferences and PD **g.** Unanticipated related expenses **h.** Provide centralized counselor for at-risk youth focused on services for Foster Youth and Homeless students **i.** Support low income students with Tutoring and Academic Support **j.** Mileage	All High School students	__ALL OR: _X_Low Income pupils _X__English Learners _X_Foster Youth ___Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups Specify)_____	**a. $1,035,000 LCFF** 1200 ($840,000) 3000 ($195,000) **b. $140,000 LCFF** 1300 ($117,000), 3000 ($23,000) **c. $10,000 LCFF** 5200 **d. $142,000 LCFF** 1900 ($22,000), 2400 ($91,000), 2200 ($10,000), 3000 ($19,000) **e. $15,000 LCFF** 4300 **f. $10,000 LCFF** 5800 **g. $68,000 LCFF** 1200 ($21,900), 3000 ($32,000), 4300 ($5,000), 5800 ($9,100) **h. $110,000 LCFF** 1200 ($88,000), 3000 ($22,000) **i. $80,000 LCFF** 5800 **j. $12,000 LCFF** 5200

LCAP Year 3: 2018 -2019

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. Proficiency rate on district and state assessments in math and English will increase by 2% for English Learners and Limited income students** State metric: Share of English Learners that become English Proficient/EL Reclassification Rates State Proficiency Rate • 2015-16 62% -- Decrease 2% from Baseline on State Proficiency rate • Target 66% Reclassification Rate • 2015-16 15% -- Increase 2% on State Reclassification rate • Target 19% **2. Proficiency rates on the final district common assessments in math and English will increase by 1% for English Learners, Low-Income, and Foster Youth** State metric: Target subgroup students will increase academic proficiency rates on state assessments **Subgroup SBAC Data**

2014-15	SBAC ELA	English Learners	Meet/Exceeds 17%	Target 19%
2014-15	SBAC ELA	Low Income	Meet/Exceeds 41%	Target 43%
2014-15	SBAC ELA	Foster Youth	Meet/Exceeds 53%	Target 55%
2014-15	SBAC Math	English Learners	Meet/Exceeds 15%	Target 17%
2014-15	SBAC Math	Low Income	Meet/Exceeds 15%	Target 31%
2014-15	SBAC Math	Foster Youth	Meet/Exceeds 18%	Target 20%

Local metric: Target subgroup students will increase academic proficiency rates on district and state assessments

2016 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)			
EL	ELA	28% Meet/Exceeds	Target 30%
EL	Math	25% Meet/Exceeds	Target 27%
Low Income	ELA	48% Meet/Exceeds	Target 50%
Low Income	Math	41% Meet/Exceeds	Target 43%
Foster Youth	ELA	22% Meet/Exceeds	Target 24%
Foster Youth	Math	24% Meet/Exceeds	Target 26%

All Middle School English Learners will receive daily ELD instruction aligned to CCSS and the new ELD/ELA Frameworks
Local metric: All Middle School English Learners will receive ELA/ELD aligned instruction

- 2014-15 Levels 1-3 100%
- 2014-15 Levels 4-5 98%

3. 100% of Foster Youth will receive support services from Academic Case Carriers
Local metric: Foster Youth attendance rates and grades

- 2014-15 Implementation Year Foster Youth Identified/Assigned through Analytic

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
5.1 Provide teacher training on strategies specific to subgroup success **a.** Provide optional three (3) days of training in "Strategies for success," training to target the needs of students in low income and foster youth subgroups **b.** Substitute costs **c.** Training of Trainers program development **d.** Training materials **e.** Outside Training (e.g. QTEL)	All students grades TK-12	__ALL OR: _X_Low Income pupils _X_English Learners _X_Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups: (Specify)_____	**a. $63,000 LCFF** 5200 **b. $98,000-LCFF** 1100 ($85,000), 3000 ($15,000) **c. $10,000-LCFF** 1100 ($8,614), 3000 ($1,386) **d. $10,000LCFF** 4300 **e. $30,000 LCFF** 5200
5.2 Increase EL teacher staffing at all middle schools to provide coordinated ELA/ELD instruction aligned to adopted CCSS Core materials **a.** Provide (4) ELA FTE one (1) to each middle school. **b.** Collaboration, including subs/hourly pay **c.** ELA/ELD Leadership Team Meetings	All Middle School Students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups: (Specify)_____	**a. $420,000 LCFF** 1100 ($318,468), 3000 ($101,532) **b. $2,500 LCFF** 1100 ($2,154), 3000 ($346) **c. $6,700** 1100 ($2,000), 3000 ($1,200); 4200

			($3,500)
5.3 Increase EL translation services **a.** Bilingual stipend for translation by existing staff **b.** Language Line to be purchased and available to all school sites **c.** Hourly compensation for EL translators	All students grades TK-12	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups: (Specify)_____	**a. $25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($9,500), 2400 ($11,000), 3000 ($4,500) **b. $10,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $10,000 LCFF** 1100 ($3,750), 2400 ($4,575), 3000 ($1,675)
5.4 Provide targeted instructional program to support long-term English Learners in grades 6-10 **a.** Purchase English 3D Program Instructional materials **b.** Utilize the School Improvement Coordinator to effectively manage the EL Program from the district level to ensure effective communication and translation services, parent training, and outreach	All Middle School & High School students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups: (Specify)_____	**a. $6,700 LCFF** 4300 **b. No Cost**
5.5 Provide additional services to increase monitoring and support of re-designated English Proficient pupils **a.** EL site coordinator stipend for support beyond the contract day providing mentoring and support services for grades 3-11 **b.** Increase collaboration time for EL teachers to provide quarterly meetings to review EL student progress and refine support for students **c.** Support a District Language Assessment Center for identification, reclassification, and progress monitoring **d.** Contract extra hours for support personnel to assist with the reclassification monitoring process	All Middle School & High School students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups: (Specify)_____	**a. $25,000 LCFF** 1100 ($20,000), 3000 ($5,000) **b. $10,000 LCFF** 1100 ($7,500), 3000 ($2,500) **c. $170,000 LCFF** 2400 ($130,000), 3000 ($40,000) **d. $50,000 LCFF** 2900 ($46,000), 3000 ($4,000)
5.6 Update Policies and Data Infrastructure to Support Foster Youth **a.** Refine protocol for immediate enrollment and develop professional development for school office and administrative staff to implement the protocol **b.** Develop procedures for "Credit Capture" to ensure all Foster Youth receive proper partial credits **c.** Purchase data system to establish infrastructure to capture: attendance rates, credit completion rates, percent of students remaining at school of origin, GPA, suspensions for FY	All High School students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners _X_Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups: (Specify)_____	**a – b No cost will use existing personnel and resources** **c. $11,000 LCFF** 5800

5.7 Coordinate Services to increase support to Foster Youth, and selected ELs and Low Income students, through Academic Case Carriers (ACCs) who provide targeted support beyond the scope of school counselors **a.** Personnel cost of Academic Case Carriers to provide support above and beyond the regular counselor for Foster Youth and selected at risk English Learners and Low Income students **b.** Program Coordinator **c.** Professional Development and collaboration **d.** Classified Support Staff **e.** Support materials and supplies **f.** Conferences and PD **g.** Unanticipated related expenses **h.** Provide centralized counselor for at-risk youth focused on services for Foster Youth and Homeless students **i.** Support low income students with Tutoring and Academic Support **j.** Mileage	All High School students	__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners _X_Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups: (Specify)_____	**a. $1,035,000 LCFF** 1200 ($840,000) 3000 ($195,000) **b. $140,000 LCFF** 1300 ($117,000), 3000 ($23,000) **c. $10,000 LCFF** 5200 **d. $142,000 LCFF** 1900 ($22,000), 2400 ($91,000), 2200 ($10,000), 3000 ($19,000) **e. $15,000 LCFF** 4300 **f. $10,000 LCFF** 5800 **g. $68,000 LCFF** 1200 ($21,900), 3000 ($32,000), 4300 ($5,000), 5800 ($9,100) **h. $110,000 LCFF** 1200 ($88,000), 3000 ($22,000) **i. $80,000 LCFF** 5800 **j. $12,000 LCFF** 5200

Goal 6	**RUSD will increase the number of students passing math courses and enrolling in high level math courses.**	**Related State and/or Local Priorities:** 1__ 2__ 3__ 4_X_ 5__ 6__ 7__ 8_X_ COE only: 9__ 10__ Local : Specify _____

Identified Need:	**1.** Data collected from 8th grade math and Math I scores confirms the need to provide additional intervention support to improve academic outcomes for students. **2.** CAHSEE Passing rates for math confirm a continued need to support the success of RUSD students in math.
Goal Applies to:	Schools: LEA-wide Applicable Pupil Subgroups: All students grades 8-9

LCAP Year 1: 2016 -2017

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. State assessment results for participating students will increase by 1%** State metric: student performance on standardized tests • Middle School Program Participants SBAC Math Meet/Exceeds 15% (Grade 7 SBAC) • High School Program Participants SBAC Math Meet/Exceeds 4% (Grade 8 SBAC) **2. Student academic grades for participating students will demonstrate a positive upward trend** Local metric: grades for participating students • 11% Fewer D's/F's Middle School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 3% More A's Middle School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 9% Fewer D's/F's High School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades

	• 12% More A's High School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades **3. Proficiency rate on district common assessments in math will increase overall by 2% for participating students** Local metric: district assessment scores for participating students 2015 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year) • Middle School Small Class 5% Math Advanced/Proficient • High School Support Class 5% Math Advanced/Proficient 2016 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year) • Middle School Small Class Math 20% Meet/Exceeds • High School Support Class Math 25% Meet/Exceeds

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
6.1 Add support courses for mathematics at the secondary level **a.** Increase staffing to provide 4 Math FTEs, one (1) per middle school, focused on small, 8th grade math classes of 10-15 students per class **b.** Increase staffing to provide three (3) FTE for Math support parallel class, at each comprehensive high school **c.** Provide curriculum for Math Support Course **d.** Support training & Collaboration (Including Subs)	High Schools, Middle Schools	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups (Specify)_____	**a. $400,000 –LCFF** 1100 ($320,000), 3000 ($80,000) **b. $300,000 –LCFF** 1100 ($240,000), 3000 ($60,000) **c. $20,000 –LCFF** 4200 ($15,000), 5800 ($5,000) **d. $4,500 –LCFF** 1100 ($3,600), 3000 ($900)

LCAP Year 2: 2017 – 2018

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. State assessment results for participating students will increase by 1%** State metric: student performance on standardized tests • Middle School Program Participants SBAC Math Meet/Exceeds 15% (Grade 7 SBAC) • High School Program Participants SBAC Math Meet/Exceeds 4% (Grade 8 SBAC) **2. Student academic grades for participating students will demonstrate a positive upward trend** Local metric: grades for participating students • 11% Fewer D's/F's Middle School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 3% More A's Middle School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 9% Fewer D's/F's High School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 12% More A's High School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades **3. Proficiency rate on district common assessments in math will increase overall by 2% for participating students** Local metric: district assessment scores for participating students 2016 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year) • Middle School Small Class Math 20% Meet/Exceeds Target 22% • High School Support Class Math 25% Meet/Exceeds Target 26%

