Local Control and Accountability Plan

The instructions for completing the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) follow the template.

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Roseville Joint Union High School District	Tu Carroz Assistant Superintendent	tcarroz@rjuhsd.us (916) 782-5979

Plan Summary [2024-25]

General Information

A description of the LEA, its schools, and its students in grades transitional kindergarten–12, as applicable to the LEA.

The Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) serves the educational needs of over 10,000 students from a diverse range of backgrounds (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023). Geographically, the district encompasses the city of Roseville, the Granite Bay community, and a portion of Antelope. It spans both Placer and Sacramento counties and is situated approximately 35 miles northeast of Sacramento.

Roseville has evolved significantly since its incorporation in 1909, transitioning from a railroad-centric town to a vibrant city with a diverse population. The city has earned a reputation for its excellent schools, expanding employment opportunities, and a welcoming environment for families.

RJUHSD operates six comprehensive high schools (Antelope, Granite Bay, Oakmont, Roseville, Woodcreek, and West Park), along with an adult school (Roseville Adult), and alternative education options through Roseville Pathways which include two campuses, Adelante and Independence, serving continuation, independent study, and middle college students. According to data from the fall 2023 California School Dashboard, the RJUHSD student population totaled 10,570 (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023). Breaking down this population, 25.6% of students are classified as socioeconomically disadvantaged, 4.7% are English Learners, 0.8% are experiencing homelessness, and 0.2% are foster youth. Over the past decade, the RJUHSD student body has become more diverse, with the current ethnic breakdown showing 49.5% white students and 50.5% non-white students. The most commonly spoken non-English languages among our families are Spanish, Russian, Ukrainian, Punjabi, Arabic, and Filipino (Pilipino or Tagalog) (Dataquest; California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Adelante High School has also been identified as an equity multiplier school. The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Equity Multiplier (Equity Multiplier) gives extra funding to local educational agencies (LEAs) to distribute to schools with non-stability rates over 25 percent and socioeconomically disadvantaged student rates over 70 percent from the previous year pursuant to California Education Code (EC) 42238.024. In the context of the LCFF Equity Multiplier, "non-stability" refers to schools where there is a high rate of students who experience unstable housing situations, such as homelessness or frequent moves. These students face challenges related to housing instability, which

can significantly impact their educational experiences and outcomes. The Equity Multiplier provides additional funding to schools with non-stability rates greater than 25 percent to support these students and address their unique needs. Equity Multiplier funding is required to be used to provide evidence-based services and supports for students at these schoolsites. The district is also required to document the efforts to improve outcomes for students at these schoolsites beginning with the 2024–25 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) (Local Control Funding Formula Equity Multiplier - Local Control Funding Formula (CA Dept of Education), n.d.).

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

Graduation Data Insights

The Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) achieved a commendable graduation rate of 91.7%, surpassing the statewide average—a testament to the dedication of students, educators, and the supportive community. However, beneath this accomplishment lies a more nuanced narrative. Analysis reveals divergent graduation rates among different student demographics when compared to California statewide averages: 73.8% for English Learners (compared to 77.3% statewide), 85.1% for socioeconomically disadvantaged students (compared to 82.5% statewide), 67.1% for homeless students (compared to 66.9% statewide), and 65.7% for students with disabilities (compared to 64.3% statewide). These statistics indicate a need for improvements, particularly among vulnerable groups such as foster youth. Despite an overall graduation rate increase of 0.8% and positive advancements for homeless and African American students, achieving success across all demographics remains a challenge (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

The California School Dashboard (Dashboard) is an online tool designed to help communities across the state access important information about kindergarten through grade twelve schools and districts. The Dashboard features easy-to-read reports on multiple measures of school success. The Dashboard represents one of many steps taken over the past decade that have raised the bar for student learning, increased the focus on equity, and expanded the review of performance data to a specific set of state and local measures (How Colors are Determined (CA Dept of Education) n.d.). Results are presented for all districts, schools, and defined student groups (e.g., racial/ethnic groups, low income, English learners, homeless, foster youth, and students with disabilities). For the 2023 Dashboard, schools and districts receive one of five performance levels for each eligible state measure except for College/Career Readiness. The performance levels are determined using current year and prior year data and are represented by a color ranging from Red to Blue. The district's performance in graduation rates for homeless students and students with disabilities fell within the red (very low) area, with several schools scoring in the red for at least one or more demographic groups:

Adelante High: (All Students, Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED)
Antelope High: Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED)
Granite Bay High: Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Independence High: (Hispanic)
Oakmont High: Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Roseville High: Students with Disabilities (SWD)

College and Career Measures Report Findings

The report provided a comprehensive overview of student achievements across six distinct categories, shedding light on their diverse capabilities. Notably, 41.3% of students demonstrated success by passing Advanced Placement (AP) exams, while 4.9% excelled in International Baccalaureate (IB) exams, showcasing their academic dedication (AP Score Reports for Educators | College Board, 2023).

In terms of career readiness, there was a significant 7.4% increase in students completing Career Technical Education (CTE) Pathways, indicating a growing recognition of practical, real-world skills. The district also made significant progress, with a 31.3% improvement in meeting the University of California's "a-g" requirements, underscoring its commitment to providing a comprehensive education. Additionally, there was a noteworthy 10.1% increase in graduates earning the esteemed State Seal of Biliteracy, highlighting the district's proactive support for language proficiency and recognition of students' linguistic abilities (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023). However, the district's performance in college and career indicators for homeless students fell within the orange (very low) area, with several schools scoring in the orange for at least one or more demographic groups:

Adelante High: All Students, English Learners (EL), Hispanic, Homeless, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED), White
Antelope High: Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Independence High: Hispanic, Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Oakmont High: English Learners (EL), Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Woodcreek High: English Learners (EL)

Academic Achievement

In RJUHSD, academic achievement presents a multifaceted picture, showcasing both successes and challenges across various student demographics. In terms of English Language Arts (ELA), the overall percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standard stands at 67%. While some groups, such as Filipino and Asian students, demonstrate high achievement rates, with percentages reaching 86% and 74% respectively, others face significant hurdles. Notably, English Learners (EL) and students with disabilities (SWD) exhibit lower proficiency rates, at 8% and 18%. African American students also face challenges, with only 49% meeting or exceeding English Language Arts (ELA) standards. In mathematics, the overall achievement rate is 36%, with similar disparities evident among student groups. While Asian and Filipino students show relatively higher proficiency, at 55% and 57% respectively, African American students and those with disabilities struggle, with rates at 15% and 5% respectively (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

RJUHSD scored in the red (lowest) area for academic achievement in both mathematics and ELA, particularly for certain student groups such as English Learners in ELA, and African Americans and students with disabilities in math. Several school sites, including Antelope High, Independence High, John Adams Academy - Roseville, Roseville High, and Woodcreek High, also scored in the red for at least one or more demographic groups, highlighting the need for targeted interventions.

Antelope High: African American
Independence High: African American, White
John Adams Academy - Roseville: Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Roseville High: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED)

Woodcreek High: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED), Students with Disabilities (SWD)

To address these disparities, RJUHSD has integrated strategies into its Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), focusing on providing additional support and resources for underperforming student groups and schools (RJUHSD LCAP Plan, Goal 2, Actions 1 & 3, 2024). These efforts aim to foster a more equitable learning environment and improve academic outcomes for all students within the district.

Suspension Rates

In RJUHSD, suspension rates highlight both successes and challenges in maintaining a positive school climate. The overall suspension rate stands at 4.4%, with variations evident among different student demographics. While some groups exhibit relatively lower suspension rates, such as Asian and Filipino students at 3% and 2% respectively, others face higher rates, particularly foster youth (17%), homeless students (16%), and students with disabilities (10%). African American and American Indian students also experience higher suspension rates at 8% (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Notably, the district's performance in suspension rates for foster youth, homeless students, and students with disabilities fell within the red (lowest) area, indicating areas requiring urgent attention. Several schools, including Adelante High, Antelope High, Roseville High, and Woodcreek High, scored in the red for at least one or more demographic groups, underscoring the need for targeted interventions.

Adelante High: All Students, Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED), White
Antelope High: Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Roseville High: English Learners (EL), Students with Disabilities (SWD), Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED)
Woodcreek High: Students with Disabilities (SWD)

These results emphasize the need to prioritize the implementation of restorative justice practices, along with providing social-emotional support services and fostering cultural competence among staff. Restorative practices, outlined in Education Code 48900.5, involve referring individuals to counselors, social-emotional support services, behavior intervention teams, and positive behavior support programs, all aimed at enhancing staff competence for a supportive and effective environment (RJUHSD LCAP Plan, Goal 3, Action 2, 2024).

Challenges and Strategies for Improvement

The analysis of graduation rates pinpointed specific areas in need of improvement, particularly among American Indian and Native populations, students from diverse racial backgrounds, and vulnerable groups like Students with Disabilities and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged individuals. Oakmont High School showed low dashboard indicators for both Students with Disabilities and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. Roseville Pathways, our alternative education program that includes both Adelante and Independence campuses, is part of the Comprehensive School Improvement due to their low graduation rates and both the site and the district will continue efforts to enhance these rates in the upcoming academic year of 24-25.

According to the 2023 California Dashboard results, Adelante specifically needs to address graduation rate improvements for Hispanic students, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, and the general student body. Similarly, Independence High School has low

graduation indicators for Hispanic and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. Across the board, graduation rates for these student groups are notably low, even falling into the very low range.

To bolster the graduation rate for Students with Disabilities, the district has initiated changes. This involves modifying classes, resequencing courses within the Functional Skills Program, the Independent Living Program, as well as Academic Labs A and B, ensuring these courses now count towards content area credits instead of elective credits. These changes are guided by the student's Individual Education Plan (IEP) team, ensuring tailored support for individual academic paths. These initiatives include a complete overhaul in how elective credits are earned, the introduction of Career Technical Education Pathways, and the establishment of more flexible learning pathways within Roseville Pathways (RJUHSD LCAP Plan, Goal 1, Action 1.6, 2023).

Concurrently, the district crafted Continuous Improvement Monitoring (CIM) strategies. These aim to bolster participation rates in the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP), elevate academic achievement, and ensure active engagement in post-secondary options for students with disabilities. These measures underscore the district's commitment to evolving and enriching educational opportunities for all students.

Ongoing Support Efforts

Differentiated Assistance stands as a critical support in our district, aiming to address disparities in graduation rates, suspension rates, and academic performance among Students with Disabilities and homeless populations. Differentiated Assistance involves tailored interventions and strategies designed to meet the unique needs of various student groups. For Students with Disabilities, this may include personalized learning plans, specialized instructional techniques, increased support services such as counseling or tutoring, and professional development for educators on inclusive teaching practices. With a focus on equitable education, this support plays a pivotal role in rectifying these gaps and fostering inclusive learning environments.

Recent curriculum changes are integral to this effort, particularly in how modified classes for students with disabilities are categorized. Shifting these classes from elective to subject-area credits signifies the district's drive to enhance graduation rates and offer more comprehensive pathways for these students' academic success. These adaptations emphasize the district's unwavering dedication to ensuring every student has ample opportunities to excel and thrive academically.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

In the ongoing efforts of Differentiated Assistance for the Roseville Joint Union High School District, a comprehensive overview has unveiled a dynamic landscape of challenges, strengths, and opportunities. Observations have identified patterns in various metrics across different schools.

In the examination of specific schools within the Roseville Joint Union High School District, notable trends and concerns emerge. At Adelante High School (AdHS) and Independence High School (IHS), the graduation rates for students with disabilities (SWD) and those experiencing homelessness are in the red (very low) status indicator, signaling areas requiring attention. Simultaneously, Granite Bay High School (GBHS)

has experienced an uptick in suspension rates, particularly among homeless, foster youth, and SWD populations. In contrast, Oakmont High School (OHS) stands out positively, demonstrating an increase in performance, while AdHS and Roseville High School (RHS) have witnessed a decrease (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023). The district as a whole is undergoing noticeable shifts in its population, and an examination of testing methodologies reveals a lack of significant changes. For example, over three years from 2020 to 2023, English Learners increased from 3.1% to 4.7%, while Foster Youth and Homeless student numbers decreased slightly. The Hispanic and Asian student populations grew, with a notable decline in the percentage of White students from 55.8% to 49.5%. These changes reflect a more diverse student body, prompting RJUHSD's commitment to inclusive education strategies. Regarding suspension trends, discrepancies in the duration of penalties are observed across different school sites. Additionally, there is a consistent rise in identified populations, particularly in socio-economic disadvantaged (SED) growth. Notably, every struggling subgroup, encompassing homeless, foster youth, and SWD, records a state assessment participation rate below 95%, indicating a broader challenge in engagement and involvement within these demographics (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Strengths

Upon evaluating the strengths and opportunities within the Roseville Joint Union High School District, both positive aspects and potential areas for enhancement emerge. The performance of English Learners (EL) stands out as a notable strength, showcasing commendable achievements in this student demographic. The implementation of the new Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) has played a pivotal role, proving instrumental in instilling the district with a newfound sense of purpose and clarity. Moreover, the district demonstrates commendable consistency in its workforce, complemented by a positive budgetary situation. This stability not only ensures a reliable and dedicated staff but also facilitates strategic investments in various opportunity areas, fostering an environment conducive to continuous improvement and growth.

Opportunities

The data points underscore pressing areas requiring improvement within the Roseville Joint Union High School District. Suspension rates of 16% for homeless students and 10% for students with disabilities (SWD) signal a need for targeted interventions to create a more inclusive and supportive environment. Additionally, a mere 9% readiness indicator for homeless students and 12% for SWD raises concerns about the preparedness of these student populations, urging a reevaluation of educational strategies and support systems. The relatively low 66% graduation rate for SWD further emphasizes the necessity for comprehensive measures to ensure equitable educational opportunities and successful academic outcomes. Proficiency percentages of 18% in English Language Arts (ELA), 5% in Math, and 9% in Science for SWD spotlight areas where instructional strategies and curriculum require enhancement to address specific academic challenges (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023). These data points collectively serve as crucial benchmarks, highlighting the urgency for targeted interventions and comprehensive improvements to elevate the district's overall performance and foster equitable educational success for all students. Ensuring access to the math curriculum, one of the most crucial areas to address, for unduplicated students is a priority. An urgency to provide additional opportunities for collaboration time for IM1-IM3 teams to enhance course development and to ensure that counselors and math teachers receive enhanced support to increase math enrollment also rises to the forefront. Establishing before/after school math tutoring can further bolster efforts to improve math achievement and providing comprehensive professional learning on effective strategies in math classrooms for both instructors and site leaders becomes imperative.
The need for comprehensive support services for homeless students is clear, particularly those that address basic needs and provide academic, counseling, and case management support. Mentorship and guidance play a crucial role and opportunities, such as pairing

students with mentors who assist in college applications, career exploration, and goal setting, are emerging as possible solutions. Ensuring access to financial aid and scholarships, along with flexible academic programs tailored to their needs are also rising as possible remedies to improve the success rates of homeless students in pursuing higher education and career opportunities.

These and several other notable opportunities have been identified within the Roseville Joint Union High School District. Adapting and growing with the changing demographics in the district is recognized as a significant opportunity, emphasizing the importance of recognizing and adjusting to these shifts for continued success. As the district continues with a relatively consistent professional workforce, a valuable opportunity arises for targeted and intentional professional development (PD). This strategic approach aims to enhance the capacity of educators and staff, equipping them to address specific challenges effectively. Another area of opportunity lies in improved data input, particularly in Aeries reporting, which can significantly enhance the district's overall information management capabilities. Additionally, fostering collective responsibility is acknowledged as a growth area, advocating for a collaborative approach to address challenges and cultivate a sense of shared accountability among all stakeholders. These opportunities collectively represent avenues for strategic growth and improvement within the district (RJUHSD LCAP Plan, Goal 2, Action 1, 2024).

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

Schools Identified

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

Adelante High School

Support for Identified Schools

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

RJUHSD (Roseville Joint Union High School District) supports the implemented comprehensive support and improvement plan for Adelante High School (AdHS) with a strong commitment to the continuous improvement cycle. The district's approach is rooted in the Plan, Do, Study, and Act (PDSA) cycles, emphasizing ongoing assessment and refinement.

