


LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Cucamonga School District
CDS Code: 36-676940000000
School Year: 2026-27
LEA contact information:
Michael Chaix
Superintendent
mchaix@cuca.k12.ca.us
(909)987-8942

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 2026-27 School Year




This chart shows the total general purpose revenue Cucamonga 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 Cucamonga School District is $67,276,174, of which $53,082,659 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), $8,615,690 is other state funds, $3,699,780 is local funds, and $1,878,045 is federal funds. Of the $53,082,659 in LCFF Funds, $7,900,641 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 Cucamonga School District plans to spend for 2026-27. 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: Cucamonga School District plans to spend $77,443,752 for the 2026-27 school year. Of that amount, $36,346,800 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and $41,096,952 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:


Admin Salaries/Benefits, Classified support Salaries/Benefits, Classified Management Salaries/Benefits, Clerical/Secretarial Salaries & Benefits, Noon Duty Salaries/Benefits, Insurance, Utilities, Special Ed, Transportation, Title II, Title III, Title IV, LEA Medical, ASES, Lottery, Restricted Lottery, Custodial/Security/Alarms, supplies and services, Classified Professional Development, and STRS On-Behalf Contribution.

Increased or Improved Services for High Needs Students in the LCAP for the 2026-27 School Year

In 2026-27, Cucamonga School District is projecting it will receive $7,900,641 based on the enrollment of Foster Youth, English learner, and low-income students. Cucamonga School District must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Cucamonga School District plans to spend $24,266,407 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 2025-26



This chart compares what Cucamonga 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 Cucamonga 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 2025-26, Cucamonga School District's LCAP budgeted $19,490,546 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Cucamonga School District actually spent $24,638,053 for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2025-26.



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
Cucamonga School District	Michael Chaix Superintendent	mchaix@cuca.k12.ca.us (909)987-8942

Plan Summary [2026-27]

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.

The Cucamonga School District (CSD) is located in the western region of San Bernardino County and serves students residing in the cities of Rancho Cucamonga and Ontario, California. As one of four elementary districts in the area serving transitional kindergarten through eighth grade, CSD students matriculate to the Chaffey Joint Union High School District for grades nine through twelve.

CSD serves approximately 2,360 students across four school sites, including three elementary schools serving grades TK–5 and one middle school serving grades 6–8. The district is committed to providing a high-quality educational program that supports the academic achievement and social-emotional development of all students.

The district serves a diverse student population that reflects the surrounding community. The student population is composed of 66.7% Hispanic, 16.9% African American, 7.1% White, and 3.3% Asian, with the remaining 6% representing American Indian, Pacific Islander, Filipino, and other ethnic groups.

CSD serves several identified student groups that require targeted supports and services to ensure equitable access to educational opportunities. Approximately 10.6% of students are English Learners (EL), 0.5% are Foster Youth (FY), 76.7% are Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED), and 14.5% are Students with Disabilities (SWD). These student groups inform the district's planning and implementation of programs, services, and instructional supports designed to improve student outcomes and reduce achievement gaps.

Cucamonga School District is a community-funded district, meaning local property tax revenues exceed the base funding levels generated through California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). As reflected in the 2026–27 Budget Overview for Parents, the district receives LCFF base funding as well as supplemental and concentration grant funding generated through the enrollment of English learners, foster youth, and low-income students. In 2026–27, CSD is projected to receive approximately $7.9 million in supplemental and concentration grant funds and plans to invest more than $24.3 million in actions and services that increase or improve supports for high-needs students, as outlined throughout the LCAP.

Mission

The Cucamonga School District, with an appreciation for diversity, provides a comprehensive education that promotes academic, emotional, and social development, enabling students to become lifelong learners and realize their full potential as contributing members of society.

Vision

In the Cucamonga School District, student achievement is the central focus of the organization, and all members of the educational community are motivated to support the success of every student academically, socially, and economically. A collaborative partnership among administration, staff, parents, students, and the community ensures shared responsibility for student success.

District staff use standards, data analysis, and research-based practices to continuously improve classroom instruction and student learning. Student success is supported through a safe and inclusive learning environment that promotes respect, tolerance, and dignity for all individuals.