Actions/Services	Scope of	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures

	Service		
6.1 Add support courses for mathematics at the secondary level **a.** Increase staffing to provide 4 Math FTEs, one (1) per middle school, focused on small, 8th grade math classes of 10-15 students per class **b.** Increase staffing to provide three (3) FTE for Math support parallel class, at each comprehensive high school **c.** Provide curriculum for Math Support Course **d.** Support training & Collaboration (Including Subs)	High Schools, Middle Schools	_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups (Specify)_____	**a. $400,000 LCFF** 1100 ($320,000), 3000 ($80,000) **b. $300,000 –LCFF** 1100 ($240,000), 3000 ($60,000) **c. $20,000 –LCFF** 4200 ($15,000), 5800 ($5,000) **d. $4,500 –LCFF** 1100 ($3,600), 3000 ($900)

LCAP Year 3: 2018 -2019

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**a. State assessment results for participating students will increase by 1%** State metric: student performance on standardized tests • Middle School Program Participants SBAC Math Meet/Exceeds 15% (Grade 7 SBAC) • High School Program Participants SBAC Math Meet/Exceeds 4% (Grade 8 SBAC) **b. Student academic grades for participating students will demonstrate a positive upward trend** Local metric: grades for participating students • 11% Fewer D's/F's Middle School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 3% More A's Middle School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 9% Fewer D's/F's High School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 12% More A's High School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades **c. Proficiency rate on district common assessments in math will increase overall by 2% for participating students** Local metric: district assessment scores for participating students 2016 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year) • Middle School Small Class Math 20% Meet/Exceeds Target 24% • High School Support Class Math 25% Meet/Exceeds Target 28%

Actions/Services	Scope of Service	Pupils to be served within identified scope of service	Budgeted Expenditures
6.1 Add support courses for mathematics at the secondary level **a.** Increase staffing to provide 4 Math FTEs, one (1) per middle school, focused on small, 8th grade math classes of 10-15 students per class **b.** Increase staffing to provide three (3) FTE for Math support parallel class, at each comprehensive high school **c.** Provide curriculum for Math Support Course **d.** Support training & Collaboration (Including Subs)	High Schools, Middle Schools	_x_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups: (Specify)_____	**a. $400,000 –LCFF** 1100 ($320,000), 3000 ($80,000) **b. $300,000 –LCFF** 1100 ($240,000), 3000 ($60,000) **c. $20,000 –LCFF** 4200 ($15,000), 5800 ($5,000) **d. $4,500 –LCFF** 1100 ($3,600), 3000 ($900)

Annual Update

Annual Update Instructions: For each goal in the prior year LCAP, review the progress toward the expected annual outcome(s) based on, at a minimum, the required metrics pursuant to Education Code sections 52060 and 52066. The review must include an assessment of the effectiveness of the specific actions. Describe any changes to the actions or goals the LEA will take as a result of the review and assessment. In addition, review the applicability of each goal in the LCAP.

Guiding Questions:

1) How have the actions/services addressed the needs of all pupils and did the provisions of those services result in the desired outcomes?
2) 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?
3) How have the actions/services addressed the identified needs and goals of specific schoolsites and were these actions/services effective in achieving the desired outcomes?
4) What information (e.g., quantitative and qualitative data/metrics) was examined to review progress toward goals in the annual update?
5) What progress has been achieved toward the goal and expected measurable outcome(s)? How effective were the actions and services in making progress toward the goal? What changes to goals, actions, services, and expenditures are being made in the LCAP as a result of the review of progress and assessment of the effectiveness of the actions and services?
6) What differences are there between budgeted expenditures and estimated actual annual expenditures? What were the reasons for any differences?

<table>
<tr><td>Original GOAL from prior year LCAP:</td><td colspan="2">Goal 1: Continue existing efforts to foster student academic success by creating a cohesive focused, base program for all students</td><td colspan="2">Related State and/or Local Priorities:
1_X_ 2__ 3_X_ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ 8_X_
COE only: 9__ 10__
Local: Specify _____</td></tr>
<tr><td>Goal Applies to:</td><td colspan="3">Schools: LEA-wide
Applicable Pupil Subgroups: All</td></tr>
<tr><td>Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:</td><td>1. RUSD will maintain 100% high quality appropriately assigned teachers and leaders
State metric: Rate of Teacher Misassignment
• Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 94.55%
2. 100% of RUSD facilities will achieve a rating of “good” or “exemplary” on our local facilities rating tool
State metric: Facilities in good repair
• Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 96% (5/25 Exemplary; 19/25 Good; 1/25 Poor)
3. 100% of all RUSD students will have access to core</td><td>Actual Annual Measurable Outcomes:</td><td>1. RUSD will maintain 100% high quality appropriately assigned teachers and leaders
State metric: Rate of Teacher Misassignment
• Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 94.55%
• Increased in 2014-15 to 98.22%
• Increase in 2015-16 to 98.93%
2. 100% of RUSD facilities will achieve a rating of “good” or “exemplary” on our local facilities rating tool
State metric: Facilities in good repair
• Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at</td></tr>
</table>

	instructional materials aligned to state standards including the Common Core State metric: Student access to standards-aligned instructional materials • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 100% **4. Access to a web-based parent portal will be provided to 100% of RUSD Parents** Local metric: Parent access to web-based portal • Baseline set with tracking parent accounts in 2013 at 47% Parent Participation (9962 accounts)		96% (5/25 Exemplary; 19/25 Good; 1/25 Poor) • Increased in 2014-15 to 100**%** (5/25 Exemplary; 20/25 Good) **3. 100% of all RUSD students will have access to core instructional materials aligned to state standards including the Common Core** State metric: Student access to standards-aligned instructional materials • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 100% • Maintained in 2014-15 at 100% • Maintained in 2015-16 at 100% **4. Access to a web-based parent portal will be provided to 100% of RUSD Parents** Local metric: Parent access to web-based portal • Baseline set with tracking parent accounts in 2013 at 47% Parent Participation (9962 accounts) • Increased in 2014 to 50% (10,579 accounts) • Decreased in 2015 to 42% (9039 accounts)

LCAP Year: 2015 - 2016

Planned Actions/Services		Budgeted Expenditures	Actual Actions/Services		Estimated Actual Annual Expenditures
1.1 Provide high quality appropriately assigned teachers, counselors, administrators, and teacher coaches **a.** Recruit, hire and retain fully credentialed and highly qualified teachers **b.** Ensure site Master Schedules/teacher assignments reflect appropriate placement of teachers		**a. $79.25 million LCFF** 1100 ($63.4 million), 3000 ($15.85 million) **b. $5.75 million LCFF** 1100 ($4.6 million), 3000 ($1.15 million)	**1.1** **a.** RUSD continues to maintain a stable and consistent number of highly qualified teachers. Hiring practices include rigorous standards of testing, interviewing and presenting which ensures that the most qualified candidates are hired for positions. The funding allocated met the needs of the district and proper allocations were provided to support contracted student/teacher ratios. **b.** The Director of Curriculum and Instruction and Director of School Improvement and Professional Development work with site leaders to guarantee that the appropriate placement of all personnel is reflected in the Master Schedule. This includes all content area teachers and specialized instruction teachers.		**a. $72,547,7** LCFF 1100, 3000 **b. $5,960.746** LCFF 1100, 3000
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	

_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
1.2 Provide safe and clean facilities **a.** Routine restricted maintenance **b.** M & O work order tracking software **c.** M & O supervisor, (William's) **d.** M & O Foreman, (Williams)	**a. $800,000 LCFF** 2200 ($185,000), 3000 ($40,000), 4300 ($175,000), 5600 ($400,000) **b. $35,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $120,000 LCFF** 2300 ($96,000), 3000 ($24,000) **d. $90,000 LCFF** 2200 ($72,000), 3000 ($18,000)	**1.2** **a.** RUSD schools consistently receive Exemplary or Good as scores on the Annual FIT Reports. However, the age and condition of many of the schools require vigilance and constant monitoring. The Maintenance and Operations Department and the Grounds Department have utilized the structure and function of Professional Learning Communities to support the maintenance of effort to guarantee consistent repairs are done in a timely manner. The team has developed a rubric and protocols to use to collect data for the meetings. **b.** Work order tracking is completed and shared during regular PLC meetings. **c.** Supervisor and Foreman report findings, organize efforts and budget resources to meet the needs of the 24 sites.	**a. $800,000** LCFF 2200, 3000, 4300, 5600 **b. $7,790** LCFF 5800 **c. $73,941** LCFF 2300 **$27,809** 3000 **d. $40,867** 2300 **$25,686** 2200, 3000
Scope of service: All _X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service: All _X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
1.3 Provide standards based instructional materials for all students **a.** Purchase all necessary CCSS instructional materials to effectively support student achievement **b.** Develop and implement web-based K-12 scope and sequence aligned state standards including the Common Core **c.** Purchase a typing program so students develop	**a. $3.0 million LCFF** 4100 ($2,000,000), 4300 ($400,000), 5800 ($600,000) **b. $600,000 LCFF** 1100 ($455,000),	**1.3** **a.** RUSD's current adoption of materials for CCSS has been supported through the purchase and maintenance of all Core, ancillary and consumable materials. In addition, RUSD has begun the adoption process for the High School ELA materials through extensive review process. **b.** RUSD utilizes Rubicon Atlas to support a comprehensive Scope and Sequence for all grade	**a. $2,414,277** LCFF 41XX-42XX **$595,289** 43XX-44XX **$336,353** 52XX, 5810, 5850 **b. $243,414**

strong keyboarding skills to succeed on computer based assessments **d.** Purchase a Common Assessment Item Bank to support district-wide local assessments **e.** Bar coding Textbooks **f.** iBoss Internet Filtering **g.** Laptop Carts for Special Education Classes		3000 ($95,000), 5800 ($50,000) **c. $10,000 LCFF** 5800 **d. $33,000 LCFF** 5800 **e. $50,000 LCFF** 4300 ($4,000), 4400 ($8,000) 5800 $38,000) **f. $90,400 LCFF** 4300 ($2400), 4400 ($4000), 5800 ($10,000), 6400 ($74,000) **g. $1,250,000.00 LCFF** 4300 ($100,000), 4400 ($1,150,000)	levels. **c.** To support the transition to computerized summative testing, as an enhancement to the instructional practices aligned to 21st Century technology skills and CCSS Literacy/Writing standards, RUSD continues to support a typing program for elementary students. **d.** Illuminate and the associated Item Banks have been utilized to support the Common Assessment Program and the Cumulative Final Exams for RUSD students. **e.** The continual monitoring of textbooks and ancillary materials was supported through site barcoding. Records are maintained to support the inventory of textbooks and the purchasing of needed replacements. **f.** Internet access continues to be a necessary instructional tool to enhance instructional practices and to support CCSS Literacy Standards. Content area courses require investigative tools to support good first instruction. **g.** Technology was purchased to assist with access to CCSS		LCFF 1100, 3000 **$90,435** 5800 **c. $8000** LCFF 5800 **d. $80,000** LCFF 5800 **e. $61,036** LCFF 4300, 4400, 5800 **f. $132,199** LCFF 4300, 4400, 5800, 6400 **g. $582,826** LCFF 6400
Scope of service:	All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service:	All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
1.4 As allocated in previous years, provide instructional support services to all schools **a.** Provide site funding resources for student intervention supports before, during and after school **b.** Provide personnel and materials needed to effectively support the Continual School Improvement Model		**a. $2.3 million LCFF** 1100 ($1.84 million), 3000 ($.46 million) **b. $800,000 LCFF** 1100 ($645,000), 3000 ($130,000), 4300 ($25,000)	**1.4** **a.** The Director and Coordinator of School Improvement and Professional Development support the sites in implementing intervention programs that support student achievement. The site administrators met regularly with district administration to focus funding on the needs of the students. **b.** RUSD Continual School Improvement Model is monitored through the Office of School Improvement and Professional Development. Sites share with Stakeholders at ELAC and School Site Council.		**a. $1,164,611** LCFF 1100 **$168,622** LCFF 3000