To ensure effective support, Adelante High School leaders are engaged in continuous cycles of data review. Adelante Continuation High School is scheduled for a full cycle review by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) this academic year, aligning with the standard procedure for all high schools in California. With the support of the LEA, the WASC process involves collaborative efforts from staff, parents, and students to analyze data, with a specific focus on the graduation rate and identifying root causes for any challenges.

Funding allocated for Adelante High School is strategically directed toward enhancing first instruction based on Project-Based Learning, following Michael McDowell's approach of Surface, Deep, and Transfer learning. This includes instructional coaching, external training, and resources aligned with the instructional vision across all classes. The funds also contribute to opening up college and career options, implementing a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) across Tiers 1-3, and establishing structures for evaluating and monitoring individual student progress. The partnership between Adelante High School and RJUHSD involves sharing the outcomes of investments in

Tier 1 Instructional improvements, particularly under the guidance of Michael McDowell and other capacity training professionals. The school provides progress monitoring data during these sessions and engages in discussions with the district to make informed changes based on the data.

A significant portion of the funds is dedicated to addressing root causes such as attendance, credit earnings, and engagement in curriculum and instruction. Additionally, there is a focus on practices for effective time management and developing 4-year plans for future goals. Data utilization is at the core of monitoring progress, involving extensive collaboration with the LEA, staff, parents, and students to inform stakeholders of strategies aimed at helping each student achieve the goal of graduation.
Feedback from the staff, students, parents, and the LEA is actively sought and utilized to refine systems, programs, and overall school culture. The district ensures a rigorous review process for all external contracts, involving the school leadership team and Cabinet. This process includes thorough research, interviews, and scrutiny of evidence-based strategies to uphold the highest standards in supporting Adelante High School's improvement initiatives.

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

Adelante High School in Roseville, California, identified as an equity multiplier school, is undergoing a significant transformation as part of California's Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) program. The Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) has developed a comprehensive plan to carefully monitor and evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the CSI initiative, ensuring continual growth and development.

RJUHSD and Adelante High School are forging a partnership to bolster graduation rates through comprehensive strategies. Together, they are prioritizing continued growth in communication among all stakeholders to foster a deep understanding of goals, expectations, and system opportunities. This includes proactive communication with students to increase their involvement in the diverse opportunities available within the Adelante community, such as college courses and Career and Technical Education (CTE) Pathways. Moreover, efforts are underway to enhance parent involvement, recognizing its critical role in student success. By increasing enrollment in college courses and ensuring more students complete CTE Pathways, they aim to provide a robust academic foundation. Additionally, initiatives are being implemented to enrich classroom interactions, facilitating the development of academic language, social skills, and student efficacy through meaningful peer-to-peer interactions. A pivotal aspect of this plan involves the development and implementation of Professional Learning Team (PLT) common assessments, tailored to track student growth on specific standards. These assessments, whether project-based or traditional, will inform targeted interventions and support. Furthermore, ongoing communication will continue to engage students and parents in the opportunities available within the Pathways Community, reinforcing their commitment to student success.

RJUHSD and Adelante High School will monitor the CSI process regularly, meeting twice a year for comprehensive reviews, with additional monthly meetings of the School Site Council (SSC) focusing on data and fund utilization, and quarterly agenda sessions with staff leadership specifically addressing data and finances. District and site teams will support this process by setting clear, specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) goals aligned with the school's improvement priorities and California's state standards. A key element of the monitoring plan will involve thorough data collection and analysis. Various data sets, including academic performance, attendance rates, student demographics, and stakeholder feedback, will be regularly examined to measure progress. This thorough examination will provide

insights into Adelante High School's strengths and areas requiring attention. Formative assessments will play a crucial role in the monitoring process, offering ongoing snapshots of student learning throughout the academic year. These assessments will facilitate timely adjustments to instructional strategies, ensuring a responsive approach to the evolving needs of students. The school's culture will embrace regular progress monitoring, systematically reviewing data at set intervals. This continuous assessment will not only track improvement but also identify areas needing additional focus and support. Progress monitoring will be pivotal in evaluating whether all student groups have equal access to resources, programs, and opportunities. Addressing disparities and ensuring inclusivity will be integral to ongoing improvement efforts.

District partner involvement will be actively engaged, with parents, students, teachers, administrators, and community members taking part in the monitoring process. This inclusive approach will ensure a comprehensive understanding of the school's dynamics. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will serve as collaborative hubs where educators will analyze data, share best practices, and develop strategies to support student success. This collective effort will enhance the capacity to address challenges and capitalize on opportunities. Resource allocation will undergo regular review to align with school improvement goals. Staffing, materials, and programs will be scrutinized to maximize their impact on identified priorities. Quality improvement plans, responsive to evolving needs, will be developed and updated based on meticulous data analysis. These plans will serve as roadmaps guiding the school toward continuous improvement.

Capacity building will be prioritized through professional development opportunities enhancing educators' skills in data analysis, instructional strategies, and interventions aligned with improvement goals. Continuous communication will form the backbone of the monitoring strategy, establishing transparency and collaboration. In partnership with Adelante High School, RJUHSD will regularly share progress, challenges, and strategies with stakeholders, fostering a sense of shared responsibility within the local education agency (LEA). In the journey, achievements will not only be recognized but celebrated. Milestones and successes will become markers of the collective efforts of students, teachers, and staff in the relentless pursuit of improvement. Adelante High School, with the support of RJUHSD, will thrive in an environment of continuous growth, emerging as a beacon of progress within the CSI program.

Engaging Educational Partners

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

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

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

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

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
Teachers	Teacher Meetings Targeted discussions in district department leader meetings to align LCAP goals with curriculum needs. [October 2023-January 2024] Bargaining Units Involvement Held LCAP discussions that included representatives from the Roseville Secondary Education Association (RSEA) leadership team to ensure teacher representation and input in the planning process. [September 2023-April 2024] Survey Data and Feedback Conducted anonymous surveys to gather opinions, suggestions, and areas of concern from teachers regarding LCAP priorities and implementation. [November-December 2023] Provided dedicated forms for teachers and teacher leadership teams to submit feedback, suggestions, and concerns related to the LCAP. [December 2023-January 2024] Administered surveys within focus groups to collect detailed insights on specific LCAP components and strategies. [November-December 2023] Collaborative Workshops Integrated LCAP-related workshops with the curriculum and Instruction team to foster teacher, administrator, and staff understanding and engagement. [October 2023-March 2024]

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Executed department workshops focused on aligning curriculum needs and instructional practices with LCAP objectives to ensure coherence in educational planning. [January-April 2024]
Parents	Parent Surveys and Feedback Forms Distributed online surveys to gather parent opinions, concerns, and suggestions regarding LCAP priorities and initiatives. [January 2024] Advisory Committees or Focus Groups Formed advisory committees that included parents. The committee met regularly and discussed LCAP elements, ensuring their perspectives were included in decision-making. [September 2023-April 2024] Hosted smaller focus group discussions with diverse parent groups to collect more in-depth feedback on specific LCAP components. [April 2024] The superintendent of the LEA responded, in writing, to any comments submitted by the parent advisory committee and the English learner parent advisory committee. [April 2024] Adelante High School focus group sessions (Equity Multiplier site): centered on improving communication and understanding among stakeholders, increasing student involvement in the community, and boosting enrollment in college courses and Career Technical Education (CTE) Pathways. Discussed enhancements to classroom discussions and peer interactions to develop academic language and social skills, while also partnering with district leadership to address pathway-specific needs based on student demographics and academic goals. Multilingual Engagement Conducted LCAP discussions and feedback sessions with the District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) which included languages spoken by diverse parent communities, ensuring inclusivity. [April 2024] Offered translated LCAP documents and information to facilitate understanding and engagement among non-English speaking parents. [September 2023-April 2024]

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	DELAC reviewed the LCAP and provided comments on the proposed LCAP. [April 2024] The superintendent of the LEA responded, in writing, to any comments submitted by the parent advisory committee and the English learner parent advisory committee. [April 2024] School Site Council Engagement Engaged parents in School Site Council meetings where LCAP priorities and strategies were discussed and reviewed. [February-March 2024] Encouraged parent representation on the School Site Council to ensure their perspectives are considered in decision-making. [August-September 2023]
Students	Student Surveys and Feedback Platforms Distributed online surveys along with the California Healthy Kids Survey tailored for different age groups to gather student perspectives on various LCAP priorities and initiatives. [November 2023; January 2024] Focus Groups and Advisory Committees Organized student forums at each school site to delve deeper into specific LCAP elements and gather more detailed feedback. [November-December 2023] Formed advisory committees that included students. The committee met regularly and discussed LCAP elements, ensuring their perspectives were included in decision-making. [September 2023-April 2024] Student Council Involvement Engaged student council members to discuss LCAP priorities, gather insights, and represent student perspectives in decision-making. [February-March 2024]
Administrators	Meetings and Workshops

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Held regular meetings with school administrators to discuss LCAP goals, review progress, and gather their insights. [October 2023-April 2024] Data Review and Analysis Collaborated with administrators to review academic, attendance, and other pertinent data to identify areas of improvement aligned with LCAP goals. [January-April 2024] Hosted workshops focusing on data interpretation and analysis to understand how different metrics align with the LCAP priorities. [November-December 2023] Feedback Forums and Committees Facilitated focused group discussions for administrators to share their perspectives, challenges, and recommendations related to LCAP initiatives. Invited site principals to LCAP advisory committee discussion responsible for various aspects to offer targeted insights and solutions. [October 2023-April 2024] Training and Professional Development Offered training sessions on LCAP reporting requirements and methodologies for administrators involved in data collection and reporting. [March-April 2024]
Other School Personnel	Survey Data and Feedback Conducted anonymous surveys to gather opinions, suggestions, and areas of concern from counselors and support staff members regarding LCAP priorities and implementation. [November-December 2023] Meetings and Workshops Held regular meetings with Learning Support Specialists to discuss LCAP goals, review progress, and gather their insights. [October 2023]

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	The LCAP leadership team held meetings every two weeks to prepare for Parent Advisory Committee engagement. [September 2023-April 2024]
SELPA	Reviewed the LCAP goals and meeting outcomes with the special education and co-teaching curriculum and Instruction team to acquire teacher and support staff feedback, understanding, and engagement of appropriate metrics and actions. [October 2023-March 2024] The SELPA administrator was invited to Advisory Committee meetings to review and provide input on the actions for Students with disabilities (SWD) [March 2024; April 2024]. The district Special Education team was regularly consulted to determine that specific actions for students with disabilities (SWDs) are included in the LCAP. [October 2023-April 2024] This included, but was not limited to: Reviewing data for SWDs to identify areas of challenge, root causes, and specific needs; Identifying specific actions in the LCAP to address student needs; and Identifying professional development opportunities needed to support the capacity of teachers and administrators serving SWD.
Community Partners	Posted the LCAP for public comment before the public hearing [May 2024] Held a public hearing to solicit the recommendations and comments of members of the public regarding the specific actions and expenditures proposed to be included in the LCAP [May 2024] Adopted the LCAP and Budget at the board meeting and reported local indicator data as a non-consent item [June 2024] Posted the adopted LCAP prominently on our district web page [July 2024]

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

In response to the needs that educational partners identified related to college, career, and life readiness needs identified by educational partners, Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) will implement a broad goal that includes actions to:

English Language Learners (ELL) Support:
Hire an EL Director for Multilingual Education to implement programs aligning with district goals.
Include test-taking and organizational skills in the ELD Seminar course.
Use Ellevation program to identify students who may be English Language Learners or in need of language support services.
Develop new ways to inform staff and families about Seal of Biliteracy requirements to encourage more students to participate in language learning and proficiency assessments.
Develop a communication plan for underrepresented students, including language testing information, to empower students to take control of their educational journey giving them the knowledge and resources they need to make informed decisions about their language learning goals and pathways.
Implement language programs to address barriers.

College and Career Pathways:
Raise student awareness of CCI programs and clarify differences.
Create a survey for student input on AP/IB/Dual Enrollment (DE)/CTE courses.
Provide multilingual information for all RJUHSD families.
Increase outreach to recruit underrepresented groups for participation in college and career pathway programs to create a more representative and equitable learning environment that reflects our broader society.
Increase targeted support and resources to support college and career pathway programs.
Enhance academic support in tutoring centers.
Simplify the dual enrollment (DE) application process for families to remove potential barriers that may deter families from participating in dual enrollment programs.
Offer targeted support for dual enrollment (DE) students.
Improve understanding of dual enrollment (DE) course benefits.
Boost outreach to partner districts.
Train counselors and registrars for better dual enrollment (DE) course communication.
Target underrepresented groups for support and communication.

In response to the needs that educational partners identified related to significantly reducing and ultimately eliminating the achievement gap among specific student groups and the needs identified by educational partners, Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) will implement a focus goal that includes actions to:

CAASPP Testing and Curriculum Support:
Improve CAASPP testing culture.
Prioritize PLT training and implementation plan for math and English teachers on CAASPP resources and interims.
Emphasize CAASPP's role in supporting curriculum through standards alignment.
Launch an educational campaign on CAASPP's importance for students and teachers.
Educate parents/guardians on the significance of CAASPP.
Provide CAASPP interim testing training for teachers, emphasizing data-driven instruction.
Establish before/after school math tutoring.

Implement automatic unit recovery for failing IM1-3 units.
Increase co-taught IM1 classes for SWD and general education students.
Explore year-long math course options for students needing extra support.
Allocate collaboration time for IM1-IM3 teams to enhance course development.
Enhance support for counselors and math teachers to increase math enrollment.
Provide coaching on Ellevation.
Deliver professional development on explicit language teaching.
Facilitate professional learning on strategies in math classrooms.

Student Support and Engagement:
Determine common key explicit language strategies for language acquisition in tier 1 instruction.
Place students with disabilities (SWD) into co-teaching courses as a priority.
Execute a parent engagement plan targeting chronically absent students.
Review the Credit Recovery system for enhanced learning outcomes.
Offer professional development (PD) to promote learner-centered, deep learning.
Ensure equitable access to math curriculum for unduplicated students.
Expand intensive English Language Development (ELD) programs for EL students.
Enhance academic support for foster youth (FY) and homeless students through Learning Support Specialists (LSS).
Develop attendance support plans for foster youth (FY) and homeless students.
Create targeted before and after-school math and science tutoring programs.
Increase counselor and teacher support for completing the math and science. pathways.
Expand co-taught NGSS Biology for students needing additional support.

In response to the needs that educational partners identified related to increasing parent and student engagement and the needs identified by educational partners, Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) will implement a broad goal that includes actions to:

Student Support and Alternative Pathways:
Develop systematic processes for alternatives to suspensions.
Targeted supports for homeless, SWD, EL, and FY.
Develop clear alternative pathways and supports for students reaching expulsion thresholds.
Enhance school counselor program by implementing peer support programs, counseling services, awareness campaigns.
Supplement and implement student supports.
Support alternative approaches to suspension.
Enhance parent education, access, and outreach action steps.
Facilitate an annual LCAP survey to monitor goal and action progress.

Training and Response Strategies:
Provide training and support on:
Crisis Response and Recovery Training (All Staff Levels).
Intervention strategies and how to provide appropriate responses to intervention.

Create a positive, effective response to discipline and inclusive school culture (administrators, wellness, counselors, teachers).
De-escalation strategies and student engagement.
Recognizing and addressing bullying behaviors.

Communication and Outreach:
Enhance district communication systems and the district website.
Expand resources for multilingual education and English Learner (EL) support.
Establish a district communication specialist position to support student and parent engagement initiatives.

