

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Redwood City Elementary School District

CDS Code: 41-69005-6044531

School Year: 2025-26

LEA contact information:

Anna Herrera, Assistant Superintendent, Ed Services


Rick Edson, Chief Business Official

redson@rcsdk8.net

(650) 482-2232

School districts receive funding from different sources: state funds under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), other state funds, local funds, and federal funds. LCFF funds include a base level of funding for all LEAs and extra funding - called "supplemental and concentration" grants - to LEAs based on the enrollment of high needs students (foster youth, English learners, and low-income students).

Budget Overview for the 2025-26 School Year




This chart shows the total general purpose revenue Redwood City Elementary School District expects to receive in the coming year from all sources.

The text description for the above chart is as follows: The total revenue projected for Redwood City Elementary School District is \$133,733,052, of which \$102,390,348 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), \$17,030,409 is other state funds, \$10,557,501 is local funds, and \$3,754,794 is federal funds. Of the \$102,390,348 in LCFF Funds, \$10,631,496 is generated based on the enrollment of high needs students (foster youth, English learner, and low-income students).

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

The LCFF gives school districts more flexibility in deciding how to use state funds. In exchange, school districts must work with parents, educators, students, and the community to develop a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) that shows how they will use these funds to serve students.



This chart provides a quick summary of how much Redwood City Elementary School District plans to spend for 2025-26. It shows how much of the total is tied to planned actions and services in the LCAP.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: Redwood City Elementary School District plans to spend \$151,467,845 for the 2025-26 school year. Of that amount, \$65,894,364 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and \$85,573,481 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:

General Fund expenditures not included in the LCAP primarily cover districtwide administrative and operational costs—such as utilities, payroll, accounting, human resources, technology, data processing, maintenance, custodial services, and contracted non-instructional services like legal and audit. These expenditures support core district functions but are not directly tied to the goals and actions outlined in the LCAP.


Increased or Improved Services for High Needs Students in the LCAP for the 2025-26 School Year

In 2025-26, Redwood City Elementary School District is projecting it will receive \$10,631,496 based on the enrollment of foster youth, English learner, and low-income students. Redwood City Elementary School District must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Redwood City Elementary School District plans to spend \$11,171,711 towards meeting this requirement, as described in the LCAP.

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Update on Increased or Improved Services for High Needs Students in 2024-25

Prior Year Expenditures: Increased or Improved Services for High Needs Students



This chart compares what Redwood City Elementary School District budgeted last year in the LCAP for actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students with what Redwood City Elementary School District estimates it has spent on actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students in the current year.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: In 2024-25, Redwood City Elementary School District's LCAP budgeted \$10,443,343 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Redwood City Elementary School District actually spent \$11,320,450 for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2024-25.

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
Redwood City Elementary School District	Anna Herrera, Assistant Superintendent, Ed Services Rick Edson, Chief Business Official	aherrera@rcsdk8.net (650) 482-2255 (650) 482-2232

Plan Summary [2025-26]

General Information

A description of the LEA, its schools, and its students in grades transitional kindergarten–12, as applicable to the LEA. LEAs may also provide information about their strategic plan, vision, etc.

For more than 100 years, Redwood City School District (RCSD) has educated Pre-School through 8th grade students in Redwood City and portions of Atherton, Menlo Park, San Carlos, and Woodside. The area has continued to change and the school district's demographics are different than even five years ago. Local data as of May, 2025 there were 6,703 TK-8 grade students, 3,804 students receiving free and reduced lunch (low income), 262 homeless, 6 foster youth and 2,075 English Learners.

RCSD offers a variety of school options to families. All schools provide students with a rigorous academic program based on a common instructional framework, but each school has its own unique emphasis, classroom approach, and personality. RCSD offers families a mix of neighborhood schools and “schools of choice” to meet the needs of our students. In RCSD classrooms, learning is interactive, and teachers rove the classroom providing feedback as students explore and discover.

The District has developed its Learner Framework, fostering a passion for learning through agency and student-centered strategies. The Learner Framework, woven into the fabric of daily lessons, equips RCSD students with tools and traits that foster lifelong success. As they guide instruction, RCSD teachers create engaging and empowering classroom conditions that tap student curiosity, provide choice in demonstrating skill sets, promote creative thought, and elevate student voice and interaction. These student-centered strategies are designed to meet the diversity of all students’ needs and to accelerate learning. This framework, rooted in our District’s vision and mission, focuses on ensuring that all students are prepared to be Empowered Learners, Knowledge Constructors, Effective Collaborators, and

Creative Communicators. Building upon these characteristics serves students at school and well into their futures as the next generation of difference makers and problem solvers.

Besides its commitment to high academic standards, the District also strives to meet students' developmental needs -- intellectual, physical, mental, and social-emotional -- through a wide variety of programs offered during and after the school day. The district implemented the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS), which offers an integrated whole-child approach to support all students academically, emotionally, and socially. MTSS is an integrated, comprehensive framework that focuses on core instruction, differentiated learning, student-centered learning, individualized student needs, and the alignment of systems necessary for all students' academic, behavioral, and social success.

In 2022–23, RCSD prioritized student mental health and academics as schools fully reopened, partnering with Stanford to place a mental health clinician at every site—a program recognized with multiple awards. Due to the teacher shortage, the district also restructured by moving over 200 middle school students from two PreK–8 schools to comprehensive middle schools to maintain instructional quality.

To address staffing challenges, RCSD restructured its PreK–8 schools to better compete for the more available single-subject credentialed teachers needed at the middle school level. At the same time, the district expanded its Transitional Kindergarten (TK) program from 5 to 11 classrooms to meet new state requirements and serve younger children, requiring the recruitment of additional teachers and instructional assistants. In 2025-2026 three new additional transitional classrooms will be added to general education and two additional special learning classroom for a total of 18 TK classrooms.

In response to equity challenges amplified by pandemic-era Distance Learning, RCSD deepened its five-year partnership with the National Urban Alliance (NUA) to promote equity consciousness and dismantle barriers to student success. This work led to the adoption of an Equity Policy in November 2020, the development of administrative regulations, and a revised district mission and vision finalized in May 2021.

Our Mission

RCSD creates a safe and supportive, inspirational and rigorous, joyful and inclusive environment for all learners

Our Vision

RCSD will be a thriving, dynamic, innovative, and nurturing community where each student realizes their unique gifts and strengths to achieve high intellectual performances for personal and academic success

Our Values

RCSD has a collective responsibility to achieve our vision through a commitment to these values

Innovation

To analyze systemic practices, including racial biases, through an equity consciousness lens that dismantle barriers to student learning and emotional well being.

Student Voice

To encourage students' bravery, voice and leadership.

Equity

To instill passion in learning emphasizing student strengths and gifts for all learners: all abilities, all ethnicities and cultural identities, LGBTQ + youth, and multilingual learners

Engagement

To offer opportunities and access to joyful, rigorous, and enriching instruction and resources

Partnerships

To build family and community partnerships for student success

Equity Board Policy Adopted November 2020

The Governing Board believes that the diversity that exists among the district's community of students, staff, parents/guardians, and community members is integral to the district's vision, mission, and goals. Addressing the needs of the most marginalized learners requires recognition of the inherent value of diversity and acknowledgement that educational excellence requires a commitment to equity in the opportunities provided to students and the resulting outcomes.

In order to eradicate institutional bias of any kind, including implicit or unintentional biases and prejudices that affect student achievement, and to eliminate disparities in educational outcomes for students from historically underserved and underrepresented populations, the district shall proactively identify class and cultural biases as well as practices, policies, and institutional barriers that negatively influence student learning, perpetuate opportunity achievement gaps, and impede equal access to opportunities for all students.

The Board shall make decisions with a deliberate awareness of impediments to learning faced by students of color and/or diverse cultural, linguistic, or socio-economic backgrounds. To ensure that equity is the intentional result of district decisions, the Board shall consider whether its decisions address the needs of students from racial, ethnic, and indigent communities and remedy the inequities that such communities experienced in the context of a history of exclusion, discrimination, and segregation. Board decisions shall not rely on biased or stereotypical assumptions about any particular group of students.

The Board and the Superintendent or designee shall develop and implement policies and strategies to promote equity in district programs and activities, through measures such as the following:

1. Routinely assessing student needs based on data disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and socio-economic and cultural backgrounds in order to enable equity-focused policy, planning, and resource development decisions
(cf. 0400 - Comprehensive Plans)
(cf. 0460 - Local Control and Accountability Plan)
(cf. 6162.5 - Student Assessment)
2. Analyzing expenditures and allocating financial and human resources in a manner that provides all students with equitable access to district programs, support services, and opportunities for success and promotes equity and inclusion in the district. Such resources include access to high-quality administrators, teachers, and other school personnel; funding; technology, equipment, textbooks, and other instructional materials; facilities; and community resources or partnerships.
3. Enabling and encouraging students to enroll in, participate in, and complete curricular and extracurricular courses, advanced college preparation programs, and other student activities
4. Building a positive school climate that promotes student engagement, safety, and academic and other supports for students
5. Adopting curriculum and instructional materials that accurately reflect the diversity among student groups
6. Providing and/or collaborating with local agencies and community groups to ensure the availability of necessary support services for students in need

The Board shall regularly monitor the intent and impact of district policies and decisions in order to safeguard against disproportionate or unintentional impact on access to district programs and achievement goals for specific student populations in need of services.

MTSS

The California Department of Education's (CDE) definition of Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) provides a basis for understanding how RCSD educators can work together to ensure equitable access and opportunity for all students to achieve the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). MTSS includes Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI2) as well as additional, distinct philosophies, and concepts. In RCSD, MTSS is an integrated, comprehensive framework that focuses on CCSS, core instruction, differentiated learning, student-centered learning, individualized student needs, and the alignment of systems necessary for all students' intellectual, mental and physical, and social-emotional development and success. RCSD provides numerous systems of support, during and after the school day. These include support for Special Education, Title I, Title III, support services for English Learners, American-Indian students, and those in gifted and talented programs. MTSS offers the potential to create needed systemic change through intentional design and redesign of services and supports that quickly identify and match the needs of all students.

In addition to its commitment to high academic standards, the District also strives to meet students' developmental needs -- intellectual, physical, mental, and social-emotional -- through a wide variety of programs offered during and after the school day. The Expanded Learning Opportunities Program has brought numerous partners to our sites and has opened up opportunities for unduplicated pupils to thrive in a variety of after school classes and opportunities.

Dual Language Immersion and World Language Programs:

Redwood City School District's (RCSD) has two TK-8 Dual Language Immersion Programs: Spanish and Mandarin. Each site brings together Spanish-speaking or Mandarin-speaking students and English-speaking students and families for the opportunity of a promising future of being bilingual, biliterate, and academically enriched. The student populations are composed of 50% Spanish-speaking or Mandarin-speaking students and 50% English-speaking students. Our immersion schools have high expectations for students. They are expected to show high levels of proficiency in two languages by the time they exit 5th grade. RCSD's Dual Language Immersion Program in Spanish is housed at Adelante Selby Spanish Immersion School and Dual Language Immersion Program in Mandarin is housed at Orion Alternative Mandarin Immersion School. Both programs feed into Kennedy Middle School, which houses the 6-8 grades for both Mandarin and Spanish Immersion.

Neighborhood Schools:

RCSD operates seven neighborhood schools--Clifford, Garfield, Henry Ford, Hoover, Roosevelt, Roy Cloud, and Taft. Our neighborhood schools offer academic rigor, a culture of parental involvement, student diversity, and a strong sense of community through student and family connections and friendships. All RCSD families are assigned to one of the seven neighborhood schools.

Community Schools:

RCSD has expanded its Community Schools to eight sites: Adelante Selby (TK-5), Clifford (TK-8), Garfield (K-5), Hoover (TK-8), Kennedy (6-8), McKinley Institute of Technology (6-8), Roosevelt (TK-5) and Taft (TK-5). Community School is a model focused on achieving educational success and developing the social, emotional, and physical well-being of students, families, and the community. Community schools provide multiple services through intentional partnerships to provide opportunities, optimize impact, and address identified needs at an individual and community level. These schools close any service gaps that can act as barriers to learning while proactively offering initiatives as part of learning through the whole-child lens. Community School faculty and staff attend to equitable practices and are culturally aware. Community

School Site Administration adopts shared leadership, effective coordination, and collective responsibility as the principles for student success. Opportunities and services are integrated into the fabric of daily life in school and into the landscape of the school community.

Schools of Choice:

While the district assigns families to one of its seven neighborhood schools, all students have the choice to transfer to any other program or school including five specialized programs--Adelante Selby Spanish Immersion School, the Mandarin Immersion Program, McKinley Institute of Technology (MIT), North Star Academy, or Orion Alternative Elementary School.

District demographics

As of April, 30, 2025, there were 6,520 TK-8 grade students, 3,780 students receiving free and reduced lunch (low income), 462 homeless, 7 foster youth and 2,165 English Learners.

The percentage of unduplicated students (free/reduced meal program, EL, homeless and foster youth) at each site is as follows:

Adelante Selby: 65%

Clifford: 52%

Garfield: 97%

Henry Ford: 70%

Hoover: 97%

Kennedy: 69%

MIT: 93%

North Star: 1%

Orion: 32%

Roosevelt: 73%

Roy Cloud: 16%

Taft: 97 %

The numbers of students with disabilities at each site is as follows:

Adelante Selby: 110

Clifford: 149

Garfield: 73

Ford: 107

Hoover: 148

Kennedy: 154

MIT: 93

Orion: 65

North Star: 42

Roosevelt: 116

Roy Cloud: 126

Taft: 107

Preschool: 76

Non public/Private: 116

Despite the challenges our school district has faced in recent years, RCSD is an organization that always puts students first. Led by its School Board and Superintendent and inspired by its mission and vision, the district will continue to persevere collaborating with its supportive community to create a safe and supportive, inspirational and rigorous, joyful and inclusive environment for all learners.

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

The Redwood City School District (RCSD) has made notable advancements across several key areas as evidenced by the 2024 California School Dashboard and local data metrics. This reflection outlines both areas of progress and areas requiring further focus.

State and local metrics:

On the 2023 School Dashboard

The area in Red is English Learner Progress for both English Language Arts and Mathematics, this is addressed in Goal 2 all actions for English Learners, and Goal 3 actions address English Language Arts and Mathematics. For Chronic Absenteeism and Suspensions RCSD is in the orange. The student group target for both Absenteeism and Suspensions was red for African American as well as in Mathematics. This is addressed in Goal 1 (Action 1.3 and 1.6), and Goal 3 (3.7).” - RWC 2024-25 LCAP

2023 Dashboard information indicates:

Across the district, Asian, Filipino, White and Two or more Races students groups have a very high performance status in the category of Academic performance. The English Learner Progress performance status declined by 14.8% with 40.1% making progress towards English language proficiency. The Suspension rate increased by 0.4%.

1. State Academic Performance:

****The 2024 Dashboard indicates high performance in academic areas for Asian, White, and students identified as Two or More Races.

****English Learner Progress increased by 7.2%, with 47.3% of EL students making progress towards proficiency.

****Suspension rates decreased by 0.6% across the district.

****African American students demonstrated a decline in chronic absenteeism by 9.9% and in suspension rates by 13.4%.

****A new action plan for Long Term English Learners was implemented, with 55.5% making progress toward English language proficiency, marking a 5.9% increase.

2. CAASPP Performance 2023-2024 :

****Reading: 45.2% of students met or exceeded standards districtwide. Asian (85%), Two or More Races (86%), and White (78%) students led in meeting standards.

****Economically Disadvantaged students had the lowest percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards at 28%.

****The grade with the highest percentage of students who met or exceeded the standard in ELA was 7th grade (52%), followed closely by 8th grade (48%).

****Math: 37.17% of students met or exceeded standards. Asian (85%), Two or More Races (80%), and White (73%) students performed strongest.

****Economically Disadvantaged (20%) and Students with Disabilities (14.28%) showed the lowest percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards in their respective subgroups.

****The grade with the highest percentage of students who exceeded the math standard is 3rd grade (46%), closely followed by 4th grade (42%). Asian students (85%), Two or More Races (80%) and White students (73%) have the highest percentage in achieving Met or Exceeded the standard.

Updated CAASPP Performance data for 24-25 (Only 91% released)

****Reading: 49.6% of students met or exceeded standards districtwide. An increase of 4.4 growth from the 2023-2024.

Asian (83%), Two or More Races (83%), and White (80%) students led in meeting standards.

****English Learners data (2023/2024) 5.27% to (2024-2025), 8.8% an increase of 3.53% growth

****Subgroup of English Learners, LTELs (2023/2024) 1.2% to (2024-2025) 5.2%. This is a increase of 4%

**** African Americans data (2023/2024) 32% to (2024-2025) 26.3%, a decrease in 5.7%

****Economically Disadvantaged students had higher percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards at 31%. An increase of 3% from 2023-2024.

****The grade with the highest percentage of students who met or exceeded the standard in ELA was 8th grade (56%), followed closely by 7th grade (53%).

****Math: 39.9% of students met or exceeded standards. A district wide increase of 2.73% growth.

Asian (85%), Two or More Races (82%), and White (75%) students performed strongest.

****English Learners data (2023/2024) 7.17% to (2024-2025) 7.1%. This is a decrease of 0.7%.

****Subgroup of English Learners, LTELs (2023/2024) 0% to (2024-2025) 1.2%. This is a an increase of of 1.2% growth.

**** African Americans data (2023/2024) 25% to (2024-2025) 15.8%. This was a decrease of 9.2%.

****Economically Disadvantaged (18.8%) and Students with Disabilities (13.8 %) showed the lowest percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards in their respective subgroups.

****The grade with the highest percentage of students who exceeded the math standard is 3rd grade (52%), closely followed by 4th grade (43%).

3. Local data for 2024-2025 as of April 4, 2025:

****Overall suspension rates decreased districtwide, with the exception of Foster Youth, whose rates increased to 1.4%.

****Chronic absenteeism decreased by 3% for Homeless students and 17% for Foster Youth. However, absenteeism increased by 0.7% across EL, LTELs, SED, SWD, and African American subgroups.

****Attendance rates showed a slight increase of 0.8% for Homeless students, with other subgroups (SED, SWD, African American) showing slight declines (0.5%-1.1%).

4. English Learners:

**** The 2023-2024 Reclassification rate was set as a baseline at 15.3%.

**** LTELs showed 55.5% making progress towards proficiency, a 5.9% increase.

5. i-Ready Data Analysis:

Reading:

The percentage of students performing at or above grade level on the Spring Reading Diagnostic remained relatively stable, with 45% in 2023–2024 and 46% in 2024–2025. However, there was a 3% districtwide increase in students meeting their annual expected growth, rising from 54% to 57%.

Between the initial and final i-Ready Diagnostics in ELA for the 2024–2025 school year:

- 35% of students advanced by at least one placement level.
- 57% of students below grade level showed no change in placement, although 69% of students who met annual growth targets were from this below-grade-level group.
- Student groups such as English Learners (EL), Long-Term English Learners (LTEL), and Homeless students demonstrated notable improvement, with increases of at least 5% in meeting annual growth compared to the prior year.
- In contrast, Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Foster Youth showed little to no change, with SWD at 49% (down from 50%) and Foster Youth remaining at 50% across both years.
- The African American student group experienced a decline in students meeting annual growth targets, dropping from 46% in 2022–2023 to 35% in 2023–2024.

Math:

The percentage of students performing at or above grade level on the Spring Math Diagnostic increased slightly, from 38% in 2023–2024 to 40% in 2024–2025. The percentage of students meeting their annual expected growth remained relatively unchanged, with a marginal increase from 46% to 47%.

Between the initial and final i-Ready Diagnostics in Math for the 2024–2025 school year:

- 42% of students advanced by at least one placement level.
- 55% of students below grade level showed no change in placement, although 71% of students who met their annual growth targets came from this group.
- Over one-third of students who met annual growth were one grade level below.
- 3rd and 4th grade students had the highest percentages of students on or above grade level in Math.
- Middle school students had the highest percentages of students performing two or more grade levels below.
- Across student groups—including English Learners (EL), Long-Term English Learners (LTEL), Students with Disabilities (SWD), African American students, and Homeless students—the percentage meeting annual growth showed little to no change compared to the 2023–2024 school year.

RCSD changed the annual survey from Panorama Education to California Healthy Kids Survey in the 2024-2025 school year. The annual climate survey is facilitated by an independent organization and administered to students in grades 4-8. The questions were drawn from an archive of research-based questions developed by California Department of Education with quality local data which can be used to improve student academic performance and social-emotional, behavioral, and physical health of all youth.

The California Healthy Kids Survey was administered in the spring 2024-2025. Grades 4-6 need to opt in to take the survey. Low turn out of 4th graders did not provide a large enough percentage to provide the LEA with information with a large sample size.

4-5 grades: 1,549 students took the survey

6-8 grades: 1,670 students took the survey

Grade 5

School Engagement and Supports

Academic Motivation: 84%

Caring adult relationships: 67%

School connectedness: 73%

School Safety and Cyberbullying

Perceived safety at school: 78%

Cyberbullying: 25%

Grade 6-8

School Engagement and Supports

Academic Motivation: 63%

Caring adult relationships: 62%

School connectedness: 57%

School Safety and Cyberbullying

Perceived safety at school: 58%

Cyberbullying: 25%

The Fall Student Climate Survey (Grades 3-8):

** 71% of the students feel close to people at school.

** 68% are happy at school

** 66% feel they are treated fairly

** 66% feel safe at school

** 43% felt that there is a caring adult at the school site

** 69% feel they feel that there is an adult who listens to students at school

** 74% feel that they have opportunities to collaborate on school projects

** 54% feel that when they have a conflict they can share with an adult and they feel heard

Overall, RCSD remains in the Orange category for both English Language Arts and Mathematics according to the 2024 Dashboard, with improvements in English Learner Progress (Green) and Suspensions (Green). Chronic Absenteeism moved to Yellow. However, key subgroups such as African American, Pacific Islander, Homeless, Long-Term English Learners, and Students with Disabilities continue to require targeted support, particularly in ELA, Math, and attendance. Focused efforts will continue to address these areas to further close performance gaps and enhance student outcomes in 2025-2026. This is addressed in Goal 1 for attendance, Goal 2 for English Learners and

Goal 3 for academics.

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DATA

In addition to the California Healthy Kids survey, data is collected through our 8 Community Schools. In the 2024-25 school year for the first 2 trimesters the following services were provided by the RCSD.

Family Centers:

-1880 students participated in our expanded learning programs from our 8 Community Schools (Police Activities League-PAL Center, Boys and Girls Club of the Peninsula-BGCP,

YMCA, Casa Circulo, Envisioneers, Siena Youth Center, Catalyst Kids, Redwood City Parks and Rec.