Scope of service:	All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service:	All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
1.5 Provide operational support services and classified support personnel to all schools as needed **a.** Provide personnel and materials needed to effectively support the basic operations of the district and school sites		**a. $22 million LCFF** 2100 ($5,000,000), 2200 ($5,000,000), 2400 ($4,400,000), 3000 ($3,600,000), 4300 ($4,000,000)	**1.5** **a.** Classified personnel and support services assist in the organization and function of school sites. All basic operations are supported through Site administration, the District Business Services Division and the Personnel Division. Allocations and expenditures include salary, benefits, equipment, supplies and material costs.		**a. $356,466** LCFF 21XX **$4,637,250;** 22XX **$8,817,001;** 24XX **$1,020,900;** 29XX **$6,177,746;** 3000 **$437,865** 4XXX-6XXX
Scope of service:	All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service:	All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
1.6 Provide support staff personnel to all schools as needed **a.** 9 FTEs for grades TK-3 to maintain staffing ratios		**a. $700,000 LCFF** 1100 ($560,000), 3000 ($140,000)	**1.6** **a.** In compliance with CA Ed Code Sections 41376 and 41378, RUSD supports the reduction of class size and ratio of students to teachers in the elementary grades. The Business Office maintains documentation to ensure the staffing meets the necessary requirements to maintain the mandated ratio.		**a. $717,045** 1100, 3000
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	

_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		
1.7 Parent & Community Engagement **a.** Technology Platform for Parent Communication **b.** Community Engagement Technician **c.** Community Engagement equipment, materials, supplies		**a. $73,000 LCFF** 5800 **b. $90,000 LCFF** 2100 ($72,000), 3000 ($18,000) **c. $50,000 LCFF** 4300 ($5000), 4400 ($20,000), 5800 ($25,000)	**1.7** **a.** RUSD utilizes education technology systems and engaging communication programs focused on the communication tools to support parent outreach. **b.** No personnel, equipment or additional services were included in the expenditures for the current year.		**a. $101,650** 5800 **b. $0** **c. $0**
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	
_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		
1.8 Increase Visual & Performing Arts to expand course of study through a 4-8 Instrumental Music Program **a.** Provide 1 FTE (teacher) to expand elementary strings program (salary & extra hours) **b.** Provide hourly paraprofessional support **c.** Program operating expenses		**a. $130,000 LCFF** 1100 ($104,000),3000 ($26,000) **b. $15,000 LCFF** 2100 ($12,000), 3000 ($3000) **c. $27,000 LCFF** 4300 ($10,000) 4400 ($17,000)	**1.8** **a.** The expansion of the Visual and Performing Arts program was highly successful. The coordination of the expansion was coordinated through the Office of Curriculum and Instruction. The Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction monitored the scheduling of the itinerant personnel and maintained the program operating costs. Enrollment was maintained and the program allowed students that begin in the program as beginners to continue with the instructional support to grow in ability. **b.** Additional support will be needed to coordinate the efforts of the program in the upcoming year and operating costs not included in this year's LCAP.		**a. $102,585** LCFF 1100 **$27,210** 3000 **b. $0** **c. $1151** LCFF 4300; **$1264** 5XXX
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	

_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
1.9 Beginning Teacher Support **a.** BTSA Support Personnel **b.** Recording technician for capturing training **c.** Individual Study Team Leaders	**a. $135,000 LCFF** 1100 ($108,000), 3000 ($27,000) **b. $20,000 LCFF** 2100 ($16,000), 3000 ($4000) **c. $36,550 LCFF** 1100 ($29,240), 3000 ($7310)	**1.9** **a.** Support of Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Induction. RUSD provides for Teachers participating in the BTSA program are fully credentialed 1st and 2nd year teachers and/or teachers with an out-of-state credential. BTSA is a 2-year induction program based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). Teachers participating in BTSA are provided with a "*Support Provider*" who works with them to complete the program. These Support Providers are experienced teachers who are trained in CSTP and FACT. **b.** No recording of teacher training was conducted in the current year. The district administration is motivated to complete this action in the upcoming year. **c.** Individual Study Team leaders will continue in the upcoming implementation of Beginning Teacher Support.	**a. $6933** LCFF 1100**; $922** 3000 **b. $0** **c. $50,493** LCFF 1100; **$5862** 3000
Scope of service: All _X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service: All _X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
1.10 Increase support to School Improvement and Professional Development **a.** Contract LCAP Coordinator **b.** Program supplies and support materials	**a. $150,000-LCFF** 1100 ($120,000), 3000 ($30,000) **b. $1000-LCFF** 4300	**1.10** **a.** This action and service was an additional service to the LCAP beginning in 2015-16. The position is monitored and evaluated by the Director of School Improvement and Professional Development. The goals of the department are to support site and district level programs funded through LCFF with the specific goals	**a. $96,519** LCFF 1100; **$25,890** 3000 **b. $2142** LCFF 4300

			of supporting at-risk youth and unduplicated populations that generate funding.		
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	
_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		

What changes in actions, services, and expenditures will be made as a result of reviewing past progress and/or changes to goals?	**1.1** Current projections for appropriately assigned teachers will remain consistent so allocations will remain as indicated in the previous LCAP. **1.2** The need to coordinate and maintain district facilities has been realized through the formation of PLCs and with the tracking/monitoring of conditions. Therefore, additional funding has been allocated to support this effort. Additional funds will be spent on Routine Restricted Maintenance and Operations. Personnel and equipment and supplies will be increased to support this effort. (Funding Increase $145,000) **1.3** The support of the Core Instructional Program through instructional materials and supplies has been monitored throughout the year and it has been determined that some of the funding allocated to the item bank, typing program and additional laptops could be unencumbered in the upcoming year. The support of struggling students with instructional materials and supplies will continue through LCAP Programs within Goal 3, Goal 5, and Goal 6. (Funding Decrease $1,205,400) **1.4** No Change **1.5** No Change **1.6** The requirements to maintain mandated staffing ratios may require an increase in allocation to personnel for TK-3 enrollment. (Projected Increase to allocate funding for 15 total FTE for class size reduction) **1.7** Parent and Community Engagement and Active Decision-Making continue to be a focus for RUSD. Therefore, additional funding has been allocated to improve the technology platform and to contract with a design consultant to improve the networking currently being utilized for parent communication. (Funding Increase $47,000) **1.8** No change **1.9** Although other funding sources can be utilized for the services to Beginning Teachers, RUSD remains committed to the program and will allocate funding in support of Induction for upcoming LCAP years. **1.10** No Change

Original GOAL from prior year LCAP:	**Goal 2:** **Continue existing efforts to foster positive school environments to effectively support student learning**	**Related State and/or Local Priorities:** 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5_X_ 6_X_ 7__ 8__ COE only: 9__ 10__ Local : Specify _____
Goal Applies to:	Schools: LEA-wide Applicable Pupil Subgroups: All	

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. Average daily attendance will increase to 96%** State metric: school/district student attendance rates • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 96.04% **2. Suspension and expulsion rates will decrease by 1%** State metric: student suspension & expulsion rates • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 5.2% Suspension Rate and .4% Expulsion Rate **3. Dropout rate will decrease by .25%** State metric: student dropout rates • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 4.9% **4. Pupil, and teacher survey will provide school community perception baseline data** Local metric: school/community perception data • Survey not submitted **5. Graduation rate will increase by .2%** State metric: High school graduation rate • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 at 90.4%	Actual Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. Average daily attendance will increase to 96%** State metric: school/district student attendance rates • Decreased in 2014-15 to 95.80% • Decreased in 2015-16 to 95.17% **2. Suspension and expulsion rates will decrease by 1%** State metric: student suspension & expulsion rates • Decreased in 2014-15 to 4.8% Suspension Rate and .2% Expulsion Rate • Decreased in 2015-16 to 3.7% Suspension Rate and Maintained at .2% Expulsion Rate **3. Dropout rate will decrease by .25%** State metric: student dropout rates • Decreased in 2014-15 to 4.8% • Maintained in 2015-16 at 4.8% **4. Pupil, and teacher survey will provide school community perception baseline data** Local metric: school/community perception data • Survey not submitted **5. Graduation rate will increase by .2%** State metric: High school graduation rate • Increased in 2014-15 to 91.2% • Decreased in 2015-16 to 90.6%

LCAP Year: 2015 - 2016

Planned Actions/Services		Actual Actions/Services	
	Budgeted Expenditures		Estimated Actual Annual Expenditures
2.1 Provide individual and group counseling opportunities as well as social skills classes to students to promote positive school climate. **a.** Pilot a Positive Behavior Intervention Support program at 7 school sites **b.** Contract additional outside counseling services **c.** Contract Board Certified Behavioral Analysts for Social Skills classes	**a. $30,000 - LCFF** 5800 **b**. Program is grant funded (no RUSD cost) **c. $250,000 - LCFF** 1100 ($200,000), 3000 ($50,000)	**2.1** **a.** The current schools implementing Positive Behavior Intervention and Support report an improvement in school climate. Additional sites have requested funding to begin the program. The program implementation will include tracking and monitoring with the use of the Student Interface System (SIS) used district-wide. **b.** As part of the program, students identified for support will require interventions and recommendations for improvement. The district supports the use of outside counseling resources to ensure the students identified receive support. **c.** To ensure preventative measures are established,	**a. $49,653** LCFF 5800 **b. $0** **c. $258,000** - Mental Health Funds 1100, 3000