Receiving Equity Multiplier funds additionally prompted RJUHSD to engage in collaborative consultation with educational partners at Roseville Pathways and Adelante High School to inform the development of the adopted LCAP (Local Control and Accountability Plan). This consultation process ensured that diverse perspectives and insights were considered, leading to the creation of a comprehensive plan that addresses the specific needs and priorities of the school community. In addition to informing the above goals, feedback from educational partners has influenced the following aspects of the LCAP and/or LCAP process:
Improve communication and understanding of goals, expectations, and opportunities among all stakeholders, including students, parents, and staff
Increase student involvement in Adelante community opportunities, with a focus on fostering more parent involvement
Increase enrollment of students in college courses and completion of Career Technical Education (CTE) Pathways, along with increased engagement in college and career readiness activities for both students and parents
Enhance opportunities for productive classroom conversations and peer-to-peer interactions to develop academic language, social skills, and student efficacy, including the implementation of multiple response strategies to promote student engagement and targeted support for at-risk youth
Partner with district leadership and increase their presence on campus, including more involvement in campus walk-throughs or visits to address the unique needs of each pathway based on student population, programs, and academic goals.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	RJUHSD students will be college, career, and life-ready.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The Roseville Joint Union High School District crafted this LCAP goal in response to significant educational challenges. A decline in students meeting academic standards signaled a pressing issue in achieving educational benchmarks. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated learning gaps, underscoring the need for targeted interventions to address disparities in academic achievement. The influx of newcomers in the English Learner (EL) population added complexities in meeting diverse linguistic needs.

Supporting the academic achievement of English Learners (ELs) is a critical focus in educational research. Effective strategies are vital to assist ELs in mastering English and excelling academically across all subjects. Barriers to success in English Language Development (ELD) include challenges such as poor attendance, which hinders consistent language learning. Additionally, the lack of Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) poses a hurdle. SDAIE refers to instructional strategies that are specifically designed for ELs to access grade-level content while learning English. Insufficient teacher training in ELD methods can also impede progress, and various factors can impact scores on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), which evaluate ELs' language proficiency levels. The ELPAC is a state-required test that measures the English language proficiency of EL students. Addressing these challenges through targeted interventions and professional development is crucial for the success of ELs in the educational system. To address these issues and improve the low ELPAC summative proficiency score of 21.43%, targeted interventions are necessary (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Long Term English Learners (LTELs) are students who have been designated as an English Learner (EL) for seven years or more without being reclassified as fluent English proficient. According to the California Department of Education (CDE) and research on EL education, students often become LTELs due to insufficient academic progress, inadequate support, or inconsistent language development programs (LTEL COP - Resources (CA Dept of Education), n.d.). To be reclassified from EL to fluent English proficient, a student must meet criteria set by the state or school district, which typically includes achieving a specified level on English language proficiency assessments, demonstrating mastery of basic skills on state tests, and receiving teacher evaluations and parent opinions supporting the reclassification. Challenges in language learning, proficiency testing, and barriers to AP and IB participation indicated a need for addressing cultural, socioeconomic, and self-belief factors to staff, parent, and student partner groups.

Dual enrollment can significantly impact college enrollment and completion rates. A study conducted by Karp et al. (2007) noted that dual enrollment participants were more likely to go to college and complete their degrees. This is especially true for underrepresented student populations, as dual enrollment programs help demystify the college experience and make higher education appear more attainable. Statistical data and discussions with both parent and student groups indicated success in dual enrollment programs (DE) but highlighted additional needs to support the program. Challenges in dual enrollment (DE) arose from a shortage of instructors meeting the minimum qualifications required to teach these courses. Educational partners recognized the need to establish scaffolding and support structures to tackle achievement gaps in college-level courses and to address concerns regarding inconsistent teaching styles in both college and career courses.

Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs in high schools have received strong support from various research studies highlighting their benefits for students, educators, and the broader economy. Graduates of CTE programs often experience higher employment rates. Research by Alfeld et al. (2007) indicated that high school CTE students were more likely to be employed, and those who continued into postsecondary CTE programs had even higher rates of employment. Challenges in RJUHSD's Career and Technical Education (CTE) program involve unduplicated student participation, barriers to that participation, and specific course challenges identified by student partners and the data revealing 16.9% of graduating students completing a CTE pathway in 2023. Although this is an increase from the 14.0% of students completing a pathway in 2022, there is more work to be done in some areas to increase this percentage (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

The College/Career Indicator (CCI) aims to measure the extent to which students are prepared for postsecondary options, whether that involves attending a college or starting a career. The CCI combines various measures to provide a more holistic view of student preparedness, including completion of college-preparatory coursework, performance on standardized tests, and completion of career technical education sequences. Gaps in the College and Career Indicator (CCI) Action Plans, including disparities among EL and homeless students, persistent math challenges, and gaps in college and career guidance, prompted the identification of barriers and the need for enhanced teacher training. Strengths identified in increased CTE completions, as previously mentioned, a rise in Seal of Biliteracy numbers, and steady CCI performance were acknowledged by educational partners; however, challenges persisted in certain student groups completing CTE pathways, the Seal of Biliteracy, and lower A-G completion rates with 15.9% of English Learners, 38.8% of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and 33.3% of foster youth students meeting the status of Prepared for CCI (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	Percent of EL students who are Long-Term English Learners Data Source: Dataquest	10% of our EL population are Long Term EL students			4% of our EL population are Long Term EL students	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.2	Percentage of Students Earning the Seal of Biliteracy upon Graduation Data Source: Dataquest	Overall: 26% EL: 12% FY: 25% Homeless: 0% SED: 23% SWD: 8% African American: 25% American Indian: 0% Asian: 35% Filipino: 31% Hispanic: 33% Two or More Races: 25% Pacific Islander: 13% White: 22%			Overall 29% EL: 18% FY: 31% Homeless: 6% SED: 29% SWD: 14% African American: 31% American Indian: 6% Asian: 41% Filipino: 37% Hispanic: 39% Two or More Races: 31% Pacific Islander: 19% White: 28%	
1.3	Percent of Students taking IB Courses *At GBHS and OHS, students can take International Baccalaureate (IB) classes without being IB diploma candidates. Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	Overall: 5% EL: 0% FY: 0% Homeless: 0% SED: 4% SWD: 4% African American: 3% American Indian: 13% Asian: 9% Filipino: 8% Hispanic: 4% Two or More Races: 8% Pacific Islander: 13%			Overall: 8% EL: 6% FY: 6% Homeless: 6% SED: 10% SWD: 10% African American: 9% American Indian: 19% Asian: 15% Filipino: 14% Hispanic: 10%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		White: 4%			Two or More Races: 14% Pacific Islander: 19% White: 10%	
1.4	Percentage of students earning a C or better in IB Courses Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	Overall: 96% EL: 100% FY: N/A% Homeless: 100% SED: 94% SWD: 100% African American: 100% American Indian: 100% Asian: 97% Filipino: 94% Hispanic: 94% Two or More Races: 95% Pacific Islander: 100% White: 96%			Overall: Maintain or Increase Overall: 99% EL: 100% FY: TBD% Homeless: 100% SED: 100% SWD: 100% African American: 100% American Indian: 100% Asian: 100% Filipino: 100% Hispanic: 100% Two or More Races: 100% Pacific Islander: % White: 100%	
1.5	Percent of Students taking AP Courses Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	Overall: 42% EL: 23% FY: 25% Homeless: 29% SED: 28% SWD: 15%			Overall: 45% EL: 29% FY: 31% Homeless: 35% SED: 34% SWD: 21%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		African American: 32% American Indian: 13% Asian: 60% Filipino: 51% Hispanic: 25% Two or More Races: 44% Pacific Islander: 13% White: 41%			African American: 38% American Indian: 19% Asian: 66% Filipino: 57% Hispanic: 31% Two or More Races: 50% Pacific Islander: 19% White: 47%	
1.6	Percentage of students earning a C or better in AP Courses Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	Overall: 95% EL: 86% FY: 67% Homeless: 100% SED: 91% SWD: 91% African American: 89% American Indian: 79% Asian: 97% Filipino: 96% Hispanic: 91% Two or More Races: 93% Pacific Islander: 80% White: 96%			Overall: Maintain or Increase Overall: 98% EL: 92% FY: 73% Homeless: 100% SED: 97% SWD: 97% African American: 95% American Indian: 85% Asian: 100% Filipino: 100% Hispanic: 97% Two or More Races: 99% Pacific Islander: 86% White: 100%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.7	Percent of Students taking DE Courses Data Source: Dataquest; Internal Aeries report	Overall 8% EL: 3% FY: 0% Homeless: 7% SED: 10% SWD: 3% African American: 6% American Indian: 4% Asian: 8% Filipino: 7% Hispanic: 9% Two or More Races: 11% Pacific Islander: 7% White: 8%			Overall: 11% EL: 9% FY: 6% Homeless: 13% SED: 16% SWD: 9% African American: 12% American Indian: 10% Asian: 14% Filipino: 13% Hispanic: 15% Two or More Races: 17% Pacific Islander: 13% White: 14%	
1.8	Percentage of students earning a C or better in dual enrollment courses Data Source: Internal Aeries report	Overall: 94% EL: 74% FY: N/A Homeless: 100% SED: 90% SWD: 75% African American: 85% American Indian: 75% Asian: 97% Filipino: 96% Hispanic: 92% Two or More Races: 93% Pacific Islander: 91%			Overall: Maintain or Increase Overall: 97% EL: 80% FY: 100% Homeless: 100% SED: 96% SWD: 81% African American: 91% American Indian: 81% Asian: 100%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		White: 95%			Filipino: 100% Hispanic: 98% Two or More Races: 99% Pacific Islander: 97% White: 100%	
1.9	Percentage of Graduates Who Successfully Completed CTE Pathways Data Source: Dashboard Additional reports	Overall: 17% EL: 8% FY: 23% Homeless: 3% SED: 15% SWD: 6% African American: 13% American Indian: 10% Asian: 21% Filipino: 29% Hispanic: 14% Two or More Races: 12% Pacific Islander: 18% White: 17%			Overall: 25% EL: 31% FY: 56% Homeless: 6% SED: 31% SWD: 21% African American: 20% American Indian: 6% Asian: 29% Filipino: 36% Hispanic: 26% Two or More Races: 28% Pacific Islander: 31% White: 27%	
1.10	Percentage of Students Who Enrolled in a CTE Course But Did Not Complete the Pathway Data Source: Dashboard Additional reports	Overall: 80% EL: 84% FY: 67% Homeless: 92% SED: 82% SWD: 92%			Overall: 83% EL: 90% FY: 73% Homeless: 98% SED: 88% SWD: 98%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		African American: 82% American Indian: 88% Asian: 73% Filipino: 65% Hispanic: 82% Two or More Races: 81% Pacific Islander: 67% White: 81%			African American: 88% American Indian: 96% Asian: 79% Filipino: 71% Hispanic: 88% Two or More Races: 87% Pacific Islander: 73% White: 87%	
1.11	Percentage of Students with Successful Course Completion of A-G courses Data Source: Dashboard Additional reports	Overall: 61% EL: 23% FY: 39% Homeless: 14% SED: 44% SWD: 15% African American: 54% American Indian: 52% Asian: 76% Filipino: 78% Hispanic: 47% Two or More Races: 46% Pacific Islander: 50% White: 64%			Overall: 64% EL: 29% FY: 45% Homeless: 20% SED: 50% SWD: 21% African American: 60% American Indian: 58% Asian: 82% Filipino: 84% Hispanic: 53% Two or More Races: 52% Pacific Islander: 56% White: 70%	
1.12	Percentage of Students with Readiness on	Overall: 57% EL: 16%			Overall: 60% EL: 22%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	College and Career Indicator Data Source: Dashboard Additional reports	FY: 33% Homeless: 9% SED: 39% SWD: 12% African American: 41% American Indian: 38% Asian: 75% Filipino: 79% Hispanic: 41% Two or More Races: 46% Pacific Islander: 38% White: 60%			FY: 39% Homeless: 15% SED: 45% SWD: 18% African American: 47% American Indian: 44% Asian: 81% Filipino: 85% Hispanic: 47% Two or More Races: 52% Pacific Islander: 44% White: 66%	
1.13	Number of IB courses offered at GBHS and OHS Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	IB Courses offered at each of the IB High Schools Site: GBHS Course #: 21 Enrollment: 716 Site: OHS Course #: 10 Enrollment: 742			Maintain or increase the number of IB Courses offered at each of the IB High Schools Site: GBHS Course #: 21+ Enrollment: TBD Site: OHS Course #: 10+ Enrollment: TBD	
1.14	Number of AP Courses Offered at all High Schools	AP Courses offered at each of the High Schools			Overall: Maintain or Increase Site: AnHS	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	Site: AnHS Course #: 15 Enrollment: 852 Site: GBHS Course #: 21 Enrollment: 2066 Site: OHS Course #: 10 Enrollment: 668 Site: RHS Course #: 21 Enrollment: 879 Site: AdHS/ IHS Course #: 0 Enrollment: 0 Site: WPHS Course #: 16 Enrollment: 824 Site: WHS Course #: 17 Enrollment: 1372			Course #: 15+ Enrollment: TBD Site: GBHS Course #: 21+ Enrollment: TBD Site: OHS Course #: 10+ Enrollment: TBD Site: RHS Course #: 21+ Enrollment: TBD Site: AdHS/ IHS Course #: 0+ Enrollment: TBD Site: WPHS Course #: 16+ Enrollment: TBD Site: WHS Course #: 17+ Enrollment: TBD	
1.15	Number Of DE Courses Offered At All High Schools Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	DE Courses offered at each of the High Schools Site: AnHS Course #: 7 Enrollment: 416 Site: GBHS			Site: AnHS Course #: 7+ Enrollment: TBD Site: GBHS Course #: 3+ Enrollment: TBD Site: OHS	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Course #: 3 Enrollment: 159 Site: OHS Course #: 1 Enrollment: 13 Site: RHS Course #: 6 Enrollment: 170 Site: AdHS/ IHS Course #: 10 Enrollment: 72/45 Site: WPHS Course #: 0 Enrollment: 0 Site: WHS Course #: 9 Enrollment: 198			Course #: 1+ Enrollment: TBD Site: RHS Course #: 6+ Enrollment: TBD Site: AdHS/ IHS Course #: 10+ Enrollment: TBD Site: WPHS Course #: + Enrollment: + Site: WHS Course #: 9+ Enrollment: TBD	
1.16	Percentage of Students Who Accessed CTE Internships Data Source: Internal Aeries Report	EL: 0% FY: 0% Homeless: 0% SED: 21% SWD: 1% African American: 4% American Indian: 0% Asian: 24% Filipino: 4% Hispanic: 16% Two or More Races: 5% Pacific Islander: 0% White: 45%			EL: 6% FY: 6% Homeless: 6% SED: 27% SWD: 7% African American: 10% American Indian: 6% Asian: 30% Filipino: 10% Hispanic: 22%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Two or More Races: 11% Pacific Islander: 6% White: 51%	

Goal Analysis [2023-24]

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

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.1	Multilingual Education and English Learner Support	The EL Director of Multilingual Education and English Learner Support will provide leadership and directions by implementing and supporting multilingual integrated and designated English Learner programs to support student achievement and rigorous, innovative learning aligned to the district and school goals.	$394,261.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Embed test-taking and organizational (study skills) in ELD Seminar Continue the use of Ellevation to support the identification of students Purchase and implement translation headsets/devices that allow us to correspond with our EL parents in real-time, during DELAC meetings, etc. Funds provided to site for EL support		
1.2	Seal of Biliteracy Program Improvements	Implementation of New Seal of Biliteracy Standards and Inclusive Language Testing Strategy at RJUHSD. Communicate new Seal of Biliteracy requirements to staff and families Build a comprehensive promotional plan specifically targeting unduplicated students and families, including information on testing for languages not currently offered at RJUHSD.	$0.00	No
1.3	Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs	Implement comprehensive strategies to enhance access, support, and success for students in advanced coursework. Develop an annual student survey for AP/IB/DE/CTE courses to gather input for program outreach with an emphasis on unduplicated students. Provide information in languages accessible to all RJUHSD families across print, digital, and other platforms. Enhance outreach and recruitment efforts targeting unduplicated groups. Increase the number of unduplicated students completing AP coursework Increase the number of AP courses and sections Assess and enhance the effectiveness of the tutoring center to maintain and improve the academic support system. Provide supports for students in AP and IB courses AP Coordinators Operational expenses of the IB programs at GBHS and OHS Preparation of students for AP exams Enhance AVID programs to support student academic success and college readiness	$977,020.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.4	Support for Dual Enrollment (DE) Program	Enhance access and support for students in Dual Enrollment (DE). Implement English language development strategies to support EL students to access DE. Simplify and clarify the application and onboarding process for students and families. Increase access and opportunity of our unduplicated students in DE courses. Effectively communicate diverse course options to unduplicated student groups and families. Create tools for counselors and registrars to enhance parent communication about DE options.	$1,116,727.00	No
1.5	Support for Career Technical Education (CTE) Program	Implement personalized support initiatives for students. Offer targeted support for unduplicated students. Enhance communication with unduplicated students and families to provide additional support. Develop individualized learning plans for students that align with their career interests and academic needs Create structured mentorship programs where students are paired with mentors from industries relevant to their CTE track Offer specialized career services and a comprehensive inventory of career options to help students explore career opportunities, understand the educational requirements for these careers, and learn about pathways for advancement.	$1,502,654.00	No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Significantly reduce and ultimately eliminate the achievement gap among specific student groups, promoting educational opportunities for all students.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

RJUHSD formulated this LCAP goal with the primary objective of significantly reducing and ultimately eliminating the achievement gap among unduplicated student groups. The goal is rooted in a commitment to fostering educational opportunities for all students, ensuring that each individual has equitable access to quality education. The decision to develop this goal is supported by a comprehensive examination of various data points, shedding light on the disparities among student subgroups in different academic and non-academic aspects.