- 2600 students in total for the entire school district, all 12 schools, participated in our expanded learning programs.
- 1,048 students received backpacks and school supplies
- 540 families received holiday support for Thanksgiving and the Winter holidays
- 641 students received tutoring
- 5,466 households received distributions from the Second Harvest Food organization
- 463 families received emergency food /essential groceries
- 614 transportation passes
- 1,765 intentional outreach to build school/home communication
- 2355 safety net enrollment/referrals(medical, Fair Oaks Community Center, housing, legal, etc.)

Mental health supports included(Trimester 1 only):

- 453 individual student sessions
- 34 students working in group sessions

We have expended all LRGB funds. The LEA will not use funds in the 25-26 LCAP, LEA will identify the needs from the community in the spring of 2026 in order to allocate LREBG funds and will provide an explanation of how RCSD will expending funds in the outyears of 26-27, 27-28 in the Plan Summary: Annual Performance prompt in the 25-26 LCAP, the LEA will identify any additional LREBG funds apportioned as part of the 25-26 budget act as part of the 26-27 LCAP.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

Technical Assistance focus is on reducing suspensions and chronic absenteeism for the African American groups as per the California Dashboard.

Monthly meetings were held with the County for Differentiated Assistance in which a needs assessment was created by the LEA to identify target groups and schools in which students attend. LEA met with the Director of Student Services to identify work to be done in terms of

suspensions and chronic absenteeism . The Director of Student Services continued to meet with administrators at each site to discuss alternatives to suspensions for targeted groups.

Suspensions in 2022-2023, we had 9 students who were African American and in 2023-2024 so far only 1 students who is African American has been suspended. For 2023-2024 school year, as of March 17, 2025 we currently have no suspensions for our sub group for African American students. This is a decline in suspensions overall.

In order to address suspensions, the LEA continues to work with schools in the implementation of PBIS, currently the LEA has six schools participating for the 2024-2025.

- 3 schools are in year 2 of the training

- 3 schools are in year 1.

We are planning on adding 2 more school in 2025-2026 so that all school sites are implementing PBIS at the school sites with Fidelity. This is addressed in Goal 1 1.2.

The District PBIS team is currently working on evaluating the PBIS implementation at all of our schools and revising our PBIS behaviors and SEL interventions of support.

Chronic Absenteeism: LEA identified students who were chronically absent, the African American target group.

10 students were below 90% rate

- **1 Students at: first, and seventh

- **3 student at: sixth and fifth

- **2 students in eighth

11 students are between 95% - 90% rate

- **1 student at: Tk, seventh, eighth, and sixth

- **2 students at: fourth, and fifth

- **3 students in second

7 students are between 96%-100%

As a result of technical assistance, the LEA will continue to address student absenteeism and support students effectively:

- ***Continue to have Teachers and Office Staff Initiate Contact: The first step involves teachers and office staff reaching out to families to understand the reasons behind student absences. This direct communication helps in identifying any underlying issues that might be contributing to the absenteeism

- ***Continue to Offer Support: During these initial contacts, the school staff offers necessary support to families, which may include providing information on available resources, addressing transportation issues, or offering counseling services.

- ***Continue to offer MTSS TOSAs Role: Multi-Tiered System of Support Teachers on Special Assignment (MTSS TOSAs) play a crucial role in identifying students who are chronically absent. They analyze attendance data to pinpoint those who are at risk of truancy.

- ***Continue to identify students Student Engagement Support Plan (SESP): For students who become truant, MTSS TOSAs request a Student Engagement Support Plan meeting. This meeting involves setting specific, achievable goals tailored to each student's needs to improve their attendance and engagement in school.

***Continue to create Goal Setting and Monitoring: The SESP includes setting goals to address the root causes of absenteeism, such as academic struggles, social-emotional issues, or family-related challenges. The progress towards these goals is regularly monitored to ensure that students receive the necessary support and interventions. This is addressed in Goal 1, 1.3 and 1.10.

These steps ensure a proactive and supportive approach to managing absenteeism, focusing on early identification, direct communication, and personalized support plans. By involving families and providing targeted assistance, the LEA aims to reduce chronic absenteeism and improve overall student engagement and success.

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.

Garfield Community School (exited CSI with the release of 2024 dashboard)
Roosevelt Elementary School (exited CSI with the release of 2024 dashboard)

Support for Identified Schools

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

Not applicable

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

Not applicable

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
San Mateo County Office of Education Technical Assistance Team	Dates-Sept, 25, 2024; Nov. 25, 2024; Jan. 14, 2025, Mar. 4, 2025, March 19, 2025, Apr. 23, 2025 Reviewed CA Dashboard results and Target groups, Resource Mapping, CSI schools and LCAP resources
Special Education Team: RCSD Directors and staff and parents	During the English LCAP Advisory committee held on April 22nd and April 28 parents provided input during the LCAP meeting
Certificated and Classified Staff as well as Local Bargaining Units	During the English LCAP Advisory committee held on April 22 multiple certificated and classified staff provided input during the LCAP meeting.
District English Learner Advisory Council	In-person meeting in Spanish were held on Oct. 21,2024; Nov. 18, 2024; Feb. 3, 2025; In addition at the March 24,2025 and April 28,2025, May 19, 2025 LCAP was presented to the families and receive written feedback and comments were submitted at the DELAC Meeting in order to gather input from our parent community.
Parents and Community, and SELPA parents	We involve our parent community in multiple ways. Parent Survey for district priorities was sent out to all families in the fall. Budget renewal committee was formed and met in person on Oct. 10, 21, and 30th. Superintendent's Advisory Spanish Council reviewed budget in LCAP on Sept. 27th. Oct. 22nd special session with Hoover families was held to review LCAP priorities. LCAP Committee met on April 22nd for English parents committee and April 28th for Spanish Speaking community. We also had LCAP survey embedded in our

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Panorama Survey and we aim to provide ample opportunities for parents to interact with district personnel.
Student Voice	All twelve schools participated in LCAP Student Climate Survey in Nov. 2024 to gather information about school climate. June 16, 2025 Students input was gathering during summer school. 38 students participated.
LCAP Advisory Committee make up: Teachers, parents, board members, classified staff, and district directors.	During the English LCAP Advisory committee held an English parent meeting on April 22nd. During the English meeting multiple certificated and classified staff provided input during the LCAP meeting where the draft LCAP was presented. In-person meeting in Spanish were held on April 28, 2025 and at DELAC Meeting in order to gather input from our parent community.
SELPA meeting	Consultation with the administration in regards to the LCAP was provided on: Feb. 28th, March 28th, and April 28th.

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

During the two meetings of the RCSD LCAP Advisory Committee, which included parents, staff, board members, and district staff, data from all stakeholder groups were provided data to analyze the actions in the goals and the implementation of each action that informed the development of the LCAP. In the fall 2024 a parent committee was formed to make recommendations in regard to budget reductions that were being eliminated due to one-time funds being expended. The comprehensive review of the LCAP survey sent to families provided crucial insights that shaped the recommendations for the LCAP plan. Below is a summary of the information gathered and the recommendations made by families:

Goal 1 Success and needs identified by LCAP Advisory committee and LCAP parent survey.

Decline in absenteeism

***Reduction in absences for McKinney vento, Foster Youth, and African American Students.

Suspensions

***Suspension rate for some students are going down.

***6 schools going through PBIS implementation.

*** Why is there an increase of suspension for Foster Youth at 14%?

***There seems to be an increase in referrals for behavior support.

***Students feel less safe as they get older.

Mental Health

**** Clarification why were their budget cuts to mental health counselors?

Based on this data and the input of educational partners, the district has identified the following to continue to improve in the wellness of RCSD students.

1: Continue to provide Mental Health Support. The LEA recognizes the importance of mental health support for students and has committed to continuing support for mental health counselors. These counselors play a crucial role in providing Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for students who require additional support beyond what is typically provided. By maintaining and possibly expanding these resources, the LEA aims to address the mental health needs of its students comprehensively. (Goal 1: 1.6)

2: Chronic Absenteeism. To address chronic absenteeism, the LEA plans to continue supporting Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) TOSAs (Teachers on Special Assignment) to focus on attendance issues. These TOSAs likely work closely with schools to implement strategies aimed at improving attendance rates, such as targeted interventions for chronically absent students and proactive outreach to families. By maintaining this support and creating individualized plans for students with ongoing attendance challenges, the LEA aims to reduce absenteeism and increase student engagement. (Goal 1: 1.3)

3: Suspension Reduction and Positive Behavior Supports. The LEA recognizes the need to address suspension rates and promote positive behavior supports across all schools. To achieve this, the LEA plans to focus on fidelity to Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) at all sites. PBIS is a proactive approach to establishing the behavioral supports and social culture needed for all students in a school to achieve social, emotional, and academic success. Additionally, the LEA plans to implement Tier 1 MTSS Social Emotional and Behavior supports to help students who may be in need of extra support and to create safe environments for all students. Moreover, LEA will continue to support an alternative to suspension programs for sixth through eighth graders with the additional resources and programs at an opportunity school. (Goal: 1, 1.2, 1.7,1.10)

Goal 2 Success and needs identified by LCAP Advisory committee and LCAP parent survey.

Successes:

***The new program, Language Power, has high standards and the kids can relate to it. Seeing the students' EL developing.

***As a 3rd grade teacher, a lot of non-fiction reading materials.

*** Another participant agreed with the above comment and also shared that the "Boot Camp" and the lunch tutorial for EL students have been successful. This is for those that would like to improve their scores on the ELPAC.

Suggestions from families:

*** Spanish speaking families are asking to have more information sent to families about how our school system works, especially for students who are absent.

*** More information about the importance of parent involvement.

*** Provide more classes for families

*** Prefer meeting in person as the internet doesn't always work well.

English Meeting

***As a parent, not familiar with Language Power. The suggestion is to share the program components and successes with the community.

***Communicate with Katherine if materials are needed.

***Familia Unidas really supports families through their work around literacy-it is really interactive. Maybe they can support with fiction and non-fiction.

Based on this data and the input of educational partners, the LEA recognizes the importance of providing targeted support for English learners across all content areas. To address this, the LEA plans to continue to implement supports in Tier 1 instruction, particularly focusing on Integrated English Language Development (ELD) across all content areas.

Integrated ELD involves embedding language development instruction within content-area instruction, ensuring that English learners have access to grade-level content while simultaneously developing their English language proficiency. By implementing Integrated ELD strategies, teachers can provide meaningful language support to English learners without pulling them out of core instruction, thus promoting academic language development and content mastery simultaneously.

The LEA's commitment to supporting Integrated ELD across all content areas demonstrates a proactive approach to addressing the needs of English learners and ensuring their academic success. By providing teachers with the training and resources needed to implement effective Integrated ELD strategies, the LEA aims to create inclusive learning environments where all students, including English learners, can thrive academically.

RCSD is taking proactive steps to support English learners (EL's) in the upcoming school year (2025-2026). Here's an overview of the initiatives that will be supported through Goal 2.2.2

Contracting with Komin for Integrated ELD Support to provide support for 2nd-8th grade teachers in planning for Integrated English Language Development (ELD). This support is specifically targeted at schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI).

Komin offers expertise and resources to help teachers effectively integrate language development instruction into content-area lessons, ensuring that EL's have access to grade-level content while simultaneously developing their English language proficiency. (Goal 2.2.2, 2.29) These initiatives aim to empower teachers with the knowledge and tools they need to effectively meet the diverse needs of ELs, ultimately promoting their academic success and language development.

Goal 3 Success and needs identified by LCAP Advisory committee and LCAP parent survey.

***Math improvement was great

***Roosevelt and Garfield exited from CSI status as well as Taft, Hoover, Clifford, and Henry Ford exited ATSI Status.

***McKinley continues in ATSI status

***The curriculum at Clifford in middle-school is rigorous and planned well; assessments throughout the year work well

***A strong focus on foundational skills has paid off

***Enrichment activities as part of Parent Venture Series such as climate action and art and group projects are powerful

- ***Similar assessment across the district allows data-tracking to be more effective
- ***Professional learning communities monitoring how students are doing and driving instruction based on assessment results
- ***Professional development to veteran and new teachers to support implementation of teaching strategies and interventions including for students with disabilities
- ***School newsletters are sharing good information
- ***Music classes are increasing student participation at sites
- ***Students in tutoring programs are showing growth in both reading and math.

Suggestions

- ***Continue to provide tutoring in Reading and Math
- *** Send out short messages to families for communication.
- ***As a district how will you reach out to parents to support students in academic areas.
- *** Teachers need to inform families about available tutoring.

LCAP parent survey priorities for the district:

- | | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| #1 Mental Health as the top priority for parents. | 4.3 average ranking | |
| #2. Bilingual Instructional Assistants at priority sites. | 4.4 average ranking | |
| #3. After school tutoring as the third priority. | 4.48 average ranking | |
| #4 Board Certified Behavior Analyst and Behavior Technicians to support students with severe behaviors. | | 5.09 average ranking |
| #5. Reading Intervention Teachers | 5.23 average ranking | |
| #6. Multi-Tiered Systems of Support: Teachers on special assignment. | 5.87 average ranking | |
| #7. STEAM teachers | 6.23 average ranking | |
| #8. Music teachers | 6.56 average ranking | |
| #9 Newcomer Teachers and staff to support newly arrived students. | 7.08 average ranking | |

Students were interviewed during summer school, we had 38 students participate in responding to our LCAP goals. Many students were happy with their school sites and wanted to make sure that they maintain what they have at the school sites. Several students responded that they wanted to make sure schools continue to support field trips, tutoring in math and several students identified that they needed help in writing. Many students stated that they were supported by the family center and that we should continue to prioritize this support. Students who wrote in Spanish wanted to make sure that they had supports to learn English and valued that they could get support with an extra adult in the classroom to help them during classes. A small group identified that they wanted to make sure students had working computers, continue to have more apps in Clever for them to use and to make sure that there were electives to choose from in middle school.

Based on this data and the input of educational partners, the LEA has identified the following areas to prioritize in order to support student achievement. These priorities aim to address the diverse needs of the students and ensure they receive necessary support to succeed academically.

LEA will continue to provide professional development for K-5 in the areas of mathematics and reading comprehension. Continued professional development will focus on enhancing instructional strategies in mathematics and reading to improve foundational skills and

reading comprehension in the early grades. Teachers will receive training on effective practices, curriculum alignment, and data-driven instruction.

Partnering with California Reading and Literature Project (CRLP) professional development will focus on reading comprehension for 3-8. K-2 will focus on reading comprehension with support from Benchmark Adelante to use resources and assessments in current curriculum. Middle school language arts teachers will be trained in Expository Creative Writing and Reading in order to support students in writing and reading.

Reading Intervention at Targets school will provide intensive support for students struggling with literacy. These programs will include evidence-based interventions and individualized instruction to help students improve their reading skills.

Targeted Tutoring: Tutoring programs will be implemented to provide targeted academic support for students who need additional help. These programs will focus on core subjects, particularly mathematics and reading, and will be designed to address specific learning gaps identified through assessments.

Professional Learning Community

Establishing and supporting PLCs will allow teachers to collaborate regularly, share best practices, analyze student data, and develop effective instructional strategies. This collaborative approach ensures continuous professional growth and improved instructional quality. Planning for differentiated instruction will be embedded in the PLCs cycles for the 25/26 school year.

Ongoing Support for Teachers: Instructional coaches will be available to provide ongoing support and guidance to teachers. Coaches will help with the implementation of new strategies, model effective teaching practices, and assist in analyzing student data to inform instruction.

Smaller Class size for K-2: Reducing class sizes in the early grades (K-2) will ensure more individualized attention for each student, allowing teachers to better address the diverse needs of young learners and provide more personalized instruction.

Instructional aides at ATSI site and other target sites: Hiring additional instructional aides will provide crucial support in classrooms, helping to manage small group instruction, assist with differentiated learning activities, and provide one-on-one support for students who need it.

Summer school programs will be offered to provide extended learning opportunities for students who need additional time to master key concepts. These programs will focus on remediation and enrichment, helping to prevent learning loss and prepare students for the upcoming school year.

By prioritizing these areas, the LEA aims to create a supportive and effective educational environment that enables all students to achieve their full potential. These targeted efforts, informed by data and stakeholder input, are designed to address specific challenges and leverage opportunities for enhancing student learning outcomes.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	By June of 2027, every student in the RCSD will receive appropriate social-emotional support designed to meet their needs in an inclusive and supportive environment through the implementation of the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) framework. By June of 2027, the LEA aims to reduce Chronic Absenteeism by 3% each year in all student groups across the LEA, specifically the African American Students and student groups at English learners at Clifford, Henry. Improve Attendance rate by 2% each year in all groups. Reduce suspensions by 0.5% for district and other sub groups: SED, ELs, Homeless each year and by 1% annually for African Americans, and Students with Disabilities, sub group of English Learners LTELs.	Broad 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 LEA has identified specific sites and subgroups with high absenteeism and suspension rates based on the 2023 California Dashboard results. The goal is to continue addressing these issues while maintaining and building on the steady growth observed over the past two years. Below is an outline of the targeted areas, strategies, and the rationale behind maintaining the results.

2023 Dashboard results:

High absenteeism at the following sites and subgroups:

All students at Clifford and Roy Cloud- English Learners

All students at Henry Ford, Orion, Garfield- Students with Disabilities

Henry Ford, Orion, Clifford, Roy Cloud- Hispanic and Socio-economically disadvantaged

Kennedy and Clifford- White

Clifford- Two or More Races

Suspensions at the following sites and subgroups:

McKinley and Clifford for -English Learners
Taft- Students with Disabilities
All Students at Garfield for Hispanic
Clifford- Hispanic
All students at Garfield for Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
Clifford and McKinley- Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
Kennedy- African Americans

The Local Education Agency (LEA) developed this goal in response to the need for sustained improvement in student attendance and behavior as highlighted by data from the California Dashboard. The goal is designed to address chronic absenteeism and suspension rates, which are critical indicators of student engagement and school climate. The data demonstrates both areas of progress and areas requiring continued attention:

Chronic Absenteeism: Overall decline of 2.6% for all groups in 2022-2023 and 27.4% of students were chronically absent. Notable decreased in Foster Youth, Homeless, and Pacific Islander, and Students with Disabilities.

Suspensions: Slight increase of 0.4% for all groups as in 2022-2023, 2.8% students were suspended at least one day. With a decrease in Foster Youth and Homeless students.

Actions and Metrics to achieve these goals:

Continue the implementation and reinforcement of PBIS across all site and establish consistent and clear expectations for student behavior.
Metric to reduce suspension rates and improve school climate survey results.

Rollout of Tier 1 Social Emotional Learning and Behavior framework to provide foundational support for all students, promoting positive behavior and emotional well-being. Thus reducing both chronic absenteeism and suspension rates, increase in SEL competency.

MTSS TOSAs and office staff will continue to implement Student Engagement Support Plan (SESP) to support chronic absences. As a result improvement in attendance rates and reduction in chronic absenteeism, measured by school attendance records.

Ongoing professional development for staff on effective strategies to support staff on effective attendance strategies, behavior management, cultural competency, and trauma-informed practices.

Strengthen family and community partnerships to support student attendance and behavior, including regular communication, workshops, and resource provision.

Regularly monitor attendance and suspension data to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions and adjust strategies as needed.

Within three years, the district will reduce rates of chronic absenteeism and suspension for specific subgroups identified: socioeconomically disadvantaged, African American students, and students with disabilities by implementing actions that promote positive outcomes for each group.

The development of this goal is a strategic response to the specific needs identified through data analysis and stakeholder input. The combined actions and metrics are designed to create a comprehensive and supportive framework that addresses both absenteeism and suspension rates. By maintaining focus on these areas and implementing targeted, evidence-based interventions, the LEA aims to create a positive and inclusive educational environment that promotes student engagement, well-being, and academic success.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	Attendance Rate	23-24 (local data) District: 93.9% EL: 92.5% LTEL: 93.6% Homeless: 91.6% Foster: 89.1% SED: 93% SWD: 92.1% AA: 92.1%	24-25 (local data) District: 93.7 % EL: 92.2% LTEL: 88.8% Homelessness: 92% Foster: 87.9% SED: 92.4% SWD: 91.6% AA: 91.0%		May 2027 District: 99.9% EL: 97.3% LTEL: 99.4% Homeless: 97.6% Foster: 96.4% SED: 99% SWD: 98.1% AA: 97.7%	24-25 Spring District: (-0.2 %) EL: (-0.3%) LTEL: (-4.8%) Homelessness: (+0.4%) Foster: (-1.2%) SED: (-0.6%) SWD: (-0.5%) AA: (-1.1%)
1.2	Chronic Absenteesim Rate	23-24 (local data) District: 18.3% EL: 26.4% LTEL: 20.7% Homeless: 30.4% Foster: 50% SED: 24% SWD: 25.4% AA: 35%	24-25 (local data) District: 17.7% EL: 25.6% LTEL: 37.5% Homelessness: 27.2% Foster: 33.3% SED: 24.5% SWD: 28.1% AA: 37.5%		May 2027 District: 9.9% EL: 17.6% LTEL: 11.5% Homeless: 21.4% Foster: 24.3% SED: 14.8% SWD: 17.1% AA: 26%	24-25 Spring District: (-0.6 %) EL: (+0.5 %) LTEL:(+16.8%) Homelessness: (-3.2%) Foster: (-16.70 %) SED: (+0.5 %) SWD: (+2.7 %) AA: (+2.5%)
1.3	Suspension Rate	23-24 (local data) District: 2.2% EL: 3.3% LTEL: 7.8%	24-25 (local data) District: 1.1% EL: 1.7% LTEL: 6.9%		May 2027 District: 0.7% EL: 0.7% LTEL: 3.0%	24-25 Spring District: (-1.1%) EL: (-1.6%) LTEL:(-0.9%)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Homeless: 3.8% Foster: 0% SED: 3.2% SWD: 4.4% AA: 5%	Homelessness: 2% Foster: 16.7% SED: 1.6% SWD: 2.2% AA: 0%		Homeless: 0% Foster: 0% SED: 0.8% SWD: 0.8% AA: 3%	Homeless: (-2.2%) Foster: (+16.7%) SED: (-1.6%) SWD: (-2.2%) AA: (-5%)
1.4	Panorama Survey	Spring 2024 Grade 3-5 School Belonging: 62% School Safety: 61% School Climate: 58% School Engagement: 48% School Teacher-Student Relationships: 70% Grade 6-8 School Belonging: 33% School Safety: 51% School Climate: 38% School Engagement: 23% School Teacher-Student Relationships: 42%	Metric is no longer being used		May 2027 Grade 3-5 School Belonging: 70% School Safety: 69% School Climate: 66% School Engagement: 56% School Teacher-Student Relationships: 78% Grade 6-8 School Belonging: 41% School Safety: 59% School Climate: 46% School Engagement: 38% School Teacher-Student Relationships: 50%	No longer being used

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.5	Expulsion rate	2023-2024: District: 0%	2024-2025 District 0%		May 2027 District: 0%	2024-2025 District (0%)
1.6	Middle school drop out rate	2022-2023 drop out rate as of 23-24 CBEDS District: 0%	2023-2024 drop out rate as of 24-25 CBEDS District: 0%		May 2027 District: 0%	2024-2025 District (0%)
1.7	California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS)	2024-2025 (Spring) Grade 4-5 School Engagement and Supports Academic Motivation: 84% Caring adult relationships: 72% School connectedness: 74% School Safety and Cyberbullying Perceived safety at school: 80% Cyberbullying: 26% Grade 6-8 School Engagement and Supports Academic Motivation: 63% Caring adult relationships: 62% School connectedness: 57% School Safety and Cyberbullying	N/A		2026-2027 (Spring) Grade 4-5 School Engagement and Supports Academic Motivation: 92% Caring adult relationships: 80% School connectedness: 82% School Safety and Cyberbullying Perceived safety at school: 88% Cyberbullying: 18% Grade 6-8 School Engagement and Supports Academic Motivation: 71% Caring adult relationships: 70%	N/A

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Perceived safety at school: 58% Cyberbullying: 25%			School connectedness: 65% School Safety and Cyberbullying Perceived safety at school: 66% Cyberbullying: 17%	

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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.