			Social Skills classes were developed to provide relevant social skill instruction that will generalize into daily routines.		
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	
_X_ ALL			_X_ ALL		
OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		
2.2 **Provide student drug testing program and interventions to students in grades 6-12 to foster school safety and student learning.** **a.** Contract student drug testing services		**a. $40,000 - LCFF** 5800	**2.2** **a.** The voluntary drug testing program is implemented under the supervision of the Director of Student Services. Program policies, procedures and progress are reported to the RUSD Board of Education. The positive impact of the program is documented in Letters of Support from Law Enforcement and from the District Attorney. The program was established to decrease the number of students expelled for drug-related offenses. (In 2012, it was reported that over the past seven years, 1,542 high school students have been suspended for drug-related offenses; an average of 220 per year)		**a. $37,870** LCFF 5800
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	
_X_ ALL			_X_ ALL		
OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		
2.3 Provide staff training on Positive Behavioral Interventions to reduce student suspensions and expulsions **a.** Provide necessary training for positive behavioral interventions		**a. $20,000 LCFF** 1100 ($8,000), 3000 ($2000), 5800 ($10,000)	**2.3** **a.** The Positive Behavior Interventions and Support program requires and informed and committed staff as part of guaranteeing a successful program. As schools progress through the three stages of the program implementation (Installing, Emerging, Operational), further training is required.		**a. $11,125** LCFF 1100, 3000

Scope of service: All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			Scope of service: All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
2.4 Develop sense of student connectedness through character education programs, staff training, mentoring, positive student recognition **a.** Support character education with appropriate funding and training	**a. $50,000 LCFF** 1100 ($15,000), 3000 ($3000), 4300 ($25,000) 5800 ($7,000)		**2.4** **a.** RUSD supports site implementation of Character Education through enrichment and site-based programs. The sites will continue to focus on student recognition and training for stakeholders.	**a. $51,800** 4000-5000
Scope of service: All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			Scope of service: All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
2.5 Increased parent and community outreach regarding available resources and parent involvement opportunities **a.** Support parent and community outreach programs with appropriate funding and training	**a. $40,000 - LCFF** 1100 ($8.000), 2200 ($5,000), 3000 ($2,000), 4300 ($10,000), 5800 ($15,000)		**2.5** **a.** RUSD continues to build on the parent and community outreach programs offered at the site and the district level. The district expended additional funding in support of programs and will continue to allocate the 2015 funding amount over the next three years.	**a. $51,797 LCFF** 2400 ($16,800); 2900 ($2710); 3300 ($4056); 4200-4300, 5600-5800 ($28,231)
Scope of service: All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils			Scope of service: All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils	

__English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		__English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
What changes in actions, services, and expenditures will be made as a result of reviewing past progress and/or changes to goals?	**2.1** Based upon the decrease in Graduation Rate and the disparity in graduation rate between the subgroups, RUSD district staff recognize that preventative measures implemented early in a students' educational career can have lasting benefits on student achievement, school connectedness and student wellness. Therefore, RUSD will be implementing a new program for the upcoming year which will focus on counseling for Elementary Students. This will result in an increase in services through the addition of the Elementary Counselor Program (Increase $1,000,000). **2.2** In support of the implementation of Positive Behavior and Intervention Supports, the district will increase the availability to the Voluntary Drug testing program. (Increase $10,000) **2.3 No change** **2.4** To increase the sites' ability to build school connectedness RUSD will increase the site funding allocation associated with character education. (Increase $190,000) **2.5 No change**		
Original GOAL from prior year LCAP:	**Goal 3:** **All students will participate in a high quality K-12 instructional program aligned to State Standards including the Common Core**	**Related State and/or Local Priorities:** 1__ 2__ 3__ 4_X_ 5__ 6__ 7__ 8_X_ COE only: 9__ 10__ Local : Specify _____	
Goal Applies to:	Schools: LEA-wide Applicable Pupil Subgroups: All		
Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. Proficiency rate on District ELA and Math common assessments will increase by 1% for all subgroups** Local Metric: Student Proficiency Rates on District Common Assessments • 2014-15 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year) ○ K-3 ELA 65% Proficient ○ K-3 Math 66% Proficient ○ Gr 4-5 ELA 21% Proficient ○ Gr 4-5 Math 31% Proficient ○ Gr 6-8 ELA 20% Proficient ○ Gr 6-8 Math 20% Proficient ○ Gr 9-12 ELA 28% Proficient ○ Gr 9-12 Math 30% Proficient **2. Proficiency rate on District reading benchmarks will increase by 2% for students grades 1-3** Local Metric: Student Proficiency Rates on District Reading Benchmarks • Metric captured 2016	Actual Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**Common Assessment Proficiency Rate** • 2015-16 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year) ○ K-3 ELA 74% Meet/Exceed ○ K-3 Math 69% Meet/Exceed ○ Gr 4-5 ELA 41% Meet/Exceed ○ Gr 4-5 Math 45% Meet/Exceed ○ Gr 6-8 ELA 55% Meet/Exceed ○ Gr 6-8 Math 49% Meet/Exceed ○ Gr 9-12 ELA 60% Meet/Exceed ○ Gr 9-12 Math 74% Meet/Exceed • **Trimester Report Card Data** • Grade Level Equivalency Rate 2015-1 is 66.55% • Target 68.55% **3. Student Proficiency on State Testing** • ELA ○ Grade 3 – 49% of students Met or Exceeded Standard; Grade 4 – 49% of students Met or Exceeded Standard; Grade 5 – 53% of students Met

	3. Student proficiency on state assessments (SBAC, CELDT, CAHSEE) will increase overall by 1% State Metrics: Performance on standardized tests, EL Reclassification rates • SBAC: ○ Baseline established with the released scores: 2014-15 SBAC ELA 53% of Students Exceed or Meet Standard ○ Baseline established with the released scored: 2014-15 SBAC Math 40% of Students Exceed or Meet Standard • CELDT: ○ Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 48% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced ○ Decrease in 2014-15 47% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced ○ Decrease in 2015-16 46% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced • Reclassification: ○ Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 with 3% of students reclassified ○ Increase 2014-15 13% of students reclassified		or Exceeded Standard Secondary ELA ○ Grade 6 – 50% of students Met or Exceeded Standard; Grade 7 – 50% of students Met or Exceeded Standard; Grade 8 – 51% of students Met or Exceeded Standard; Grade 11 – 66% of students Met or Exceeded Standard • SBAC Math ○ Grade 3 – 50% of students Met or Exceeded Standard; Grade 4 – 42% of students Met or Exceeded Standard; Grade 5 – 35% of students Met or Exceeded Standard ○ Grade 6 – 37% of students Met or Exceeded Standard; Grade 7 – 35% of students Met or Exceeded Standard; Grade 8 – 43% of students Met or Exceeded Standard; Grade 11 – 40% of students Met or Exceeded Standard • CELDT: ○ Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 48% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced ○ Decrease in 2014-15 47% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced ○ Decrease in 2015-16 46% of Students scored Advanced or Early Advanced • Reclassification: ○ Increase 2014-15 13% of students reclassified ○ Increase 2015-16 15% of students reclassified

LCAP Year: 2015-16

Planned Actions/Services		Actual Actions/Services	
	Budgeted Expenditures		Estimated Actual Annual Expenditures
3.1 Provide extensive professional development around the new state standards including math and ELA Common Core curriculum and pedagogy **Math Academy** **a.** 3 days of training for *all continuing* K-10 teachers to extend learning on math CCSS **b.** 5 days of training for all teachers *new* to the district **c.** 2 days of Integrated II Math Training	**a. $230,000 LCFF** 5800 **b. $20,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $10,000 LCFF** 1100 ($8500), 3000 ($1500)	**3.1** **a.** The district continued to support all teachers through math training. Teacher attendance was monitored through ERO (Electronic Registration Online). Presentation Evaluations were completed by the teachers that attended and were collected and shared with the LCAP Advisory Committee. **b.** The district provided the same 5 day trainings for all	**(a-b) $116,800 LCFF** 5800 **c. $35,826 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **d. $26,578 LCFF** 1100, 3000

d. Optional Summer/ Saturday/ Afternoon training **e.** Substitutes / hourly pay for training **f.** Equipment & supplies **Reading Academy** **g.** 3 days of ongoing reading training for *all* teachers in grades 1-3 **h.** 5 days Reading Academy training for *new* teachers in grades 1-3 and all K teachers **i.** Substitutes, hourly pay for training **j.** Training materials		**d. $250,000 LCFF** 1100 ($130,000), 3000 ($35,000), 5800($85,000) **e. $450,000 LCFF** 1100 ($360,000), 3000 ($90,000) **f. $5000 LCFF** 4300 **g. $85,000 LCFF** 4200 ($10,000) 5800 ($75,000) **h. $95,000 LCFF** 5800 **i. $150,000 LCFF** 1100 ($120,000), 3000 ($30,000) **j. $25,000 LCFF** 4300	teachers new to the district and also provided three days of extended training to all teachers throughout the district Math grades K-10 and Reading for grades 1-3. The attendance was monitored and tracked through ERO. **c.** As the district continues to implement the Integrated Math program, ongoing professional development will continue to support the teachers with implementation. Training offered during the school day was very well attended and continues to be the best option for the current professional development. **d.** RUSD continues to support the teachers with optional training that supplements the CCSS Standards implementation and support received during the initial training offered during the school day. **e.** Costs to support training were overestimated and the actual costs for substitutes and hourly pay were not fully expended. **f.** A cost to support training materials was overestimated and the actual cost for materials was not fully expended. **g.** The district continued to train teachers in Reading Strategies and literacy standards in Grades 1-3. Teacher attendance was monitored through ERO. Based upon the evaluations and positive feedback from the teachers that attended the professional development, the district will implement further training for Grades 4-5. **h.** The district will continue to support training for new teachers K-3. **i.** The allocation was sufficient to support substitutes and hourly pay for training. **j.** Funding was overestimated for materials.	**e. $180,352 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **f. $50,080 LCFF** 4300 **g. $100,345 LCFF** 4200, 5800 **h. $91,224** **i. $126,332 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **j. $134 LCFF** 4300
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	
_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		