Academic Performance
The CAASPP (California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress) is the statewide educational assessment program in California. It measures student knowledge and skills in English language arts, mathematics, and science, providing key data on student performance for grades three through eight and grade eleven. For California's Local Education Agencies (LEAs), CAASPP results are crucial as they help evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and curricula, identify areas needing improvement, and ensure compliance with state and federal educational standards, contributing to accountability and educational improvement strategies.

In English Language Arts (ELA), the overall percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards is 67%, as measured by the 2023 California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP). The student groups listed in the LCAP (Local Control and Accountability Plan) are dashboard groups for which we are held accountable, representing specific demographic categories whose academic progress and outcomes are monitored and evaluated. and notable disparities exist among these groups. With 8% of English Learners (EL) meeting or exceeding the proficiency standard in ELA, there is a clear need for targeted interventions to address learning gaps (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Similarly, in Mathematics, the overall percentage of 11th-grade students meeting or exceeding standards is 36%, with significant variations among subgroups. For instance, EL students have a lower percentage at 3%, highlighting the need to focus on specific support mechanisms for this group. Providing specialized training sessions and workshops in mathematics instruction focusing on research-proven strategies is a clear need. Additionally, supporting and guiding math instructors in data analysis to effectively evaluate student performance and inform

instructional decisions can help identify the root cause of achievement gaps. Educational partners identified a need for workshops, lesson modeling, coaching, and collaboration sessions with math teachers and site leaders as a need to facilitate continuous professional development and implementation of effective instructional practices in mathematics. Additionally, there is a need to contribute to the development of instructional materials that cater to diverse student needs and align with math standards, ensuring accessibility and relevance for all learners. Finally, aligning assessments in math to measure progress and identify areas for improvement is crucial for enabling targeted interventions and differentiated instruction, ultimately fostering student success. Based on math trends, RJUHSD has established a proficiency goal of 39% of students meeting or exceeding the standard of proficiency on the CAASPP by 2027, incorporating a growth goal of 1% annually for the system as a whole. This goal is informed by the historical data trends, including proficiency rates of 36% in 2022-23, 33% in 2021-22, 34% in 2020-21, 40% in 2018-19, and 39% in 2017-18 (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Both parents and teachers acknowledged the difficulty of making the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) relevant to both teachers and students. Educational partners also recognized that these barriers extended to insufficient training for test formats, inadequate support for students with disabilities, resistance to CAASPP as an accurate measure of student performance, and a general lack of success consciousness among students, highlighting multifaceted challenges. When educational partners reviewed the data related to the CAASPP test, they noted fewer students meeting standards, increased learning gaps due to the pandemic, and the need to provide additional scaffolds and supports due to the increase in English learners emphasizing significant hurdles in achieving educational goals. Barriers, such as a lack of buy-in for CAASPP, changes in the EL population, and pandemic-related disruptions, underscored the complexity of addressing issues in student performance and educational access.

The percentage of students within our 2023 graduating cohort taking higher-level math courses upon graduation was 78%, demonstrating a commitment to providing advanced educational opportunities. However, further analysis based on student subgroups is required to ensure equitable access to these courses. Over the past five years, there has been a fluctuation in the percentage of the graduating cohort taking higher-level math courses upon graduation. Baseline data collected in 2023 included all courses above Common Core Integrated Math II (CCIM2) including CCIM3, College Algebra, Precalculus, AP Statistics, AP Calculus, dual enrollment (DE) Math courses, or IB Math courses completed by the student’s senior year. This is an increase compared to the previous two years (36.5% in 2022 and 35.9% in 2021; however, the data collected during these years only considered year 3 or year 4 A-G or dual enrollment (DE) math courses into consideration. These trends across the last three years, including the incorporation of a more comprehensive definition of “high-level” math courses and pathways, suggest that a goal of a 1% increase annually is an appropriate target for the district (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023). These trends also suggest a need for targeted services to enhance academic performance and support student progression in mathematics. Prioritizing communication of CAASPP resources to district staff and alignment with Interim Assessment Benchmarks (IABs), with a particular focus on providing PLT training for math and English departments, is a clear need. Improving communication and support for counselors and math teachers is also essential to encourage increased math enrollment and facilitate student progression in math courses.

The California Science Test (CAST) is an assessment part of the CAASPP system, designed to evaluate students' understanding of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) for California public schools. For California's Local Education Agencies (LEAs), CAST is important as it provides critical data on student achievement in science, aiding in curriculum improvement, helping to ensure that educational practices align with the NGSS, and contributing to the overall assessment of school and district performance. Science proficiency, as measured by the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards, reveals an overall rate of 45%. Again, disparities among student subgroups emphasize the additional need for targeted interventions in this area (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023). High-

leverage strategies suggested by educational partners to improve science achievement involve integrating technology and hands-on experiments to make learning more interactive and engaging, thereby enhancing students' understanding and retention of scientific concepts. Another suggested approach was the implementation of professional development (PD) programs for teachers, focusing on the latest science education practices and curricula, which can equip educators with the tools and knowledge to better address diverse learning needs and improve instructional quality.

Graduation Rates
Research consistently shows that individuals with high school diplomas earn significantly more than those without. According to data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, high school graduates earn approximately 30% more than those who have not completed high school and are more likely to be employed than those without a diploma (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, (n.d.). A commendable 92% overall graduation rate is observed in RJUHSD; however, disparities persist among various student subgroups, emphasizing the importance of addressing equity in educational outcomes (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

English Learner Progress
Reclassifying English learners (ELs) refers to the process of transitioning students from an English learner status to a proficient English status based on specified criteria, which often includes assessment scores, teacher evaluations, and parent input. Reclassified students often experience significant improvements in academic performance. Research by Ilana Umansky and Sean Reardon, for example, suggests that reclassified ELs frequently perform at par with or better than their native English-speaking peers in academic assessments (Umansky & Reardon, 2014). This implies that reclassification, when accurately aligned with true language proficiency, can lead to enhanced educational outcomes. Notable progress is seen in the reclassification of EL students, with 73% achieving this milestone; however, a detailed analysis of The English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) levels, which shows the percentage of current English learners making progress towards English language proficiency or maintaining the highest performance level, indicates areas where additional support may be necessary (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Teaching Staff
A significant body of research indicates that teacher quality is one of the most important factors affecting student achievement. For example, a study by Aaronson, Barrow, and Sander (2007) found that the quality of the teacher was the most important factor influencing student performance in math, surpassing class size and the socioeconomic status of students. Teachers with strong content knowledge and pedagogical skills are better equipped to deliver effective instruction and engage students. The high percentage of appropriately assigned teachers in RJUHSD (92%) is indicative of a commitment to ensuring students have access to qualified educators (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).
In summary, the LCAP goal is a response to the nuanced data collected, aiming to address disparities in academic achievement, college and career readiness, graduation rates, attendance, and discipline among specific student groups. The goal reflects a commitment to promoting equitable educational opportunities for all students within the RJUHSD community.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard: ELA (SBAC/CAASPP) Data Source: Dashboard ELA Indicator	Overall: 67% EL: 8% FY: N/A (4 enrolled; 0 tested) Homeless: N/A (5 enrolled; 4 tested) SED: 53% SWD: 18% African American: 49% American Indian: 50% Asian: 74% Filipino: 86% Hispanic: 56% Two or More Races: 61% Pacific Islander: 57% White: 72%			Overall: 70% EL: 14% FY: 2% annual increase from baseline %* Homeless: 2% annual increase from baseline %* SED: 59% SWD: 24% African American: 55% American Indian: 56% Asian: 80% Filipino: 92% Hispanic: 62% Two or More Races: 67% Pacific Islander: 63% White: 78%	
2.2	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard: MATH (SBAC/CAASPP) Data Source: Dashboard Math Indicator	Overall: 36% EL: 3% FY: N/A (4 students enrolled; 0 tested) Homeless: N/A (4 students enrolled; 0 tested) SED: 20% SWD: 5% African American: 15%			Overall: 39% EL: 9% FY: 2% annual increase from baseline %* Homeless: 2% annual increase from baseline %* SED: 26% SWD: 11%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		American Indian: 23% Asian: 55% Filipino: 57% Hispanic: 22% Two or More Races: 32% Pacific Islander: 35% White: 39%			African American: 21% American Indian: 29% Asian: 61% Filipino: 63% Hispanic: 28% Two or More Races: 38% Pacific Islander: 41% White: 45%	
2.3	Percentage of students who took a higher level (above IM2) math course upon graduation (CCIM3, College Algebra, Precalculus, AP Statistics, AP Calculus (AB or BC), DE Math, IB Math) Data Source: SIS	Overall: 78% (of the 2023 graduating cohort) EL: 26% FY: N/A (2 students that were in the 2023 cohort that graduated, took a higher level math course - N/A given the low number)* Homeless: 28.6% SED: 67% SWD: 15% African American: 54% American Indian: 77% Asian: 86% Filipino: 96% Hispanic: 68% Two or More Races: 78% Pacific Islander: 90% White: 80%			Overall: 81% (of the 2026 graduating cohort) EL: 32% FY: TBD Homeless: 34% SED: 73% SWD: 21% African American: 60% American Indian: 82% Asian: 92% Filipino: 100% Hispanic: 74% Two or More Races: 84% Pacific Islander: 96% White: 86%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.4	High School Graduation Rate Data Source: Dashboard	Overall: 92% EL: 74% FY: 70% Homeless: 67% SED: 85% SWD: 66% African American: 89% American Indian: 86% Asian: 96% Filipino: 97% Hispanic: 85% Two or More Races: 88% Pacific Islander: 100% White: 94%			Overall: 95% EL: 80% FY: 76% Homeless: 73% SED: 91% SWD: 72% African American: 95% American Indian: 92% Asian: 100% Filipino: 100% Hispanic: 91% Two or More Races: 94% Pacific Islander: 100% White: 100%	
2.5	Percent of EL students who are reclassified Data Source: Dataquest	73% of EL students were reclassified according to our 2023 graduating cohort data			76% of EL students reclassified	
2.6	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard: SCIENCE Data Source: Dataquest (CAST)	Overall: 45% EL: 1% FY: N/A (0 enrolled)* Homeless: N/A (6 enrolled; 4 tested)* SED: 28% SWD: 9% African American: 27% American Indian: 31%			Overall: 48% EL: 7% FY: 2% annual increase from baseline %* Homeless: 2% annual increase from baseline %* SED: 34% SWD: 15%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Asian: 58% Filipino: 72% Hispanic: 31% Two or More Races: 43% Pacific Islander: 44% White: 48%			African American: 33% American Indian: 37% Asian: 64% Filipino: 78% Hispanic: 37% Two or More Races: 49% Pacific Islander: 50% White: 54%	
2.7	Number/Percentage of Appropriately Assigned Teachers Data Source: Dashboard	Appropriately Assigned Teachers: 92%			Appropriately Assigned Teachers: 100%	

Goal Analysis [2023-24]

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

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.1	Instructional Capacity Building	Coordinate comprehensive educational initiatives for student success in mathematics. The Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction will oversee the development, implementation, and evaluation of educational programs and strategies to enhance teaching and learning outcomes for unduplicated students, including but not limited to; Provide Targeted Professional Development in Mathematics Monitor strategy implementation progress from math professional development The Director II of State and Federal Programs and Accountability will ensure compliance with state and federal regulations, coordinate grant funding initiatives, and monitor academic performance metrics to drive continuous improvement within an educational institution. Align assessments to measure progress and identify areas for improvement, enabling targeted interventions and differentiated instruction Provide professional learning specialists to support teachers in accessing quality instructional materials. Provide specialized training sessions and workshops to math instructors. Provide support and guidance in data analysis. Conduct workshops, modeling lessons, coaching, and collaboration sessions. Contribute to the development of instructional materials catering to diverse student needs and aligning with math standards. Develop the capacity of site leadership to be instructional leaders through training and focused implementation of high-level math instruction. Direct instruction and training in research-based, effective mathematical instruction practices Observation of specific classroom practices and providing coaching to teachers in mathematics	$2,558,291.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Expand the current articulation opportunities between RJUHSD and its partner districts (high school and middle school math teachers) increasing both alignment and strengthening the instructional knowledge and capacity of each math instructor and department Implement highly effective strategies in all math classrooms Provide professional development research and resources for all instructors as part of capacity building efforts Incorporate engaging, high-leverage action habits into professional development at the beginning of the year as a form of capacity building Implement coaching cycles for math teachers throughout the year Ensure administrators participate in coaching cycles throughout the year, integrating high-leverage strategies.		
2.2	Explicit Language Strategies	Provide targeted support that enhances language acquisition and fosters academic success in all subject areas Provide additional ELD sections to sites to support EL students. Identify and implement explicit integrated English language development (ELD) strategies and training for teachers to support language acquisition. Provide professional development through professional learning specialists to use visual aids, hands-on activities, and simplified language to support comprehension while maintaining rigorous content standards. Train instructors to explicitly teach and reinforce academic language skills, such as vocabulary development, reading comprehension strategies, and academic writing, within the context of their specific subject area. Train teachers to increase collaborative learning opportunities for EL, newcomer, and Long-Term English Learner (LTEL) students (pair students with varying language proficiency levels, build language skills through meaningful interactions, use English in academic contexts). Provide professional development to teachers to increase engagement in discussions, debates, presentations, and projects that require EL, newcomer, and Long-Term English Learner (LTEL) LTEL students to use academic language and apply content knowledge.	$1,064,680.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Create intensive, integrated English Language development programs for newly arrived or newcomer students. Provide targeted support to Long-Term English Learners (LTELs). Implement targeted integrated English language development (ELD) programs that provide intensive English language instruction tailored to the proficiency level and individual needs of LTELs with the guidance of professional learning specialists. Incorporate language-rich activities and integrated English language development (ELD) instructional strategies into core content areas. Incorporate culturally relevant materials, texts, examples, and sharing opportunities into instruction. Train instructors to break down learning tasks into manageable steps, provide clear explanations and modeling, and offer guided practice and feedback to help LTELs develop academic language proficiency and content knowledge.		
2.3	Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science)	Ensure equitable access to high-quality education and foster academic success for all students, regardless of background or circumstance. Offer training and support for teachers administering CAASPP interim testing and utilizing formative data for instruction through professional learning specialists. Facilitate professional development to enhance learner-centered, deep thinking and learning, with a focus on strategies to reduce D and F rates in math classrooms, in partnership with various providers. Investigate and provide professional development for sites to support high school students with significant skill gaps, ensuring successful progression in our Integrated Math sequence with an emphasis on unduplicated student groups. Deliver professional development through professional learning specialists on explicit language teaching strategies for teachers, along with establishing a progress monitoring system to assess program effectiveness for EL students with particular emphasis on math, English, and science instruction.	$1,311,878.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Increase counselor and teacher support for students to finish the science pathway from Biology, Physics through Chemistry by the end of their junior year for CAASPP prep. Implement PowerSchool Unified Insights districtwide for data management and analysis of student outcomes data, to support the planning and adjustment for high-quality first instruction.		
2.4	Targeted Intervention and Academic Support	Offer additional academic support (i.e. mathematics tutoring) and opportunities for mastery across subjects, promoting access and academic success for all learners. Credit recovery opportunities for targeted credit deficient students (i.e., summer school, credit recovery during the school year). Implement a high dosage school math and science tutoring program. Implement a targeted selection process based on data analysis to identify students who will benefit most. Utilize pre and post assessments and measure individual student progress and adjust instructional strategies to maximize educational outcomes (Nickow, Oreopoulos, & Quan, 2020).	$552,256.00	Yes
2.5	Co-Taught Learning Support	Ensure universal access to education, accommodate diverse learning needs, and facilitate academic growth and success for students with disabilities (SWD). Provide and expand co-taught courses in IM1, IM2, Eng9, Eng10, and NGSS Bio for the SWDs who require it according to their IEPs at each comprehensive school site Introduce co-taught DE courses for SWD	$3,545,404.00	No
2.6	Academic Supports and Services for	Address the unique challenges socio-economically disadvantaged (SED), homeless, and foster youth (FY) students face, ensuring stability in their education, and promoting their academic success.	$927,759.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
	Unduplicated Students	Establish a plan of support for homeless, foster youth (FY), and low-income (SED) students to help address attendance issues. Increase targeted academic support of SED, FY, and homeless students through Learning Support Specialists (LSS). Maintain a transportation service to ensure students, including those who are low-income (SED), foster youth, and homeless, have access to transportation to and from school as needed.		
2.7	Enhance Guidance Services	Provide academic, college and career guidance to students Support the unduplicated proportional cost of school counselor positions	$2,226,957.00	Yes
2.8	Senior Credit Recovery Program	Support 12th-grade students at risk of not graduating. Facilitate the concurrent enrollment of 12th-grade students at risk of not graduating in credit recovery programs at Roseville Adult School.	$71,470.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	Expand support for students and increase parent involvement.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The Roseville Joint Union High School District has established a strategic goal to expand support for students and increase parent involvement, driven by comprehensive data highlighting areas for improvement within our educational community. Positive indicators, such as student and parent perceptions of school connectedness and safety, provide a foundation for engagement efforts.