The primary focus of Goal 1 in the 2024-2025 academic year was to address attendance, absenteeism, and student supports, particularly for underserved populations. This included continued outreach to families of unduplicated pupils, trauma-based training for teachers, targeted community school support, mental health services, and monitoring of MTSS implementation across the district. Despite some challenges, significant progress was observed in several areas.

1.1 Amendment of Action Plan for 2025-26

The action plan for the 2025-26 school year will be amended. Item 1 will be discontinued as it was supported through one-time funds and is not sustainable for ongoing implementation. Item 2, which involved stipends for teachers, was not utilized this year as training was successfully conducted during a professional development day. Item 3 was effectively implemented with the completion of the pilot, resulting in the district moving forward with 7 sites adopting the Wayfinder platform for implementation in the 2025-26 school year.

1.2 PBIS Training Implementation

PBIS training was successfully provided at six sites during the 2024-25 school year. This initiative will continue, with two additional sites joining and three sites moving into their second year of implementation. Preliminary data indicates that the adoption of consistent PBIS framework practices has contributed to a reduction in suspension rates across most sites. Early intervention for severe behavioral issues has also seen a positive impact, with fewer reported incidents this year.

1.3 Addressing Attendance, Absenteeism, and Student Supports:

Implementation of this action remained aligned with the initial plan. The Director of Student Services maintained regular communication with school site attendance teams, including MTSS TOSAs, administrators, and community school staff. However, the rise in the unhoused

population to over 500 students presented an ongoing challenge. The Bilingual Administrative Assistant continued outreach efforts, providing transportation vouchers and assisting with documentation. This outreach will continue into the 2025-2026 school year, with an emphasis on further increasing support for the growing number of unhoused students.

1.4 Trauma-Based Training for Teachers:

The trauma-based training initiative at Kennedy, Hoover, Garfield, and Taft was successfully implemented, with 40 teachers participating. The training was well received, with feedback indicating a strong interest in expanding this program to additional sites in the upcoming school year. Planning for this expansion is underway, with consideration for increased staff participation and targeted follow-up sessions to reinforce learning.

1.5 Community School Support and Chronic Absenteeism:

Community School Coordinators and office assistants continued to provide essential wraparound services at eight schools. The CSPP grant enabled three sites to implement targeted strategies to address chronic absenteeism, resulting in a 5% increase in attendance among the families supported. This initiative underscores the value of comprehensive family engagement in reducing absenteeism and promoting school connection.

1.6 Mental Health Support:

The emphasis on mental health services remained critical throughout the year. As of December 2024, 393 students were receiving individual counseling, with some sites experiencing waitlists. Despite a reduction in reported emotional distress (78 cases in 2023 to 40 in 2024), the increase in reported suicidal ideation (29 in 2023 to 62 in 2024) highlights a concerning trend that warrants further attention. Additionally, the reduction in Tier 1 intervention needs to 605 students reflects successful Socioemotional support and outreach by counselors.

1.7 Support for Unhoused Students:

The district maintained its proactive approach in supporting unhoused students, providing financial assistance through gift cards, rental aid, and transportation support. Thrive counselors continued to provide case management and counseling services to affected families. This support will continue in the 2025-2026 school year, with plans to further refine data tracking to better assess the impact of these services.

1.7 Unhoused students continue to need support and we continue to be proactive in supporting families who need financial assistance through gift cards, rental assistance, transportation cost. Through a grant, Thrive counselors also continue to support families experiencing homelessness. Case managers actively support identified families.

1.8 MTSS Implementation and Monitoring:

Progress in MTSS monitoring was evident as data collection and analysis became more systematic. The transition to the CA Healthy Kids Survey enabled the district to capture broader climate data from approximately 1,200 parents and students in grades 4-8.

1.9 Behavioral Support Services:

Contracted services for behavior specialists continued to provide targeted interventions for general education students requiring additional support. Feedback from site administrators and TOSAs indicated a need for increased capacity and sustained funding to meet growing demand for behavior support.

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.

Why we didn't spend the amount

1.1 Amendment of Action Plan:

Item 1 Discontinued due to reliance on one-time funds and limited sustainability. Low teacher recruitment in 4th/5th grades and lack of GSAs at all sites led to minimal implementation. Afterschool stipends were not needed due to the use of Stanford PD days.

Item 2, Stipends for teacher training were not needed as training was successfully conducted during existing PD days.

Item 3 Action completed as planned. Seven sites will adopt the Wayfinder platform for the 2025–2026 school year..

1.2 PBIS training expanded to include two new sites and continued support for three existing sites in their second year of implementation.

1.3 Higher salary and benefit costs for two staff members, plus the addition of a new contract with Attention to Attendance increased the cost allocated.

1.5 Classified contract settlement included retroactive salary and benefits over two years. Additional contracted services were needed to cover two staff members on leave, thus increasing the allocation.

1.6 Overestimated the cost of raise and benefits for all the district mental health counselors and district school psychologist.

1.7. Transportation costs for homeless families were lower than expected.

1.9 Contract costs for the Behavior Specialist were lower than projected.

1:10 One site was unable to hire an MTSS TOSA for the 2024–2025 school year.

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

Goal 1: The primary focus was on addressing attendance, absenteeism, and student supports for underserved populations. Despite challenges, several areas showed progress:

***PBIS Training Implementation: Successfully implemented at six sites, contributing to a reduction in suspension rates. Expansion planned for two additional sites in 2025-26.

***Attendance and Absenteeism Support: Outreach to families of unduplicated pupils continued, but the rise in the unhoused population to over 500 students remained a challenge. Further support is planned for 2025-26.

***Trauma-Based Training: Implemented at four sites, reaching 40 teachers. Feedback was positive, with plans to expand in the next academic year.

***Community School Support: Coordinators and office assistants provided wraparound services at eight schools, resulting in a 5% increase in attendance for targeted families.

***Mental Health Support: 393 students received individual counseling, but waitlists persist. Suicidal ideation cases increased, signaling a need for additional intervention.

***MTSS Implementation: Improved data collection and analysis allowed for more targeted supports and more effective monitoring.

Data from the CA Healthy Kids Survey data points suggest that while overall academic motivation is relatively high, there is a need to strengthen perceived caring adult relationships and school connectedness, particularly in Grades 6-8. Additionally, the cyberbullying rate of 25% indicates a critical area for targeted intervention and support to enhance student safety and well-being.

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.

Discontinues the use of Panorama Survey and replaced with California Healthy Kids Survey.

1.1.1 GSA support will be discontinued as this was being supported by one-time funding.

1.1.3 SEL curriculum of Wayfinder will be supported at 7 sites in the 25/26

1.4. Expanding of teacher training for Trauma informed practices to four other sites.

1.6 Mental Health reduction at 4 site is being discontinued and will be supported through One-Life counseling. Reduction is due to one time funding that was currently supporting the program.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.1	Tier 1: Social-emotional (SEL) supports	1. Stipends for GSA (Gender and Sexuality Alliance) teacher leads/advisors will be provided for K-5 sites. (Discontinued in 25/26. Will no longer be funded as this was one-time funds) 2. Collaboration with Stanford University/Gardner Center will continue to develop and ensure a system of SEL supports for staff, students and families. Teacher series on supporting students with anxiety, ADHD and other concerns that teachers need support on. 3. Pilot new SEL program at 2-5 sites which will be multi-funded by Sequoia Health Care funding. (No longer a pilot) Wayfinder will be supported at 7 school sites for the 25/26 school year. These actions are strategically designed to create an inclusive, supportive, and well-managed educational environment, addressing both the causes and effects of chronic absenteeism and suspension rates. The integration of these actions with the overall goal includes: Supporting GSAs and implementing SEL programs promote inclusivity and emotional well-being, directly impacting attendance and engagement. Professional development	\$53,034.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		and additional classroom resources equip teachers to better support students with diverse needs, reducing behavioral issues and improving classroom climate. Partnerships with institutions like Stanford University ensure that the strategies employed are research-based and effective, enhancing the overall support system for students.		
1.2	Tier 1: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)	1. Training and support will be provided by the Santa Clara County Office of Education to six schools, 3 new site will begin year 1 and 3 sites will complete year 2. Each school will have a PBIS or Leadership team who attends the training in order to implement Tier I PBIS strategies. Address CSI schools Roosevelt and Garfield and ATSI schools Clifford and MIT. (Changes in PBIS training are the following for 25/26 school year) Three sites will continue into year 2, two sites will begin year. Provide stipends for teachers to attend afterschool trainings and 3 sites will be in Tier 3 with maintaining support.	\$49,000.00	Yes
1.3	Tier 1: Student Services and outreach to families experiencing chronic absenteeism specifically unduplicated pupils.	The provided actions outline a comprehensive approach to addressing attendance, absenteeism, and student support needs within the school community, particularly focusing on underserved populations. By prioritizing outreach to families of unduplicated pupils, such as homeless students and English Learners, this action addresses the specific needs of vulnerable student populations and fosters family engagement in addressing attendance challenges. 1. The Director of Student Services will monitor attendance, absenteeism, suspensions and expulsions and provide outreach to students and their families, with particular outreach to families of unduplicated pupils . 2. A 1.0 dedicated Bilingual Administrative Assistant provides targeted outreach and support to families of homeless students, addressing their unique needs for clothing, school supplies, and transportation. 3. The Student Services department carefully oversees student attendance issues. Letters, phone calls and weekly emails are sent home to encourage attendance. The addition of a social worker intern enhances the	\$523,981.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		capacity of the Student Services department to conduct home visits and provide more intensive support to students facing attendance challenges, particularly those with complex needs (Discontinue for 25/26 the section of Social worker) 25/26 Contract for Attention to Attendance. 4. As part of Tier 1 services, MTSS TOSAs at the school sites reach out to families of students who are absent, specifically identify students who are African American, Students with Disabilities and English Learners. 5. 25/26 Attendance Intervention specialist who collaborates with staff, students, and families to address barriers to resolve attendance issues as well as continue Opportunity School for part of the year. Tier II services involve a collaborative effort between site administrators, MTSS TOSAs, and mental health counselors, if needed, to provide targeted support and intervention for students with persistent attendance issues.		
1.4	Tier 1: Trauma based training for teachers at Kennedy, Hoover, CSI school Garfield, ATSI school Taft	Administrators, Teachers and Community School Coordinators will receive Trauma-based training to support students who need support for Trauma in the 2024- 2025 school year. RCSD continues to receive newcomers throughout the school year, many have experienced trauma and need additional supports. CSI schools of Garfield and Roosevelt exited the CSI status as well as Taft exited ATSI status. 25/26 Expansion of teacher training for 4 more sites to will be take place in the new school year. Pay teacher stipends to attend after school training. Trauma-based training is a proactive step toward supporting students who have experienced trauma. Training will provide participants with a deeper understanding of trauma and its impact on students' behavior, emotions, and learning. Participants will learn evidence-based strategies for supporting students who have experienced trauma, including trauma-informed classroom practices, de-escalation techniques, and crisis intervention. By equipping educators and support staff with practical tools	\$13,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		and techniques, the training will enable them to provide immediate support to students in crisis and create safe and supportive learning environments.		
1.5	Tier II: Community School wrap-around service support for families CSI schools focus on wrap-around services for Roosevelt and Garfield. ATSI schools MIT, Taft, and Clifford will also receive support for wrap-around services	Our community schools: Use proven strategies and culturally responsive practices Serve as a hub for the community by providing multiple services accessible through our site Family Centers and our Community School Coordinators - mental health, safety net services, food distributions, extended learning programs and various other resources through intentional partnerships to provide opportunities, optimize impact, and address identified needs at an individual and community level to address the barriers to learning. 1. Adelante Selby, Clifford, Garfield, Hoover, Roosevelt, Kennedy, MIT and Taft are designated as Community Schools. Each site has a full-time Community School Coordinator and Administrative Assistant to support families at each site.	\$1,305,772.00	Yes
1.6	Tier II: Site-based Mental Health Supports. Full time counselors will continue at schools with high suspensions to support schools in CSI (Roosevelt and Garfield) and ATSI (Clifford, Taft and McKinley)	LEA is prioritizing the mental health of students as recommended by the parents in the advisory and LCAP survey, particularly those identified as unduplicated students, and fostering a supportive and nurturing school environment. By adding mental health counselors at all school sites, the district ensures that students have access to timely and on-site mental health support. 1. Mental Health Counselors have been added to each school site to provide support principally directed towards unduplicated students. Full-time counselors are supporting our priority schools Garfield, Roosevelt, Taft, and Hoover, K-8 schools Clifford, Roy Cloud and our comprehensive Middle schools. McKinley, Kennedy. Part-time counselors are supporting North Star, Adelante Selby, and Orion. This allows for targeted support	\$3,380,996.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		where it is most needed, ensuring equitable access to services. (Changes for 25/26: Roosevelt, Taft, North Star, and Orion eliminated their district Mental Health counselor and will continue to be supported by One-Life.) 2. School Psychologists are currently located at each site whose services are principally directed towards unduplicated students. 3. Additional Mental Health support will be provided by OneLife, based on additional needs at each site and contracted services complementing the work of mental health counselors. 4. A lead counselor facilitates coordination among site personnel, ensuring that services are effectively delivered and that resources are utilized efficiently. Lead Counselor will Collect and report data for ongoing evaluation of mental health services, identifying areas for improvement and informing decision-making. 5. Supplies are provided for Mental Health Therapists to set up welcoming room environments and provide nurturing toys and games for children. (Supplies discontinued in 25/26, license for online data tracking will be supported in the new school year.) 6. Online counseling support for students and parents.		
1.7	Tier III: Homeless Students Thrive case managers- Grant	These actions collectively contribute to a coordinated and compassionate response to homelessness within the school community. By identifying at-risk families early, providing proactive case management and support services, and addressing immediate needs such as transportation and financial assistance, the district aims to promote stability and resilience among homeless families and mitigate the impact of housing instability on students' educational outcomes. 1. Director of Student Services identifies families at risk of currently facing homelessness through the annual housing questionnaire. Provides Homeless training to all staff. 2. Thrive Case Managers providers: (Hoover, Garfield, Taft, MIT) Outreach to families who are at risk of being homeless to assist them by referring them to community services available. (Grant funded) Case management services to proactively identify families who are at risk of becoming homeless, currently are homeless or are in the process of housing stability and continue to need assistance.	\$56,300.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		3. Transportation will be provided to homeless students to their schools of choice. 4. Additional assistance is provided to families experiencing homelessness: rental assistance, gift cards, travel and auto costs.		
1.8	Tier 1: MTSS System Monitoring	System monitoring of Tier 1 is essential for ensuring that universal interventions are effective in promoting positive outcomes for all students. By collecting and analyzing data, monitoring progress, reviewing intervention implementation, engaging in problem-solving, and making adjustments as needed, schools can provide a strong foundation of support within the general education setting and address the diverse needs of their student population. 1. Training will be provided by the SMCOE and SELPA Coordinator to the MTSS Coordinators to further develop the MTSS purpose and process districtwide. The MTSS team will reflect and revise site processes to align the needs of the students with Tier I, Tier II and Tier III supports, and the development of these tiered supports. 2. A Coordinator of Assessment and Accountability has been hired to collect, monitor, and analyze data to determine the efficacy of actions and services and provide data for schools, and teachers. The Coordinator of Assessment and Accountability will work closely with the MTSS TOSAs at each site to ensure the fidelity and appropriate scope of the student data. 3. The Healthy Kids Survey will continue to provide school climate information from students, families and district staff. 4. The Ed Services Department Secretary will support the collection of this data, monitoring of expenditures, process purchase orders, stipends, etc. 5. Contract with Powerschool Analytics for data tracking for MTSS work. 6. Purchase of testing materials for assessments: CAASP, ELPAC, and IAB's 7. 25/26 Additional monitoring for Behavior through Powerschool Behavior platform contract	\$386,384.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.9	Tier III: Behavior Specialists	1. Contracted services can provide access to professionals with specialized training and expertise in addressing intensive behavior needs, including behavior analysts and technicians to support students in general education classrooms. Additional support for intensive behavior of unduplicated pupils student needs will be added to high priority sites through contracted services.	\$300,000.00	No
1.10	Tier 1: MTSS System Monitoring	1. MTSS Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) will be located at every site, and work together with site administrators to support the tiered levels of academic, emotional and behavioral supports, provide data for discussions by site based MTSS teams and teacher PLCs, and collaborate districtwide to problem solve implementation issues as needed. Their role is to coordinate MTSS implementation, the collection of data, facilitate SSTs and 504 plan writing, and ensure the appropriate access to services for students and their families, and align supports that cultivate growth for the whole child and family. Site based MTSS teams meet regularly to discuss and ensure students receive the supports that are needed. (25/26 2. Through the student referral system, student data and family requests, MTSS Site TOSAs will support the review of individual, small group and community needs through the Screen Team to determine appropriate interventions, and timelines for progress monitoring as defined by the district MTSS team being implemented by the site 3. Consultant agreement to support coaching administrators and leadership team in order to facilitate development of collaborative structures and best practices aligned to PLC work.	\$1,330,297.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	By June of 2027, 55% of 2nd- 8th grade English Learner (EL) students will progress by a minimum of one level on the ELPAC each school year as measured by Summative ELPAC Assessment. Increase our reclassification rate to 20%. Decrease our Long Term English Learner to 10%	Focus Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The LEA's goal to address English Learner (EL) and Long-Term English Learner (LTEL) needs at specific sites and subgroups, as informed by the results of the California Dashboard, reflects a commitment to improving outcomes for these student populations.

Based on the results of the California Dashboard, the LEA will address English Learner and subgroup of ELs: Long Terms English Learners at the following sites and subgroups:

Clifford, Garfield, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Henry Ford- English Learners

According to the California Dashboard the following progress was achieved in 2022-2023

The decline in the percentage of ELs making progress towards English proficiency from 55.7% to 40.1% suggests a need for targeted interventions to support language acquisition and proficiency development.

While 43% of ELs maintained their ELPI levels, there was a decrease from the previous year (34.2% in 2021-2022).

The 15.8% of ELs who progressed on the Summative Alternate ELPAC represents positive growth, but there may be opportunities to further support these students in achieving English proficiency

The decline of 9 points in recently reclassified ELs indicates the importance of ongoing support and monitoring for EL students even after reclassification.

The LEA developed this goal with the progress that English Learners have made in the prior year.

The LEA continues to focused on implementing supplemental curriculum for English Language Development courses demonstrates a commitment to providing targeting instructional language acquisition. Targeting instructional supports for Integrated English Language

Development for third through eighth grade teachers aligns with best practices for providing language-rich content instruction across subject areas.

Intentional coaching support at ATSI schools: Taft, Clifford, and MIT as well as CSI school: Garfield and Roosevelt and other sites with high numbers of English Learners at Henry Ford and Hoover ensures that educators receive the guidance and resources needed to effectively support ELs in their classrooms.

The LEA is taking a proactive approach to addressing the needs of EL and LTEL students. By providing targeted instructional supports, supplemental curriculum, coaching support, and monitoring progress, the LEA aims to improve outcomes for ELs and support their continued progress towards English proficiency and academic success.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	Summative ELPAC	23-24 (local data): 39.8% of Gr 2-8 EL making progress at least 1 ELPAC lv. Level 4: 9.5% Level 3: 28.1% Level 2: 30.6% Level 1: 28.5%	24-25 (Local data): 41.6% of Gr 2-8 EL making progress at least 1 ELPAC lv. ELPAC Levels Level 4: 14.5% Level 3: 30.5% Level 2: 30.1% Level 1: 24.9%		June 2027 55% of grade 2-8 ELs progress at least 1 ELPAC level	EOY Local data EL1 year progress: +1.8% ELPAC Levels Level 4: +5% Level 3: +2.4% Level 2: -0.5% Level 1: -3.6%
2.2	RFEP Rate	23-24 (local data): 15.3%	24-25 (Local data): 16% (355 RFEPs)		May 2027: 20%	EOY Local data: +0.7%
2.3	Long Term English Learner Rate	23-24 (local data): 26%	23-24 (local data): 12%		May 2027: 10%	EOY Local data: -14%
2.4	Panorama Family Survey	2023-2024 (Spring) Response: 17% (1,098) Academic Care- 77% School Safety- 77% School Climate-76%	No longer use this metric		Response: 45% Family Academic Care- 86%	N/A

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Cultural Awareness-58% Family Engagement-25%			School Safety-86% School Climate-85% Cultural Awareness- 67% Family Engagement-34%	
2.5	CHKS Parent survey	2024-2025 (Spring) - EL parents Parents feel welcome to participate: 97% Promotion of parental involvement: 92%	N/a			N/A

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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.

In the previous year, the focus of Goal 2 was to support English Learners (ELs) and unduplicated pupils by ensuring that various academic, support, and outreach services were delivered effectively. These efforts were designed to address both Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports, as well as specific interventions for Tier 3 students, such as SPED and dual-identified students.

2.1 Tier 1: Program (Daily Instruction and ELD Materials):

All EL students received daily instruction in Designated ELD with State Adopted and supplemental instructional materials. This action was successfully implemented.

2.2 Tier 1: PD for Staff (Integrated ELD PD and Ellevation):

Professional development (PD) in grades 3-8 was aimed at training staff on Integrated ELD strategies. RCSD contracted for services with Teachers Created Materials (TCM) to support the PD. Progress monitoring was used three times during the school year through the Ellevation Platform. Implementation occurred as planned, with TCM conducting demonstration lessons and coaching sessions at targeted sites. Teachers at all school sites in grades 3-5 participated in Integrated ELD instructional practices and lesson design through

comprehensive two half-day PD days. A full contract with TCM was established as initially planned. The training on strategies was conducted, and findings showcased the need for planning among district coaches and TCM trainers.