3.2 Increase onsite support for Math and ELA teachers K-12 **a.** Continue with existing 15 math and Reading Coaches **b.** PD TOA to facilitate custom professional learning opportunities district-wide **c.** TOA Training **d.** Materials, supplies for TOA Professional Development **e.** Professional Development Services for TOAs		**a. $1.7 Million LCFF** 1100 ($1.36 million), 3000 ($340,000) **b. $100,000 LCFF** 1100 ($80,000), 3000 ($20,000) **c. $25,000 LCFF** 5800 **d. $25,000 LCFF** 5800 **e. $10,000 LCFF** 5200 ($4000), 5800 ($6000)	**3.2** **a.** TOAs supported sites with ELA and Math. The program was monitored and tracked by the Director of Curriculum and Instruction and the Director of School Improvement and Professional Development. Coaching logs were utilized to collect data that was shared with the LCAP Advisory Committee to monitor progress. **b.** In 2015-16 the district increased TOA instructional support by one additional TOA to support professional development and planning collaboration. **c.** To support the TOAs with implementation of the program, the district continued their professional development training in Reading and Math. **d.** The allocation was overestimated to support the materials and supplies for the TOA training. **e.** The support of teachers during First Instruction is needed to		**a. $1,639,278 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **b. $89,210 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **c. $25,000 LCFF** 5800 **d. $8303 LCFF** 5800 **e. $39,389 LCFF** 5200, 5800
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	
_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		
3.3 Develop/provide reading intervention at all elementary school sites to increase student proficiency **a.** Purchase supplemental reading intervention curriculum to increase effectively assess and guide reading instruction to increase student proficiency in reading and language arts **b.** District-wide reading assessment tool to monitor student progress and identify student needs for extra support **c.** Intervention Support Personnel **d.** Training and Collaboration (includes subs/hourly)		**a. $320,000 LCFF** 5800 **b. $50,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $230,000 LCFF** 1100 ($120,000), 2100 ($75,000), 3000 ($35,000) **d. $10,000 LCFF** 1100 ($8000) 3000 ($2000)	**3.3** **a.** TOAs and other stakeholders involved in the Reading Academy training were included in the selection of intervention materials to be used for elementary school sites. The Elementary Report Card was fully developed to include meaningful feedback on student achievement including data regarding Grade Level Equivalency in Reading. **b.** The Director of Curriculum and Instruction coordinated a district pilot program of early reading intervention. Several sites piloted the program at Grade 3 and collected data to assess the program. Reports generated from the pilot program were shared with the LCAP Advisory Committee. Teachers, administrators and committee members were included in the decision to purchase the assessment tool that will be		**a. $179,616 LCFF** 5800 **b. $33,530 LCFF** 500 **c. $0** **d. $6340 LCFF** 1100; **$1750** 3000

			implemented in 2016-17. **c.** Student performance on ELA SBAC and CELDT indicates that there is a need to continue to support Early Intervention in Reading to prevent a further decline in reading proficiency as students are introduced to more rigorous standards.		
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	
_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		
3.4 Implementation of State Standards, including the Common Core **a.** Middle School teacher training in the core adopted CCSS materials (Collections) **b.** CCSS Social Studies Training **c.** Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) Training		**a. $46,000 LCFF** 1100 ($21,000), 3000 ($5000), 5800 ($20,000) **b. $70,000 LCFF** 1100 ($42,000), 3000 ($8,000), 5800 ($20,000) **c. $40,000 LCFF** 1100 ($20,000), 3000 ($5,000), 5800 ($15,000)	**3.4** **a.** ELA SBAC and CELDT indicates that there is a need to continue to support strong first instruction to prevent a further decline in reading proficiency as students are introduced to more rigorous CCSS standards. The Middle School teachers attended **b.** Social Science teachers at secondary level received AVID training and therefore did not proceed with Social Science content area training. Elementary teachers received focused training in the areas of Reading and Math, and to avoid excessive number of days outside of the classroom, professional development will be postponed until the introduction of CCSS Social Science. **c.** NGSS Training will be a focus in the upcoming LCAP as the implementation plan is begun in 2016-17.	**a. $5600 LCFF** 5800 **b. $0** **c. $4500 LCFF** 5800	
Scope of service:	All		Scope of service:	All	
_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			_X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		

What changes in actions, services, and expenditures will be made as a result of reviewing past progress and/or changes to goals?	**3.1** As the professional development cycle continues through its third year, focus on Reading K-3 and Elementary Math will subside. Student mastery of the Writing Genres and College and Career Literacy Standards will need to be addressed in the upcoming year. Also, the introduction and implementation of the Next General Science Standards will require teacher training and support. Therefore, there will be a shift in the actions and services within this goal. (Decrease $702,000) **3.2** Student mastery of the Writing Genres and College and Career Literacy Standards will need to be addressed in the upcoming year. The roles of the TOAs may shift, therefore, there will be a decrease in the actions and services within this goal. (Decrease $274,000) **3.3** The focus of the Reading Intervention Program will be on the implementation and use of the new Reading Intervention Program. The support of the site teachers will be through current personnel. There will be a decrease in the current funding due to over allocation and estimated costs in 2015-16. (Decrease $428,000) **3.4** The training and implementation of the High School ELA Adoption requires less funding that the previous adoptions. The implementation of NGSS will begin in an introductory phase in 2016-17 with further implementation in 2017-18. The allocation for the current year was not fully expended. (Decrease $74,000) **3.5** Additional Writing Program K-12 to meet the needs of CCSS Performance Standard and Writing Across the Curriculum. Writing is recognized as a necessary component for EL Performance on Language Assessments and Reclassification Criteria. Additionally, Writing Standards are imbedded in all content standards including Next Generation Science Standards. Writing is also foundational for course access and remains a significant foundation for all College and Career Readiness actions and services. (Increase $1,606,000)

Original GOAL from prior year LCAP:	**Goal 4:** **Increase the number of students successfully ready for college and career.**	**Related State and/or Local Priorities:** 1__ 2__ 3__ 4_X_ 5__ 6__ 7_X_ 8__ COE only: 9__ 10__ Local : Specify _____

Goal Applies to:	Schools: All District High Schools Applicable Pupil Subgroups: All

Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. AVID program enrollment will increase by 2%** Local metric: Student Enrollment Rates within the AVID Program • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 with 523 students enrolled **2. AVID student state and district assessment data will increase by 2%** Local metric: AVID student achievement scores on state and district assessments Local metric: AVID student achievement scores on state and district assessments • 2014-15 ELA District Common Assessment 41% Proficient • 2014-15 Math District Common Assessment 30% Proficient	Actual Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. AVID program enrollment will increase by 2%** Local metric: Student Enrollment Rates within the AVID Program • 2014-15 620 students enrolled (18.5% increase) • 2015-16 710 students enrolled (14.5% increase) **2. AVID student state and district assessment data will increase by 2%** Local metric: AVID student achievement scores on state and district assessments • 2014-15 ELA District Common Assessment 41% Proficient • 2014-15 Math District Common Assessment 30% Proficient • 2015-16 ELA District Common Assessment 63% Exceed or Met Standard

	• 2015-16 ELA District Common Assessment 63% Exceed or Met Standard • 2016-16 Math District Common Assessment 44% Exceed or Met Standard • SBAC ELA 59.3% Exceed or Meet Standard • SBAC Math 40.05% Exceed or Meet Standard **3. AVID AP course enrollment will increase by 1%.** Local metric: AVID AP course enrollment • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 with 23% of AVID students enrolled in AP **4. AVID student-tutor ratio will match the AVID program requirements** Local metric: AVID tutor hours • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 with 2713 Tutor Hours **5. AVID student A-G course completion rate will increase by 2%** Local metric: AVID student A-G course completion rate • Baseline set at the initiation of LCFF in 2013-14 with 100% of AVID ca-g course completion rate **6. 80% of targeted teachers will complete AVID engagement strategy training** Local metric: Percent of teachers who have completed AVID training **7. Student registration for CTE/ROP courses will increase by 1%** State metric: Percent of students completing CTE Programs of Study • 2014-15 32% of students have completed CTE course of study **8. Student opportunity to pursue one Program of Study (CTE) baseline data will be established** State metric: Percent of students enrolled CTE Programs of Study • 2014-15 32.91% of students have enrolled in CTE course of study		• 2016-16 Math District Common Assessment 44% Exceed or Met Standard • SBAC ELA 59.3% Exceed or Meet Standard • SBAC Math 40.05% Exceed or Meet Standard **3. AVID AP course enrollment will increase by 1%.** Local metric: AVID AP course enrollment • 2014-15 Increase to 25% of AVID students enrolled in AP • 2015-16 Decrease to 24% of AVID students enrolled in AP **4. AVID student-tutor ratio will match the AVID program requirements** Local metric: AVID tutor hours • 2014-15 increase to 5245 Tutor Hours • 2015-16 increase to 7043 Tutor Hours **5. AVID student A-G course completion rate will increase by 2%** Local metric: AVID student A-G course completion rate • 2014-15 Maintain 100% of AVID ca-g course completion rate • 2015-16 Maintain 100% of AVID ca-g course completion rate **6. 80% of targeted teachers will complete AVID engagement strategy training** Local metric: Percent of teachers who have completed AVID training • 2014-15 94% of Social Science Teachers have completed AVID Strategy Training • 2015-16 Maintain 91% Science Teachers have completed AVID Strategy Training **7. Student registration for CTE/ROP courses will increase by 1%** State metric: Percent of students completing CTE Programs of Study • 2015-16 Decrease to 18% of students have completed CTE course of study **8. Student opportunity to pursue one Program of Study (CTE) baseline data will be established** State metric: Percent of students enrolled CTE Programs of Study • 2015-16 Increase to 33.48% of students have enrolled in CTE course of study

LCAP Year: 2015 -2016

Planned Actions/Services		Actual Actions/Services	
	Budgeted Expenditures		Estimated Actual Annual Expenditures
4.1 Provide training and collaboration time to establish equitable AVID programs at all high schools and middle schools **a.** Summer institute & Site Team Conference Training Expenses **b.** Substitutes, daily stipends for summer training, hourly pay for non-contract day training **c.** Membership fees to AVID Consortium **d.** 3 FTE (1 for each HS, including OWHS) to coordinate program and teach 4 AVID electives **e.** Provide AVID tutoring and support at all high schools and two middle schools **f.** Provide 3 extra periods for two middle schools to offer AVID classes **g.** AVID Library for OHS & Clement	**a. $65,000 LCFF** 5200 **b. $15,000 - LCFF** 1100 ($12,000), 3000 ($3000) **c. $15,000 LCFF** 5300 **d. $320,000 – LCFF** 1100 ($256,000), 3000 ($64,000) **e. $75,000 LCFF** 2200 ($60,000), 3000 ($15,000) **f. $100,000 LCFF** 1100 ($80,000), 3000 ($20,000) **g.** $10,000 LCFF 4300	**4.1** **a.** In the 2015-16, the District increased services by implementing the AVID Program at two middle schools in addition to all four high schools. **b.** The allocation for substitutes and hourly pay was designated appropriately. **c.** The metrics indicate that the students involved in the AVID program, performed more successfully on the district common assessments than in previous years. The goal is to support this growth at the middle school level to increase foundational skills in preparation for high school. **d.** The allocation for the FTEs was over the budgeted amount, so there will be an increase in allocation for the upcoming year. **e.** The need for more assistance for AVID students enrolled in AP courses has impacted the district's decision to allocate more funding to the AVID tutoring program. The increase in hours provides feedback regarding the need for supporting AVID through the tutoring component of the program. **f.** The middle school AVID program is significant for building the success of the high school program. The allocation will continue for the upcoming year. **g.** The allocation for library funding was expended appropriately.	**a. $123,761 LCFF** 5200 **b. $15,584 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **c. $13,290 LCFF** 5300 **d. $436,149 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **e. $91,881 LCFF** 2200, 3000 **f. $108,267 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **g. $12,036 LCFF** 4300
Scope of service: All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient		Scope of service: All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient	

__Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		__Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
4.2 Provide CCSS aligned AVID strategy training for all secondary teachers **a.** Training for all High School Science and Social Studies Teachers **b.** Substitutes and/or hourly pay for non-contract day training	**a.$55,000-LCFF** 5800 **b. $15,000– LCFF** 1100 ($12,000), 3000 ($3,000)	**4.2** **a.** Training for the High School Science and Social Science teachers was tracked and monitored through ERO. The Director of School Improvement and Professional Development coordinated the training and will continue with Middle School Social Science teachers and Secondary Elective teachers.	**a. $29,670 LCFF** 5800 **b. $15,584 LCFF** 1100, 3000
Scope of service: All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service: All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
4.3 Develop Program of Study for each comprehensive high school **a.** Provide a stipend for Program Coordinator (lead teacher) at each high school **b.** Level I summer school class offerings **c.** Purchase needed materials and supplies for each Program of Study (CTE) at all high schools **d.** Increase Program of Study (CTE) course sections at high schools **e.** Subs for site visits with Program of Study Team (CTE) PD **f.** Purchase Equipment for Programs of Study (CTE) **g.** Establish industry connections to support Programs of Study (CTE) **h.** Continue CRYOP coordination/ partnership	**a. $15,000 - LCFF** 1100 ($12,000), 3000 ($3000) **b. $20,000 - LCFF** 1100 ($16,000), 3000 ($4,000) **c. $150,000 - LCFF** 4300 **d. $150,000 LCFF** 1100 ($120,000), 3000 ($30,000) **e. $5,000 LCFF** 1100 ($4000), 3000 ($1000) **f. $300,000 LCFF** 4400 **g./h.** No Cost	**4.3** **a.** As the Programs of Study are implemented throughout the upcoming LCAP years, a stipend for site coordination will be necessary to continue to monitor the growth of the program and to coordinate resources with the district level Administrator on Assignment. **b.** The current allocation for summer school courses was not expended and the program in the upcoming year will not be funded during summer session. **c.** The materials for the program were not purchased during the implementation of the program. The lead for the program began the planning stages this year organizing the Programs of Study and assessing the needs at each site. **d.** The planning stages of the Programs of Study were begun during 2015-16 so the upstart of programs will be implemented during 2016-17. Therefore, no funds were expended on new programs. The allocation for 2016-17 will be increased to implement the programs that were established. **e.** The majority of the planning was done within the district and did not require the full allocation to visit other programs to engage in collaboration. **f.** The Programs of Study that will begin with courses in	**a. $13,709 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **b.** $0 **c. $37,291 LCFF** 4300 **d. $0** **e. $302 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **f. $43,420 LCFF** 4400 **g-h No Costs** ***Additional Implementation Costs*** • **$5684 LCFF** 2100, 3000; • **$162** 4200; • **$837.90** 5200; • **$74,895** 1300, 3000

			2016-17 will require an increase in allocation for equipment and materials. **Additional Costs for Planning and Implementation:** • Support Staff, hourly wages, supplies and office equipment. (LCFF 2100, 3000, 4200) • Conferences and Training (LCFF 5200) • Administrator on Assignment (LCFF 1300, 3000)		
Scope of service:	All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service:	All _X_ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
What changes in actions, services, and expenditures will be made as a result of reviewing past progress and/or changes to goals?	**4.1** The allocations for increasing tutoring hours at the middle schools and the additional funding for a period of AVID into the Orangewood master schedule will require increased funding for the upcoming year. The data on student performance and active participation in tutoring are metrics that suggest a need to build the program. (Increase $273,000) **4.2** Additional funding will be required to complete the training of Middle School Social Science teachers and Secondary Elective teachers. (Increase $119,000) **4.3 Increase $962,000** **Additional actions and services to support Goal 4**: Increase the number of students successfully ready for college and career: **4.4** This additional action and service articulates the College Readiness work already being developed at the secondary sites. The actions compliment the Career Technical Education programs of study developed in Goal 4.3. Both actions support the College and Career Readiness requirements for future State Accountability Multiple Measures and will assist students in preparation for the rigor of The College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for ELA and Literacy. (Increase $1,490,000)				
Original GOAL from prior year LCAP:	**Goal 5:** **Close the achievement gap for underperforming subgroups.**		**Related State and/or Local Priorities:** 1__ 2_X_ 3__ 4_X_ 5_X_ 6__ 7__ 8_X_ COE only: 9__ 10__ Local: Specify _____		
Goal Applies to:	Schools: LEA-wide Applicable Pupil Subgroups: EL, LI, FY, RFEP				
Expected Annual	**1. Proficiency rate on district and state assessments in math and English will increase by 2% for English**		Actual Annual	**1. Proficiency rate on district and state assessments in math and English will increase by 2% for English**	

Measurable Outcomes:	**Learners and Limited income students** State metric: Share of English Learners that become English Proficient/EL Reclassification Rates <u>State Proficiency Rate</u> • 2015-16 62% -- Decrease 2% from Baseline on State Proficiency rate • Target 64% <u>Reclassification Rate</u> • 2015-16 15% -- Increase 2% on State Reclassification rate • Target 17% **2. Proficiency rates on the final district common assessments in math and English will increase by 1% for English Learners, Low-Income, and Foster Youth** State metric: Target subgroup students will increase academic proficiency rates on state assessments <u>Subgroup SBAC Data</u> • 2014-15 SBAC ELA for English Learners Meet/Exceeds 17% • 2014-15 SBAC ELA for Low Income Meet/Exceeds 41% • 2014-15 SBAC ELA for Foster Youth Meet/Exceeds 53% • 2014-15 SBAC Math for English Learners Meet/Exceeds 15% • 2014-15 SBAC Math for Low Income Meet/Exceeds 29% • 2014-15 SBAC Math for Foster Youth Meet/Exceeds 18% Local metric: Target subgroup students will increase academic proficiency rates on district and state assessments <u>2015 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)</u> • EL ELA 2% Advanced/Proficient • EL Math 12% Advanced/Proficient • Low Income ELA 16% Advanced/Proficient • Low Income Math 19% Advanced/Proficient • Foster Youth ELA 18% Advanced/Proficient • Foster Youth Math 22% Advanced/Proficient **3. All Middle School English Learners will receive daily ELD instruction aligned to CCSS and the new**	Measurable Outcomes:	**Learners and Limited income students** State metric: Share of English Learners that become English Proficient/EL Reclassification Rates <u>State Proficiency Rate</u> • 2015-16 62% -- Decrease 2% from Baseline on State Proficiency rate • Target 64% <u>Reclassification Rate</u> • 2015-16 15% -- Increase 2% on State Reclassification rate • Target 17% **2. Proficiency rates on the final district common assessments in math and English will increase by 1% for English Learners, Low-Income, and Foster Youth** State metric: Target subgroup students will increase academic proficiency rates on state assessments <u>Subgroup SBAC Data</u> • 2014-15 SBAC ELA for English Learners Meet/Exceeds 17% • 2014-15 SBAC ELA for Low Income Meet/Exceeds 41% • 2014-15 SBAC ELA for Foster Youth Meet/Exceeds 53% • 2014-15 SBAC Math for English Learners Meet/Exceeds 15% • 2014-15 SBAC Math for Low Income Meet/Exceeds 29% • 2014-15 SBAC Math for Foster Youth Meet/Exceeds 18% • ***2015-16 Data Not Available at Time of Annual Update Submission*** Local metric: Target subgroup students will increase academic proficiency rates on district and state assessments <u>2016 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year</u> • EL ELA 28% Meets/Exceeds • EL Math 25% Meets/Exceeds • Low Income ELA 48% Meets/Exceeds • Low Income Math 41% Meets/Exceeds • Foster Youth ELA 22% Meets/Exceeds • Foster Youth Math 24% Meets/Exceeds

	ELD/ELA Frameworks Local metric: All Middle School English Learners will receive ELA/ELD aligned instruction • 2014-15 Levels 1-3 100% • 2014-15 Levels 4-5 98% **4. 100% of Foster Youth will receive support services from Academic Case Carriers** Local metric: Foster Youth attendance rates and grades o 2014-15 Implementation Year Foster Youth Identified/Assigned through Analytic		**3. All Middle School English Learners will receive daily ELD instruction aligned to CCSS and the new ELD/ELA Frameworks** Local metric: All Middle School English Learners will receive ELA/ELD aligned instruction • ***Data was not fully implemented or tracked. This will become a priority for 2016-17*** **4. 100% of Foster Youth will receive support services from Academic Case Carriers** Local metric: Foster Youth attendance rates and grades o Data was not fully implemented or tracked. This will become a priority for 2016-17

LCAP Year: 2015 - 2016

Planned Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Actual Actions/Services	Estimated Actual Annual Expenditures
5.1 Provide teacher training on strategies specific to subgroup success **a.** Continue with 2-3 days of EL sub-group training for teachers and administrators **b.** Provide optional three (3) days of training in "Strategies for success," training to target the needs of students in low income and foster youth subgroups **c.** Substitute costs **d.** Training of Trainers program development **e.** Training materials	**a.$10,000-LCFF** 1100 ($8000), 3000 ($2000) **b.$16,000-LCFF** 1100 ($12,800), 3000 ($3,200) **c.$20,000-LCFF** 1100 ($16,000), 3000 ($4000) **d.$10,000-LCFF** 1100 ($6000), 3000 ($1500), 5200 ($2500) **e.$10,000–LCFF** 4300	5.1 **a.** The subgroup training consisted of bringing in Nationally known experts in training teachers with strategies that can be implemented to support subgroup success. The program was monitored through registration in ERO and was evaluated through teacher feedback gathered from an electronic survey within ERO. Teacher Per Diem was paid for Saturday Training **b.** The District provided three full-day training workshops on research-based best practices for English Learners, Low Income and other at-risk student groups. This is in addition to or complimentary to the current ongoing support of instructional coaches to assist with the implementation of these new strategies. **c.** Since the training was offered on a non-work day and was voluntary, the amount allocated was not fully utilized. **d.** The Trainer of Trainer model was not fully developed and did not require funding from the current LCAP. Funding for developing this model and for integrating the Strategies for Success (QTEL) will be coordinated through the Office of Professional Development. Funding will continue to be allocated in 2016-17.	**a. $24,747 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **b. $13,000 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **c. $377 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **d. $0**