District Goals

Student Achievement and Academic Excellence
Promote and challenge the success of all students to meet or exceed grade-level standards through the implementation of research-based curriculum, effective instructional strategies, and ongoing professional learning for staff.
Family and Community Engagement
Strengthen partnerships among parents, teachers, students, and the community through ongoing communication and collaboration to support student achievement and school connectedness.
Effective and Responsible Use of Resources
Utilize available resources to provide optimal learning opportunities for students, while maintaining responsible fiscal management and strategic prioritization of district expenditures.

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

2026

Celebrations and Notable Progress

The Cucamonga School District continues to advance student outcomes through a strategic focus on engagement, climate, and core academic performance. A primary driver of this year's progress is the sustained improvement in student engagement, as evidenced by a 5.5% district-wide decline in chronic absenteeism. This positive trend was observed across multiple high-priority student groups, including Long-Term English Learners (LTEL), Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students (SED), Students with Disabilities (SWD), and Homeless Youth (HY), reflecting the efficacy of the district's proactive outreach and strengthened attendance systems. These efforts toward an inclusive school climate are further mirrored at Rancho Cucamonga Middle School, where targeted supports contributed to measurable reductions in suspension rates among African American students, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, and Students with Disabilities.

These improvements in school culture have provided a stable foundation for academic growth, as evidenced by district-wide academic gains across multiple student groups in both ELA and Mathematics. Local assessment data supports these trends, as i-Ready results indicate a 5% increase in ELA performance and a 3% increase in Mathematics district-wide.

Compared to 2024–2025 data, these results reflect a gradual shift out of the lowest performance bands, indicating that districtwide instructional and intervention efforts are producing measurable gains.

Areas of Need

Despite progress, performance in English Language Arts and Mathematics remains an area of focus. Overall ELA Distance from Standard Increased by 10.1 Points and Mathematics increased by 6.2 Points. Students with Disabilities, LTEL, and African American students continue to perform below standard in both content areas.

Chronic absenteeism, while improved, remains elevated for specific student groups, including African American students, Students with Disabilities, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students.

At the school level, Cucamonga Elementary continues to experience challenges in academic achievement, while Rancho Cucamonga Middle School and Ontario Center show improvement with continued need for targeted support in ELA and Mathematics.

While these gains in engagement and core academics highlight the district's systemic strengths, English Learner progress has emerged as a critical area for refinement and renewed focus. Current data shows that 47.3% of English Learners are making progress toward proficiency, which represents a decline of 6.1% from the previous year. Because this decline was consistent across the district, with none of the individual school sites demonstrating an increase in progress, the district is committed to evaluating and realigning its targeted language supports. By integrating the successes found in our attendance and core academic data with a more robust approach to English Language Development, the district continues to adapt its instructional framework to ensure equitable growth for all students.

Alignment to Strategic Priorities

The district's progress and areas of need align directly with its focus on student achievement, engagement, and equitable access.

Key strategies include:

Implementation of the Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM) with high staff participation
Use of evidence-based curriculum and instructional practices, including structured literacy and standards-aligned mathematics
Ongoing instructional coaching and support
Continued development of a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) with universal screening and targeted intervention

These efforts are strengthening Tier 1 instruction while expanding targeted supports for identified student groups.

Performance Gaps and Context

Persistent gaps remain for Students with Disabilities, English Learners, Homeless Youth, and African American students, particularly in academic achievement and engagement.

Additionally, as MTSS systems continue to be refined and implemented across sites, variability in implementation may impact consistency in outcomes.

Next Steps

The district will continue to focus on:

Strengthening MTSS implementation to ensure consistent, targeted support
Expanding professional development and instructional coaching
Enhancing attendance systems and family engagement strategies
Continuing restorative practices and PBIS to improve school climate
Providing targeted support to identified schools and student groups
Using data to monitor progress and adjust strategies

Through these efforts, Cucamonga School District will continue to strengthen systems, close achievement gaps, and improve outcomes for all students.

The district has approximately $163,785 in unexpended Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG) funds remaining. A comprehensive needs assessment utilizing California Dashboard data, i-Ready diagnostics, and educational partner input identified three primary areas of need: (1) academic recovery in English language arts and mathematics, (2) student engagement and chronic absenteeism, and (3) social-emotional and mental health supports.