2.3 Outreach was provided for Unduplicated Pupil families to ensure that they have sufficient information for high school preparation (enrollment, assessments, A-G requirements, accelerated pathways, etc.), meeting with students in 8th grade. A bilingual parent liaison supported individual families and worked with the MTSS TOSA's at the sites to support families in registration for high school. The LEA prioritized Bayside schools and Spanish-speaking families.

2.4 The Communication and Outreach plan included the Director of Communications, Community Liaison, interpreters, and document translation. Implementation proceeded as planned, with significant outreach efforts to engage Spanish-speaking families. Increased interpreter requests during family meetings demonstrated heightened engagement, though logistical challenges in coordinating interpreters across multiple sites were noted.

2.5 Tier II: Field Trip Support for Unduplicated Pupils (Outdoor Education):

The plan included funding for field trips, especially for outdoor education for Taft, Hoover, Garfield, and Roosevelt schools. All sites were given an allocation, and not all funding was used, as sites had money at the sites to support their students as well.

2.6 Tier II: Specialized Support for Newcomer Students:

The plan included hiring additional teachers and instructional aides at various sites for newcomer students and providing specialized support through a Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA). This action was successfully implemented, and all targeted sites had support for recently arrived newcomers. This allowed for better support at schools like Kennedy, Hoover, McKinley, and additional part-time aides at other sites.

2.7 - Tier III: Dual-Identified Students (SPED and EL)

The Director of SPED and Multilingual Programs initiated collaboration to monitor the progress of dually identified students. Implementation focused on data-sharing and co-planning meetings. While initial progress was made in aligning services, further clarity on roles and responsibilities was identified as a need for the next phase.

2.8 - Program Monitoring

The Director of EL and Categorical Programs led monitoring efforts using the Ellevation platform. Data analysis reports were available for site leaders, identifying key areas of need and tracking RFEP progress. The platform provided valuable data for monitoring EL student progress.

2.9 - Tier 1: Integrated ELD Support for ATSI and CSI Schools

Implementation of the Integrated ELD coaching series proceeded as planned, with outside consultants providing targeted support to ATSI and CSI schools. Staff feedback indicated positive reception of the coaching but highlighted a need for follow-up sessions to reinforce strategies and monitor implementation fidelity.

The implementation of Goal 2 for the 2024-2025 academic year made significant strides in addressing the needs of EL and unduplicated students. Moving into the 2025-2026 school year, the focus will continue to be on expanding support for underserved populations, refining program monitoring, and ensuring more comprehensive outreach and services for families and students in need.

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

- 2.1 Testing specialist salaries were omitted from the original 2024–2025 LCAP allocation, resulting in an increased cost due to this planning oversight.
- 2.2 Only 2 of the 5 Stanford PD days were utilized, as the content did not align with district goals for integrated ELD. As a result, stipends for middle school teacher planning were not used.
- 2.5 Not all site funds were used, as some sites used prior-year carryover funds to cover Outdoor Education costs.
- 2.6 Some paraprofessionals were hired mid-year, resulting in partial expenditure of allocated funds.
- 2.8 The cost of the Ellevation platform was lower than anticipated for the 2024–2025 school year.

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

- 2.1 While the daily ELD instruction and supplemental materials were well received, the delay of starting ELD classes after the first 10 days of school affected the consistency and routines at the start of the year. Monitoring of the use of materials was done throughout the year to provide feedback about the implementation of the use of materials and instruction.
- 2.2 The PD sessions were positively received, particularly the coaching series, which enhanced instructional practices in targeted sites. With multiple different individual trainers at each of the sites, we noticed that there was some streamlining that needed to be done. Feedback was mixed from the staff as instruction depended on the trainers experience in the grade levels.
- 2.3 The need to support families at the middle school site is still needed. Bringing in the family centers to provide the information for families in regards to high school is important and needs to be supported at a large level.
- 2.4 The outreach was effective in increasing engagement, as evidenced by higher attendance at family meetings and workshops. However, logistical challenges in managing interpreter availability limited consistent support across sites.
- 2.5 The field trips were highly effective in providing experiential learning opportunities for those students and families who needed support to pay the high cost of the field trip.
- 2.6 This action was successfully implemented, and all targeted sites had support for recently arrived newcomers. This allowed for better support at schools like Kennedy, Hoover, McKinley, and additional part-time aides at other sites.

2.7 The effort to align services for dually identified students is a promising step forward. Continued follow-up is necessary in order to support the dually identified students.

2.8 The Ellevation platform is used effectively and, with the added updates, makes information easier to access. It has the potential to be used more by staff, training is needed in order to use the resources that are available to teachers.

2.9 The coaching series was effective in enhancing instructional strategies for targeted schools of ATSI (Taft, MIT, and Clifford) and CSI (Roosevelt and Garfield) and in addition to Hoover and Henry Ford. Contract with Montenegro Consulting Group, LLC provided professional development for the MIT Staff and coaching for the administrator on effective implementation of Social Emotional Learning practices to support school climate and the academic success of all students at McKinley Middle School. Learnings from this support are that support for new teachers was needed to establish consistent routines to address SEL at the school site. Teachers received per diem pay in August, specifically McKinley, Garfield, and Roosevelt, to plan for meeting the needs of English Learners for the school year.

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.

No Changes to the goal or metrics for the next year.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.1	Tier I: Program	1. Every English Learner (EL) and subgroup of English Learner of Long Term English Learner students will receive daily instruction in ELD, aligned with their language levels. Integrated units that focus on language acquisition and student-centered teaching strategies will continue to be developed and shared with teachers across the district. 2. Primary language instruction in Spanish will continue to be supported at Garfield, Hoover, and Taft 3. The Pathway to the Seal of Biliteracy will continue at Kennedy Middle School, MIT Hoover for Spanish bilingual students and Mandarin bilingual students. 4. Additional materials for D-ELD instruction will be provided to each site.	\$831,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		5. Out-of-ratio designated ELD teachers are provided to MIT, Kennedy, and Hoover in order to ensure sufficient staffing and support to newcomer students not meeting the criteria for the Newcomer student (more than 540 days in United States Schools.) 6. Bilingual testing specialist will ensure each EL student is ELPAC tested 7. 25/26 Purchase Reading Intervention materials for Bilingual schools.		
2.2	Tier I: PD for staff	The professional development plan aims to provide targeted support to staff and instructional assistants, focusing on the needs of English Learners (ELs) and LTELs. Grounded in language acquisition theory and evidence-based instructional strategies, this plan is designed to build educator capacity and improve student outcomes across all proficiency levels. This plan is designed to equip educators with the necessary skills and strategies to effectively support EL students, particularly at CSI target schools (Garfield and Roosevelt), Hoover, Taft, and ATSI schools (Clifford, Henry Ford, MIT). Professional Development will be provided to staff and instructional assistants in: 1. Curriculum training on ELD supplemental curriculum-Language Power 2. Professional Development grounded in language acquisition will cover specific ELD strategies such as building vocabulary and oral language development (Komir Minds) 3. Training on strategies to support newcomer students who may face additional challenges in adjusting to a new educational environment. 4. Development and sharing of integrated units that focus on language development through content instruction. (Komir Minds) 5. Training on using Ellevation to monitor progress for English Learners and use embedded supports 6. Collaboration with Stanford University to support middle school teachers with integrated ELD focus across content areas. (Discontinued) 7. Professional development provided by TCM with an emphasis on integrated ELD strategies for third through fifth grade. (For 25-26, will add 2nd grade at Hoover and Roosevelt, and continue to work with McKinley with a new contract company, Komir Minds for PD)	\$272,500.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		8. A comprehensive professional development plan integrating Administration, Support Coaches, and Classroom Teachers is designed to enhance skills and foster growth across the board. Through a combination of professional development focused on language acquisition for coaching sessions, this approach aims to elevate professional standards and subsequently improve student outcomes for all students with a focus on English Learners. CSI Target Schools: Garfield and Roosevelt, Hoover, Taft, as well as ATSI schools Clifford, Henry Ford, and MIT (CSI schools exited this status; Hoover, Taft, Clifford, and Henry Ford exited ATSI status in 24/25).		
2.3	Tier I: Academic Planning for Success	Support will be provided for Unduplicated Pupil families to ensure that they have sufficient information for high school preparation (enrollment, assessments, A-G requirements, accelerated pathways, etc.), meeting with students in 8th grade. Instructional Coach will meet 1- 1 with families, hold group meetings, be available to advocate for student placement in high school, among other actions and services for students who are typically under-enrolled in high-level classes. LEA will prioritize Bayside schools and Spanish-speaking families. (Cost of personal is in 2.4)		
2.4	Tier I: Outreach to Spanish-speaking families: Former CSI schools, Roosevelt and Garfield	The LEA has developed a series of initiatives to ensure effective communication and supports for English Learners students and their families, with an emphasis on engaging Spanish-speaking families. 1. 0.3FTE of the Director of Communications position ensures frequent communication with Spanish-speaking families using a variety of platforms and strategies 2. Community Liaison/Family and Newcomer Outreach position focuses on outreach to families and newcomers, helping them navigate the school system and access resources. 3. Three full-time Spanish Interpreters provide translation at public meetings, IEPs, site functions both orally and written documents. Funding is also included for interpretation in languages other than Spanish, as needed.	\$714,180.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		4. Instructional Coaches at Roosevelt, Garfield and Hoover will collaborate with the Community School Coordinator to support parent engagement. (goal 3) 5. Educational materials and important information will be translated and made publicly available on the school district's website. 6. New addition for 25/26 Family Engagement to support families in learning about the resources in Redwood City. By implementing these actions, the LEA is committed to supporting English Learners and their families, improving communication, and fostering a supportive and inclusive school environment.		
2.5	Tier II: Providing for additional needs	To enhance educational experiences for English Learners, the LEA has identified the need for financial support for student enrichment activities. 1. Financial assistance will be provided for students from Taft, Hoover, Garfield, Roosevelt, MIT, Kennedy to attend Outdoor Education and field trips. These actions are designed to ensure that EL students receive the necessary instructional support and have access to enriching educational experiences, regardless of financial barriers.	\$81,000.00	Yes
2.6	Tier II: Specialized support for recently arrived Newcomer students	Recognizing the unique needs of international students who have recently arrived in the U.S., the LEA will establish a comprehensive language acquisition informed system of support to ensure these students receive the necessary academic and social-emotional support to succeed in RCSD. RCSD will establish a system of support. Tier 1: 1. Recently arrived newcomer students in middle school (less than 1 year in the US) will receive instruction in a bilingual center located at the comprehensive middle school of Kennedy and McKinley. An on-site Teacher on Special Assignment will be available to welcome students and their families, provide (2024-25).	\$776,675.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		2. A dedicated TOSA liaison will work with the families of newcomer students to ensure they are well-supported and integrated into the school community. 3. Newcomer students at sites in the district, enrolled in bilingual and non-bilingual classrooms, will receive additional support from instructional assistants at Taft, Garfield, Clifford, Henry Ford, Adelante Selby and Roosevelt. (Instructional Assistant at Henry Ford and Adelante is discontinued due to lack of newcomers at the school sites) 4. After-school tutoring programs will be offered to newcomer students and Long Term English Learners to provide additional academic support and language practice. (Goal 3) 5. Invest in newcomer-specific training for staff and purchase necessary instructional materials. RCSD is committed to providing equitable and educational opportunities for all students. By addressing the specific needs of newcomer students through bilingual instruction, targeted academic support, family engagement, and professional development, the LEA aims to ensure that these students can thrive academically and socially in their new environment.		
2.7	Tier III: SPED and EL dual-identified students	1. The Director of SPED and the Director of Multilingual Learners will implement a collaborate approach to review the process of identification, progress monitoring and reclassification of EL students who are also identified as SPED. 2. Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams will include an EL specialist to provide ideas, feedback and next steps for supporting English learners. 3. All site admin will be involved in the progress monitoring of dually identified students By fostering collaboration between the SPED and ELD departments, involving EL specialists in IEP teams, and engaging site administrators in progress monitoring, the LEA aims to provide comprehensive and effective support for EL students who are also identified as SPED. These actions ensure that the educational and developmental needs of dually identified	\$0.00	

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		students are met with a well-coordinated, responsive, and supportive approach.		
2.8	Program Monitoring	To ensure effective monitoring and support of English Learner students the LEA will: 1. LEA will provide a Director of Multilingual of Categorical programs to oversee the student data, monitor EL student progress, and provide data to schools, administrators, and teachers. The Director will regularly review EL student data, analyze progress trends, and identify areas of need and success. 2. The Ellevation platform will be used to store, track, and monitor EL student data, providing a centralized system for data management and analysis. 3. Spanish Language program assessment and monitoring tool to analyze program effectiveness. By overseeing EL student data and utilizing the Ellevation platform for comprehensive data management, the LEA aims to enhance the monitoring and support of EL students. These actions ensure that data-driven decision-making informs instructional practices, promotes the sharing of successful strategies, and ultimately improves educational outcomes for EL students across the district.	\$509,753.00	Yes
2.9	Tier 1: Integrated ELD	To enhance the instructional support for English Learners students the LEA will implement a comprehensive Integrated English Language Development professional development grounded in language acquisition theory and best practices for instructional coaches. This initiative focuses on ATSI School and CSI school, leveraging expert contracts and providing stipends for teachers to support planning and collaboration. 1: Contract with Teacher Created Materials to provide professional development for ATSI (Taft, MIT, and Clifford) and CSI (Roosevelt and Garfield) in addition, Hoover and Henry Ford. Taft, and Clifford exited		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		ATSI status. Roosevelt and Garfield exited CSI status in 24/25. McKinley continues in ATSI status. (For 25/26 school year will contract with Komir Minds Creative Education to continue to work with district coaches and the following three target sites: Hoover, MIT, and Roosevelt) Cost is in 2.2 2. Contract with Montenegro Consulting Group, LLC to provide professional development and coaching on effective implementation of Social Emotional Learning practices that will transform the school climate and the academic success for all students at McKinley Middle School. (Discontinued for 25/26) 3. Teachers from ATSI and CSI schools, specifically McKinley, Garfield, and Roosevelt, will receive per diem pay for collaboration and planning work in August. (Discontinued for 25/26)		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	By June of 2027, all RCSD students will increase at least 4% annually in ELA and Math on i-Ready, the district's local assessment program. (Adjusted until board adopts in June). By June 2027, RCSD goal is to increase the percentage of students meeting annual expected growth by at least 4% each year in ELA and Math as measured by i-Ready, the district's local assessment program. English learner students in grades 3-8 will increase in meeting or exceeding the standard in ELA to 20% and in Math to 16% on the CAASPP, the state assessment program.	Focus Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

- Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
- Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)
- Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)
- Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
- Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Based on the results of the California Dashboard, the LEA has identified specific areas and subgroups where academic support is needed across various subjects.

Indicators that are red for RCSD are the following:

*English learners performance for both Math and Language Arts at McKinley, Clifford, Garfield, Roosevelt, Kennedy and Language Arts for Taft and Hoover

All students with disabilities for Math at McKinley

*Students with disabilities for both Math and Language Arts: Clifford, Garfield, Taft, Hoover; Language Arts for Roosevelt and Kennedy

*All students Hispanic and Socioeconomically disadvantaged for both Math and Language Arts at Garfield and Roosevelt

*All students for Language Arts for Hoover

*All students Hispanic and Socioeconomically disadvantaged for Language Arts for Hoover and Taft, and in Mathematics for McKinley and Kennedy

*Socioeconomically disadvantaged in Language Arts: Taft and Hoover

*African Americans and White for both Math and Language Art: Roosevelt

*Two or More Races for both Math and Language Arts: Clifford

The data highlights a particular concern for English learners, with a low percentage of students performing at grade level or above in both English Language Arts (ELA) and Math. The LEA is prioritizing professional development and instructional coaching supports for target schools, ATSI, and CSI school. Parent Advisory and LCAP parent survey also indicated a support for students in academic areas for English learners.

Targeted support for English learners in both ELA and Math will be provided at McKinley, Clifford, Garfield, Roosevelt, Kennedy, Taft, and Hoover. (Goal 2)

Integrated English Language Development (ELD) training will be provided for third through fifth grades to address the specific needs of English learners. (linked to Goal 2)

Recognizing the ongoing need for extra support, the LEA will prioritize resources and interventions to address the academic needs of English learners.

Coaching sessions will provide targeted guidance and strategies for supporting English learners' academic growth, with a focus on effective instructional practices and differentiation. Coaching support for Integrated ELD will be offered to ATSI and CSI schools, focusing on grades 3-8. CSI schools will have dedicated site coaches for planning instruction in all subject areas for grades K-5. (Goal 2)

The LEA is committed to addressing the academic needs highlighted by the California Dashboard results, particularly for English learners and other identified subgroups. By providing targeted support, including training, coaching, and interventions, the LEA aims to improve student outcomes and ensure equitable access to high-quality education for all students. Through ongoing monitoring and evaluation, the LEA will track progress and adjust strategies as needed to achieve its goals for academic improvement and 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	i-Ready Reading Annual Growth Met or Exceeded 85% Projected Growth Target	Spring 2024 District wide: 54% EL's: 49% LTEL's: 50% African American: 48%	Spring 2025 District wide: 57% EL's: 54% LTEL's: 52% African American: 35%		Spring 2027 District wide: 66% EL's: 59% LTEL's: 62% African American: 60%	Spring 2025 District wide: +3% EL's: +5% LTEL's: +2% African American: -13%
3.2	i-Ready Math Annual Growth Met or Exceeded 85% Projected Growth Target	Spring 2024 District wide: 46% EL's: 42% LTEL's: 47% African American: 50%	Spring 2024 District wide: 47% EL's: 43% LTEL's: 46% African American: 45%		Spring 2027 District wide: 58% EL's: 54% LTEL's: 57% African American: 64%	Spring 2025 District wide: 1% EL's: 1% LTEL's: -1% African American: -5%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.3	CAASP ELA - Standard Met or Exceeded	23-24 Dashboard data District wide: 45% EL's: 5% LTEL's: 1.2% African American: 32% SWD: 16%	24-25 Preliminary data as of 08/01/2025 District wide: (49.1%) EL's: (8.8%) LTEL's: (5%) African American: (26.3%) SWD: (16%)		Spring 2027 District wide: 59.7% EL's: 20% LTEL's: 18.3% African American: 46.1% SWD: 31%	24-25 Preliminary data as of 08/01/2025 District wide: (+4.1%) EL's: (+3.8%) LTEL's: (+3.8%) African American: (-9.7%) SWD: (0%)
3.4	CAASP Math - Standard Met or Exceeded	23-24 Dashboard data District wide: 37% EL's: 7% LTEL's: 0% African American: 25% SWD: 14%	24-25 Preliminary data as of 08/01/2025 District wide: (39.6%) EL's: (7.2%) LTEL's: (1.2%) African American: (15.8%) SWD: (15.1%)		Spring 2027 District wide 46% EL's 16% LTEL's 12% African American 33% SWD: 23%	24-25 Preliminary data as of 08/01/2025 District wide: (+2.6%) EL's: (+0.2%) LTEL's: (+1.2%) African American: (-9.2%) SWD (+1.1%)
3.5	CAASPP Science - Standard Met or Exceeded	23-24 Dashboard data District wide: 31.2% EL's: 0% LTEL's: 0% African American: 11% SWD: 12.2%	24-25 Preliminary data as of 08/01/2025 District wide: (33%) EL's: (1.5%) LTEL's: (1.5%) African American: (10%) SWD: (12.1%)		Spring 2027 District wide: 43.2% EL's: 10% LTEL's: 10% African American: 23% SWD: 23.4%	24-25 Preliminary data as of 08/01/2025 District wide: (+1.8%) EL's: (+1.5%) LTEL's: (+1.5%) African American: (-1%) SWD: (-0.1%)
3.6	SARC Properly Credentialed Teachers	2023-2024 71.82% of teachers are fully credentialed in the	2024-2025 75%		Spring 2027 100% of teachers being fully credentialed in the	2024-2025 +3.18

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		area that they are assigned to teach.			area that they are assigned to teach	
3.7	SARC: Student access to instructional materials	2023-2024 100%	2024-2025 100%		Spring 2027 100%	2024-2025 0%
3.8	SARC/ FIT: Facilities in good repair	2023-2024 100%	2024-2025 100%		Spring 2027 100%	2024-2025 0
3.9	Local Indicator	2023-2024 : Local staff survey Priority #2 score: 2 - Beginning Development	2024-2025: Local staff survey Priority #2 score: 3 - Initial Implementation		2027-2028 Priority 2: 4 Full Implementation	2024-2025: Local staff survey Priority #2 score: +1

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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.

3.1 During the 2024-25 school year, the LEA implemented a comprehensive plan to enhance the professional growth of staff and improve instructional effectiveness through ongoing training, coaching, and targeted support. The primary areas of focus included the implementation of the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework, targeted professional development in mathematics and literacy, coaching support from TOSAs, and structured collaboration opportunities for staff.

3.2 Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Framework: Implementation efforts centered on refining Tier 1 supports in academics, social-emotional learning, and positive behavior interventions. District-wide Leadership Teams and Site-Based MTSS Teams collaborated to coordinate implementation efforts around professional learning communities (PLCs). Ongoing professional development was provided in areas such as Illustrative Mathematics, and data analysis through PLCs. Additionally, California Reading and Literature Project (CRLP) trainers worked with Reading Specialists, TOSAs, and instructional coaches, and administrators to lead PLCs. Release time was provided to facilitate collaborative planning during the school day, and stipends were offered for after-hours professional development and planning sessions. Focus for science training was moved to work with the new middle school science teachers that needed support. MIT supports were not used as teachers had dedicated time during the school day to work as well as their Thursday afternoon release times.