Scope of service:	All students grades TK-12		Scope of service:	All students grades TK-12	
__ALL OR: _X_Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			__ALL OR: _X_Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		
5.2 Increase EL teacher staffing at all middle schools to provide coordinated ELA/ELD instruction aligned to adopted CCSS Core materials **a.** Provide (4) ELA FTE one (1) to each middle school. Training and collaboration, including subs/hourly pay **b.** Laptop carts for additional ELA Classes (4) **c.** Support materials for these teachers **d.** EL Diagnostic Assessment tool to guide instruction		**a. $420,000 LCFF** 1100 ($336,000), 3000 ($84,000) **b. $12,500 LCFF** 1100 ($6000), 3000 ($1500), 5200 ($5000) **c. $140,000 LCFF** 4300 ($10,000), 4400 ($120,000), 5800 ($10,000) **d. $1,500 LCFF** 4300 **e. $5,000 LCFF** 5800	**5.2** **a.** The Middle School Small English Class for EL students was implemented and the allocation of funds was expended. Collaboration time was used to review Scope and Sequence and to work on lesson design that incorporated strategies for success. **b.** Laptops and carts were purchased to assist in the implementation of the program. Each site received the materials. **c.** The amount allocated for supplemental materials was not fully expended and will not be allocated to this action/service in 2016-17. **d.** Funding not fully expended. **e.** The tracking tool will be part of the 2016-17 planning and implementation and will be used to support the collaboration time to review data and monitor student progress.		**a. $346,705 LCFF 100, 3000** **b. $103,384 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **c. $4,639 LCFF** 5200 **d. $86 LCFF** 4300 **e. $0**
Scope of service:	All Middle School Students		Scope of service:	All Middle School Students	
__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			__ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		
5.3 Increase EL translation services **a.** Bilingual stipend for translation by existing staff **b.** Language Line to be purchased and available to all school sites **c.** Hourly compensation for EL translators		**a. $15,000 LCFF** 1100 ($6,000), 2100 ($7000), 3000 ($2000) **b. $8,000 LCFF** 5800 **c. $12,000 LCFF** 1100 ($6000),	**5.3** **a.** The use of translation services was increased over 2016-17. The allocation was expended and additional funding was required to fulfill the service. **b.** Language Line was used frequently and will continue to be funded in 2016-17. **c.** The hourly compensation for translators was expended and additional funding was allocated to support the		**a. $24,740 LCFF** 1100, 2100, 3000 **b. $6839 LCFF** 5800 **c. $17,091 LCFF** 1100, 2100, 3000

	2100 ($5000), 3000 ($1000)	service. The service will continue in 2016-17.	
Scope of service: All students grades TK-12 __ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service: All students grades TK-12 __ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
5.4 Provide targeted instructional program to support long-term English Learners in grades 6-10 **a.** Purchase English 3D Program Instructional materials **b.** Utilize the School Improvement Coordinator to effectively manage the EL Program from the district level to ensure effective communication and translation services, parent training, and outreach	**a. $10,000 LCFF** 4200/4300 **b.** No Cost	**5.4** **a.** The supplemental materials purchased for Designated ELD support were replenished based up student enrollment. The allocation exceeded the demand for new materials. Sites will continue to monitor the instructional materials and will purchase ancillaries and consumables based upon 2016-17 enrollment.	**a. $3337 LCFF** 4200, 4300
Scope of service: All Middle School & High School students __ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service: All Middle School & High School students __ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	

5.5 Provide additional services to increase monitoring and support of re-designated English Proficient pupils **a.** EL site coordinator stipend for support beyond the contract day providing mentoring and support services for grades 3-11 **b.** Increase collaboration time for EL teachers to provide quarterly meetings to review EL student progress and refine support for students **c.** Support a District Language Assessment Center for identification, reclassification, and progress monitoring **d.** Contract extra hours for support personnel to assist with the reclassification monitoring process		**a. $20,000 LCFF** 1100 ($16,000), 3000 ($4000) **b. $5,000 LCFF** 1100 ($4200), 3000 ($800) **c. $200,000 LCFF** 2100 ($160,000), 3000 ($40,000) **d. $12,000 LCFF** 2100 ($9600), 3000 ($2400)	**5.5** **a.** The continual monitoring of EL progress will be implemented again through site EL coordinators. The teachers track student progress which assists in the reclassification of students. The data indicates that the students are adapting to the new Reclassification Criteria and are being recommended for reclassification appropriately. **b.** EL coordinators currently meet regularly. However, since the meetings occurred beyond the school day, and have been incorporated within the stipend allocation, no funding was expended. **c.** The Language Assessment Center assists in the monitoring and identification of EL students. The data collection and communication with sites continues to be necessary to guarantee progress within the reclassification criteria. **d.** Additional support was utilized to assist during reclassification time periods and to collect data to track individual student progress.	**a. $16,900 LCFF 1100** **b. $0** **c. $135,020 LCFF** 2100, 3000 **d. $8925 LCFF** 2100, 3000
Scope of service: All Middle School & High School students __ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			Scope of service: All Middle School & High School students __ALL OR: __Low Income pupils _X_English Learners __Foster Youth _X_Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	

5.6 Update Policies and Data Infrastructure to Support Foster Youth **a.** Refine protocol for immediate enrollment and develop professional development for school office and administrative staff to implement the protocol **b.** Develop procedures for "Credit Capture" to ensure all Foster Youth receive proper partial credits **c.** Purchase data system to establish infrastructure to capture: attendance rates, credit completion rates, percent of students remaining at school of origin, GPA, suspensions for FY **d.** Develop/Acquire system to ensure flow of information between agencies to effectively monitor and locate students who enter and leave the district to facilitate a timely transition	a – b No cost will use existing personnel and resources **c. $30,000 LCFF** 5800 **d. $45,000 LCFF** 5800	**5.6** **a.** The district will continue to maintain the data system being utilized for monitoring Foster youth and the specific challenges faced by the students that frequently relocate. **b.** The allocation was not fully expended and will not be continued in 2016-17. The analytics and community outreach will be coordinated through Action 5.7.	**a. $0** **b. $0** **c. $10,411 LCFF** 5800 **d. $9750 LCFF** 5800
Scope of service: All High School Students __ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners _X_Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service: All High School Students __ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners _X_Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
5.7 Coordinate Services to increase support to Foster Youth, and selected ELs and Low Income students, through Academic Case Carriers (ACCs) who provide targeted support beyond the scope of school counselors **a.** Personnel cost of Academic Case Carriers to provide support above and beyond the regular counselor for Foster Youth and selected at risk English Learners and Low Income students **b.** Program Coordinator **c.** Professional Development and collaboration **d.** Classified Support Staff **e.** Support materials and supplies **f.** Supplemental materials and supplies for caseload students **g.** Start-up equipment **h.** Unanticipated related expenses (program development anticipated August 2015-November	**a. $900,000 LCFF** 1100 ($820,000) 3000 ($180,000) **b. $150,000 LCFF** 1300 ($120,000), 3000 ($30,000) **c. $30,000 LCFF** 5200 **d. $200,000 LCFF** 2100 ($160,000), 3000 ($40,000) **e. $10,000 LCFF** 4300 **f. $40,000 LCFF** 4300	**5.7** **a.** The core of the program is the personnel that will directly service the students in need of support. The number of case carriers will continue; however, the allocation for 2016-17 will increase as the case carriers will be funded for an entire year. The current program did not begin until mid-year, therefore the full amount allocated was not expended. **b.** The Program Coordinator will continue to track and monitor the program. The Director of Student Services will continue to coordinate the scope of the program and will continue to monitor and track the progress of the students within the program. **c.** To support the specific needs and challenges of the students receiving service, the Academic Case Carriers will attend conferences and training to strengthen the program. **d.** Support Staff will be funded in 2016-17.	**a. $349.355 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **b. $86,408 LCFF** 1300, 3000 **c. $4868 LCFF** 5200 **d. $45,571 LCFF** 2100, 3000 **e. $8393 LCFF** 4300 **f. $461 LCFF** 4300 **g. $100,925 LCFF** 4300, 4400

2015, thus anticipated needs are still unknown) **i.** Provide centralized counselor for at-risk youth focused on services for Foster Youth and Homeless students. **j.** Support low income students with AP course examination fees		**g. $90,000 LCFF** 4300/4400 **h. $500,000 LCFF** 1100 ($120,000), 2100 ($100,000), 3000 ($40,000), 4300 ($50,000), 5800 ($90,000), 6200 ($100,000) **i. $110,000 LCFF** 1100 ($88,000), 3000 ($22,000) **j. $30,000 LCFF** 5300	**e.** The allocation was appropriate and will continue. **f.** The planning and implementation of the program was not completed until mid-year. Therefore, the full amount of the allocation was not expended. It will be allocated in 2016-17. **g.** The start-up equipment will not be funded in 2016-17. **h.** Building (Facility Costs) costs and the other materials required to set up office space were captured in Goal 1.2.b. **i.** This position is part of the organization chart of the program and will continue through 2016-17. **j.** This allocation was not expended and will be captured in the College Readiness program in 2016-17 (Goal 4.4.e)	**h. $0** **i.** $119,313 **LCFF** 1100, 3000 **j. $0**	
Scope of service:	All High School Students		Scope of service:	All High School Students	
__ALL OR: _X_Low Income pupils _X_English Learners _X_Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____			__ALL OR: _X_Low Income pupils _X_English Learners _X_Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		
What changes in actions, services, and expenditures will be made as a result of reviewing past progress and/or changes to goals?	**5.1** Analyses of the data indicate that there is progress being made on many measures to close the achievement gap. However, the gap is still evident and actions and resources will continue to be focused on this action. This goal will remain unchanged, however, the actions and services will be reconfigured and revised to provide greater clarity and focus on key action areas and related expenditures. (Increase $145,000) **5.2** The English course for Middle School students will continue to be tracked through common assessments and reclassification criteria. The training provided to teachers in subgroup success strategies will be implemented in 2016-17. The need for further training and materials is not evident and will not be included in 2016-17. (Decrease $144,500) **5.3** No Change **5.4** No Change **5.5** No Change **5.6** The continued support of Foster Youth at secondary sites to ensure an increase in graduation rate and decrease in transiency will be maintained. The need to monitor progress toward graduation and to ensure course access is still evident. Some of the services will be included in the role of the Academic Case Carriers (Action 5.7) and therefore will decrease the allocation for this action/service in 2016-17. **(**Decrease $64,000) **5.7** The need to support Foster Youth with AP test funds was allocated in Goal 4.4 through the strengthening of the College Readiness program. Additionally, costs to set up office access for the program and upstart equipment and				

	material fees will not be included in the 2016-17 LCAP. (Decrease $479,000)		
Original GOAL from prior year LCAP:	**Goal 6:** **RUSD will increase the number of students passing math courses and enrolling in high level math courses**		**Related State and/or Local Priorities:** 1__ 2__ 3__ 4_X_ 5__ 6__ 7__ 8_X_ COE only: 9__ 10__ Local : Specify _____
Goal Applies to:	Schools: LEA-wide Applicable Pupil Subgroups: All students grades 8-9		
Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. State assessment results for participating students will increase by 1%** State metric: student performance on standardized tests • Middle School Program Participants SBAC Math Meet/Exceeds 15% (Grade 7 SBAC) • High School Program Participants SBAC Math Meet/Exceeds 4% (Grade 8 SBAC) **2. Student academic grades for participating students will demonstrate a positive upward trend** Local metric: grades for participating students • 11% Fewer D's/F's Middle School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 3% More A's Middle School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 9% Fewer D's/F's High School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 12% More A's High School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades **3. Proficiency rate on district common assessments in math will increase overall by 2% for participating students** Local metric: district assessment scores for participating students <u>2015 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)</u> • Middle School Small Class 5% Math Advanced/Proficient • High School Support Class 5% Math Advanced/Proficient	Actual Annual Measurable Outcomes:	**1. State assessment results for participating students will increase by 1%** State metric: student performance on standardized tests • Middle School Program Participants SBAC Math Meet/Exceeds 15% (Grade 7 SBAC) • High School Program Participants SBAC Math Meet/Exceeds 4% (Grade 8 SBAC) **2. Student academic grades for participating students will demonstrate a positive upward trend** Local metric: grades for participating students • 11% Fewer D's/F's Middle School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 3% More A's Middle School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 9% Fewer D's/F's High School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades • 12% More A's High School Program Participants 2013-14 Grades to 2014-15 Grades **3. Proficiency rate on district common assessments in math will increase overall by 2% for participating students** Local metric: district assessment scores for participating students <u>2016 Common Assessment 5 (End of Year)</u> • Middle School Small Class Math 20% Meet/Exceeds • High School Support Class Math 25% Meet/Exceeds
LCAP Year 2015 -2016			
Planned Actions/Services		Actual Actions/Services	
	Budgeted		Estimated