To address these needs, the district will utilize remaining LREBG funds to supplement existing instructional expenditures through targeted academic supports aligned to LCAP Goal 2 (Student Achievement), with a focus on providing additional learning time and intervention opportunities for students performing below grade level. Instructional aides will support the implementation of structured small-group

instruction, intervention blocks, and academic reinforcement in English language arts and mathematics, directly supporting LCAP Actions 2.5, 2.10, 2.11, and 3.2. These supports also complement the district's efforts under Action 3.2 to promote students' social-emotional well-being and mental health by providing additional individualized attention, positive adult relationships, and supportive learning environments that strengthen student engagement, confidence, and connection to school. Research supports expanded learning opportunities and targeted intervention as effective strategies for accelerating learning and addressing unfinished learning while also supporting students' social emotional well-being, school connectiveness, and engagement.

This approach aligns with allowable uses under EC Section 32526(c)(2), including increasing instructional time and services, providing tutoring and small-group supports, and implementing learning recovery programs. Research cited by the Institute of Education Sciences indicates that high-quality tutoring, targeted intervention, and increased learning time are effective strategies for accelerating student learning, improving engagement, and increasing academic outcomes for students most impacted by unfinished learning (Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, 2021). Research cited by CASEL indicates that social-emotional learning supports students' well-being, strengthens relationships and school connectedness, and promotes student engagement and academic outcomes (CASEL, 2023). The use of LREBG funds for additional instructional support aligns with these findings by increasing students' access to supportive learning environments and positive adult relationships while providing additional opportunities for academic intervention and learning recovery, thereby complementing the district's efforts to support students' social-emotional well-being and mental health through LCAP Action 3.2.

The following information is from the 2023 CA state Dashboard.

The following schools have the lowest performance on the CA Dashboard:
* Ontario Center - ELPI
* Rancho Cucamonga Middle - Math
* Cucamonga Elementary - Chronic Absenteeism

The following student groups have the lowest performance rating:
*English learners
ELA
Math

* Foster Youth
Suspension

* Homeless
ELA
Math

* Students with Disabilities

ELA
Math

* African American
ELA (orange)
Math
Chronic Absenteeism

* Filipino
Chronic Absenteeism

* White
Chronic Absenteeism

The following student groups within a school have the lowest performance rating:
Cucamonga Elementary
Chronic Absenteeism
- English learners
- Students with disabilities
- African American
- White

Ontario Center
ELPI – English learners
ELA
- English learners
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged.

Math
- Students with disabilities

Chronic Absenteeism
- African American

Rancho Cucamonga Middle
ELA
- English learners
- Students with disabilities

Math
- English learners
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged.
- Students with disabilities

o African American
o Hispanic
Suspension
o Socioeconomically disadvantaged.
o Students with disabilities
o African American
Chronic Absenteeism
o English learners

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

Reason for Technical Assistance

This year, the district has engaged in a comprehensive approach to address areas identified for Differentiated Assistance, focusing on supporting African American students, Long-Term English Learners (LTEL), and Homeless Youth.

Based on the Fall 2025 California School Dashboard, African American students were newly identified for Differentiated Assistance in the areas of suspension rates and chronic absenteeism. Additionally, based on the Fall 2024 Dashboard, the district remains eligible for Year 2 Differentiated Assistance for Homeless Youth and Long-Term English Learners in the areas of academic achievement (ELA/Math) and chronic absenteeism, with Homeless Youth also identified in school climate (suspension rates).

Provider of Support

Key efforts this year include continued collaboration with the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools (SBCSS) to support identified student groups. District leadership teams participated in technical assistance workshops focused on data analysis, root cause identification, and the development of targeted improvement strategies.

Strategies and frameworks developed through SBCSS support have been adapted to strengthen supports for African American students, Long-Term English Learners, and Homeless Youth. Additionally, site and district leaders have engaged in professional learning to strengthen systems related to attendance, school climate, and targeted academic support, including efforts to reduce suspension rates and improve student engagement.

Summary of Work Underway

To address identified needs, the district has implemented a systems-based approach focused on strengthening instruction, student support, and family engagement.

To improve academic outcomes in ELA and Mathematics, the district continues to prioritize high-quality Tier 1 instruction and targeted intervention (action 2.10). Professional development has been provided to teachers to strengthen instructional capacity, alongside coaching and support through Teachers on Assignment (TOAs). Additional targeted supports have been implemented for Long-Term English Learners, ensuring that instructional practices are aligned to their specific learning needs.

The district has also expanded social-emotional and behavioral supports to improve school climate and reduce suspensions (action 1.5). Staff have received training in restorative practices, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and culturally responsive practices to support inclusive and supportive learning environments.