Suspension and Expulsion Rates
RJUHSD places a significant emphasis on reducing suspension rates. Suspended students are more likely to fall behind in their studies, miss out on crucial instructional time, and become disconnected from the school environment. Research by Balfanz, Byrnes, and Fox (2015) highlighted the profound impact of even a single suspension during ninth grade, significantly decreasing the likelihood of graduating from high school. Moreover, studies have found that suspension is not effective at deterring poor student behavior (Fenning & Bohanon, 2006; Losen & Skiba, 2011). Instead, suspension tends to be a reactive response by adults that fails to address the underlying causes of misconduct, which may stem from experiences of trauma (Verdugo, 2002). Consequently, RJUHSD is actively focusing a culture of care that examines alternatives to suspension, seeking interventions that target the root causes of disruptive behavior. This proactive approach aims to provide support and resources to students in need, ultimately fostering a more inclusive and supportive learning environment.
Current suspension rates currently stand at 4.4% district-wide. Subgroups such as foster youth (FY) and homeless students experience disproportionately high suspension rates at 17% and 16%, respectively. Students with disabilities (SWD), also notable, have a suspension rate of 9.7%, with at least one day of suspension. Addressing these disparities is key to fostering a safe and inclusive learning environment for all students (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).
Expulsion rates remain relatively low at 0.1% overall, but attention is warranted to ensure equitable outcomes across all student demographics (Expulsion Rate, Dataquest - Roseville Joint Union High (CA Dept of Education), 2023). Disaggregated data reveals disparities, with certain groups, such as American Indian and Hispanic students, experiencing slightly higher expulsion rates, warranting further investigation and support.

Absenteeism
Chronic absenteeism is not only a strong predictor of dropout rates but also has far-reaching consequences beyond K-12 education. According to a study by Balfanz and Byrnes (2012) from the Everyone Graduates Center at Johns Hopkins University, chronic absenteeism as early as sixth grade can foreshadow lower graduation rates. Moreover, the impacts of chronic absenteeism stretch into future educational

and career opportunities, affecting college preparedness, attendance, and subsequent employment prospects. On a positive note, chronic absenteeism, defined as the percentage of students absent for 10 percent or more of instructional days they were enrolled to attend, is notably lower in RJUHSD, currently at 15%, compared to the statewide rate of 25.4% (Chronic Absenteeism Rate, Dataquest - Roseville Joint Union High (CA Dept of Education), 2023). Disparities among student subgroups are notable, with rates particularly high among English Learners (EL) at 24%, foster youth (FY) at 33%, and homeless students at 45% (Chronic Absenteeism Rate, Dataquest - Roseville Joint Union High (CA Dept of Education), 2023). Similarly, students from socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) backgrounds and those with disabilities (SWD) also exhibit elevated rates, emphasizing the need for targeted intervention and support.

Extracurricular Activities
Participation in extracurricular activities has been consistently linked with improved academic performance. According to Fredricks and Eccles (2006) students who engage in these activities tend to have higher grades and demonstrate greater aspirations for continuing education. This is often attributed to the development of organizational skills, time management, and a positive attitude towards school (Fredricks & Eccles, 2006). Research shows that students who participate in extracurricular activities are less likely to engage in risky behaviors such as substance abuse and delinquency, largely because these activities offer structured and supervised environments that encourage healthy choices, as highlighted in a report by the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (n.d.). Additionally, involvement in these activities is associated with higher levels of school engagement and attendance. Extracurricular opportunities provide students with compelling reasons to be more invested in their school community, thus enhancing their overall commitment to education.
Athletic program participation in RJUHSD, one of the key extracurricular programs, is strong with 4,517 students engaged in sports, representing 44% of the total enrollment of 10,357. This showcases the district's commitment to athletics as an integral part of school life with nearly equal numbers of sports teams for both genders (Female: 188, Male: 181). Despite this commitment, the disparity in participation rates between genders exists, with 1,978 females (40%) compared to 2,539 males (47%) engaging in athletes. This indicates a need for further investigation to ensure equitable opportunities and encouragement for all students to participate in sports.

Co-Curricular Engagement
Co-curricular participation in high schools, additionally, is widely recognized for its positive effects on students' academic, social, and emotional development. Many studies have found that participation in extracurricular activities is positively associated with higher grades, higher academic aspirations, and higher standardized test scores (Broh, 2002). Participation in co-curricular activities result in better exam grades, less disciplinary issues, increased attendance, and less dropout rate from school (Darling, Caldwell, and Smith, 2005). Specific to students who were engaged in fine arts activities, Olson (2008) found students had significantly improved attendance compared to those students who preferred to limit only to studies at school. Being involved in co-curricular activities is significantly related with class attendance and higher class attendance is linked with higher academic achievement (Olson, 2008).
In RJUHSD, a range of co-curricular activities including club participation is seen as an integral component of the educational experience, fostering both personal growth and academic enrichment. In reviewing the current data, GBHS stands out with notably more clubs than its counterparts; however, a reassessment of quality club offerings to enhance student involvement and cater to a wider array of interests is warranted. The district-wide participation in additional co-curricular activities, which complement academic learning, involves 4,799 students. The activities, which include AVID, Yearbook, Speech and Debate, and others, are critical as they support diverse aspects of student development, from leadership skills to creative expression. The high participation rate indicates
strong engagement and suggests that these programs are well-received by students, potentially contributing positively to their academic and personal growth.

At-Risk Students
Research on credit recovery programs and concurrent enrollment for at-risk students supports their effectiveness in facilitating graduation and improving academic outcomes. Several studies have demonstrated the positive impact of credit recovery programs on graduation rates and student achievement. For example, a study by the National Dropout Prevention Center found that credit recovery programs can significantly increase graduation rates for at-risk students by providing alternative pathways to earning credits and completing high school requirements (National Dropout Prevention Center, 2024). Additionally, research conducted by the What Works Clearinghouse has highlighted the effectiveness of concurrent enrollment programs in allowing students to earn college credit while still in high school, leading to higher rates of college enrollment and completion (WWC | Find What Works!, n.d.).
Facilitating concurrent enrollment of at-risk 12th-grade students in credit recovery programs at Roseville Adult School can effectively address academic challenges and ensure timely graduation. Research confirms the vital role of targeted interventions for students at risk of not graduating, with concurrent enrollment programs recognized as effective strategies for credit recovery and academic progress. Such programs offer opportunities for students to regain missed credits, improve academic standing, and increase graduation rates. Through engaging internal and external partners and launching educational campaigns, RJUHSD can efficiently communicate available resources and support to students, teachers, and parents, enhancing district-wide communication and fostering community partnerships focused on student success.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Suspension rates Data Source: DataQuest	Overall 4.4% EL: 7% FY: 17% Homeless: 16% SED: 8% SWD: 10% African American: 8% American Indian: 8% Asian: 3% Filipino: 2% Hispanic: 7% Two or More Races: 6% Pacific Islander: 6% White: 4%			Overall: 1.4% EL: 1% FY: 11% Homeless: 10% SED: 2% SWD: 4% African American: 2% American Indian: 2% Asian: 0% Filipino: 0% Hispanic: 1% Two or More Races: 0%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Pacific Islander: 0% White: 0%	
3.2	Expulsion Rates Data Source: DataQuest	Overall 0.1% African American: 0.0% American Indian: 0.9% Asian: 0.1% Filipino: 0.0% Hispanic: 0.2% Two or More Races: 0.0% Pacific Islander: 0.0% White: 0.0%			Overall: Maintain or decrease African American: 0.0% American Indian: 0.0% Asian: 0.0% Filipino: 0.0% Hispanic: 0.0% Two or More Races: 0.0% Pacific Islander: 0.0% White: 0.0%	
3.3	Rate of Student Connection 1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree Data Source: Annual District Survey	Student Survey Rating I feel like I belong at this school: 3.75 I like this school: 3.63 I think this is a good school: 3.80 Students at this school like me: 3.56 Participating in extracurricular activities is important to me: 3.73			Student Survey Rating I feel like I belong at this school: 4.0 I like this school: 4.0 I think this is a good school: 4.0 Students at this school like me: 4.0 Participating in extracurricular	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					activities is important to me: 4.0	
3.4	Rate of Student Perceptions on School Safety 1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree Data Source: Annual District Survey	I feel safe at school: 3.88			I feel safe at school: 4.0	
3.5	Rate of Parent Perceptions on School Safety 1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree Data Source: Annual District Survey	My child is safe at school: 3.95 There is adequate supervision during school: 3.72 There is adequate supervision before and after school: 3.56			My child is safe at school: 4.0 There is adequate supervision during school: 4.0 There is adequate supervision before and after school: 4.0	
3.6	Chronic Absenteeism Data Source: CALPADS EOY 3	Overall: 15% EL: 24% FY: 33% Homeless: 45% SED: 25% SWD: 30%			Overall: 12% EL: 18% FY: 27% Homeless: 39% SED: 19% SWD: 24%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		African American: 18% American Indian: 24% Asian: 8% Filipino: 6% Hispanic: 20% Two or More Races: 21% Pacific Islander: 17% White: 14%			African American: 12% American Indian: 18% Asian: 2% Filipino: 0% Hispanic: 14% Two or More Races: 15% Pacific Islander: 11% White: 8%	
3.7	Rate of Parent Perceptions on a sense of feeling welcomed, adequately informed of choice for their child's post-secondary options, as well as their child being prepared 1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree Data Source: Annual District Survey	I feel welcome at my child's school: 4.0 The school provides adequate information to students about attending college after graduation: 3.83 The school provides adequate information about non-college options after graduation: 3.36 The school succeeds at preparing its students for future work: 3.73			I feel welcome at my child's school: 4.0 The school provides adequate information to students about attending college after graduation: 4.0 The school provides adequate information about non-college options after graduation: 4.0 The school succeeds at preparing its	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					students for future work: 4.0	
3.8	Number of students participating in co-curricular opportunities (Co-curricular is defined as an activity or program that takes place outside of the traditional classroom but in some manner complements academic learning from the classroom curriculum). Data Source: Internal Data Source	Overall: 4799 students Co-curricular courses include: AVID Yearbook Speech and Debate Student Government Choir Drama Dance Band Media Mock Trial			Overall: 4943 Co-curricular courses include: AVID Yearbook Speech and Debate Student Government Choir Drama Dance Band Media Mock Trial	
3.9	Student Athletic Participation Data by Gender Data Source: California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS)	Total Comprehensive Enrollment in Schools FEMALE: 4,904 MALE: 5,387 N: 66 Total # of Student Participants by Gender FEMALE: 1,978 MALE: 2,539 N: 10 Total # of Sports Teams by Gender FEMALE: 188 MALE: 181			Overall: Maintain or Increase Total Comprehensive Enrollment FEMALE: 4,904+ MALE: 5,387+ N: 66+ Total # of Student Participants by Gender FEMALE: 1,978+ MALE: 2,539+ N: 10+	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Total # of Sports Teams by Gender FEMALE: 188+ MALE: 181+	

Goal Analysis [2023-24]

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

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.1	Strategy, Communication, Community Partnerships and Outreach	Support the strategy, communication, partnerships and outreach with internal and external partners, to increase the engagement with families and students Launch an educational campaign for students, teachers, and parents on the significance of academic achievement.	$238,850.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Communicate academic resources to district families, students and community. Enhance communication and support for the RJUHSD community.		
3.2	Supportive and Healthy School Culture	Provide a supportive school culture and climate for all students who are physically, socially, and emotionally healthy. Implement peer support programs and awareness campaigns to foster a supportive school environment. Support Intervention Response Teams (IRT) systems to more effectively monitor and support at risk students and school connectedness. Sustain extracurricular and co-curricular programs Allocate scheduled release periods and compensation for Athletic Directors to plan, coordinate, and oversee school sports programs Provide opportunities and resources for extra-curricular and co-curricular programs to support school connectedness and expand engagement in the arts, athletics, and clubs. Enhance the Unified Sports program and allocate stipends for a district coordinator and site coaches. Support Student Summits to ensure more frequent opportunities for student engagement and support Maintain the Care Solace program to support the needs of students, families, and staff. Maintain Wellness Coordinators, Wellness Mental Health Specialist and Associates, and the Wellness intern programs. Provide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Coordinator stipends and allocate PBIS District and Site Funds Support the development of PBIS action plans based on Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) survey data	$2,628,428.00	Yes
3.3	Supportive and Safe School Culture	Provide a supportive school culture and climate for all students who are physically, socially, and emotionally safe.	$2,190,011.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Provide resources, programs and services that support a learning culture and climate. Establish systematic processes for alternatives to suspensions, with targeted support for unduplicated student groups. Develop clear pathways and supports for students at risk of suspension and expulsion. Provide training and support for Standard Response Protocols, Behavioral Threat and Assessment Management (BTAM), and crisis response for all staff. Assign a School Resource Officer to each school site. Train School Resource Officers on school based interventions, trauma informed practices, classroom engagement, and working with adolescents. Assign campus monitors to each school site. Train specified staff in de-escalation strategies and student engagement techniques. Offer interventions and training in conflict resolution, motivational interviewing, and reframing behavior for school staff with emphasis on supporting unduplicated students. Provide training on recognizing and addressing bullying behaviors for students, teachers, and staff. Support programs for Tobacco Use Prevention Education (TUPE), Restorative Practices, and Attendance Interventions. Pilot vape detectors in two schools to enhance a safe school culture.		
3.4	Parent Engagement	Create a welcoming school environment and access to parent education and outreach opportunities. Support Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Liaisons for parent education, access, and outreach initiatives with specific emphasis on engaging unduplicated students and their families. Conduct parent workshops and informational sessions on navigating the education system, understanding how to use district technology, and advocating for educational needs of their child, with a focus on supporting Homeless, English Learner (EL), and Foster Youth (FY) families. Provide resources and support for teachers on how to foster relationships with parents and students.	$1,125,308.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Enhance Student Support with College & Career Technicians. Organize parent workshops addressing risk behaviors. Host Parent and Student Safety Forums and engage students and families in promoting a safe school environment. Host LCAP Nights to engage the community in discussing and shaping the Local Control and Accountability Plan.		
3.5	Data Systems	Utilize data systems for better connections and engagement between educational partners. Administer the LCAP Survey to gather input from educational partners. Enhance district communication systems and website for improved parent engagement. Train staff to effectively use the various features of district communication tools to better connect with more parents and students. Train EL families to use website features to search for and access information	$316,600.00	Yes
3.6	Language Translation Services	Foster inclusive communication practices. Offer language translation services to enhance communication and outreach efforts with multilingual families Ensure that all districtwide email communications and community meeting materials are translated into prevalent community languages.	$25,257.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
4	By 2027, Hispanic and Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED) students at Adelante High School will: Increase the graduation rate by 3% overall, Increase the graduation rates of both Hispanic and Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED) students by 6% for each group as measured by the California School Dashboard, Decrease the suspension rate for Hispanic, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED), and White students by 3%.	Equity Multiplier Focus Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The Roseville Joint Union High School District has set a focused goal for Adelante High School, an Equity Multiplier School, recognizing the need to address both areas of success and improvement identified through key data points. By 2027, the aim is for Hispanic and low-income (SED) students at Adelante High School to achieve significant progress in their graduation rates and experience fairer disciplinary practices (Local Control Funding Formula Equity Multiplier - Local Control Funding Formula (CA Dept of Education), n.d.).