- 3.3 The LEA implemented strategies to provide educators with high-quality online resources and to pilot innovative math initiatives aimed at improving instructional practices and student outcomes. This included the provision of updated online applications, a math pilot program for grades 6-8, math assessments for grades 3-8, and the purchase of additional literacy resources.
- 3.4 The LEA implemented several strategies to ensure equitable access to high-quality instruction for all students, with particular attention to unduplicated pupils and students with disabilities. These strategies focused on differentiated instruction, targeted support through small group instruction, specialized interventions, and ongoing monitoring through formative and diagnostic assessments.
- 3.5 The LEA implemented targeted coaching support at CSI schools Garfield and Roosevelt, as well as at the Target school Hoover. The objective was to enhance instructional practices and improve student learning outcomes through structured coaching cycles, data analysis, and professional development through observation, modeling and debriefing of lessons.
- 3.6 The LEA prioritized maintaining class sizes in grades K-2 and providing instructional assistants at priority sites to support student learning and achievement. This initiative aimed to enhance individualized attention, provide targeted intervention, and promote equitable access to academic support, particularly in ELD, Math, and Literacy.
- 3.7 The LEA implemented initiatives aimed at providing comprehensive support and enrichment opportunities for students across various grade levels, with a particular focus on schools with high numbers of unduplicated pupils. These initiatives included middle school elective teachers, a shared music teacher, STEAM instruction, and Career Technical Education (CTE) modules for 7th and 8th graders at Kennedy and Hoover.
- 3.8 The LEA prioritized initiatives aimed at supporting the diverse needs of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and promoting inclusive practices across all school sites. This included collaboration with the SMCOE, SIP, and SELPA Coordinators and participation in the SMCOE EIEEP grant to enhance educator awareness and the implementation of inclusive instructional strategies.
- 3.9 The LEA implemented a plan to provide instructional aides in Transitional Kindergarten (TK) classrooms to support student learning, social skills development, and behavior management. This initiative aimed to provide individualized and small group support to address diverse learning needs and promote positive classroom environments.
- 3.10 The LEA implemented a series of initiatives to provide additional academic support and enrichment opportunities, with a particular focus on unduplicated pupils. These initiatives included targeted summer school, after-school tutoring, and supplemental tutoring models to address specific areas of academic need in ELA and Math.
- 3.11 Reading Intervention Teachers were deployed at key ATSI and CSI schools—Taft, Hoover, Garfield, and Roosevelt—as well as at Adelante Selby and Orion. Their role focused on providing targeted literacy interventions to K-5 students who demonstrated struggles with foundational reading skills.

3.12 the LEA invested in purchasing Spanish decodable books to complement the Aprendo a Leer curriculum. These materials were intended to strengthen foundational Spanish literacy skills—specifically phonics, phonemic awareness, and reading fluency—for students receiving Spanish literacy instruction. This action will be discontinued in 2025-2026.

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.

3.1 Districtwide salary schedule increases led to a higher overall budget for the 2024–2025 school year.

3.6 Classified salary and benefits increased due to a 2024–2025 settlement, which also included retroactive pay for the 2023–2024 year and current year-to-date payments.

3.7 The salary for the new music teacher was overestimated. Costs were shared across five sites and the LCAP, reducing the overall expenditure.

3.9 Raises for instructional aides and staffing for three new classrooms were overestimated, resulting in lower actual costs.

3.11 A salary increase and rise in benefits led to a higher total for this budgeted item in 2024–2025.

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

3.3.1. Educators were provided access to curated online resources such as Newsela and Nearpod libraries, offering diverse instructional content aligned with curriculum standards. Challenges: Ensuring consistent usage across classrooms was hindered by varying levels of familiarity with the platforms. Successes: Teachers who integrated these resources reported increased student engagement, particularly in ELA and

3.3.2. The Illustrative Math pilot program continued, focusing on providing standards-aligned curriculum materials designed to deepen students' conceptual understanding of mathematics. Feedback from pilot teachers indicated positive student responses to the curriculum and moved forward to recommend for adoption for 25/26 school year.

3.3.3. Math Assessment was not conducted as the company changed and was more expensive than anticipated.

3.3.4. Licenses for Heggerty Phonemic Awareness, SIPPS, and Benchmark Cards to support literacy instruction and foundational skill development were purchased. Data indicates promising outcomes in foundational literacy skills, particularly in grades K-3.

3.4 1. All students received daily instruction in language arts and math, utilizing both whole group and small group formats to address varying learning needs. Challenges: Ensuring sufficient instructional time for both whole group and targeted small group sessions proved difficult, particularly in classrooms with higher numbers of unduplicated pupils. Scheduling enough time for students during the school day as well as providing enrichment is challenging to meet.

3.4.2. Teachers utilized various instructional strategies to differentiate instruction, addressing the learning needs of unduplicated pupils and students with disabilities. More support is needed in training teachers to support the diverse needs of learners in their classrooms.

3.4.3. Small group instruction was emphasized as a key strategy to provide targeted intervention and support for students struggling to master grade-level content. More support is needed in training teachers in UDL supports.

3.4.4. Specialized instruction and intervention programs were provided to support students with disabilities, ensuring equitable access to curriculum. Challenges: Enhanced collaboration between general education teachers and resource specialists is needed in order create a more cohesive support plans for students with IEPs.

3.4.5. Ongoing assessment and progress monitoring were conducted using formative assessments and diagnostic tools, including K-2 BPST and Aprendo a Leer for phonics, Literably for oral fluency, and content-specific assessments in ELA and math. Data from assessments provided valuable insights into student learning needs, informing targeted interventions and differentiated instruction. Challenges: Managing the data collection took time as teachers had to collect the data and many still used paper and pencil to collect data vs. online programs. Teachers need to be given time to enter data into the district spreadsheets as they are not using the online assessments.

3.4.6. I-Ready diagnostic assessments and personalized lessons were integrated to identify student needs, tailor instruction, and monitor progress effectively. Data from I-Ready diagnostics helped teachers identify key skill gaps and adjust instructional plans accordingly. Challenges: Alignment of diagnostic assessment and district curriculum is not aligned. Teachers need time to be able to analyze the data and create alignment between the two.

3.4.7. Individual reading assessments, including Literably for grades 1-3 in both Spanish and English, were conducted to monitor oral fluency and foundational literacy skills. The implementation of individual reading assessments provided critical data for early identification of literacy skill gaps, informing targeted support plans. Challenges: Purchase of noise canceling headphones with mirco-phones are necessary in order to provide accurate data from the assessment.

3.5.1. Coaches collaborated with teachers to schedule designated planning sessions focused on curriculum, instructional strategies, and student needs. Coaches assisted in developing lesson plans and identifying resources to enhance instructional effectiveness. Challenges were finding more dedicated time to plan with teachers.

3.5.2. Coaches provided targeted data analysis support, helping teachers identify trends, patterns, and areas of need based on student assessment data. Emphasis was placed on using data to inform small group instruction and targeted interventions. Challenges: Some teachers required additional support in interpreting data and translating findings into actionable instructional plans. This is a focus for 2025-2026 school year.

3.5.3. Challenges for supporting UDL principles and supports for teachers is an area in which more training is needed as many teachers at these sites are new to the profession or have no experience with these practices.

3.5.4. Coaches engaged in structured coaching cycles, including modeling lessons, observing instruction, and providing feedback. Debrief discussions focused on identifying instructional strengths and areas for refinement. Challenges were that teacher receptivity to feedback varied, particularly among those with less experience in instructional coaching frameworks.

3.6 The LEA implemented class size reduction efforts to maintain a 25:1 student-teacher ratio in grades K-2, allowing for more individualized attention and targeted support. Challenges were hiring staffing at the start of the school year. LEA was able to staff sites with paraprofessionals by January.

3.7 Elective teachers were assigned to middle schools with high numbers of unduplicated pupils to provide access to a diverse range of enrichment classes, including art, music, and technology. Schools that maintained a full roster of elective offerings reported increased student engagement and participation, particularly in arts and technology-focused electives. A music teacher was shared across multiple elementary sites (Taft, Adelante Selby, Orion, Roosevelt, and 3rd-5th at North Star), providing access to music education for students who might not otherwise receive it. Despite scheduling limitations, students at each site participated in music instruction, and feedback from both students and teachers indicated positive reception and interest in continued music opportunities.

3.8 The RCSD MTSS leadership team engaged in collaborative efforts with the San Mateo County Office of Education (SMCOE), Supporting Inclusive Practices (SIP), and SELPA Coordinators to develop a comprehensive plan for addressing the needs of students with IEPs.

3.9 Instructional aides were deployed to TK classrooms to provide individualized support to students who required additional assistance in academic tasks, social skills, or behavior management. Classrooms with stable aide assignments reported notable improvements in student engagement, as aides facilitated one-on-one interactions and reinforced academic and social skills. Challenges were two sites that had inconsistent instructional aides due to a variety of circumstances did not provide consistency at the school sites.

3.10.1 The LEA prioritized unduplicated students who were two to three years behind for summer school, focusing on targeted instruction in ELA and Math for the 24/25 school year. Challenges was ensuring consistent attendance was a significant challenge, as some students did not attend regularly, impacting the continuity of targeted instruction.

3.10.2 After-school tutoring was offered at Roosevelt and Garfield, with a focus on providing additional practice and reinforcement in targeted academic areas. Unduplicated students were prioritized for these services. Students who participated consistently in after-school tutoring demonstrated improved performance in targeted areas, particularly in reading comprehension and foundational math skills.

3.10.3 Supplemental tutoring models, including CAP (College Advising Prep) tutoring, peer tutoring, and AirReading, were implemented to provide additional academic support. AirReading provided targeted literacy support to students in small groups, and CAP tutors effectively supported middle school students in math and ELA, leading to notable improvements in targeted academic areas.

3.11 Intervention teachers conducted small group and one-on-one sessions targeting phonemic awareness, decoding, fluency, and comprehension. Students who regularly received interventions showed improvements in literacy benchmarks, as evidenced by progress

monitoring data and formative assessments. Challenges are scheduling conflicts with classroom instruction and making sure that Tier 1 classroom instruction is not being missed.

3.12 The books were procured and distributed to sites implementing Aprendo a Leer, ensuring teachers had access to appropriate leveled texts aligned with foundational literacy objectives. Once materials were in classrooms, educators reported increased student engagement and improved ability to practice decoding and fluency skills during independent and small group reading time.

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.

Adjustment to goal 3. By June 2027, RCSD goal is to increase the percentage of students meeting annual expected growth by at least 4% each year in ELA and Math as measured by i-Ready, the district’s local assessment program.

3.10 Purchased of decodable books will be discontinued as all bilingual classrooms now have the books needed to support foundational skills in Spanish.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year’s actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year’s actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.1	Tier I: Personnel: All teaching staff, classified staff, site administrators	To Foster academic success and promote equity within our schools, the LEA is committed to providing 1. Highly qualified staff will provide grade level instruction and any necessary differentiated supports to each student in their classrooms 2. Every students will have access to grade level, district adopted curriculum and materials in each subject area. Materials will be aligned with state and provide a rigorous and comprehensive education for all students. 3. Our curriculum will be culturally relevant, reflecting the diversity of our student body and promoting inclusivity and equity. 4. Site administrators will oversee, support, and coach teachers in providing a multi-tiered system of support	\$51,342,990.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.2	Tier I: Professional Development (PD) and coaching for all staff	To enhance professional growth and instructional effectiveness of our students of our staff, the LEA is implementing a comprehensive plan that includes ongoing training, coaching, and support initiatives. 1. The Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework, will be fully implemented over the next three years, with a focus on refining Tier 1 structures and supports in academics, social emotional learning and positive behavior interactions. District-wide Leadership Teams and Site-Based MTSS teams will collaborate to ensure effective implementation and continuous improvement. (Cost in 1.9) 2. Staff will receive ongoing professional development in various areas, including goal-setting conference, Illustrative Mathematics, Data Analysis through Professional Learning Communities, as well as Designated and Integrated ELD. California Reading and Literature Project (CRLP), will train Reading Specialists, MTSS TOSAs, Instructional Coaches, and Administrators to lead PLCs at the sites. (Changes for 25/26 School year: Continue with CRLP for 3-8 to focus on Reading Comprehension, Professional development for K-2 staff on Benchmark resources for reading comprehension and pilot at Taft and Garfield on the new 2022 version for Benchmark. Professional Development for Illustrative Mathematics will now focus on 6-8 Math teachers and administrators. Partnering with Solution trees to continue to develop work with professional learning communities.) 3. Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) will provide coaching, resources and curriculum in TK-8 grade subject areas. TOSAs will also offer assistance to new teachers helping them navigate curriculum implementation and instructional practices. 4. Staff will have opportunities for release time during school day to collaborate and plan with colleagues. Stipends will be provided for staff who engage in planning and professional development activities after work hours. 5. Training and planning sessions will be conducted to support fourth and fifth-grade Science classes, focusing on the implementation of the Full Option Science System (FOSS) curriculum at target sites. (Science supports for 25/26 will focus on 4th and 5th as in the 24/25 support in middle school was needed as there were a number of new teachers who needed support.)	\$1,676,391.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		7. K-5 and middle school Writing PLC will be established, with dedicated time allocated for collaborative work and professional development. Stipends or substitute pay will be provided to support teachers' participation. (Discontinued for 25/26) 8. MIT (Additional Targeted Support and Improvement) schools will receive stipends or substitute pay for after-school planning sessions with district coaches, supporting the development and refinement of instructional plans. (Cost in 2.9) The LEA aims to empower its staff with the knowledge, skills, and resources needed to meet the diverse needs of students effectively. Through collaborative efforts and a commitment to continuous improvement, the LEA seeks to create a positive and enriching learning environment for all students.		
3.3	Tier 1: Standards-based materials: all subject areas	The LEA is dedicated providing educators with access to high-quality online resources and piloting innovative math initiatives to enhance teaching and learning. 1. Educators will be provided Access to updated curated online applications such as Newsela, Nearpod libraries, etc. These resources offer a diverse range of content and instructional materials aligned with curriculum standards, allowing teachers to enhance their lessons and engage students with interactive learning experiences. (25/26 Nearpod will be discontinued) 2. The math pilot program for grades 6-8, focusing on Illustrative Math, will continue into the 2024-25 school year. Illustrative Math provides standards-aligned curriculum materials and resources designed to deepen students' conceptual understanding of mathematics. By piloting this program, educators can assess its effectiveness and suitability for broader implementation. (Discontinued as pilot was completed in 24/25 school year) 3. A Math Assessment trial for 3rd-8th will be conducted. These assessments offer a comprehensive evaluation of students mathematical proficiency and conceptual understanding across various domains. (Discontinued in 24/25 and future years)	\$418,828.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		4. Purchase additional literacy resources. These resources include Heggerty Phonemic Awareness License, SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phoneme Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words), and Benchmark Cards. Discontinue the purchase of SIPPS for 25/26 only.		
3.4	Tier I: Instruction	The LEA will ensure equitable access to high-quality instruction is crucial for the academic success of all students, including unduplicated pupils and those with disabilities. 1. All students, will receive daily instruction in language arts (reading and writing) and math. This instruction will encompass both whole group and small group instruction to address varying learning needs. 2. Instruction will be differentiated to meet the diverse learning needs of students, including unduplicated pupils and those with disabilities. Teachers will utilize a variety of instructional strategies and approaches to support students at different readiness levels and with varying learning styles. 3. Small group instruction allows teachers to provide targeted support and intervention to students who may require additional assistance in mastering grade-level content. (Cost of Instructional Assistants at target schools in 3.6) 4. Additional supports, such as intervention programs or specialized instruction, will be provided to students with disabilities to ensure equitable access to the curriculum and support their academic development. (Cost of Reading Specialist 3.7) 5. Ongoing monitoring of student progress will inform instructional planning and support efforts. Teachers will regularly assess student learning and adjust instruction as needed to address individual learning needs and promote growth. Assessments: K-2 BPST and Aprendo a Leer for Phonics, Literably for 1-3 oral fluency, Formative assessments for reading comprehension for ELA. In mathematics teachers will use embedded assessment in the math curriculum. Formative assessments will also be used for D-ELD and other content areas.	\$216,096.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		6. I-Ready Diagnostic Assessment and personalized lessons will be integrated into the instructional plan. This approach will help identify student needs, tailor instruction, and monitor progress effectively. 7. Provide individual reading assessments in lower grades, Literably (1 - 3) both Spanish and English Phonics assessment only Spanish (Cost in 3.3)		
3.5	Tier 1: Provide coaches to high priority schools to support Tier 1 instruction or identified school in CSI and priority site.	Designated instructional coaches at CSI school Garfield and Roosevelt and Target school Hoover to support teachers to enhance instructional practices and student learning outcomes. (Garfield and Roosevelt exited CSI status in 24/25. Hoover exited ATSI status.) Coaching will continue at these sites in 2025-2026 to continue to work with staff in collaboration and planning. 1.Designated planning time: Coaches will collaborate with teachers to schedule dedicated planning sessions. During these sessions, teachers will have the opportunity to discuss curriculum, instructional strategies, and student needs. Coaches will assist in developing lesson plans and identifying resources to support effective instruction. 2. Data analysis support: Coaches will provide support to teachers in analyzing student data to inform instructional decisions. They will help teachers identify trends, patterns, and areas of growth or need among students. This data analysis will enable teachers to tailor their instruction to meet the diverse needs of their students, particularly in small group settings. 3. Emphasize on Universal Design for Learning: Coaches will emphasize Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles and support teachers in implementing UDL strategies in their lesson planning and instruction. 4. Coaching and Modeling: Coaches will actively engage in coaching cycles with teachers, which may include modeling lessons, observing instruction, and providing feedback. Through coaching and modeling, coaches will demonstrate effective instructional practices and support teachers in refining their teaching techniques. Coaches will facilitate	\$704,912.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		debrief discussions with teachers to reflect on the lesson, identify strengths and areas for improvement, and set goals for future instruction. 5. 2025-2026 Provide two additional guest teacher or pay for substitute release days to provide additional support for teacher release time during the school day for planning. One for McKinley middle school as well as one for coaching support at target sites.		
3.6	Tier 1: Provide lower class size in grades at high priority schools by providing instructional assistants for identified school in CSI and ATSI for academics	Maintaining class sizes and providing instructional assistants are important strategies for supporting students learning and achievement. 1. Maintain class size in K -2 at 25:1. The LEA ensures that teachers can provide individualized attention and support to each student. (25/26 Class size will be 28:1 for K-2) 2. Instructional assistants will be provided at priority sites of Garfield, Roosevelt, Taft, and Hoover to push into classrooms and work with small groups of students in ELD, Math and Literacy. They will provide targeted intervention and support to students who may need additional assistance or enrichment.	\$217,388.00	Yes
3.7	Tier 1: Provide additional staff to support K-8s in providing a full curriculum, with an outreach to unduplicated pupils.	These initiatives aim to provide comprehensive support and enrichment opportunities for students across various grade levels and schools, particularly those with high numbers of unduplicated pupils as well as engaging red indicator student groups. 1. Middle School Elective Teachers: By assigning elective teachers to schools with high numbers of unduplicated pupils, the LEA ensures that all students have access to a diverse range of enrichment classes. 2. Shared Music Teacher: Sharing a music teacher among multiple sites allows for efficient allocation of resources while still providing access to music education for students at each school. K-5 sites: Taft, Adelante Selby, Orion, Roosevelt, 3rd-5th North Star. (25/26 additional part-time music teachers will be added to include Hoover and Garfield students.)	\$70,000.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		3. STEAM teachers continue to provide high-quality design thinking and foster critical thinking and problem-solving skills among students. 4. Career Technical Education modules, as per the grant for 7th and 8th graders, offer students opportunities to explore career pathways, gain practical skills, and make connections between classroom learning and real-world applications in middle schools. District part-time STEAM TOSA will support the implementation of appropriate CTE elements in primary grades. (Discontinued as the grant has been expended. STEAM Teachers in middle school will continue to use the kits purchased through the grant.)		
3.8	Tier 1: General Ed and Special Ed connections and inclusive practices	The LEA's is committed to supporting the diverse needs of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and promoting inclusive practices across schools. 1. The RCSD MTSS leadership team will collaborate with the SMCOE, SIP (Supporting Inclusive Practices, statewide organization) and SELPA Coordinators reflect a comprehensive approach to addressing the needs of students with IEPs. Plan will focus on raising awareness and sensitivity among educators to better understand the learning, behavioral, and social emotional needs of students with IEPs. 2. RCSD's involvement in the SMCOE EIEEP grant provides an opportunity to access specialized training and resources for promoting inclusive practices. Inclusive practices training may include strategies for adapting curriculum, modifying instructional methods, and creating a supportive learning environment that accommodates the diverse needs of all students.	\$0.00	No
3.9	Tier 1: Support for the Transitional Kindergarten (TK) program	Providing instructional aides in TK classrooms is a proactive step to ensure that all students receive the support they need to succeed academically and socially.	\$834,000.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Instructional aides will provide individualized support to students who may require additional assistance with academic tasks, social skills development, or behavior management. Aides will work closely with teachers to implement differentiated instruction strategies that address the diverse learning styles and abilities of students in the classroom. Aides will facilitate small group instruction or interventions for students who require targeted support in specific areas, such as literacy, numeracy, or social-emotional learning. Aides will support teachers in maintaining a positive and organized classroom environment by assisting with transitions, managing materials, and reinforcing expectations for behavior.		
3.10	Tier II: Extending learning time	The LEA provide additional academic support and enrichment opportunities for students, particularly those who are classified as unduplicated pupils. 1. Summer school will prioritize unduplicated students who are two to three years behind. Focus for summer school will be targeted instruction in ELA and Math. 2. Offer after-school tutoring opportunities allows students to receive additional supports in targeted specific areas of academic need, offering additional practice and reinforcement. Unduplicated students will be prioritized for tutoring for Roosevelt and Garfield. 3. Supplemental tutoring models with alternative models such as CAP (College Advising Prep) tutoring, peer tutoring and AirReading.	\$858,000.00	Yes
3.11	Tier 1: Provide additional staff to support K-8s in providing a full curriculum, with an outreach to unduplicated pupils.	Reading Intervention Teachers will provide targeted supports to students who may be struggling with literacy skills. K-5 students at ATSI schools Taft and Hoover, CSI schools Garfield and Roosevelt, and other sites: Adelante Selby and Orion. (All sites exited the ATSI or CSI status for the 24/25 school year. Supports will continue at these sites.)	\$954,294.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.12	Tier 1: Standards-based materials for Spanish Bilingual Classroom	To support Spanish Literacy development in foundational skills, LEA will purchase Spanish decodable books to enhance Aprendo a Leer lessons. These books will focus on phonics, phonemic awareness, and reading fluency. 25/26 Discontinued as no longer needed.	\$0.00	No

Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students [2025-26]

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant
\$10,631,496	\$599,698

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
13.343%	0.000%	\$0.00	13.343%

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
1.2	Action: Tier 1: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Need: Suspension rates for unduplicated student groups of EL's and SED are higher than the district overall rate of 1%. Each subgroup of EL and SED presents unique needs and challenges that require targeted interventions and support. The school wide will focus on	This School-wide action plan prioritizes the needs of English Learners (ELs) and low-income students by implementing a comprehensive approach to reduce suspension rates and promote positive outcomes across all student groups in 8 of the school sites. This training is concentrated on the cycle of implementation for PBIS and these are the last to receive training. Here's how it will go above and beyond to support these students:	1.3 Suspension rates

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
	establishing (PBIS) Positive Behavior Intervention Supports at each site, The identified needs based on suspension rates for specific student groups are as follows: Overall as a district it was reduced by 1.2% in 2024-2025. English Learner rate of suspension is 1.5% decrease by 0.7. Subgroup of EL:Long Term English Learner rate is 6.6% decrease by 1.2% from prior year. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged rate is 1.4% decrease by 18% from year before Subgroup of SED: Homelessness rate is 1.6% reduced by 2.2%. Scope: Schoolwide	By specifically targeting schools with high suspension rates, the Redwood City School District is focusing its resources on the areas where the need is greatest.A school-wide effort ensures that ELs and low income students, who are often disproportionately impacted by suspensions, receive the support they need to succeed. The School-wide rollout of Tier 1 PBIS provides a universal, foundational support system for all students. This system promotes positive behavior and emotional well-being, which are critical for reducing suspensions. For ELs and low income students, who may face additional challenges in the school environment, this proactive approach helps create a more inclusive and supportive atmosphere. The School-wide a integration of SEL into the curriculum ensures that all students, particularly those from marginalized backgrounds, develop the competencies they need to manage emotions, build healthy relationships, and make responsible decisions. This is especially crucial for ELs, who may struggle with language barriers, and low income students, who may experience stress related to economic hardship. By emphasizing restorative practices, the school is implementing a School-wide a approach to address conflicts and behavioral issues through dialogue and community-building rather than punishment. This approach helps students, including ELs and low income students, feel heard and valued, which can lead to a stronger sense of belonging and reduce the likelihood of future behavioral issues.	