To address chronic absenteeism, particularly for African American students and Homeless Youth, the district has strengthened systems for early identification and intervention (action 1.4). Student Services teams have collaborated with families to provide timely supports, utilizing tools such as Aeries and Attention 2 Attendance (A2A) to monitor attendance and implement targeted strategies.

As part of the District Improvement Team (DIT) process, a focused 90-day improvement cycle was implemented to address absenteeism among African American students. The identified problem centered on the need to strengthen systems for engaging diverse families. In response, the district conducted targeted family outreach, developed and analyzed survey data to better understand barriers to attendance, and refined engagement strategies to improve connection and communication with families.

For Homeless Youth, the district continues to strengthen coordination of services, ensuring students have access to academic support, intervention programs, and engagement opportunities that support both attendance and achievement.

Technical Assistance Reflection

Technical assistance continues to serve as a key reflection and improvement tool for the district. Through ongoing collaboration with SBCSS and the use of continuous improvement cycles, the district is strengthening systems, aligning resources, and refining practices to better meet the needs of identified student groups.

Clear documentation and alignment of this work within the LCAP ensures transparency, accountability, and a continued focus on improving outcomes in achievement, engagement, and school climate for all students.

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.

N/A

Support for Identified Schools

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

N/A

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

N/A

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
LCAP Advisory Committee Includes parents/guardians representing unduplicated students, CSD's faculty and staff, teachers, community members, principals, district administrators, local bargaining units and other school personnel.	Meetings held on February 19 and April 16, 2026, with over 40 educational partners to reflect and advise on the development of the LCAP. A survey was developed to gather community input related to school culture and academic perspectives and was distributed through emails and ParentSquare. Educational partners, including parents/guardians representing unduplicated students, CSD faculty and staff, teachers, community members, principals, district administrators, local bargaining units, and other school personnel, were invited to meetings where disaggregated data on academic achievement, chronic absenteeism, suspension rates, and other key indicators by student group were reviewed.
Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) Includes parents/guardians representing unduplicated students, SED students, and EL students	Meetings held on January 6 and May 20, 2026 to reflect and advise on the development of the LCAP. A draft was presented on May 20, 2026. No comments were received; therefore, the superintendent did not need to provide a written response.
District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC)	Meetings held on January 6 and May 20, 2026, including parents/guardians, administrators, teachers, and district personnel, to reflect and advise on the development of the LCAP. A draft was presented on May 20, 2026. No comments were received; therefore, no written response was required.

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
District African American Parent Advisory Council (DAAPAC)	Meetings held on October 7, December 4, 2025, and February 3 and April 9, 2026, with approximately 25 participants, including parents/guardians, administrators, teachers, classified staff, and parent liaisons. A survey was developed to gather input on the experiences of African American families and was distributed through emails and ParentSquare. A draft was presented on April 9, 2026. No comments were received; therefore, no written response was required.
SELPA Consultation	Meetings held on February 25, March 16, and April 10, 2026 with approximately 7 members to reflect and advise on the development of the LCAP.
CTA and CSEA	Several surveys were developed to gather CTA and CSEA members' input related to school culture and academic perspectives. The surveys were sent to all faculty and staff through emails and Parent Square during the month of March.
Community Members	Several informal community engagements occurred monthly during school pickup/drop-offs, Inclusion Infusion, Family Literacy Night, Coffee with the Principal, Donuts with Dads, Back to School Backpack giveaways, and other community engagement events.
CSD Governing Board	Presented mid-year report to governing Board on February 12, 2026. Presented for public hearing to governing Board on June 4, 2026. No comments received, therefore the superintendent did not need to provide a written response. Board adopted on June 11, 2026.
Student Advisory Committee	The Student Advisory Committee includes a diverse group of students in grades 6–8 representing student voice. Meetings were held on November 6, 2025; January 13, 2026; and March 19, 2026 to gather input on what is working well, areas for improvement, and student needs. 2026-2027 LCAP Goals and Actions were presented to the committee. The full draft LCAP was presented at the Student Advisory Committee on April 16, 2026, with

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	opportunity for review and feedback. No comments or feedback were received; therefore, no written response was required.

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

To engage educational partners in the development of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), Cucamonga School District utilized a collaborative process that included advisory committee meetings, surveys, and community engagement opportunities. Educational partners included parents, students, teachers, school and district staff, and community members. Surveys were distributed through platforms such as ParentSquare to ensure broad participation and input.