Looking at the data, Adelante High School currently has an overall graduation rate of 62%. This figure indicates room for improvement to ensure more students successfully complete their high school education. Of particular concern is the Hispanic graduation rate, which stands at 45%. This data point highlights a significant gap in outcomes that needs attention to better support Hispanic students. On the other hand, the White graduation rate is notably higher at 82%, indicating a need to maintain this level of success while also focusing on access and success for other groups (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

In terms of suspension rates, the overall rate at Adelante High School is 18.8%. This suggests a significant portion of students facing disciplinary actions, indicating the need for strategies to create a more inclusive and supportive school environment. The Hispanic suspension rate, slightly lower at 19.4%, still needs improvement to ensure fair treatment and opportunities for Hispanic students. Low-income (SED) students face a suspension rate of 23.6%, highlighting the challenges they encounter and the necessity to address barriers to their academic success. Even the White student suspension rate, at 16%, suggests that there is room for improvement in creating a more equitable disciplinary system (California School Dashboard (CA Dept of Education), 2023).

Therefore, the goal developed by the district is driven by a focus on equity. By targeting specific groups, namely Hispanic and low-income students, the district aims to tackle graduation and disciplinary disparities that exist compared to their peers. This goal is based on a data-

driven approach, using insights from the California School Dashboard to guide interventions and improvements. With a timeline set for 2027, the goal allows for sustained efforts and strategies to create lasting positive change in graduation rates and disciplinary practices at Adelante High School.

In essence, the goal for Adelante High School is a strategic response to the data, aiming to improve graduation rates for Hispanic and low-income students, while also fostering a more inclusive and fair disciplinary environment for all students.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.1	Graduation Rate: Adelante High School (Equity Multiplier; See "General Information" above) Data Source: Dashboard	Overall: 62% EL: 25% FY: N/A (Less than 11 students) Homeless: 53% SED: 60% SWD: N/A (Less than 11 students) African American: N/A (Less than 11 students) American Indian: N/A (Less than 11 students) Asian: N/A (Less than 11 students) Filipino: N/A (Less than 11 students) Hispanic: 45% Two or More Races: N/A (Less than 11 students) Pacific Islander: N/A (Less than 11 students) White: 82%			Overall: 65% EL: 31% FY: TBD% Homeless: 59% SED: 66% SWD: TBD% African American: TBD% American Indian: TBD% Asian: TBD% Filipino: TBD% Hispanic: 51% Two or More Races: TBD% Pacific Islander: TBD% White: 88%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.2	Suspension Rate: Adelante High School (Equity Multiplier; See "General Information" above) Data Source: Dashboard	Overall: 18% EL: 30% FY: N/A (Less than 11 students) Homeless: 27.3% SED: 23% SWD: 17% African American: N/A (Less than 11 students) American Indian: N/A (Less than 11 students) Asian: N/A (Less than 11 students) Filipino: N/A (Less than 11 students) Hispanic: 19% Two or More Races: 33% Pacific Islander: N/A (Less than 11 students) White: 16%			Overall: 15% EL: 24% FY: TBD% Homeless: 21% SED: 17% SWD: 11% African American: TBD% American Indian: TBD% Asian: TBD% Filipino: TBD% Hispanic: 13% Two or More Races: 27% Pacific Islander: TBD% White: 10%	

Goal Analysis [2023-24]

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

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
4.1	Integrated Instructional and Literacy Coaching	Optimize student success and address the needs of at-risk youth. Collaborate with subject teachers to implement high-leverage strategies. Facilitate evidence-based instructional practices. Integrate structured Project Based Learning (PBL) experiences emphasizing critical thinking, collaboration, and real-world application of knowledge. Collect and analyze student data to identify areas of need and guide teachers in selecting impactful strategies. Provide direct literacy support to at-risk students Ensure interventions align with the specific needs of at-risk youth, fostering a culture of continuous improvement. Measure targeted outcomes through academic gains in attendance, credits earned, and graduation rates.	$162,074.00	No

Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students [2024-25]

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant
$9,388,871	$0

Required Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the LCAP Year

Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year	LCFF Carryover — Percentage	LCFF Carryover — Dollar	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year
7.368%	0.000%	$0.00	7.368%

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

Required Descriptions

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.3	**Action:** Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs **Need:** College and career indicator data show low enrollment rates among English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in dual enrollment (DE) courses, with only 16%, 33%, and 39% compared to 57% of all students.	Research highlights the effectiveness of interventions (personalized academic counseling, early identification of high-potential students, expansion of dual enrollment programs) in increasing enrollment and success rates among unduplicated students (Education Commission of the States, 2020; Center for Public Education, 2018). Offering customized support for engaging unduplicated students in college and career	We will monitor progress by tracking several key college and career indicator (CCI) metrics including the college and career indicator on the California Dashboard. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Career Technical Education (CTE) program data indicated disparities in participation rates among unduplicated student groups, with only 27% of EL, 50% of FY, and 25% of SED students having completed CTE pathways compared to 22% of all students. Educational partner feedback indicated a need to communicate diverse course options and to provide targeted support to English Learners (EL), foster youth, and low-income students to promote equitable access, highlighting the need to expand outreach into all pathways, including CTE, DE, AP, and IB programs. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	pathway (AP, IB, CTE, DE) opportunities district-wide will ensure consistency and universal access to resources, aligning with the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils. Engagement will include a comprehensive survey of all students, including unduplicated, to better understand student interest in college and career pathways. Targeted outreach systems, support plan development, and progress monitoring implementation will support engaged populations.	the new outreach and targeted support programs.
2.1	**Action:** Instructional Capacity Building **Need:** Current data shows that overall, 36% of students met or exceeded the math standard on the SBAC. Achievement levels varied among subgroups compared to the overall 36% meeting or exceeding the math standard, with strengths evident in Asian (55%), Filipino (57%), and White (39%) populations, while	The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) in their 2020 publication "Catalyzing Change in High School Mathematics: Initiating Critical Conversations" emphasizes the importance of high-quality instruction in high school mathematics, advocating for focused, coherent, and rigorous teaching practices to enhance student learning. Additionally, Desimone's (2009) research on improving impact studies of teachers' professional development suggests the need for better conceptualizations and measures to assess the effectiveness of	We will monitor progress by tracking several key elements including the effectiveness of professional development trainings, school site support implementation, coaching cycles for both teachers and administrators, and the indicator on the California Dashboard.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	deficits were observed in EL (3%), SWD (5%), and SED (20%) groups, among others. Educational partners indicated a need for a comprehensive strategy implemented to enhance math education by improving testing culture, provide training for teachers, emphasize CAASPP's support in curriculum, develop language strategies, support SWD students, engage parents, offer PD, ensure curriculum access, facilitate collaboration, increase tutoring, and develop targeted programs, all aimed at improving math and science achievement. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	professional development programs for math instruction. Offering services and supports such as teacher training in high-quality instruction, curriculum access, increased tutoring and implementation of language development strategies, and collaboration on targeted math instruction programs benefits all high school students, including unduplicated populations, by enhancing their opportunities to succeed in completing math and science pathways.	We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the new supports and services.
2.2	**Action:** Explicit Language Strategies **Need:** The academic performance of English Learner (EL) students is significantly lower than that of the general student population, indicating a critical need for additional support. Specifically, only 3% of EL students are meeting or exceeding the math standard, compared to 36% of all students. In English Language Arts (ELA), just 8% of EL students meet or exceed the standard, whereas 67% of	Research supports the implementation of various language development strategies in supporting English Learners (ELs) to acquire English language skills essential for academic success in all subjects including mathematics, English, and science. Scaffolding, as described by Hammond and Gibbons and provided through English Learner specialists, provides temporary support tailored to students' needs, facilitating language acquisition and understanding. Similarly, explicit language instruction, provided by individuals who specialize in this work, directly teaches language skills and functions, accelerating ELs' language	We will measure the effectiveness of this action by monitoring math achievement metrics along with graduation rates, the number of EL students who are reclassified, and outcomes on the English Learner Performance Indicator (ELPI). We will also seek feedback from students,

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	all learners achieve this level. Furthermore, in science, a mere 1% of EL students meet or exceed the standard, in stark contrast to 45% of all students. These disparities highlight the urgent need for targeted interventions to support EL students' academic success. Educational partner feedback indicated a need to mitigate the disparities in math, English, and science proficiency among this unduplicated student group through additional supports and resources. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	development and comprehension. Additionally, differentiated instruction addresses diverse learning needs, ensuring equitable access to grade-level content and promoting language proficiency among ELs. (Source: Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). By utilizing a Director II, Multilingual Education & English Learner Support, the district will be able to supplement the existing math, English, and science curriculum to support EL students and provide critical achievement data. This individual will also develop and implement key strategies to increase student achievement, rigorous learning and English acquisition for newcomers, English Learners (EL), and LTEL students in these core areas.	parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the EL program and its initiatives.
2.3	**Action:** Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science) **Need:** Current data shows that overall, 36% of students met or exceeded the math standard on the SBAC. Achievement levels varied among subgroups compared to the overall 36% meeting or exceeding the math standard, with strengths evident in Asian (55%), Filipino (57%), and White (39%) populations, while deficits were observed in EL (3%), SWD (5%), and SED (20%) groups, among others.	The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) in their 2020 publication "Catalyzing Change in High School Mathematics: Initiating Critical Conversations" emphasizes the importance of high-quality instruction in high school mathematics, advocating for focused, coherent, and rigorous teaching practices to enhance student learning. Additionally, Desimone's (2009) research on improving impact studies of teachers' professional development suggests the need for better conceptualizations and measures to assess the effectiveness of professional development programs for math instruction.	We will monitor progress by tracking several key elements including the effectiveness of professional development trainings, school site support implementation, coaching cycles for both teachers and administrators, and the indicator on the California Dashboard. We will also seek feedback from students,

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Educational partners indicated a need for a comprehensive strategy implemented to enhance math education by improving testing culture, provide training for teachers, exphasize CAASPP's support in curriculum, develop language strategies, support SWD students, engage parents, offer PD, ensure curriculum access, facilitate collaboration, increase tutoring, and develop targeted programs, all aimed at improving math and science achievement. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Offering services and supports such as teacher training in high-quality instruction, curriculum access, increased tutoring and implementation of language development strategies, and collaboration on targeted math instruction programs benefits all high school students, including unduplicated populations, by enhancing their opportunities to succeed in completing math and science pathways.	parents, and staff about the new supports and services.
2.4	**Action:** Targeted Intervention and Academic Support **Need:** Data reveals academic achievement challenges, with significantly lower proficiency rates for EL and SED students in both math (3% and 20% respectively) and science (1% and 28% respectively) compared to the overall student population. Educational partner feedback indicated a need for targeted, additional supports for students with particular emphasis on additional support opportunities for unduplicated groups.	Offering additional academic support and opportunities for mastery in STEM subjects for unduplicated students promotes inclusivity and diversity in STEM fields. By providing tailored support and resources, schools can encourage unduplicated students to pursue STEM interests and careers, contributing to a more diverse and skilled STEM workforce (Source: National Science Foundation, 2013; National Research Council, 2011). Providing the tutoring program on a districtwide basis will ensure equitable access to academic support for all students, including unduplicated students, regardless of their background or circumstances.	We will measure the effectiveness of our academic achievement actions by tracking the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards in Math, and Science, along with monitoring the percentage of students who took higher-level math courses upon graduation. We will also seek feedback from students,

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide		parents, and staff about the tutoring program.
2.7	**Action:** Enhance Guidance Services **Need:** In terms of math course rigor, data shows that 78% of the 2023 graduating cohort took a higher-level math course, with substantial variations among subgroups, such as EL students at 26%, FY with a very low percentage due to cohort size, and SED students at 67%. Educational partners recommended prioritizing equitable access to math curriculum for unduplicated students and dedicating collaboration time for IM1-IM3 teams to enhance course development. Additionally, partners suggested enhancing support for counselors and math teachers to not only increase math enrollment but also improve guidance for students to complete the math and science pathways successfully. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections.	Counselors have an important role in increasing student achievement and post-secondary success. Counselors are Tier I of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports. They are the first to assess student need and delegate to Tier II or III (Mulhern, 2023). School counselors have a unique perspective of educator and social-emotional/behavioral specialist. (CASC (2019). Their role is multifaceted and often times they will be the implementers of change. With new staff hired (English Learners, State and Federal Programs, Education Services, etc.) It will be necessary to be able to meet with the new Directors and other departments more frequently to discuss and collaborate on expectations for our at-risk student groups. Offering districtwide school counselors ensures all students, including unduplicated ones, have equitable access to personalized support for academic, social, and emotional needs. This availability promotes early intervention and contributes to improved academic success by providing timely guidance and resources tailored to individual student needs.	We will measure the effectiveness of School Counselor Liaisons to support math and science pathway participation by tracking the percentage of students who took a higher level (above IM2) math course upon graduation. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the counselor liaison program program and its overall effectiveness for student achievement.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Scope: LEA-wide		
2.8	**Action:** Senior Credit Recovery Program **Need:** Data shows an overall high school graduation rate of 92%. However, there are notable disparities, with strengths in Asian (96%), Filipino (97%), and Pacific Islander (100%) populations, while shortfalls are evident in EL (74%), FY (70%), homeless (67%), SWD (66%), Hispanic (85%), and African American (89%) groups. Educational partners suggested several strategies to improve graduation rates: providing more intensive English Language development for EL students, addressing attendance issues among homeless students, and increasing case management to ensure consistent support for students, although acknowledging the need to enhance capacity for more effective and continuous support. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	The study by Slay, Pohl, and McGrew (2012) explores the role of adult education in high school completion, indicating that adult education programs can play a beneficial role in credit recovery for students at risk of not graduating. Their exploratory study suggests that adult education offers flexible options and targeted support that contribute to improved outcomes for students seeking to complete their high school requirements. Providing concurrent enrollment of 12th-grade students at risk of not graduating in credit recovery programs at Adult Schools benefits all students, including unduplicated students, by offering tailored support and flexible options to help them meet graduation requirements. This approach can lead to improved outcomes, increased graduation rates, and equitable access to resources for students facing academic challenges.	We will monitor progress by tracking the academic achievement of 12th grade students in the concurrent enrollment program and the graduation rate indicator on the California Dashboard. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the supports and services related to this action.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
3.2	**Action:** Supportive and Healthy School Culture **Need:** Data reveals an overall suspension rate of 4.4% highlighting the urgency to implement targeted interventions and support strategies to reduce disciplinary actions, especially among unduplicated student groups, where rates are significantly higher, such as EL at 7%, FY at 17%, and SED at 8%. Educational partners noted that offering interventions and training in conflict resolution and restorative practices would equip staff with the necessary skills to effectively support unduplicated students and cultivate a culture of understanding and empathy. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Research highlights the importance of addressing equity issues in discipline and promoting culturally responsive approaches to behavior management. PBIS and restorative practices training contribute to creating a more equitable and inclusive school environment. By emphasizing positive behavior support and restorative approaches to discipline, we intend to reduce disciplinary disparities and ensure that all students, including those from underserved populations, have access to fair and effective disciplinary practices. (Source: Skiba et al., 2014; Gregory et al., 2016). Providing these interventions and strategies on an LEA-wide basis ensures equitable access to support for all students, aligning with RJUHSD's commitment to fostering a positive and inclusive school environment.	We will measure the effectiveness of our actions by tracking the suspension rate data. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of both PBIS and restorative practice program.
3.4	**Action:** Parent Engagement **Need:** The data shows that parents generally feel welcomed at their child's school, with a rating of 4.0 (agree) on feeling welcome. Strengths include the school providing adequate information about attending college (3.83,	The research by Barr, Nevarez, and Williams (2014) emphasizes the importance of building community engagement between parents and schools for student success. Similarly, Quint, Pomeroy, and Huneycutt (2017) highlight the role of family engagement in building stronger schools, indicating that collaborative efforts between families and schools contribute to improved student outcomes.	We will measure the effectiveness of our actions by continuing to administer an annual survey to all parents and students and tracking the Rate of Parent Perceptions on a sense of feeling welcomed,