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
		The School-wide a focus on fostering a sense of belonging at each site is particularly important for ELs and low income students, who may feel isolated or marginalized. By creating an environment where these students feel they have a voice and are an integral part of the school community, the LEA is taking significant steps to support their overall well-being and academic success. Prioritizing schools with high suspension rates as part of a School-wide a strategy ensures that the resources and interventions are directed where they are most needed. This targeted approach is crucial for making meaningful progress in reducing suspensions and improving outcomes for ELs and low income students. Overall, this School-wide a action plan goes above and beyond by not only addressing the immediate issue of suspension rates but also by creating a supportive and inclusive environment that prioritizes the social and emotional needs of ELs and low income students. The ultimate goal is to reduce suspensions and increase social-emotional competencies, leading to better academic and behavioral outcomes for EL's and low income student groups.	
1.3	Action: Tier 1: Student Services and outreach to families experiencing chronic absenteeism specifically unduplicated pupils.	This action is being implemented on an LEA-wide basis to ensure that all students benefit from consistent and equitable access to outreach, communication, and attendance supports. While it is universally available, this plan is designed with a targeted focus on the unique needs of English learners, foster youth, and low-income students—	1.1 Yearly Attendance Rate 1.2 Chronic Absenteeism Monthly Attendance Reports

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
	Need: The chronic absenteeism rate for 2024-2025 for unduplicated pupils, including English learners (ELs) 26.9% and socioeconomically disadvantaged low income students 25.4%, is significantly higher than the district average of 19%. Specific subgroups such as homeless students, long-term English learners (LTELs), and foster youth show even higher rates, necessitating targeted interventions. Scope: LEA-wide	groups that often face systemic barriers to success. The Director of Student Services and administrative assistant will actively reach out to families whose primary language is not English, as well as low-income families who face economic challenges. By providing clear communication and support in the families' native languages, the LEA ensures that these families can fully engage in their children's education. This approach helps to bridge the gap between home and school, making it easier for families to participate meaningfully in their child's learning experience. The LEA's outreach efforts specifically target foster youth and low income students who have chronic attendance issues. By addressing the root causes of absenteeism, which often include economic barriers and instability, the LEA can provide the necessary support to help these students attend school regularly. This includes offering districtwide resources that alleviate financial pressures, making it easier for foster youth and low income students to focus on their education. The plan acknowledges that economic challenges can significantly impact a student's ability to attend school and succeed academically. By providing direct support and resources to low-income students and their families, the LEA is working to remove these barriers, ensuring that all students have equal opportunities to succeed. For families whose primary language is not English, the LEA is committed to ensuring they can communicate effectively with school officials. This system-wide language access support helps families feel more connected to the school	

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
		community and more empowered to advocate for their children's needs. The LEA's direct outreach approach allows for a deeper understanding of the specific challenges faced by students and their families. By addressing the root causes of absenteeism, whether they are language barriers, economic difficulties, or other factors, the LEA can implement targeted interventions that are more likely to result in positive outcomes. Overall, this LEA-wide action plan goes beyond standard practices by prioritizing personalized outreach and support for English learners, foster youth, and low-income students. The focus on communication, engagement, and addressing economic barriers directly supports these students' academic success and overall well-being.	
1.5	Action: Tier II: Community School wrap-around service support for families CSI schools focus on wrap-around services for Roosevelt and Garfield. ATSI schools MIT, Taft, and Clifford will also receive support for wrap-around services Need: Unduplicated pupils are achieving below standard in reading (CAASP data ELs 8%, below district at 50% and Math CAASP data ELs 7%, below district at 41%. The learning gap due to lack of skills deficits are due to lack of engagement. According to the CA Dashboard 23/24, the gap on the CAASP	This school-wide action plan prioritizes English learners, foster youth, and low-income students by creating a comprehensive support system that addresses their specific challenges and promotes their academic and personal well-being at the 8 Community School sites. This is school wide so all families can benefit from the services being provided. Here's how the plan prioritizes these student groups: The eight Community School Coordinators and Office Assistants play a crucial role in welcoming families into the district and school community. By ensuring that families feel supported from the moment they engage with the school, the LEA fosters an inclusive environment where English learners, foster youth, and low-income students can thrive.	(3.1-3.5)Quantitative Data: Academic Performance on Local and State Assessments: CAASP, ELPAC, I-Ready 1.1 Attendance Rate-monitor attendance and truancy rates Collect Data on mental health services Measure participation rates in family engagement workshops and events

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
	assessment is large with English learners having achieved 120.8 points and in 24/25 91 points below standard where as English only students are 41.9 in 23/24 and in 2024-2025 67.6 points above standard. Scope: Schoolwide	The Family Centers provide resources tailored to the unique needs of unduplicated pupils, including language support services, bilingual counseling, and translation services. These school-wide resources ensure that families of English learners, who may face language barriers and cultural adjustments, can fully engage in their child's education, thereby enhancing the students' academic success. Recognizing the additional stressors faced by English learners, such as language barriers, cultural adjustments, and immigration-related issues, the LEA provides mental health services to help students cope with stress, anxiety, and other challenges. This school-wide support is essential for creating an equitable environment where English learners can focus on their education without being hindered by mental health issues. The LEA ensures that English learners and other vulnerable students have access to basic necessities like food, clothing, and hygiene products. By removing these barriers, the LEA helps students focus on academics, contributing to a more equitable learning environment where all students have the opportunity to succeed. The provision of extended learning programs, such as after-school tutoring, homework assistance, and enrichment activities, is designed to support English learners in improving their language skills, catching up academically, and developing a sense of belonging within the school community. These programs are essential for helping English learners overcome academic challenges and build confidence in their abilities. By creating school-wide partnerships with eight community organizations through the Family	

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
		Centers, the LEA is able to leverage additional resources that benefit English learners, foster youth, and low-income students. These partnerships enhance the support available to these students, helping to address their diverse needs more effectively. The school-wide action plan's focus on providing holistic support—ranging from mental health services to basic necessities—demonstrates a commitment to addressing the root causes of the challenges faced by English learners, foster youth, and low-income students. By tackling these issues directly, the LEA is ensuring that these students have the best possible chance to succeed academically. Overall, this school-wide action plan goes above and beyond by implementing targeted strategies that address the unique needs of English learners, foster youth, and low-income students at the eight sites. By providing a wide range of resources, support services, and extended learning opportunities, the LEA is ensuring that these students can overcome barriers and achieve academic success in an equitable and supportive environment.	
1.6	Action: Tier II: Site-based Mental Health Supports. Full time counselors will continue at schools with high suspensions to support schools in CSI Roosevelt and Garfield) and ATSI (Clifford, Taft and McKinley)	This LEA-wide action plan is principally directed toward unduplicated pupils- English learners, foster youth, and low-income families- who often face systemic barriers that hinder academic achievement and engagement. These include: Language barriers, economic instability, limited access to mental health services, inconsistent family engagement and chronic absenteeism.	Quantitative Data: Academic Performance on Local and State (3.1-3.5) Assessments: CAASP, ELPAC, I-Ready 1.1 Attendance Rate- monitor attendance and truancy rates

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
	Need: California Healthy Kids Survey Findings School Connectedness: EL 61%, LTEL 62%, Homeless 45% Caring Adult: EL 60%, LTEL 36%, Homeless 60% School perceived very safe or safe: EL 60%, LTEL 58%, Homeless 48% Cyberbullying: EL 67%, LTEL 58%, Homeless 20% Academic Motivation: EL 67%, LTEL 63%, Homeless 57% Unduplicated pupils are achieving below standard in reading CAASP data for low income for 24/25 is 69.8 points below standards and for Math CAASP low income is 99.4 points below standard. Foster Youth is data is too small to report. Scope: LEA-wide	These actions address those needs through a comprehensive, LEA-wide system integrated supports that are both preventive and responsive. Eight Community School sites provide Family Centers that serve as central hubs for support, offering bilingual counseling, translation services, and access to school and community resources tailored to unduplicated pupils. A coordinated welcoming system—involving Community School Coordinators, administrators, and office staff—ensures families feel included and connected from their first interaction with the school. Mental health services are available across the district, including counseling, workshops, and crisis response, to support students coping with trauma, anxiety, or stress, particularly for English learners and foster youth. Community partnerships extend support beyond academics to include healthcare, legal aid, housing assistance, and resources for training—critical for families experiencing poverty or instability. Basic needs support, such as regular food distributions and hygiene products, helps eliminate non-academic barriers that affect focus and attendance. Extended learning opportunities—such as after-school tutoring, summer programs, and enrichment activities—help close academic gaps	Collect Data on mental health services Measure participation rates in family engagement workshops and events

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
		and build confidence, especially for English learners and students with interrupted learning. Parent education workshops equip families with tools to support learning at home, navigate the school system, and build advocacy skills, with specific outreach to non-English-speaking parents. Ongoing needs assessment and data monitoring ensure supports are adapted to meet evolving student and family needs. Cultural competency training for staff builds a more inclusive and responsive school culture, ensuring all students feel seen, heard, and supported. By addressing these needs holistically and systemically, the LEA is ensuring that low income, foster youth and English learners receive equitable access to opportunities, enabling them to thrive academically and socially.	
1.7	Action: Tier III: Homeless Students Thrive case managers- Grant Need: Unduplicated pupils are achieving below standard in reading CAASP data ELs 5.1%, below district at 44.7% and Math CAASP data ELs 7%, below district at 34.6%. The learning	This action is being implemented on a schoolwide basis to ensure that all students benefit from a safe, inclusive, and supportive environment, while prioritizing services for those with the highest needs-English learners, foster youth, and low-income students. A schoolwide approach allows for consistent implementation of strategies that reduce barriers to learning—particularly for unduplicated pupils, including English learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and foster youth—while also improving conditions for the entire school community.	1.1 Student Attendance Rates Monthly Attendance documentation

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
	gap due to lack of skills deficits are due to lack of engagement and chronic absenteeism. District absenteeism rate is 18.9% in 23/24. In 24/25 District rate was 19%. Indicating a notable proportion of students facing attendance challenges in the following sub groups: English learner rate (23/24) 26.4%, (24/25) 26.9% Sub group of ELs: Long-Term English Learners (23/24)20.5%, (24/25) 36.9% SED (23/24) 23.8%, (24/25) 25.4% Subgroup of SED: Homeless Student (23/24)30.4%, (24/25) 25.4% Foster Students (23/24) 50% and in (24/25) 33.3% Scope: Schoolwide	By embedding supports throughout the school system, the LEA ensures that basic needs, mental health services, and academic supports are available to any student who may require them, without stigma or separation. This approach also acknowledges that many students may experience challenges that are not always visible or formally identified, and a universal model ensures no one is overlooked. This school-wide implementation strengths the sense of belonging and equity for all students by fostering a positive school culture, enhancing peer relationships, and reducing behavioral incidents-creating a learning environment where everyone can thrive. The Director of Student Services, Office Assistant, and Thrive Case Managers work directly to connect these high-need students and their families to community-based supports that address their most urgent needs. This includes access to shelter, food, clothing, mental health support, and educational services—all of which are essential for consistent attendance and academic engagement. By stabilizing the circumstances of at-risk students, the LEA helps ensure that they are physically and emotionally prepared to learn. In turn, their improved outcomes contribute to stronger overall school performance, making the benefits of this targeted support felt schoolwide.	

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
1.10	Action: Tier 1: MTSS System Monitoring Need: Unduplicated pupils are achieving below standard in reading in 23/24 CAASP data ELs 5.1%, below district at 44.7% and Math CAASP data ELs 7%, below district at 34.6%. The learning gap due to lack of skills deficits are due to lack of engagement and chronic absenteeism. District absenteeism rate in 23/24 was 18.9% . In 24/25 District rate was 19%. Indicating a notable proportion of students facing attendance challenges in the following sub groups: English learner rate (23/24) 26.4%, (24/25) 26.9% Sub group of ELs: Long-Term English Learners (23/24)20.5%, (24/25) 36.9% SED (23/24) 23.8%, (24/25) 25.4% Subgroup of SED: Homeless Student (23/24)30.4%, (24/25) 25.4% Foster Students (23/24) 50% and in (24/25) 33.3% Scope: LEA-wide	Offering this action on an LEA-wide basis allows for a consistent and cohesive implementation of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) across all school sites, ensuring that every student has access to the same level of support and resources specifically English learners, foster youth and low-income students. By having MTSS Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) at every site, the LEA facilitates collaboration between schools. TOSAs can work together to share best practices, problem-solve implementation issues, and ensure that interventions are applied consistently across the district. This collaboration helps in identifying trends, gaps, and successes, allowing for more informed decision-making and better resource allocation. For English learners • MTSS structures provide Tier 1 instructional strategies aligned with Integrated and Designated ELD to ensure access to grade-level content and language development. • MTSS TOSAs monitor EL progress and collaborate with site teams to identify students needing additional supports. • Use of data systems (e.g., Ellevation) helps track language acquisition and ensure timely interventions. • Family engagement is strengthened through language-accessible communication and support from school staff trained in cultural responsiveness. For Foster Youth and low-income	1.1 Student Attendance Rates Monthly Attendance documentation

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
		• MTSS enables early identification of academic, emotional, or behavioral concerns through universal screening and regular check-ins. • Site-based MTSS teams coordinate wraparound services, including mental health counseling, mentoring, and attendance support. • Thrive Case Managers and Student Services staff collaborate with child welfare agencies to ensure continuity of supports across placements. • Behavioral support systems (e.g., PBIS) provide structure and consistency, which is essential for students experiencing instability. • MTSS ensures equitable access to Tiered academic interventions, including tutoring and small-group instruction during and after school. • Schools monitor for signs of chronic absenteeism and offer home visits, case management, and resource referrals to address root causes like transportation or housing insecurity • Collaboration with Community School Family Centers and food distribution programs ensures students have access to essential resources. While MTSS is offered LEA-wide to benefit all students, it is principally directed toward unduplicated pupils—English learners, foster youth, and low-income students—because these groups face disproportionate and layered challenges. By designing MTSS to identify and	

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
		respond to academic, behavioral, and emotional needs early and effectively, the LEA ensures that students most at risk of falling behind receive targeted, timely, and coordinated interventions.	
2.2	Action: Tier I: PD for staff Need: Based on ELPAC test results, English Learners who made one year growth were of 38.5% of all EL students for 2024. In 2025 39.6% made one year growth. Subgroups of EL's: LTELs in 23/24 was 26% and in 24/25 a decrease to 12%. RFEP rates in 23/24 were at 15.3% and in 24/25 rate is 16.4%. Simultaneously, on CAASSP preliminary scores for English Learner in ELA for (23/24) 5.1% and (24/25) 8%, in Math (23/24) 7.17% and (24/25) 7% ; Subgroup of LTELs in ELA is (23/24) was 1.2% (24/25) 5%. Math (23/24) 0% and (24/25) 1.4% which are below district rates for both ELA (23/24) 44.2 (24/25) 50% as well as in Math (23/24) 43.4%, (24/25) 41%. This performance gap for English learners according to the CA dashboard for Math are (23/24)120.8 which is 109.7 point difference than English only students (23/24 are 20.7). For (24/25) 139.2 points below standard where in English-only students are 21.1 points	This professional development and instructional initiative is implemented across all school sites to promote LEA-wide equity, prioritizing to improve instruction for English Learners (ELs), low income, homeless, and foster youth, to ensure that all teachers are equipped with strategies to support the diverse needs of students. Providing this support LEA-wide ensures consistency in quality and access to high-impact instructional practices, benefiting all students while specifically addressing the needs of unduplicated student groups. This LEA-wide action addresses these needs through: Professional development in effective language acquisition and newcomer support strategies, ensuring educators are equipped to support low-income students academically and socially. Integrated ELD strategies and vocabulary-focused instruction, helping low-income and English learners students build foundational language skills needed for success across content areas. All students benefit from these strategies. Use of Ellevation to track EL progress and implement timely interventions tailored to individual student needs, many of whom are low-income.	Formative assessments for English Learners Embedded assessments in Supplemental Curriculum to monitor progress K-2 Foundational Skills assessments Spanish assessment Aprendo a Leer and English BPST Literably 2.2 ELPAC scores 3.3-3.4 SBAC scores

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
	above standard. Creating a gap of 118.1 points. Homeless: 124.2 points below standard and low-income 69.8 points below standard. Scope: LEA-wide	Holistic supports that consider the social-emotional and academic transitions of low-income and English learners. All students benefit from these strategies. Curriculum development that connects learning to real-world contexts, making education relevant and accessible to low-income and English learner students. All students benefit from these strategies. Early intervention through focused training for Grades 3–5 teachers, building a strong academic foundation for students during critical years. All students benefit from these strategies. Additional Targeted Support: Through a combination of professional development focused on language acquisition and coaching sessions, this approach aims to elevate professional standards and improve student outcomes for all students, with a particular focus on English Learners and low income. This LEA-wide action provides professional development focused on language acquisition, newcomer support, and vocabulary instruction to improve outcomes for English Learners and low-income students. It addresses the unique needs of low-income students by equipping teachers with strategies that support academic language development, social-emotional transition, and access to rigorous, engaging instruction. Tools like Ellevation are used to track student progress and	

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
		guide timely interventions. Targeted support is also provided to former CSI and ATSI schools (Garfield, Roosevelt, Hoover, Taft, Clifford, Henry Ford, and MIT) to ensure sustained progress. Through consistent, high-quality training and coaching, this initiative promotes equity and academic success across the district.	
2.4	Action: Tier I: Outreach to Spanish-speaking families: Former CSI schools, Roosevelt and Garfield Need: California Healthy Kids Survey Findings School Connectedness: EL 61%, LTEL 62%, Homeless 45% Caring Adult: EL 60%, LTEL 36%, Homeless 60% School perceived very safe or safe: EL 60%, LTEL 58%, Homeless 48% Cyberbullying: EL 67%, LTEL 58%, Homeless 20% Academic Motivation: EL 67%, LTEL 63%, Homeless 57% Based on ELPAC test results, English Learners who made one year growth were of 38.5% of all EL students for 2024. In 2025 39.6% made one year growth. Subgroups of EL's: LTELs in 23/24 was 26% and in 24/25 a decrease to 12%. RFEP rates in 23/24 were at 15.3% and in 24/25 rate is 16.4%.	The LEA-wide plan to enhance support for unduplicated pupil families—specifically English Learners (ELs), Long-Term English Learners (LTELs), Foster Youth, Low-income and Homeless families. While the action benefits all students, it is principally directed toward unduplicated pupil groups whose needs require targeted outreach, translation/interpretation services, and enrollment support. By providing interpreters districtwide for families who are low-income and who speak languages other than English ensures that communication barriers are eliminated. Families are able to fully understand and engage with enrollment processes, assessment requirements, academic pathways, and available supports. This inclusive approach guarantees that EL, LTEL, Low-Income, foster youth and Homeless families receive clear, accurate information in their preferred language so they can actively participate in their child's education. The LEA-wide action reaches out to families who are often marginalized or face additional challenges—including Low-Income, foster youth and English learner families who may have less access to digital communication, printed	Continue regular meetings and workshops. Provide ongoing advocacy and enrollment assistance. Maintain regular communication and updates. Parent Surveys and California Healthy Kids Survey (2.5) Increase reclassification rates, improved attendance, and higher participation in advanced courses. Attendance participation data from family engagements events

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
	Simultaneously, on CAASSP preliminary scores for English Learner in ELA for (23/24) 5.27% and (24/25) 8.8%, in Math (23/24) 7.17% and (24/25) 7.1% ; Subgroup of LTELs in ELA is (23/24) was 1.2% (24/25) 5%. Homeless: 124.2 points below standard and low income is 69.8 points below standard. Math (23/24) 0% and (24/25) 1.2% which are below district rates for both ELA (23/24) 45.2 (24/25) 49.6% as well as in Math (23/24) 37.17%, (24/25) 39.9%. Homeless is 139 points below standard and low-income is 99.4 points below standard. This performance gap for English learners according to the CA dashboard for Math are (23/24)120.8 which is 109.7 point difference than English only students (23/24) are 20.7. For (24/25) 139.2 points below standard where in English-only students are 21.1 points above standard. Creating a gap of 118.1 points. Scope: LEA-wide	resources, or transportation to attend meetings. Timely, targeted outreach ensures families receive essential information about academic programs, supports, and opportunities before critical deadlines, reducing the risk of missed opportunities. Supporting families through the enrollment process with interpreters and targeted assistance simplifies what can be a complex and intimidating process. This reduces barriers to entry and ensures that students are enrolled in appropriate programs and classes. Ensuring that all low-income, foster youth and English learner families have equal access to information about enrollment and academic pathways promotes equity, particularly for those who might otherwise struggle to navigate the system due to language or other barriers. Providing district-wide clear and accessible explanations of assessment requirements and accelerated pathways ensures that low-income, foster youth, and English learner families understand how these elements impact their child's education and future opportunities. When information is communicated in families' home languages and aligned with language acquisition needs, it empowers caregivers to make informed decisions and advocate effectively for their children's academic success.. Improving communication through a language acquisition lens ensures that families of low-income, foster youth, and ELs can engage meaningfully with critical information about testing, placement, and reclassification.	