Across engagement opportunities, feedback remained consistent and centered on key areas, including academic support, communication, enrichment opportunities, staffing, professional development, multilingual learner support, and social-emotional well-being. This consistency across multiple years has reinforced the district's focus on maintaining and strengthening systems aligned to these priorities.

The major themes and corresponding LCAP actions are outlined below:

Academic Supports

Actions Influenced: Goal 2, Actions 3, 10, 11; Goal 3, Action 1
Source: Parent, Student, and Employee Surveys

Summary:
Educational partners emphasized the need for increased academic support, particularly in writing and differentiated instruction. Staff identified a need for additional strategies to support diverse learners, while parents and students highlighted the importance of engaging, hands-on instruction. This feedback supports continued investment in instructional coaching, intervention programs, and high-quality Tier 1 instruction.

Enrichment Opportunities

Actions Influenced: Goal 2, Action 11
Source: Student Surveys, Student Advisory Committee

Summary:
Students expressed a strong desire for expanded enrichment opportunities, including increased access to sports and a wider variety of engaging activities. Feedback also highlighted the importance of enrichment in building confidence and increasing student engagement. This input supports the continuation and expansion of enrichment programming.

Communication

Actions Influenced: Goal 1, Actions 2, 3, 4
Source: Parent, Student, and Employee Surveys

Summary:
Educational partners identified communication as both a strength and an area for continued growth. While families value tools such as ParentSquare, they also expressed a need for multiple communication methods, including phone calls and timely updates. This feedback supports continued investment in communication systems and family engagement strategies.

Staffing and Student Support

Actions Influenced: Goal 1, Action 1; Goal 3, Action 2
Source: Parent, Student, and Employee Surveys

Summary:
Educational partners emphasized the importance of maintaining key support staff, including counselors, psychologists, and parent/community liaisons. These roles are critical in supporting both academic and social-emotional needs of students. This feedback supports continued investment in staffing to ensure consistent and comprehensive student support systems.

Professional Development

Actions Influenced: Goal 2, Action 1
Source: Employee Surveys, DELAC, DAAPAC

Summary:
Staff identified a need for ongoing professional development in areas such as writing instruction, differentiated instruction, classroom management, and instructional technology. There was also a strong emphasis on expanding training in English Language Development strategies for all teachers. This feedback supports continued implementation of the Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM).

Multilingual Learner Support

Actions Influenced: Goal 2, Actions 6 and 9
Source: Parent, Student, and Employee Surveys; DELAC

Summary:
Educational partners emphasized the need to strengthen support for English Learners and Long-Term English Learners through targeted interventions and increased access to English Language Development programs. This includes both direct student support and professional development for staff to ensure effective instructional practices.

Social-Emotional and Behavioral Supports

Actions Influenced: Goal 1, Action 5; Goal 3, Action 2
Source: Parent, Student, and Employee Surveys; DELAC; DAAPAC

Summary:
Educational partners highlighted the importance of expanding social-emotional and behavioral supports, particularly for students experiencing challenges related to attendance and well-being. Feedback emphasized the need for consistent systems, access to counseling, and supportive school environments. This input supports continued implementation of PBIS, MTSS, and expanded mental health services.

Through this process, Cucamonga School District ensured that educational partner feedback directly informed the development of the LCAP. The alignment between identified needs and LCAP actions reflects a continued commitment to responsive planning, system coherence, and improving outcomes for all students.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	Partner with families to promote student and family engagement throughout the educational journey by cultivating an inclusive school community that equips students with skills in empathy, social and cross-cultural skills, initiative and self-direction and resilience.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

To engage educational partners in the development of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and promote student and family engagement, Cucamonga School District (CSD) implemented a comprehensive process that focused on cultivating an inclusive school community. The development of this goal was significantly influenced by hosting a series of educational partner meetings and distributing surveys to gather input from families, students, teachers, and community members. These engagements emphasized the importance of equipping students with skills in empathy, social and cross-cultural abilities, initiative, self-direction, and resilience.

In the 2024 Local Climate Survey, students in grades 3-8 reported their sense of safety at school, with percentages ranging from 60.5% at RCMS to 79.2% at LAES. Furthermore, in 2023, chronic absenteeism rates across the district averaged 29.6%, with notable disparities among demographic groups. Specifically, African American students had the highest chronic absenteeism rate at 33.5%, followed closely by students with disabilities (SWD) at 36.8%. Among individual schools, CES had the highest overall chronic absenteeism rate at 32.4%, with particularly elevated rates among African American students (39.7%) and SWD (42.6%).