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	nearly agree) and preparing students for future work (3.73, nearly agree). However, there are shortfalls in providing information about non-college options (3.36, neither agree nor disagree). Educational partners suggested several strategies to improve parent and family engagement, including improving communication and understanding of goals among stakeholders, enhancing parent education and outreach, upgrading district communication systems and the district website for families, and expanding resources for multilingual education and English Learner (EL) families. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Providing family and community engagement liaisons benefits all students, including unduplicated students, by fostering stronger school-family partnerships, improving communication, and ensuring access to resources. These liaisons serve as a bridge between families and schools, supporting student success through tailored support and collaboration between home and school environments.	adequately informed of choice for their child's post-secondary options, as well as their child being prepared survey metric. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the Family and Community Engagement (FACE) program.
3.5	**Action:** Data Systems **Need:** The data shows that parents generally feel welcomed at their child's school, with a rating of 4.0 (agree) on feeling welcome. Strengths include the school providing adequate information about attending college (3.83, nearly agree) and preparing students for future work (3.73, nearly agree). However, there are	The research by Barr, Nevarez, and Williams (2014) emphasizes the importance of building community engagement between parents and schools for student success. Similarly, Quint, Pomeroy, and Huneycutt (2017) highlight the role of family engagement in building stronger schools, indicating that collaborative efforts between families and schools contribute to improved student outcomes.	We will measure the effectiveness of our actions by continuing to administer an annual survey to all parents and students and tracking the Rate of Parent Perceptions on a sense of feeling welcomed, adequately informed of choice for their child's

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	shortfalls in providing information about non-college options (3.36, neither agree nor disagree). Educational partners suggested several strategies to improve parent and family engagement, including improving communication and understanding of goals among stakeholders, enhancing parent education and outreach, upgrading district communication systems and the district website for families, and expanding resources for multilingual education and English Learner (EL) families. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Providing family and community engagement liaisons benefits all students, including unduplicated students, by fostering stronger school-family partnerships, improving communication, and ensuring access to resources. These liaisons serve as a bridge between families and schools, supporting student success through tailored support and collaboration between home and school environments.	post-secondary options, as well as their child being prepared survey metric. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the Family and Community Engagement (FACE) program.

Limited Actions

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

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.1	**Action:** Multilingual Education and English Learner Support	Research supports the implementation of various language development strategies in supporting English Learners (ELs) to acquire English	We will measure the effectiveness of this action by monitoring math

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Need: The academic performance of English Learner (EL) students is significantly lower than that of the general student population, indicating a critical need for additional support. Specifically, only 3% of EL students are meeting or exceeding the math standard, compared to 36% of all students. In English Language Arts (ELA), just 8% of EL students meet or exceed the standard, whereas 67% of all learners achieve this level. Furthermore, in science, a mere 1% of EL students meet or exceed the standard, in stark contrast to 45% of all students. These disparities highlight the urgent need for targeted interventions to support EL students' academic success. Educational partner feedback indicated a need to mitigate the disparities in math, English, and science proficiency among this unduplicated student group through additional supports and resources. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	language skills essential for academic success in all subjects including mathematics, English, and science. Scaffolding, as described by Hammond and Gibbons and provided through English Learner specialists, provides temporary support tailored to students' needs, facilitating language acquisition and understanding. Similarly, explicit language instruction, provided by individuals who specialize in this work, directly teaches language skills and functions, accelerating ELs' language development and comprehension. Additionally, differentiated instruction addresses diverse learning needs, ensuring equitable access to grade-level content and promoting language proficiency among ELs. (Source: Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). By utilizing a Director II, Multilingual Education & English Learner Support, the district will be able to supplement the existing math, English, and science curriculum to support EL students and provide critical achievement data. This individual will also develop and implement key strategies to increase student achievement, rigorous learning and English acquisition for newcomers, English Learners (EL), and LTEL students in these core areas.	achievement metrics along with graduation rates, the number of EL students who are reclassified, and outcomes on the English Learner Performance Indicator (ELPI). We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the EL program and its initiatives.
2.6	**Action:** Academic Supports and Services for Unduplicated Students	Studies have shown that stable, reliable transportation reduces absenteeism among vulnerable student populations. For example, a study by Fantuzzo, LeBoeuf, Chen, Rouse, and	We will measure the effectiveness of this action by monitoring attendance metrics.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Need: Data from RJUHSD reveals disparities, including higher rates of chronic absenteeism among SED (25%), FY (33%), and homeless (45%) students compared to the overall rate of 15%. Additionally, graduation rates vary, with lower rates among SED (85%), FY (70%), and homeless (67%) students, compared to the overall rate of 92%. Educational partner feedback indicated a need for additional transportation and additional targeted supports to assist these unduplicated groups. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Culhane (2012) in Philadelphia found that homeless and highly mobile students faced significant challenges in maintaining regular school attendance, largely due to transportation issues. Providing consistent transportation helps maintain routine and reduces the stress associated with frequent school changes, which is common among low-income, foster, and homeless youth. Providing improved transportation and targeted support services to this student group and all students within the LEA will help us serve this vulnerable student population and others.	We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the targeted attendance initiatives.
3.6	**Action:** Language Translation Services **Need:** Data from RJUHSD reveals disparities, including higher rates of chronic absenteeism among SED (25%), FY (33%), and homeless (45%) students compared to the overall rate of 15%. Additionally, graduation rates vary, with lower rates among SED (85%), FY (70%), and	Studies have shown that stable, reliable transportation reduces absenteeism among vulnerable student populations. For example, a study by Fantuzzo, LeBoeuf, Chen, Rouse, and Culhane (2012) in Philadelphia found that homeless and highly mobile students faced significant challenges in maintaining regular school attendance, largely due to transportation issues. Providing consistent transportation helps maintain routine and reduces the stress associated with frequent school changes, which is common among low-income, foster, and homeless youth.	We will measure the effectiveness of this action by monitoring graduation rates. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff about the effectiveness of the transportation program.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	homeless (67%) students, compared to the overall rate of 92%. Educational partner feedback indicated a need for additional transportation and additional targeted supports to assist these unduplicated groups. See also: Engaging Educational Partners, Reflections: Annual Performance, and Metrics sections. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Providing improved transportation and targeted support services to this student group and all students within the LEA will help us serve this vulnerable student population and others.	

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

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

N/A- concentration funds not received

Staff-to-student ratios by type of school and concentration of unduplicated students	Schools with a student concentration of 55 percent or less	Schools with a student concentration of greater than 55 percent
Staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students		
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students		

2024-25 Total Expenditures Table

LCAP Year	1. Projected LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Input Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)
Totals	127,427,672	9,388,871	7.368%	0.000%	7.368%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$9,388,871.00	$12,664,208.00	$315,523.00	$567,283.00	$22,935,885.00	$14,882,329.00	$8,053,556.00

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
1	1.1	Multilingual Education and English Learner Support	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		$312,661.00	$81,600.00	$394,261.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$394,261.00	
1	1.2	Seal of Biliteracy Program Improvements	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	
1	1.3	Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$837,020.00	$140,000.00	$151,028.00	$825,992.00	$0.00	$0.00	$977,020.00	
1	1.4	Support for Dual Enrollment (DE) Program	All	No			All Schools		$346,399.00	$770,328.00	$0.00	$1,021,454.00	$95,273.00	$0.00	$1,116,727.00	
1	1.5	Support for Career Technical Education (CTE) Program	All	No			All Schools		$492,789.00	$1,009,865.00	$0.00	$1,502,654.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,502,654.00	
2	2.1	Instructional Capacity Building	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$2,145,222.00	$413,069.00	$895,429.00	$1,473,103.00	$0.00	$189,759.00	$2,558,291.00	
2	2.2	Explicit Language Strategies	English Learners	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	All Schools		$978,768.00	$85,912.00	$978,768.00	$0.00	$0.00	$85,912.00	$1,064,680.00	
2	2.3	Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$903,478.00	$408,400.00	$1,203,478.00	$108,400.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,311,878.00	
2	2.4	Targeted Intervention and Academic Support	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools		$238,006.00	$314,250.00	$132,006.00	$200,000.00	$220,250.00	$0.00	$552,256.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
2	2.5	Co-Taught Learning Support	All	No			All Schools		$0.00	$3,545,404.00	$0.00	$3,545,404.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,545,404.00	
2	2.6	Academic Supports and Services for Unduplicated Students	Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$827,759.00	$100,000.00	$876,454.00	$0.00	$0.00	$51,305.00	$927,759.00	
2	2.7	Enhance Guidance Services	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$2,226,957.00	$0.00	$2,226,957.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$2,226,957.00	
2	2.8	Senior Credit Recovery Program	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Roseville Adult School 18+		$71,470.00	$0.00	$71,470.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$71,470.00	
3	3.1	Strategy, Communication, Community Partnerships and Outreach	All	No			All Schools		$228,850.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	$238,850.00	$0.00	$0.00	$238,850.00	
3	3.2	Supportive and Healthy School Culture	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$2,553,828.00	$74,600.00	$1,833,943.00	$794,485.00	$0.00	$0.00	$2,628,428.00	
3	3.3	Supportive and Safe School Culture	All	No			All Schools		$1,489,686.00	$700,325.00	$0.00	$1,964,704.00	$0.00	$225,307.00	$2,190,011.00	
3	3.4	Parent Engagement	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$1,055,105.00	$70,203.00	$588,320.00	$536,988.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,125,308.00	
3	3.5	Data Systems	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		$0.00	$316,600.00	$11,500.00	$290,100.00	$0.00	$15,000.00	$316,600.00	
3	3.6	Language Translation Services	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		$12,257.00	$13,000.00	$25,257.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$25,257.00	
4	4.1	Integrated Instructional and Literacy Coaching	All	No			Specific Schools:		$162,074.00	$0.00	$0.00	$162,074.00	$0.00	$0.00	$162,074.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
							Adelante High School 9-12									

2024-25 Contributing Actions Table

1. Projected LCFF Base Grant	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)	Totals by Type	Total LCFF Funds
127,427,672	9,388,871	7.368%	0.000%	7.368%	$9,388,871.00	0.000%	7.368 %	**Total:**	$9,388,871.00
								LEA-wide Total:	$8,092,899.00
								Limited Total:	$1,295,972.00
								Schoolwide Total:	$0.00

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
1	1.1	Multilingual Education and English Learner Support	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$394,261.00	
1	1.3	Support for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$151,028.00	
2	2.1	Instructional Capacity Building	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$895,429.00	
2	2.2	Explicit Language Strategies	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	All Schools	$978,768.00	
2	2.3	Professional Development and Supports in Core Contents (Math, ELA, Science)	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,203,478.00	
2	2.4	Targeted Intervention and Academic Support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$132,006.00	

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
2	2.6	Academic Supports and Services for Unduplicated Students	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$876,454.00	
2	2.7	Enhance Guidance Services	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$2,226,957.00	
2	2.8	Senior Credit Recovery Program	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Roseville Adult School 18+	$71,470.00	
3	3.2	Supportive and Healthy School Culture	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,833,943.00	
3	3.4	Parent Engagement	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$588,320.00	
3	3.5	Data Systems	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$11,500.00	
3	3.6	Language Translation Services	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$25,257.00	

2023-24 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$13,286,664.00	$15,796,474.00

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
1	**1.1**	Implement and sustain Dual Enrollment	No	$50,000.00	184,050
1	**1.2**	Increase enrollment in and completion of CTE Programs of Study	Yes	$2,149,570.00	1,591,311
1	**1.3**	Implement the 4 year Planning tool in Aeries	Yes	$1,430,604.00	2,226,616
1	**1.4**	Seal of Biliteracy	No	$1,000.00	0
1	**1.5**	AP/IB Increased student course enrollment and completion	No	$20,000.00	28,020
1	**1.6**	Students with Disabilities: Higher Education	No	$200.00	0
1	**1.7**	Achievement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program	Yes	$52,246.00	54,251
1	**1.8**	College and Career Visits	Yes	$10,000.00	10,000
1	**1.9**	Credit Recovery	Yes	$367,306.00	689,846
1	**1.10**	Additional Materials and Supplies	Yes	$38,000.00	41,217
2	**2.1**	Math: Redesign the math curriculum	No	$0.00	0

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
2	2.2	Math: Parent Engagement and Student Feedback	No	$6,000.00	72,218
2	2.3	Next Generation Science Standards Implementation	No	$0.00	0
2	2.4	Students with Disabilities: CAASPP Participation	No	$0.00	0
3	3.1	Increase co-teaching in core content areas.	Yes	$2,943,000.00	4,447,275
3	3.2	Equity and Inclusion: PSAT	No	$0.00	0
3	3.3	Equity and Inclusion: English Language Development (ELD)	Yes	$1,132,503.00	1,115,679
3	3.4	Equity and Inclusion: LDI Professional Learning	Yes	$263,212.00	293,202
3	3.5	Equity and Inclusion: Resources and Communication	No	$0.00	0
3	3.6	Equity and Inclusion: Restorative Practices	No	$10,000.00	0
4	4.1	Wellness: Implementation of Wellness Centers	Yes	$1,611,502.00	1,445,422
4	4.2	Wellness: Parent Engagement	Yes	$929,642.00	1,140,494
4	4.3	Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS)	Yes	$60,742.00	60,742
4	4.4	Student Health and Well-Being: Nurse	No	$1,215,797.00	1,247,116

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
4	**4.5**	Safety on Campus: Youth Services Officer	No	$667,590.00	673,715
4	**4.6**	Athletics: Certified Trainers on Campus	No	$312,750.00	465,300
4	**4.7**	Athletics: Inside Out Initiative Implementation	Yes	$10,000	10000
4	**4.8**	Athletics: Student Participation	No	$5,000.00	0
4	**4.9**	Athletics: Student Committee	No	$0.00	0
4	**4.10**	Athletics: Plans	No	$0.0	0

2023-24 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

6. Estimated LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	7. Total Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	8. Total Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)
7,631,060	$6,589,828.00	$7,818,155.00	($1,228,327.00)	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
1	1.2	Increase enrollment in and completion of CTE Programs of Study	Yes	6,000	0		
1	1.3	Implement the 4 year Planning tool in Aeries	Yes	1,430,604	2,226,616		
1	1.7	Achievement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program	Yes	52,246	54,251		
1	1.8	College and Career Visits	Yes	10,000	10,000		
1	1.9	Credit Recovery	Yes	139,357	518,661		
1	1.10	Additional Materials and Supplies	Yes	38,000	41,217		
3	3.1	Increase co-teaching in core content areas.	Yes	906,020	901,871		
3	3.3	Equity and Inclusion: English Language Development (ELD)	Yes	1,132,503	1,115,679		
3	3.4	Equity and Inclusion: LDI Professional Learning	Yes	263,212	293,202		
4	4.1	Wellness: Implementation of Wellness Centers	Yes	1,611,502	1,445,422		
4	4.2	Wellness: Parent Engagement	Yes	929,642	1,140,494		
4	4.3	Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS)	Yes	60,742	60,742		
4	4.7	Athletics: Inside Out Initiative Implementation	Yes	10,000	10000		

2023-24 LCFF Carryover Table

9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 + Carryover %)	7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)	11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)	12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)	13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)
125,140,376	7,631,060	.11%	6.208%	$7,818,155.00	0.000%	6.248%	$0.00	0.000%

Local Control and Accountability Plan Instructions

Plan Summary

Engaging Educational Partners

Goals and Actions

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

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

Introduction and Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Plan Summary

Purpose

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

Requirements and Instructions

General Information

A description of the LEA, its schools, and its students in grades transitional kindergarten–12, as applicable to the LEA.