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
		By implementing LEA-wide targeted communication supports and outreach for unduplicated pupils specifically low-income, foster youth and English learner families, the LEA goes beyond standard practices to provide equitable, inclusive, and effective support. This approach not only helps individual students and families but also enhances the overall educational environment, promoting academic success and a positive school climate for all students	
3.5	Action: Tier 1: Provide coaches to high priority schools to support Tier 1 instruction or identified school in CSI and priority site. Need: The identified schools have a high number of students identified as English learner at each of the three sites: Garfield: 75%, Hoover: 67%, Roosevelt 43% who are in the lowest performance red indicator on the California dashboard for ELA. Roosevelt is red indicator for English Language Arts, Hoover and Garfield have a red indicator for both ELA and Math. For 24/25 the California Dashboard indicators at these sites remained in red for ELA for Garfield, Roosevelt, an Hoover. For Mathematics, Hoover and Garfield remain in red.	English Learners (ELs) require targeted instructional support to accelerate language acquisition while mastering grade-level content. Many ELs, including Long-Term English Learners (LTELs), need increased opportunities for structured academic talk, explicit vocabulary instruction, and scaffolded access to rigorous content. ELs also benefit from teachers who are skilled in integrating language development into all subject areas and in using culturally responsive strategies to engage students. By providing designated coaching support schoolwide at each target sites the LEA will: *Offer classroom-based coaching to model and co-teach lessons that integrate language development strategies and scaffolds for ELs. *Build teacher capacity in designing lessons that embed academic language supports and promote high levels of student engagement. *Facilitate professional learning communities (PLCs) to analyze student work, review EL data, and plan targeted instruction.	K-2 BPST/ Aprendo A Leer Assessments for Foundational Skills Literably Oral Assesment 1st-3rd Improved achievement in core subjects 3.1 & 3.2 I-Ready Assessment in Math and ELA (2x a year) 3.3 & 3.4 CAASPP Growth on ELPAC scores and increased reclassification rates Classroom observation data showing increased use of scaffolds, structured academic talk, and engagement strategies. Teacher survey feedback on confidence and skill in integrating language

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: Schoolwide	*Strengthen classroom conditions to ensure inclusive, culturally responsive practices that support both language and content mastery. *Provide real-time feedback to teachers to refine instructional practices that directly address the needs of ELs. While the action is principally directed toward ELs, providing coaching support schoolwide ensures: *ELs receive high-quality, scaffolded instruction across all classrooms and content areas. *All students, including those not yet identified as ELs but who may benefit from additional language supports, have access to improved instruction. *A unified, sitewide instructional approach fosters collaboration among teachers and benefits students in mixed-ability classrooms. *Sitewide implementation prevents inequities in instructional quality between classrooms	development into instruction.
3.6	Action: Tier 1: Provide lower class size in grades at high priority schools by providing instructional assistants for identified school in CSI and ATSI for academics Need: The LEA has identified a gap for English learners based on on CAASSP preliminary scores for English Learner in ELA for (23/24) 5.27% and (24/25) 8.8%, Homeless 124 points below standard and low-income is 69.8 below standard for the 24/25 assessments. in Math (23/24) 7.17% and (24/25) 7.1% ;	Maintaining class sizes in K-2 at 28:1 and providing instructional assistants at priority sites address the critical needs of unduplicated pupils, specifically low-income students by ensuring they receive individualized attention and targeted support. Implementing these actions on a LEA wide basis this also ensures that foster youth have equitable access to resources, consistency in educational experiences, and enhanced learning environments. Low-income and English learner students may have limited access to early learning opportunities prior to entering school, resulting in gaps in foundational literacy and numeracy skills. They	Local Assessment: K-5-: BPST/ IWT, and Aprendo a Leer (Every 6-8 weeks) 1-3: Oral Fluency Literably (Every 6-8 weeks) Math Assessments- Chapter Test 3.1 & 3.2 i-Ready diagnostic (2 times a year)

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
	Subgroup of LTELs in ELA is (23/24) was 1.2% (24/25) 5%. Math (23/24) 0% and (24/25) 1.2% which are below district rates for both ELA (23/24) 45.2 (24/25) 49.6% as well as in Math (23/24) 37.17.4%, (24/25) 39.9%. Homeless is 139.7 points below standard and low-income is 99.4 points below standard for 24/25 assessment. This performance gap for English learners according to the CA dashboard for Math are (23/24)120.8 which is 109.7 point difference than English only students (23/24 are 20.7). For (24/25) 139.2 points below standard where in English-only students are 21.1 points above standard. Creating a gap of 118.1 points. Scope: LEA-wide	benefit from smaller class sizes and instructional assistants who can provide targeted support, re-teaching, and enrichment. Additional adult support in the classroom increases opportunities for one-on-one and small-group instruction, which helps address academic gaps early and build confidence in learning. While the action is principally directed toward Low-Income and English learner students, maintaining reduced K–2 class sizes and providing instructional assistants on a LEA-wide basis ensures: *All unduplicated pupils benefit from equitable access to targeted early support. *Students whose unduplicated status may not yet be identified still receive the benefits of smaller class environments. *Consistency in classroom conditions across all schools to promote fairness and equal opportunity for academic success. This approach helps close the achievement gap and fosters a supportive educational framework for all students, particularly those who are most vulnerable.	
3.10	Action: Tier II: Extending learning time Need: The LEA has identified a gap for English learners based on CAASSP preliminary scores for English Learner in ELA for (23/24) 5.27% and (24/25) 8.8%, in Math (23/24) 7.17% and (24/25) 7.1% ;	The LEA-wide strategic actions, prioritizes Low Income and and English Learner students often face unique challenges such as limited access to academic resources outside of school, higher rates of learning loss, and greater instability that can interrupt their education. LEA-wide strategic actions—such as prioritizing summer school enrollment for Low Income and and English Learner students who are behind in ELA and	Quantitative Data: Academic Performance on Local Assessments: K-3, BPST, Literably for oral fluency, Math assessments 3.1& 3.2I-Ready Assessment in ELA and Math

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
	Subgroup of LTELs in ELA is (23/24) was 1.2% (24/25) 5%. Low income is 124.2 points below standard in 24/25. Math (23/24) 0% and (24/25) 1.2% which are below district rates for both ELA (23/24) 45.2 (24/25) 49.6% as well as in Math (23/24) 37.17%, (24/25) 39.9%. Low income is 99.4 points below standard in 24/25. This performance gap for English learners according to the CA dashboard for Math are (23/24) 120.8 which is, 109.7 point difference than English only students (23/24 are 20.7). For (24/25) 139.2 points below standard where in English-only students are 21.1 points above standard. Creating a gap of 118.1 points. In language arts English learners for 23/24 school year were 130.4 points below standard and English only students were 20.7 points above standards. Creating a gap of 109.7 points. For 24/25 ELS are 135.2 points below standards and English Only students were at 40.8 points above standards creating a gap 94.4 points. Both of these gaps are due to literacy/language skills deficits in both academic areas. mance gap is due to literacy/language skills deficit.	Math, offering after-school tutoring, and implementing supplemental tutoring models—are designed to address these barriers to improve their academic performance. Providing these supports across the LEA ensures equitable access to academic interventions, consistency in quality of instruction, and targeted learning opportunities for students most at risk. This approach directly responds to the needs of Low Income and English learner students, helping to close the achievement gap and fostering a more inclusive and supportive learning environment.	3.3 & 3.4 CAASP 2.1 ELPAC

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		
3.11	Action: Tier 1: Provide additional staff to support K-8s in providing a full curriculum, with an outreach to unduplicated pupils. Need: The LEA has identified a gap for English learners based on ELA for (23/24) 5.27% and (24/25) 8.8%, in Math (23/24) 7.17% and (24/25) 7.1% ; Subgroup of LTELs in ELA is (23/24) was 1.2% (24/25) 5%. Math (23/24) 0% and (24/25) 1.2% which are below district rates for both ELA (23/24) 45.2 (24/25) 49.6% as well as in Math (23/24) 37.17%, (24/25) 39.9%. This performance gap for English learners according to the CA dashboard for Math are (23/24) 120.8 which is, 109.7 point difference than English only students (23/24 are 20.7). For (24/25) 139.2 points below standard where in English-only students are 21.1 points above standard. Creating a gap of 118.1 points. In language arts English learners for 23/24 school year were 130.4 points below standard and English only students were 20.7 points above standards. Creating a gap of 109.7 points. For 24/25 ELS are 135.2 points below standards and English Only students were at	The LEA's decision to implement Reading Intervention Teachers on a school-wide basis goes above and beyond in several significant ways, ensuring that all students, especially those who are struggling with literacy skills, receive the support they need to succeed. By implementing Reading Intervention Teachers schoolwide, the LEA is ensuring that support is available to all students who need it, particularly unduplicated pupils (such as English Learners, foster youth, and low-income students). This approach goes beyond traditional methods that may limit literacy support to specific subgroups or select students. Instead, it promotes equity by allocating resources based on individual student needs, ensuring that no student is left behind. Unlike interventions that are often targeted only at certain grades or specific populations, the school-wide implementation ensures that any student who struggles with literacy, regardless of their background or grade level, can access specialized instruction. This broad-based approach helps to close literacy gaps across the entire student population, providing every struggling reader with the opportunity to improve their skills. The school-wide deployment of Reading Intervention Teachers facilitates the collection of extensive data on student literacy performance across the entire school. This data-driven approach enables the LEA to identify patterns, monitor progress, and assess the effectiveness of the interventions being used. Such a comprehensive data strategy allows for more	BPST foundational skills (every 6-8 weeks) Literably oral fluency (every 6-8 weeks) 3.1 i-Ready diagnostic (twice a year)

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
	40.8 points above standards creating a gap 94.4 points. Orion's English learner ELA CAASP scores have 63.64% not meeting standard. Both of these gaps are due to literacy/language skills deficits in both academic areas. Scope: Schoolwide	informed decision-making regarding instructional strategies and resource allocation, which is a step beyond more limited, site-specific approaches. With Reading Intervention Teachers embedded school-wide, the LEA can provide more personalized, targeted interventions that are specifically designed to address the unique challenges faced by individual students. This ability to tailor support ensures that students receive the most effective instruction possible, leading to better literacy outcomes. It also allows for flexibility in adapting strategies as students' needs evolve. The widespread presence of Reading Intervention Teachers allows for early identification of literacy challenges among students. By addressing these issues proactively, rather than waiting until they become significant barriers to learning, the LEA is taking a preventive approach that helps students stay on track academically. This goes beyond reactive measures and demonstrates a commitment to supporting students before they fall too far behind. School-wide implementation of Reading Intervention at Orion directly addresses the persistent literacy gaps experienced by unduplicated pupils—specifically English Learners and Low Income students at the site. The school-wide implementation of Reading Intervention Teachers is the best use of funds as it addresses learning gaps in reading achievement and ensures equitable access to specialized literacy support for all students, employing a data-driven approach to enhance decision-making, and	

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
		fostering a proactive, inclusive culture focused on literacy success. This addresses our district literacy goal for prioritizing our target groups.	

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
1.4	Action: Tier 1: Trauma based training for teachers at Kennedy, Hoover, CSI school Garfield, ATSI school Taft Need: Recent attendance data from Spring 2024-25 reveals that while the overall district attendance rate stands at a strong 93.7%, several student subgroups are demonstrating noticeably lower attendance rates, suggesting the presence of underlying challenges that may be trauma-related. Notably: ***Foster Youth show the lowest attendance rate at 87.4%, a significant 6.3 percentage points below the district average. ***Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) also fall behind, with 89.5%, indicating persistent barriers to engagement.	This action plan prioritizes English learners, foster youth, and low-income students by equipping teachers with the skills and strategies necessary to address their unique needs. Here's how the plan prioritizes these student groups: Teachers will receive specialized training to provide targeted academic support to English learners, particularly newcomers who may be facing language barriers and adjusting to a new educational system. This training will ensure that English learners receive the necessary resources and support to succeed academically, helping to close any achievement gaps. By incorporating Tier 1 SEL support in the classroom, the LEA ensures that all students, especially those from vulnerable groups like foster youth and low-income students, have the emotional and social skills needed to succeed in school. SEL helps students develop self-awareness, self-management, social awareness,	1.1 Attendance rate Ongoing Support: Continue providing professional development and coaching for staff on trauma informed practices Data Monitoring: Regularly track student progress and adjust interventions as needed. Feedback and Adjustment: Gather feedback from students, families, and staff to refine and improve trauma informed strategies.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	***Students Experiencing Homelessness and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students have rates of 92.1% and 92.5%, respectively, just below the district average, potentially masking broader instability. Scope: Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	relationship skills, and responsible decision-making, which are crucial for their overall well-being and academic success. Teachers will be trained in trauma-informed care, which is essential for supporting students who have experienced trauma, such as foster youth or those from low-income backgrounds. Understanding how trauma affects learning and behavior allows teachers to create a safe and supportive environment, where students feel understood and are better able to engage in learning. The training will also equip teachers with strategies to de-escalate behaviors and manage crises effectively. This is particularly important for students who may struggle with emotional regulation due to trauma or other stressors. By preventing situations from escalating, teachers can maintain a safe and supportive learning environment, which is critical for the success of English learners, foster youth, and low-income students. The combination of SEL, trauma-informed care, and behavior management training will help create a classroom atmosphere where all students, particularly those who are most vulnerable, feel safe, supported, and ready to learn. This environment is essential for fostering academic success and emotional well-being. Overall, this action plan goes above and beyond by providing teachers with the tools and knowledge they need to effectively support English learners, foster youth, and low-income students. By focusing on SEL, trauma-informed care, and behavior management, the LEA is prioritizing the needs of these students and ensuring they have	

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		the resources and support necessary to thrive in the classroom.	
2.1	Action: Tier I: Program Need: Based on ELPAC test results, English Learners who made one year growth were of 38.5% of all EL students for 2024. In 2025 39.6% made one year growth. Subgroups of EL's: LTELs in 23/24 was 26% and in 24/25 a decrease to 12%. RFEP rates in 23/24 were at 15.3% and in 24/25 rate is 16.4%. Simultaneously, on CAASSP preliminary scores for English Learner in ELA for (23/24) 5.1% and (24/25) 8%, in Math (23/24) 7.17% and (24/25) 7% ; Subgroup of LTELs in ELA is (23/24) was 1.2% (24/25) 5%. Math (23/24) 0% and (24/25) 1.4% which are below district rates for both ELA (23/24) 44.2 (24/25) 50% as well as in Math (23/24) 43.4%, (24/25) 41%. This performance gap for English learners according to the CA dashboard for Math are (23/24)120.8 which is 109.7 point difference than English only students (23/24 are 20.7). For (24/25) 139.2 points below standard where in English-only students are 21.1 points above standard. Creating a gap of 118.1 points.	This action is principally directed toward the unduplicated student group of English Learners (ELs), including the subgroups of Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) and Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students. The data clearly highlights the persistent and significant academic gaps faced by these students, which the action aims to address. The LEA-wide implementation of targeted English Language Development (ELD) strategies and MTSS ensures ELs are identified early for intervention, progress is monitored, and supports are aligned to individual student needs. ELD support is embedded in Tier 1 instruction and reinforced through supplemental intervention (Tier 2 and Tier 3) delivered through school-based teams supported by MTSS TOSAs. Professional development and coaching are provided to improve Integrated and Designated ELD instruction across all sites. The system also includes data tracking through platforms like Ellevation, which ensures teachers and administrators can monitor language progress and make informed instructional decisions. Supports also extend to family engagement, with resources available in multiple languages to empower families to support their children's language development and learning at home.	Formative assessments for English Learners Embedded assessments in Supplemental Curriculum to monitor progress K-2 Foundational Skills assessments Spanish assessment Aprendo a Leer and English BPST 3.1 IReady and 3.3 CAASPP

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	In language arts English learners for 23/24 school year were 130.4 points below standard and English only students were 20.7 points above standards. Creating a gap of 109.7 points. For 24/25 ELs are 135.2 points below standards and English Only students were at 40.8 points above standards creating a gap 94.4 points. Both of these gaps are due to literacy/language skills deficits in both academic areas. Scope: Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	This action is principally directed toward English Learners, with particular emphasis on LTELs and ELs not progressing toward reclassification. The clear academic underperformance and wide achievement gaps in both ELA and Math—rooted in language and literacy deficits—justify a comprehensive, LEA-wide approach to intervention, monitoring, and instructional support. While the system benefits all students, it is designed and implemented specifically to close the gaps for ELs, ensuring they gain the language and literacy skills necessary to succeed.	
2.5	Action: Tier II: Providing for additional needs Need: Student science performance gaps due to lack of background knowledge deficits are key for our unduplicated pupils of English Learners, Foster Youth and SED are key to engagement in school. Cost of Outdoor Education and Yosemite Field trips create a hardship for families of unduplicated pupils. Scope: Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	This action is designed to ensure that English Learners, Foster Youth, and low-income students have equitable access to alternative and engaging methods of learning Science content which are particularly effective for students who face barriers in traditional instructional models. By covering the costs associated with alternative Science learning methods, the LEA removes financial barriers that might otherwise prevent English Learners, Foster Youth, and low-income students from participating in these opportunities. This ensures that these students can fully engage in innovative and hands-on Science learning experiences without the burden of additional expenses. For English learners, this action supports their identified need by:	# of students who need financial support 3.5 CAASP Science Dashboard Indicator

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		Providing access to project-based, hands-on, and technology-enhanced Science learning experiences, which reduce language dependency and allow ELs to engage with content through observation, experimentation, and collaboration—making learning more meaningful and comprehensible. Integrating visuals, models, manipulatives, and interactive activities that support the development of academic vocabulary and conceptual understanding without over-reliance on lecture-based instruction. Scaffolding academic language through context-rich, real-world learning opportunities that allow ELs to practice speaking, listening, reading, and writing in meaningful academic contexts. By intentionally designing Science instruction to be multimodal, interactive, and accessible, the action directly addresses the language and learning needs of ELs and enhances their ability to participate in rigorous Science content while developing academic English proficiency. This action is intentionally designed to meet the unique needs of English Learners, alongside Foster Youth and low-income students, by ensuring they are prioritized for participation in alternative Science learning opportunities. By removing financial barriers, embedding language supports, and using instructional methods that are more inclusive of diverse learners, the action helps close opportunity and achievement gaps,	

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		promotes engagement, and supports long-term academic success in Science and beyond.	
2.6	Action: Tier II: Specialized support for recently arrived Newcomer students Need: Based on ELPAC test results, English Learners who made one year growth were of 38.5% of all EL students for 2024. In 2025 39.6% made one year growth. Subgroups of EL's: LTELs in 23/24 was 26% and in 24/25 a decrease to 12%. RFEP rates in 23/24 were at 15.3% and in 24/25 rate is 16.4%. Simultaneously, on CAASSP preliminary scores for English Learner in ELA for (23/24) 5.27% and (24/25) 8.8%, in Math (23/24) 7.17% and (24/25) 7.1% ; Subgroup of LTELs in ELA is (23/24) was 1.2% (24/25) 5%. Math (23/24) 0% and (24/25) 1.2% which are below district rates for both ELA (23/24) 45.2 (24/25) 49.6% as well as in Math (23/24) 37.17%, (24/25) 39.9%. This performance gap for English learners according to the CA dashboard for Math are (23/24)120.8 which is 109.7 point difference than English only students (23/24 are 20.7). For (24/25) 139.2 points below standard	This limited action specifically impacts English Learners—students who have recently arrived in the country and are at the early stages of English language acquisition. These students often require specialized support to build foundational English skills and adjust socially and academically to the new school environment. English Learners face unique challenges including: Limited English proficiency, especially in academic language, which can impede access to grade-level content. Cultural and social adjustment needs as they acclimate to a new educational system and community. Potential gaps in prior formal education which may impact foundational academic skills. Family engagement barriers, including language and unfamiliarity with the school system, that limit parental involvement in their child’s education. The LEA assigns a dedicated Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) focused on English learners and recent arrivals students and families to provide targeted academic and social-emotional support, ensuring that ELs receive specialized attention.	Ellevation progress monitoring 3.1 & 3.2 i-Ready Assessment to monitor progress 2.1 3rd-8th ELPAC IAB's to monitor and adjust progress

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	where in English-only students are 21.1 points above standard. Creating a gap of 118.1 points. Scope: Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Professional development for teachers on second language acquisition stages, instructional scaffolding, and culturally and linguistically responsive practices enhances educator capacity to meet newcomer students' needs effectively. The action includes efforts to engage English learner families who are recent arrivals by improving communication and support, empowering parents to advocate for their children and contribute positively to their educational journey. By focusing on these specific needs, the action fosters improved English proficiency, academic performance, social integration, and family involvement for English learner students. This specialized support not only benefits ELs but also contributes to a more inclusive, responsive, and effective learning environment for all students This limited action focuses on supporting English Learners students who are newly arrived and in the early stages of English language acquisition and all English learners. The LEA has assigned a dedicated Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) to provide targeted academic, social-emotional, and family engagement support for these students. Professional development focused on second language acquisition, scaffolding, and culturally responsive practices equips teachers to better meet English learner students' unique needs. By addressing language barriers, academic gaps, and family involvement challenges, this action promotes improved English proficiency, academic	

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		success, and social integration for ELs. These efforts foster a more inclusive and supportive school environment, benefiting all students.	
2.8	Action: Program Monitoring Need: Based on ELPAC test results, English Learners who made one year growth were of 38.5% of all EL students for 2024. In 2025 39.6% made one year growth. Subgroups of EL's: LTELs in 23/24 was 26% and in 24/25 a decrease to 12%. RFEP rates in 23/24 were at 15.3% and in 24/25 rate is 16.4%. Simultaneously, on CAASSP preliminary scores for English Learner in ELA for (23/24) 5.27% and (24/25) 8.8%, in Math (23/24) 7.17% and (24/25) 7.1% ; Subgroup of LTELs in ELA is (23/24) was 1.2% (24/25) 5%. SWD (23/24) 16.43% and (24/25) 15.5% Math (23/24) 0% and (24/25) 1.2% which are below district rates for both ELA (23/24) 45.2 (24/25) 49.6% as well as in Math (23/24) 37.17%, (24/25) 39.9%. SWD (23/24) 14.28% and (24/25)13.8 This performance gap for English learners according to the CA dashboard for Math are (23/24)120.8 which is 109.7 point difference than English only students (23/24 are 20.7). For (24/25) 139.2 points below standard where in English-only students are 21.1 points	This action is designed to provide targeted language supports to improve language acquisition for all EL students through a dedicated ELD instruction aligned with their specific language proficiency levels. By ensuring every EL student receives consistent and rigorous language development opportunities, the LEA works to close achievement gaps and promote English proficiency as well as increase reclassification rates. The action also includes: Ongoing monitoring of EL students' progress through assessments and data tools, enabling educators to tailor instruction and interventions as needed. Support systems that help ELs integrate socially and culturally into the school community, fostering a positive school experience and building student confidence. Providing teachers with the necessary training and resources to deliver effective, culturally responsive instruction that meets ELs' unique needs. Ensuring EL students have access to all resources and supports available within the LEA, promoting equity and inclusion. English Learners (ELs) face specific challenges that can hinder their academic progress and	Ellevation progress monitoring 3.1 & 3.2 i-Ready Assessment to monitor progress 2.1 3rd-8th ELPAC to monitor and adjust progress

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	above standard. Creating a gap of 118.1 points. Scope: Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	integration into the school community. These include: Limited proficiency in academic English, which affects their ability to access grade-level content across subjects. Need for targeted English Language Development (ELD) instruction that builds both conversational and academic language skills. Requirement for ongoing monitoring and assessment to track language acquisition progress and adjust instruction accordingly. Social and cultural integration challenges, which can impact confidence, engagement, and a sense of belonging in school. Potential disparities in access to equitable resources and supports compared to their English-only peers. English Learners face challenges in acquiring academic English and accessing grade-level content, along with social and cultural integration needs. This action ensures all EL students receive equitable access to dedicated English Language Development (ELD) instruction, ongoing progress monitoring, and culturally responsive supports. By providing targeted instruction and fostering positive school experiences, the LEA helps EL students build language proficiency, succeed academically, and feel connected to their school community.	