	Expenditures		Actual Annual Expenditures
6.1 Add support courses for mathematics at the secondary level **a.** Increase staffing to provide 4 Math FTEs, one (1) per middle school, focused on small, 8th grade math classes of 10-15 students per class **b.** Increase staffing to provide three (3) FTE for Math support parallel class, at each comprehensive high school **c.** Provide curriculum for Math Support Course **d.** Laptop cart for additional Math FTEs **e.** Support training & Collaboration (Including Subs)	**a. $400,000 - LCFF** 1100 ($320,000), 3000 ($80,000) **b. $300,000 – LCFF** 1100 ($240,000), 3000 ($60,000) **c. $40,000 – LCFF** 4200 ($15,000), 5800 ($25,000) **d. $140,000 - LCFF** 4300 ($30,000), 4400 ($110,000) **e. $17,500 - LCFF** 1100 ($8000), 1900 ($6000), 3000 ($3500)	**6.1** **a.** RUSD is increasing services by providing staffing for an additional small math class at each middle site to assist struggling students with the transition to CCSS Math. Students were identified and placed according to criteria established through the Workgroups in Spring 2015. The program was monitored and data presented indicated the need to continue the service in 2016-17. **b.** The Math Support classes at the high schools have assisted students transition into the new Integrated Math pathway. Common Assessment data, attendance rates and decline in F's indicated that the course is showing progress. **c.** The curriculum allocation was not fully expended and will be decreased in the upcoming year. **d.** The laptops have been utilized to assist in the students' preparation for high stakes tests and have been used to incorporate instructional practices designed during collaboration time. **e.** Collaboration time and extended training beyond the Integrated Math professional development in Goal 3.1 was not fully implemented. After school collaboration did occur and the expenditure reflects the hourly pay for teachers that attended the collaboration time.	**a. $321,639 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **b. $208,731 LCFF** 1100, 3000 **c. $12,715 LCFF** 4200, 5800 **d. $102,559 LCFF** 4300, 4400 **e. $1240 LCFF** 1100, 1900, 3000
Scope of service: All students grades 8 & 9 _X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____		Scope of service: All students grades 8 & 9 _X_ ALL OR: __Low Income pupils __English Learners __Foster Youth __Redesignated fluent English proficient __Other Subgroups:(Specify)_____	
What changes in actions, services, and expenditures will be made as a result of reviewing past progress and/or changes to goals?	**6.1** The program is being implemented properly and is being tracked by data. The FTEs, Collaboration time, and professional development to support teachers will continue. The allocation will be decreased because the purchase of the laptop cart and computers was expended in the current year and not needed in 2016-17. (Decrease $172,500)		

Section 3: Use of Supplemental and Concentration Grant funds and Proportionality

A. In the box below, identify the amount of 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 schoolsite 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 and any local priority areas. (See 5 CCR 15496(b) for guidance.)

Total amount of Supplemental and Concentration grant funds calculated:	**$15,711,965**

Redlands Unified School District expended approximately $8,271,142 in supplemental and concentration funds in fiscal year 2015-16. For fiscal year 2016-17, Redlands Unified School District must allocate a targeted amount of nearly $15,711,965 (supplemental and concentration funds) for continued improved and increased service and supports to principally benefit English learners (EL), foster youth (FY), low-income (LI) students.

The district's unduplicated student percentage is over 58.32% and our student groups with the most persistent achievement gaps and greatest need of support comprise even higher percentages of EL, FY and LI students. Given that English Learners, foster youth, and low income students are represented in all of our schools, there is a need to provide systemic, coordinated, and targeted supports and services across the district for these focus students and student groups. A portion of the supplemental and concentration grant funds are being used to provide direct services to the benefit of our low income, foster youth, and English Learner pupils and a portion of the funds are being applied districtwide as follows:

Each of the following actions provides direct services to the target populations with a total expenditure allocation of $7 million dollars.

- Provide instructional support services to all schools
- Parent & Community Engagement
- Increase support to School Improvement and Professional Development
- Provide infrastructure for ongoing support for Math and Reading instruction
- Provide training and collaboration time to establish equitable AVID programs at all three high schools
- Provide CCSS aligned AVID strategy training for all high school teachers
- Develop Program of Study for each comprehensive high school
- Provide teacher training on strategies specific to subgroup success
- Increase EL teacher staffing at all middle schools to provide coordinated ELA/ELD instruction aligned to CCSS Core materials
- Increase EL translation services
- Provide targeted instructional program to support long-term English Learners in grades 6-10
- Provide additional services to increase monitoring and support of re-designated English Proficient pupils
- Update Policies and Data Infrastructure to Support Foster Youth
- Coordinate Services to increase support to Foster Youth, and selected Low Income and English Learner Students

The implementation of the new Common Core State Standards requires additional training for all teachers of all students including low income, English Learner and Foster Youth students in the Common Core curricula. In addition, targeted training focused on engaging low income, English Learner and Foster Youth students to ensure subgroup academic success will be provided to all teachers district-wide. AVID is a program developed specifically to promote success for under-

represented students such as low income, English Learner and Foster Youth students. An expanded Career Pathway program as well as Math intervention also specifically targets the needs of English Learner and Foster Youth students. Finally, positive behavior intervention programs also target the specific needs of low income, English Learner and Foster Youth students.

The use of supplemental and concentration funds will be used to provide increased and improved services for the principal benefit of our focus students, and includes:

- Districtwide Strategies: Designed for the principal benefit of EL, FY, and LI students, but other students may also benefit. For example:
  - Provide increased data analysis, reporting, and instructional data support to monitor and inform instruction.
  - Provide professional development opportunities related to standards, instruction, and support for our diverse student population.
  - Provide instructional support through Common Core Cluster Support Teachers.
  - Provide enriched and enhanced learning opportunities for students at all grade levels.
  - Increase and expand positive behavioral support and restorative justice practices across the district.
- Focused Strategies: Designed for the principal benefit of EL, FY, and LI students that are focused on particular grade levels, student groups, or clusters.
- Provide all students access to high level coursework with support from Academic Case Carriers, Elementary Counselors, Coordinated Services and PD
- School Level Strategies: Designed at the school site level for the principal benefit of the school's EL, FY, and Low I students
- Provide an allocation to each school, proportionate to their unduplicated student counts to provide targeted services including intervention, classroom support, and professional development..

B. In the box below, 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).

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). 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.

9.92	%

The district's target proportionality percentage for 2016-17 is 9.92%. Services and supports for focus students (unduplicated students – EL, FY, and LI) will be increased and improved by at least $4,015,559 as compared to services and supports provided to all students for fiscal year 2015-16.

A description and overview of increased and improved services for districtwide, focused, and school based strategies is provided in Section 3a (above). Consistent with the requirements of 5CCR15496, the actions and services provided in the LCAP year demonstrate increased and improved services for the unduplicated pupils as described below:

1. Ensure teacher expertise with Common Core aligned practices and curriculum for Math and Reading with extensive professional development
2. Utilize instructional coaches to increase effective instruction aligned to the Common Core which will increase student achievement
3. Improve teacher expertise with targeted research-based instructional practices that promote student achievement for sub-group success
4. Increase opportunity for college and career readiness with comprehensive access to AVID and Programs of Study
5. Provide a Math support program in grades 6-9
6. Promote and expand parent engagement through community outreach and translation services.
7. Provide targeted instruction for long-term English Learners in grades 6-10 to ensure reclassification and promote academic success

8. Provide mentoring support services for grades 3-11 EL students supporting increased reclassification rates and the aligned opportunity for the seal of bi-literacy at graduation
9. Provide additional counseling services to support resource attainment, funding resources for higher education opportunities and improved attendance and graduation rates including a centralized counselor for at-risk youth focused on services for Foster Youth and Homeless students.

LOCAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN AND ANNUAL UPDATE APPENDIX

For the purposes of completing the LCAP in reference to the state priorities under Education Code sections 52060 and 52066, the following shall apply:

(a) "Chronic absenteeism rate" shall be calculated as follows:
(1) The number of pupils with a primary, secondary, or short-term enrollment during the academic year (July 1 – June 30) who are chronically absent where "chronic absentee" means a pupil who is absent 10 percent or more of the schooldays in the school year when the total number of days a pupil is absent is divided by the total number of days the pupil is enrolled and school was actually taught in the total number of days the pupil is enrolled and school was actually taught in the regular day schools of the district, exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays.
(2) The unduplicated count of pupils with a primary, secondary, or short-term enrollment during the academic year (July 1 – June 30).
(3) Divide (1) by (2).
(b) "Middle School dropout rate" shall be calculated as set forth in California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 1039.1.
(c) "High school dropout rate" shall be calculated as follows:
(1) The number of cohort members who dropout by the end of year 4 in the cohort where "cohort" is defined as the number of first-time grade 9 pupils in year 1 (starting cohort) plus pupils who transfer in, minus pupils who transfer out, emigrate, or die during school years 1, 2, 3, and 4.
(2) The total number of cohort members.
(3) Divide (1) by (2).
(d) "High school graduation rate" shall be calculated as follows:
(1) The number of cohort members who earned a regular high school diploma [or earned an adult education high school diploma or passed the California High School Proficiency Exam] by the end of year 4 in the cohort where "cohort" is defined as the number of first-time grade 9 pupils in year 1 (starting cohort) plus pupils who transfer in, minus pupils who transfer out, emigrate, or die during school years 1, 2, 3, and 4.
(2) The total number of cohort members.
(3) Divide (1) by (2).
(e) "Suspension rate" shall be calculated as follows:
(1) The unduplicated count of pupils involved in one or more incidents for which the pupil was suspended during the academic year (July 1 – June 30).
(2) The unduplicated count of pupils with a primary, secondary, or short-term enrollment during the academic year (July 1 – June 30).
(3) Divide (1) by (2).
(f) "Expulsion rate" shall be calculated as follows:
(1) The unduplicated count of pupils involved in one or more incidents for which the pupil was expelled during the academic year (July 1 – June 30).
(2) The unduplicated count of pupils with a primary, secondary, or short-term enrollment during the academic year (July 1 – June 30).
(3) Divide (1) by (2).
01-13-15 [California Department of Education]