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

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

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

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

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

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

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

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

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

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

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

Schools Identified

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

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

Support for Identified Schools

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

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

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

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

Engaging Educational Partners

Purpose

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

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

Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- For COEs, see Education Code Section 52068 (California Legislative Information); and
- For charter schools, see Education Code Section 47606.5 (California Legislative Information).
- **NOTE:** As a reminder, the superintendent of a school district or COE must respond, in writing, to comments received by the applicable committees identified in the *Education Code* sections listed above. This includes the parent advisory committee and may include the English learner parent advisory committee and, as of July 1, 2024, the student advisory committee, as applicable.

Instructions

Respond to the prompts as follows:

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Educational Partners

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

Process for Engagement

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

- A sufficient response to this prompt must include general information about the timeline of the process and meetings or other engagement strategies with educational partners. A response may also include information about an LEA's philosophical approach to engaging its educational partners.
- An LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also include a summary of how it consulted with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for each applicable school.

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

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

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

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

- For the purposes of this prompt, this may also include, but is not necessarily limited to:

    - Inclusion of a goal or decision to pursue a Focus Goal (as described below)
    - Inclusion of metrics other than the statutorily required metrics
    - Determination of the target outcome on one or more metrics
    - Inclusion of performance by one or more student groups in the Measuring and Reporting Results subsection
    - Inclusion of action(s) or a group of actions
    - Elimination of action(s) or group of actions
    - Changes to the level of proposed expenditures for one or more actions
    - Inclusion of action(s) as contributing to increased or improved services for unduplicated students
    - Analysis of effectiveness of the specific actions to achieve the goal
    - Analysis of material differences in expenditures
    - Analysis of changes made to a goal for the ensuing LCAP year based on the annual update process
    - Analysis of challenges or successes in the implementation of actions

Goals and Actions

Purpose

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

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

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

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

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

Requirement to Address the LCFF State Priorities

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

Respond to the following prompts, as applicable:

Focus Goal(s)

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

Description

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

Focus goals for Equity Multiplier schoolsites must address the following:

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

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

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

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

Broad Goal

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Maintenance of Progress Goal

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Measuring and Reporting Results:

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

- LEAs must identify metrics for specific student groups, as appropriate, including expected outcomes that address and reduce disparities in outcomes between student groups.
- The metrics may be quantitative or qualitative; but at minimum, an LEA's LCAP must include goals that are measured using all of the applicable metrics for the related state priorities, in each LCAP year, as applicable to the type of LEA.
- To the extent a state priority does not specify one or more metrics (e.g., implementation of state academic content and performance standards), the LEA must identify a metric to use within the LCAP. For these state priorities, LEAs are encouraged to use metrics based on or reported through the relevant local indicator self-reflection tools within the Dashboard.

- **Required metrics for LEA-wide actions:** For each action identified as 1) contributing towards the requirement to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, including long-term English learners, and low-income students and 2) being provided on an LEA-wide basis, the LEA must identify one or more metrics to monitor the effectiveness of the action and its budgeted expenditures.
    - These required metrics may be identified within the action description or the first prompt in the increased or improved services section, however the description must clearly identify the metric(s) being used to monitor the effectiveness of the action and the action(s) that the metric(s) apply to.
- **Required metrics for Equity Multiplier goals**: For each Equity Multiplier goal, the LEA must identify:
    - The specific metrics for each identified student group at each specific schoolsite, as applicable, to measure the progress toward the goal, and/or
    - The specific metrics used to measure progress in meeting the goal related to credentialing, subject matter preparation, or educator retention at each specific schoolsite.

Complete the table as follows:

Metric

- Enter the metric number.

Metric

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

Baseline

- Enter the baseline when completing the LCAP for 2024–25.
    - Use the most recent data associated with the metric available at the time of adoption of the LCAP for the first year of the three-year plan. LEAs may use data as reported on the 2023 Dashboard for the baseline of a metric only if that data represents the most recent available data (e.g., high school graduation rate).
    - Using the most recent data available may involve reviewing data the LEA is preparing for submission to the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) or data that the LEA has recently submitted to CALPADS.
    - Indicate the school year to which the baseline data applies.
    - The baseline data must remain unchanged throughout the three-year LCAP.
        - This requirement is not intended to prevent LEAs from revising the baseline data if it is necessary to do so. For example, if an LEA identifies that its data collection practices for a particular metric are leading to inaccurate data and revises its practice to obtain

accurate data, it would also be appropriate for the LEA to revise the baseline data to align with the more accurate data process and report its results using the accurate data.

- If an LEA chooses to revise its baseline data, then, at a minimum, it must clearly identify the change as part of its response to the description of changes prompt in the Goal Analysis for the goal. LEAs are also strongly encouraged to involve their educational partners in the decision of whether or not to revise a baseline and to communicate the proposed change to their educational partners.

- Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one- or two-year LCAP may identify a new baseline each year, as applicable.

Year 1 Outcome

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

Year 2 Outcome

- When completing the LCAP for 2026–27, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies.
    - Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one-year LCAP may identify the Year 2 Outcome as not applicable when completing the LCAP for 2026–27 or may provide the Year 2 Outcome for 2026–27.

Target for Year 3 Outcome

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

Current Difference from Baseline

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

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

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

Goal Analysis:

Enter the LCAP Year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Action #

- Enter the action number.

Title

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

Description

- Provide a brief description of the action.

- For actions that contribute to meeting the increased or improved services requirement, the LEA may include an explanation of how each action is principally directed towards and effective in meeting the LEA's goals for unduplicated students, as described in the instructions for the Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students section.

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

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

Total Funds

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

Contributing

- Indicate whether the action contributes to meeting the increased or improved services requirement as described in the Increased or Improved Services section using a “Y” for Yes or an “N” for No.

    - **Note:** for each such contributing action, the LEA will need to provide additional information in the Increased or Improved Services section to address the requirements in *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5 [5 *CCR*] Section 15496 in the Increased or Improved Services section of the LCAP.

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

Required Actions

- LEAs with 30 or more English learners and/or 15 or more long-term English learners must include specific actions in the LCAP related to, at a minimum:

    - Language acquisition programs, as defined in *EC* Section 306, provided to students, and

    - Professional development for teachers.

    - If an LEA has both 30 or more English learners and 15 or more long-term English learners, the LEA must include actions for both English learners and long-term English learners.

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

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

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

Purpose

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

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

Statutory Requirements

An LEA is required to demonstrate in its LCAP how it is increasing or improving services for its students who are foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income, collectively referred to as unduplicated students, as compared to the services provided to all students in proportion to the increase in funding it receives based on the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the LEA (*EC* Section 42238.07[a][1], *EC* Section 52064[b][8][B]; 5 *CCR* Section 15496[a]). This proportionality percentage is also known as the "minimum proportionality percentage" or "MPP." The manner in which an LEA demonstrates it is meeting its MPP is two-fold: (1) through the expenditure of LCFF funds or through the identification of a Planned Percentage of Improved Services as documented in the Contributing Actions Table, and (2) through the explanations provided in the Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students section.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

Complete the tables as follows:

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants

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

Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover — Percentage

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

LCFF Carryover — Dollar

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

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

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

Required Descriptions:

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

Limited Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

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

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

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

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

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

Provide the following descriptions, as applicable to the LEA:

- An LEA that does not receive a concentration grant or the concentration grant add-on must indicate that a response to this prompt is not applicable.
- Identify the goal and action numbers of the actions in the LCAP that the LEA is implementing to meet the requirement to increase the number of staff who provide direct services to students at schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent.
- An LEA that does not have comparison schools from which to describe how it is using the concentration grant add-on funds, such as a single-school LEA or an LEA that only has schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, must describe how it is using the funds to increase the number of credentialed staff, classified staff, or both, including custodial staff, who provide direct services to students at selected schools and the criteria used to determine which schools require additional staffing support.
- In the event that an additional concentration grant add-on is not sufficient to increase staff providing direct services to students at a school with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, the LEA must describe how it is using the funds to retain staff providing direct services to students at a school with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent.

Complete the table as follows:

- Provide the staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students with a concentration of unduplicated students that is 55 percent or less and the staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, as applicable to the LEA.
    - The LEA may group its schools by grade span (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and High Schools), as applicable to the LEA.

    - The staff-to-student ratio must be based on the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff and the number of enrolled students as counted on the first Wednesday in October of each year.

- Provide the staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is 55 percent or less and the staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, as applicable to the LEA.

    - The LEA may group its schools by grade span (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and High Schools), as applicable to the LEA.

    - The staff-to-student ratio must be based on the number of FTE staff and the number of enrolled students as counted on the first Wednesday in October of each year.

Action Tables

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

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

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

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

Total Planned Expenditures Table

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

- **LCAP Year**: Identify the applicable LCAP Year.
- **1. Projected LCFF Base Grant**: Provide the total amount estimated LCFF entitlement for the coming school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant program, the former Home-to-School Transportation program, and the Small School District Transportation program, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8).

Note that the LCFF Base Grant for purposes of the LCAP also includes the Necessary Small Schools and Economic Recovery Target allowances for school districts, and County Operations Grant for COEs.

See *EC* sections 2574 (for COEs) and 42238.02 (for school districts and charter schools), as applicable, for LCFF entitlement calculations.

- **2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants:** Provide the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants estimated on the basis of the number and concentration of unduplicated students for the coming school year.

- **3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year:** This percentage will not be entered; it is calculated based on the Projected LCFF Base Grant and the Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). This is the percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the coming LCAP year.

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

- **Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year:** This percentage will not be entered; it is calculated based on the Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year and the LCFF Carryover — Percentage. ***This is the percentage by which the LEA must increase or improve services for unduplicated pupils as compared to the services provided to all students in the coming LCAP year.***

- **Goal #**: Enter the LCAP Goal number for the action.

- **Action #**: Enter the action's number as indicated in the LCAP Goal.

- **Action Title**: Provide a title of the action.

- **Student Group(s)**: Indicate the student group or groups who will be the primary beneficiary of the action by entering "All," or by entering a specific student group or groups.

- **Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?:** Type "Yes" if the action **is** included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement; OR, type "No" if the action is **not** included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement.

- If "Yes" is entered into the Contributing column, then complete the following columns:

    - **Scope**: The scope of an action may be LEA-wide (i.e., districtwide, countywide, or charterwide), schoolwide, or limited. An action that is LEA-wide in scope upgrades the entire educational program of the LEA. An action that is schoolwide in scope upgrades the entire educational program of a single school. An action that is limited in its scope is an action that serves only one or more unduplicated student groups.

- **Unduplicated Student Group(s)**: Regardless of scope, contributing actions serve one or more unduplicated student groups. Indicate one or more unduplicated student groups for whom services are being increased or improved as compared to what all students receive.

- **Location**: Identify the location where the action will be provided. If the action is provided to all schools within the LEA, the LEA must indicate "All Schools." If the action is provided to specific schools within the LEA or specific grade spans only, the LEA must enter "Specific Schools" or "Specific Grade Spans." Identify the individual school or a subset of schools or grade spans (e.g., all high schools or grades transitional kindergarten through grade five), as appropriate.

- **Time Span**: Enter "ongoing" if the action will be implemented for an indeterminate period of time. Otherwise, indicate the span of time for which the action will be implemented. For example, an LEA might enter "1 Year," or "2 Years," or "6 Months."

- **Total Personnel**: Enter the total amount of personnel expenditures utilized to implement this action.

- **Total Non-Personnel**: This amount will be automatically calculated based on information provided in the Total Personnel column and the Total Funds column.

- **LCFF Funds**: Enter the total amount of LCFF funds utilized to implement this action, if any. LCFF funds include all funds that make up an LEA's total LCFF target (i.e., base grant, grade span adjustment, supplemental grant, concentration grant, Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant, and Home-To-School Transportation).

    - **Note:** For an action to contribute towards meeting the increased or improved services requirement, it must include some measure of LCFF funding. The action may also include funding from other sources, however the extent to which an action contributes to meeting the increased or improved services requirement is based on the LCFF funding being used to implement the action.

- **Other State Funds**: Enter the total amount of Other State Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.

    - **Note:** Equity Multiplier funds must be included in the "Other State Funds" category, not in the "LCFF Funds" category. As a reminder, Equity Multiplier funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, funding provided to Equity Multiplier schoolsites for purposes of the LCFF, the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP. This means that Equity Multiplier funds must not be used to replace funding that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement LEA-wide actions identified in the LEA's LCAP or that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement provisions of the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP.

- **Local Funds**: Enter the total amount of Local Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.

- **Federal Funds**: Enter the total amount of Federal Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.

- **Total Funds**: This amount is automatically calculated based on amounts entered in the previous four columns.

- **Planned Percentage of Improved Services**: For any action identified as contributing, being provided on a Limited basis to unduplicated students, and that does not have funding associated with the action, enter the planned quality improvement anticipated for the action as

a percentage rounded to the nearest hundredth (0.00%). A limited action is an action that only serves foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income students.

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

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Annual Update Table

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

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

- **6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants:** Provide the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants estimated based on the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the current school year.

- **Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions**: Enter the total estimated actual expenditure of LCFF funds used to implement this action, if any.

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

LCFF Carryover Table

- **9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant**: Provide the total amount of estimated LCFF Target Entitlement for the current school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant program, the former Home-to-School Transportation program, and the Small School District Transportation program, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). Note that the LCFF Base Grant for purposes of the LCAP also includes the Necessary Small Schools and Economic Recovery Target allowances for school districts, and County Operations Grant for COEs. See *EC* sections 2574 (for COEs) and 42238.02 (for school districts and charter schools), as applicable, for LCFF entitlement calculations.

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

Calculations in the Action Tables

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

Contributing Actions Table

- **4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)**
    - This amount is the total of the Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) column.

- **5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services**
    - This percentage is the total of the Planned Percentage of Improved Services column.

- **Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the coming school year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)**

- This percentage is calculated by dividing the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4) by the Projected LCFF Base Grant (1), converting the quotient to a percentage, and adding it to the Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (5).

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

- **6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and Concentration Grants**
  - This is the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants the LEA estimates it will actually receive based on of the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the current school year.
- **4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)**
  - This amount is the total of the Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds).
- **7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions**
  - This amount is the total of the Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds).
- **Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)**
  - This amount is the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (7) subtracted from the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4).
- **5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)**
  - This amount is the total of the Planned Percentage of Improved Services column.
- **8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)**
  - This amount is the total of the Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services column.
- **Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)**
  - This amount is the Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (5) subtracted from the Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (8).

LCFF Carryover Table

- **10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 plus Carryover %)**

- This percentage is the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (6) divided by the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9) plus the LCFF Carryover – Percentage from the prior year.

- **11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)**

  - This percentage is the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (7) divided by the LCFF Funding (9), then converting the quotient to a percentage and adding the Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (8).

- **12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount LCFF Carryover (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)**

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

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

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

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

California Department of Education
November 2023