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.

N/A

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.

Bilingual Instructional Aides are supporting students in Transitional Kindergarten, Bilingual Classrooms, Supports for English Learners are Target sites, as well as Mental Health Counselors are target sites.Goal 1: 16 Goal 2: 2.6, Goal 3: 3.6, 3.9

Reading Intervention and English Language Development support for recent arrivals are supported at the three middle schools where there are high number of English learners. Goal 2: 2.1, 2.6 and Goal 3: 3.7

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	0.358:1	0.59:1
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	0.57:1	0.06:1

2025-26 Total Planned 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	\$79,679,322	\$10,631,496	13.343%	0.000%	13.343%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	\$65,270,326.00	\$1,770,596.00	\$0.00	\$835,849.00	\$67,876,771.00	\$65,562,200.00	\$2,314,571.00

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	Tier 1: Social-emotional (SEL) supports	All	No			All Schools	August to June	\$0.00	\$53,034.00		\$53,034.00			\$53,034.00	
1	1.2	Tier 1: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)	English Learners Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Roosevelt, Henry Ford, Kennedy, Garfield, MIT, Clifford, Adelante K-8	August to June	\$5,000.00	\$44,000.00	\$49,000.00				\$49,000.00	
1	1.3	Tier 1: Student Services and outreach to families experiencing chronic absenteeism specifically unduplicated pupils.	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	August to June	\$523,981.00	\$0.00	\$523,981.00				\$523,981.00	
1	1.4	Tier 1: Trauma based training for teachers at Kennedy, Hoover, CSI school Garfield, ATSI school Taft	English Learners Low Income	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Garfield, Taft, Hoover and Kennedy. 25/26 Henry Ford, Roosevelt, Mckinley, and Clifford	August to June	\$13,000.00	\$0.00	\$13,000.00				\$13,000.00	

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	1.5	Tier II: Community School wrap-around service support for families CSI schools focus on wrap-around services for Roosevelt and Garfield. ATSI schools MIT, Taft, and Clifford will also receive support for wrap-around services	English Learners Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools Specific Schools: Adelante Selby, Clifford, Garfield, Hoover, Roosevelt, Kennedy, MIT and Taft Tk-8	August to June	\$1,305,772.00	\$0.00	\$1,305,772.00				\$1,305,772.00	
1	1.6	Tier II: Site-based Mental Health Supports. Full time counselors will continue at schools with high suspensions to support schools in CSI (Roosevelt and Garfield) and ATSI (Clifford, Taft and McKinley)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools TK-8	August to June	\$3,380,988.00	\$8.00	\$2,298,890.00	\$1,078,106.00		\$4,000.00	\$3,380,996.00	
1	1.7	Tier III: Homeless Students Thrive case managers-Grant	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Hoover, Garfield, Taft, MIT	August to June	\$0.00	\$56,300.00	\$25,000.00			\$31,300.00	\$56,300.00	
1	1.8	Tier 1: MTSS System Monitoring	All	No			All Schools	August to June	\$276,852.00	\$109,532.00	\$351,852.00	\$34,532.00			\$386,384.00	
1	1.9	Tier III: Behavior Specialists	All Homeless, Foster Youth, English Learner	No			Specific Schools: Hoover, Garfield, Roosevelt, Henry Ford, Taft K-8	August to June	\$300,000.00	\$0.00	\$300,000.00				\$300,000.00	
1	1.10	Tier 1: MTSS System Monitoring	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools K-8	August to June	\$1,299,297.00	\$31,000.00	\$1,330,297.00				\$1,330,297.00	
2	2.1	Tier I: Program	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated	English Learners	All Schools	August to June	\$679,000.00	\$152,000.00	\$831,000.00				\$831,000.00	

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
					Student Group(s)											
2	2.2	Tier I: PD for staff	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools K-8	August to June	\$0.00	\$272,500.00	\$222,500.00			\$50,000.00	\$272,500.00	
2	2.3	Tier I: Academic Planning for Success														
2	2.4	Tier I: Outreach to Spanish-speaking families: Former CSI schools, Roosevelt and Garfield	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools TK-8	August to June	\$704,180.00	\$10,000.00	\$704,180.00			\$10,000.00	\$714,180.00	
2	2.5	Tier II: Providing for additional needs	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Roosevelt, Garfield, MIT, Taft, Hoover 5th and Middle School	August to June	\$0.00	\$81,000.00	\$70,000.00			\$11,000.00	\$81,000.00	
2	2.6	Tier II: Specialized support for recently arrived Newcomer students	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	Specific Schools: Adelante Selby (eliminated in 25/26), Clifford, Garfield, Henry Ford (eliminated in 25/26), Hoover, Roosevelt, Taft, McKinley, Kennedy K-8	August to June	\$761,675.00	\$15,000.00	\$391,647.00			\$385,028.00	\$776,675.00	
2	2.7	Tier III: SPED and EL dual-identified students						August to June	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00				\$0.00	
2	2.8	Program Monitoring	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student	English Learners	All Schools Tk-8	August to June	\$269,753.00	\$240,000.00	\$469,753.00			\$40,000.00	\$509,753.00	

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
					Group(s)											
2	2.9	Tier 1: Integrated ELD														
3	3.1	Tier I: Personnel: All teaching staff, classified staff, site administrators	All	No				August to June	\$51,342,990.00	\$0.00	\$51,342,990.00				\$51,342,990.00	
3	3.2	Tier I: Professional Development (PD) and coaching for all staff	All	No			All Schools	August to June	\$1,411,118.00	\$265,273.00	\$1,371,870.00			\$304,521.00	\$1,676,391.00	
3	3.3	Tier 1: Standards-based materials: all subject areas	All	No			All Schools	August to June	\$0.00	\$418,828.00	\$65,000.00	\$353,828.00			\$418,828.00	
3	3.4	Tier I: Instruction	All	No				August to June	\$0.00	\$216,096.00		\$216,096.00			\$216,096.00	
3	3.5	Tier 1: Provide coaches to high priority schools to support Tier 1 instruction or identified school in CSI and priority site.	English Learners	Yes	School wide	English Learners	Specific Schools: Garfield, Roosevelt, and Hoover K-5	August to June	\$704,912.00	\$0.00	\$704,912.00				\$704,912.00	
3	3.6	Tier 1: Provide lower class size in grades at high priority schools by providing instructional assistants for identified school in CSI and ATSI for academics	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	August to June	\$217,388.00	\$0.00	\$217,388.00				\$217,388.00	
3	3.7	Tier 1: Provide additional staff to support K-8s in providing a full curriculum, with an outreach to unduplicated pupils.	All	No			All Schools	August to June	\$70,000.00	\$0.00	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00			\$70,000.00	
3	3.8	Tier 1: General Ed and Special Ed connections and inclusive practices	Students with Disabilities	No				August to June	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00				\$0.00	
3	3.9	Tier 1: Support for the Transitional Kindergarten (TK) program	All	No			All Schools	August to June	\$834,000.00	\$0.00	\$834,000.00				\$834,000.00	
3	3.10	Tier II: Extending learning time	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools Specific Schools: Garfield,	August to June	\$508,000.00	\$350,000.00	\$858,000.00				\$858,000.00	

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
							Roosevelt, Hoover, Taft, McKinley 3rd-8th									
3	3.11	Tier 1: Provide additional staff to support K-8s in providing a full curriculum, with an outreach to unduplicated pupils.	English Learners Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Adelante Selby, Orion, Garfield, Roosevelt, Taft, Hoover, Henry Ford K-5	August to June	\$954,294.00	\$0.00	\$954,294.00	\$0.00			\$954,294.00	
3	3.12	Tier 1: Standards-based materials for Spanish Bilingual Classroom	All	No			All Schools		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00				\$0.00	

2025-26 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
\$79,679,322	\$10,631,496	13.343%	0.000%	13.343%	\$10,969,614.00	0.000%	13.767 %	Total:	\$10,969,614.00
								LEA-wide Total:	\$6,155,236.00
								Limited Total:	\$1,775,400.00
								Schoolwide Total:	\$3,038,978.00

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	1.2	Tier 1: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Roosevelt, Henry Ford, Kennedy, Garfield, MIT, Clifford, Adelante K-8	\$49,000.00	
1	1.3	Tier 1: Student Services and outreach to families experiencing chronic absenteeism specifically unduplicated pupils.	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$523,981.00	
1	1.4	Tier 1: Trauma based training for teachers at Kennedy, Hoover, CSI school Garfield, ATSI school Taft	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Garfield, Taft, Hoover and Kennedy. 25/26 Henry Ford, Roosevelt, Mckinley, and Clifford	\$13,000.00	

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	1.5	Tier II: Community School wrap-around service support for families CSI schools focus on wrap-around services for Roosevelt and Garfield. ATSI schools MIT, Taft, and Clifford will also receive support for wrap-around services	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools Specific Schools: Adelante Selby, Clifford, Garfield, Hoover, Roosevelt, Kennedy, MIT and Taft Tk-8	\$1,305,772.00	
1	1.6	Tier II: Site-based Mental Health Supports. Full time counselors will continue at schools with high suspensions to support schools in CSI (Roosevelt and Garfield) and ATSI (Clifford, Taft and McKinley)	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools TK-8	\$2,298,890.00	
1	1.7	Tier III: Homeless Students Thrive case managers-Grant	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Hoover, Garfield, Taft, MIT	\$25,000.00	
1	1.10	Tier 1: MTSS System Monitoring	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools K-8	\$1,330,297.00	
2	2.1	Tier I: Program	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	\$831,000.00	
2	2.2	Tier I: PD for staff	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools K-8	\$222,500.00	
2	2.4	Tier I: Outreach to Spanish-speaking families: Former CSI schools, Roosevelt and Garfield	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools TK-8	\$704,180.00	

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	2.5	Tier II: Providing for additional needs	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Roosevelt, Garfield, MIT, Taft, Hoover 5th and Middle School	\$70,000.00	
2	2.6	Tier II: Specialized support for recently arrived Newcomer students	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	Specific Schools: Adelante Selby (eliminated in 25/26), Clifford, Garfield, Henry Ford (eliminated in 25/26), Hoover, Roosevelt, Taft, McKinley, Kennedy K-8	\$391,647.00	
2	2.8	Program Monitoring	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools Tk-8	\$469,753.00	
3	3.5	Tier 1: Provide coaches to high priority schools to support Tier 1 instruction or identified school in CSI and priority site.	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners	Specific Schools: Garfield, Roosevelt, and Hoover K-5	\$704,912.00	
3	3.6	Tier 1: Provide lower class size in grades at high priority schools by providing instructional assistants for identified school in CSI and ATSI for academics	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$217,388.00	
3	3.10	Tier II: Extending learning time	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools Specific Schools: Garfield, Roosevelt, Hoover, Taft, McKinley 3rd-8th	\$858,000.00	

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 (%)
3	3.11	Tier 1: Provide additional staff to support K-8s in providing a full curriculum, with an outreach to unduplicated pupils.	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Adelante Selby, Orion, Garfield, Roosevelt, Taft, Hoover, Henry Ford K-5	\$954,294.00	

2024-25 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	\$67,453,707.00	\$67,600,212.22

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	Tier 1: Social-emotional (SEL) supports	No	\$32,000	\$1,831.15
1	1.2	Tier 1: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)	Yes	\$35,000.00	\$31,778
1	1.3	Tier 1: Student Services and outreach to families experiencing chronic absenteeism specifically unduplicated pupils.	Yes	\$245,310.00	\$252,779.01
1	1.4	Tier 1: Trauma based training for teachers at Kennedy, Hoover, CSI school Garfield, ATSI school Taft	Yes	\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00
1	1.5	Tier II: Community School wrap-around service support for families CSI schools focus on wrap-around services for Roosevelt and Garfield. ATSI schools MIT, Taft, and Clifford will also receive support for wrap-around services	Yes	\$1,204,801.00	\$1,497,312.44
1	1.6	Tier II: Site-based Mental Health Supports. Full time counselors will continue at schools with high suspensions to support schools in CSI (Roosevelt and Garfield) and ATSI (Clifford, Taft and McKinley)	Yes	\$4,281,211.00	\$3,944,439.75

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	1.7	Tier III: Homeless Students	No	\$20,000.00	\$15,635
		Thrive case managers- Grant	Yes		
1	1.8	Tier 1: MTSS System Monitoring	No	\$371,624.00	\$426,941.95
1	1.9	Tier III: Behavior Specialists	No	\$300,000.00	\$266,530
1	1.10	Tier 1: MTSS System Monitoring	Yes	\$1,364,874.00	\$1,219,276.60
2	2.1	Tier I: Program	Yes	\$477,000.00	\$710,071.84
2	2.2	Tier I: PD for staff	Yes	\$89,500.00	\$74,239
2	2.3	Tier I: Academic Planning for Success	Yes	\$0.00	0
2	2.4	Tier I: Outreach to Spanish-speaking families: Specifically CSI schools, Roosevelt and Garfield	Yes	\$693,098.00	\$695,043.33
2	2.5	Tier II: Providing for additional needs	Yes	\$70,000.00	\$44,490.00
2	2.6	Tier II: Specialized support for recently arrived Newcomer students	Yes	\$620,299.00	\$516,321.21

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	2.7	Tier III: SPED and EL dual-identified students	No	\$0.00	0
2	2.8	Program Monitoring	Yes	\$314,415.00	\$301,786.03
2	2.9	Tier 1: Integrated ELD	Yes	\$287,000.00	\$283,963.54
3	3.1	Tier I: Personnel: All teaching staff, classified staff, site administrators	No	\$51,342,990.00	\$51,626,742.42
3	3.2	Tier I: Professional Development (PD) and coaching for all staff	No	\$1,417,388.00	\$1,706,632.00
3	3.3	Tier 1: Standards-based materials: all subject areas	No	\$367,653.00	\$386,920.75
3	3.4	Tier I: Instruction	No	\$264,033.00	\$186,423.00
3	3.5	Tier 1: Provide coaches to high priority schools to support Tier 1 instruction or identified school in CSI and priority site.	Yes	\$558,141.00	\$561,877.47
3	3.6	Tier 1: Provide lower class size in grades at high priority schools by providing instructional assistants for identified school in CSI and ATSI for academics	Yes	\$361,904.00	\$390,463.94
3	3.7	Tier 1: Provide additional staff to support K-8s in providing a full curriculum, with an outreach to unduplicated pupils.	No	\$63,051.00	\$37,226.15

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)
3	3.8	Tier 1: General Ed and Special Ed connections and inclusive practices	No	\$0.00	\$0
3	3.9	Tier 1: Support for the Transitional Kindergarten (TK) program	No	\$811,363.00	\$627,277.04
3	3.10	Tier II: Extending learning time	Yes	\$703,500.00	\$621,069.50
3	3.11	Tier 1: Provide additional staff to support K-8s in providing a full curriculum, with an outreach to unduplicated pupils.	Yes	\$1,103,790.00	\$1,119,379.10
3	3.12	Tier 1: Standards-based materials for Spanish Bilingual Classroom	Yes	\$45,762.00	\$45,762

2024-25 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)
\$10,522,789	\$10,443,343.00	\$11,311,804.91	(\$868,461.91)	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	Tier 1: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)	Yes	\$35,000.00	\$31,778.00		
1	1.3	Tier 1: Student Services and outreach to families experiencing chronic absenteeism specifically unduplicated pupils.	Yes	\$245,310.00	\$252,779.01		
1	1.4	Tier 1: Trauma based training for teachers at Kennedy, Hoover, CSI school Garfield, ATSI school Taft	Yes	\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00		
1	1.5	Tier II: Community School wrap-around service support for families CSI schools focus on wrap-around services for Roosevelt and Garfield. ATSI schools MIT, Taft, and Clifford will also receive support for wrap-around services	Yes	\$1,204,801.00	\$1,497,312.44		
1	1.6	Tier II: Site-based Mental Health Supports. Full time counselors will continue at schools with high suspensions to support schools in CSI	Yes	\$3,281,211.00	\$3,944,439.75		

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)
		Roosevelt and Garfield) and ATSI (Clifford, Taft and McKinley)					
1	1.7	Tier III: Homeless Students	Yes	\$20,000.00	\$15,635		
		Thrive case managers- Grant					
1	1.10	Tier 1: MTSS System Monitoring	Yes	\$1,364,874.00	\$1,219,276.60		
2	2.1	Tier I: Program	Yes	\$477,000.00	\$710,071.84		
2	2.2	Tier I: PD for staff	Yes	\$89,500.00	\$74,239.00		
2	2.3	Tier I: Academic Planning for Success	Yes	\$0.00	0		
2	2.4	Tier I: Outreach to Spanish-speaking families: Specifically CSI schools, Roosevelt and Garfield	Yes	\$693,098.00	\$695,043.33		
2	2.5	Tier II: Providing for additional needs	Yes	\$70,000.00	\$44,490.00		
2	2.6	Tier II: Specialized support for recently arrived Newcomer students	Yes	\$299,299.00	\$516,321.21		
2	2.8	Program Monitoring	Yes	\$314,415.00	\$301,786.03		
2	2.9	Tier 1: Integrated ELD	Yes	\$89,000.00	\$166,586.37		
3	3.5	Tier 1: Provide coaches to high priority schools to support Tier 1 instruction or identified school in CSI and priority site.	Yes	\$558,141.00	\$561,877.47		

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)
3	3.6	Tier 1: Provide lower class size in grades at high priority schools by providing instructional assistants for identified school in CSI and ATSI for academics	Yes	\$361,904.00	\$390,463.94		
3	3.10	Tier II: Extending learning time	Yes	\$703,500.00	\$621,069.50		
3	3.11	Tier 1: Provide additional staff to support K-8s in providing a full curriculum, with an outreach to unduplicated pupils.	Yes	\$582,528.00	\$214,873.42		
3	3.12	Tier 1: Standards-based materials for Spanish Bilingual Classroom	Yes	\$45,762.00	\$45,762.00		

2024-25 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)
76,808,143	\$10,522,789	0	13.700%	\$11,311,804.91	0.000%	14.727%	\$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 and Senate Bill 153, Chapter 38, Statutes of 2024.

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

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

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

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

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

Plan Summary

Purpose

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

Requirements and Instructions

General Information

A description of the LEA, its schools, and its students in grades transitional kindergarten–12, as applicable to the LEA. LEAs may also provide information about their strategic plan, vision, etc.

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

- For example, information about an LEA in terms of geography, enrollment, employment, the number and size of specific schools, recent community challenges, and other such information the LEA may wish to include can enable a reader to more fully understand the LEA's LCAP.
- LEAs may also provide information about their strategic plan, vision, etc.
- 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.

EC Section 52064.4 requires that an LEA that has unexpended Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG) funds must include one or more actions funded with LREBG funds within the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 LCAPs, as applicable to the LEA. To implement the requirements of EC Section 52064.4, all LEAs must do the following:

- For the 2025–26, 2026–27, and 2027–28 LCAP years, identify whether or not the LEA has unexpended LREBG funds for the applicable LCAP year.
 - If the LEA has unexpended LREBG funds the LEA must provide the following:
 - The goal and action number for each action that will be funded, either in whole or in part, with LREBG funds; and
 - An explanation of the rationale for selecting each action funded with LREBG funds. This explanation must include:
 - An explanation of how the action is aligned with the allowable uses of funds identified in [EC Section 32526\(c\)\(2\)](#); and
 - An explanation of how the action is expected to address the area(s) of need of students and schools identified in the needs assessment required by [EC Section 32526\(d\)](#).
 - For information related to the allowable uses of funds and the required needs assessment, please see the Program Information tab on the [LREBG Program Information](#) web page.
 - Actions may be grouped together for purposes of these explanations.
 - The LEA may provide these explanations as part of the action description rather than as part of the Reflections: Annual Performance.
 - If the LEA does not have unexpended LREBG funds, the LEA is not required to conduct the needs assessment required by EC Section 32526(d), to provide the information identified above or to include actions funded with LREBG funds within the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 LCAPs.

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

Requirements

School districts and COEs: [EC Section 52060\(g\)](#) and [EC Section 52066\(g\)](#) 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\(d\)](#) 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](#);
 - **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](#); and
- For charter schools, see [Education Code Section 47606.5](#).

- **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\(b\)\(1\)](#) 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.
- **Required metrics for actions supported by LREBG funds:** To implement the requirements of *EC* Section 52064.4, LEAs with unexpended LREBG funds must include at least one metric to monitor the impact of each action funded with LREBG funds included in the goal.
 - The metrics being used to monitor the impact of each action funded with LREBG funds are not required to be new metrics; they may be metrics that are already being used to measure progress towards goals and actions included in the LCAP.

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

For English Learners and Long-Term English Learners

- 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.

For Technical Assistance

- 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.

For Lowest Performing Dashboard Indicators

- 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.

For LEAs With Unexpended LREBG Funds

- To implement the requirements of *EC* Section 52064.4, LEAs with unexpended LREBG funds must include one or more actions supported with LREBG funds within the 2025–26, 2026–27, and 2027–28 LCAPs, as applicable to the LEA. Actions funded with LREBG funds must remain in the LCAP until the LEA has expended the remainder of its LREBG funds, after which time the actions may be removed from the LCAP.
 - Prior to identifying the actions included in the LCAP the LEA is required to conduct a needs assessment pursuant to [EC Section 32526\(d\)](#). For information related to the required needs assessment please see the Program Information tab on the [LREBG](#)

[Program Information](#) web page. Additional information about the needs assessment and evidence-based resources for the LREBG may be found on the [California Statewide System of Support LREBG Resources](#) web page. The required LREBG needs assessment may be part of the LEAs regular needs assessment for the LCAP if it meets the requirements of *EC* Section 32526(d).

- School districts receiving technical assistance and COEs providing technical assistance are encouraged to use the technical assistance process to support the school district in conducting the required needs assessment, the selection of actions funded by the LREBG and/or the evaluation of implementation of the actions required as part of the LCAP annual update process.
- As a reminder, LREBG funds must be used to implement one or more of the purposes articulated in [EC Section 32526\(c\)\(2\)](#).
- LEAs with unexpended LREBG funds must include one or more actions supported by LREBG funds within the LCAP. For each action supported by LREBG funding the action description must:
 - Identify the action as an LREBG action;
 - Include an explanation of how research supports the selected action;
 - Identify the metric(s) being used to monitor the impact of the action; and
 - Identify the amount of LREBG funds being used to support the action.

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:

- 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 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 2024