The educational partner participation data used to develop this goal provided a clear snapshot that by actively involving families in the dialogue, CSD ensured that the LCAP reflected the community's diverse perspectives and needs, fostering a collaborative environment. This inclusive approach helped create a supportive and engaged school community dedicated to enhancing the educational journey for all students. With the partnership of our families and working alongside them, this goal was identified as a priority since students need to be in school in order to be taught.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	Parent Participation Total Count Local LCAP Survey	2024: Overall: 73 EL: 6 SWD: 9	2025: Overall: 175 EL: 11 SWD: 33	2026: Overall: 335 EL: not available SWD: not available	Overall: 100 EL: 25 SWD: 30	Overall: +262 EL and SWD: Not Able to Disaggregate this year
1.2	Ed Partner Participation Total Count Local LCAP Survey	2024 Overall: 141	2025 Overall: 402	2026 Overall: 1410	Overall: 200	Overall: +1269
1.3	Parents participation with SWD Participation Percentage SEIS	2024 Overall: 95%	2025 Overall: 97.6%	2026 Overall: 94%	Overall: 98%	-1%
1.4	Attendance Average Daily Percentage SIS report	2024: CES: 92.19% LAES: 93.57% TOCS: 92.58% RCMS: 92.81%	2025: CES: 93.00% LAES: 93.51% TOCS: 92.70% RCMS: 93.70%	2026: CES: 94.48% LAES: 93.77% TOCS: 93.19% RCMS: 93.32%	CES: 96% LAES: 96% TOCS: 96% RCMS: 96%	CES: +2.29% LAES: +0.2% TOCS: +0.61% RCMS: +0.51%
1.5	Chronic Absenteeism Rates Percentage CA Dashboard	2023 Dashboard: District: Overall: 29.6% AA: 33.5% EL: 27.3% Filipino: 27.3% FY: 20.8% SED: 31.9% SWD: 36.8% White: 28.8% HY: 35.1%	2024 Dashboard: District: Overall: 25% AA: 32.6% EL: 18.9% Filipino: 18.2% FY: 14.3% LTEL: 31.6% SED: 26.7% SWD: 30.1% White: 24.7%	2025 Dashboard: District: Overall: 24.1% AA: 32.2% EL: 20% Filipino: 12.5% FY: 9.5% LTEL: 21.2% SED: 26% SWD: 27.8% White: 17.6%	District Overall: 14.0% AA: 14.0% EL: 10.0% Filipino: 10.0% FY: 10.0% LTEL:14.0% SED: 14.% SWD: 14.0% White: 13.8% HY: 14%	District: Overall -5.5% AA: -1.3% EL: -7.3% Filipino: -14.8% FY: -11.3% LTEL: -10.4% SED: -5.9% SWD: -9% White: -11.2% HY: -1.8%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		2024 Dashboard: LTEL: 31.6% 2023 Dashboard: CES: Overall 32.4% AA: 39.7% EL: 20.7% SWD: 42.6% White: 41.9% LAES: Overall 27.7% AA: 37.5% SWD: 32% TOCS: Overall 31.1% AA: 33.3% RCMS: Overall 27.7% EL: 32.3%	HY: 43.7% CES: Overall 26.1% AA: 29.6% EL: 23.9% SWD: 28.3% White: 30.2% LAES: Overall 22% AA: 32.1% SWD: 12.7% TOCS: Overall 25.1% AA: 37% RCMS: Overall 25.6% EL: 32.3%	HY: 33.3% CES: Overall 22% AA: 27.3% EL: 16.9% SWD: 26.2% White: 20% LAES: Overall 21.4% AA: 35.4% SWD: 10.8% TOCS: Overall 24.7% AA: 33.1% RCMS: Overall 25.5% EL: 27.7%	CES: Overall 17.0% AA: 17.0% EL: 5.0% SWD: 17.0% White: 17.0% LAES: Overall 12.0% AA: 15.0% SWD: 15.0% TOCS: Overall 16.0% AA: 16.0% RCMS: Overall 12.0% EL: 12.0%	CES: Overall: -10.4% AA: -12.4% EL: -3.8% SWD: -16.4% White: -21.9% LAES: Overall: -6.3% AA: -2.1% SWD: -21.2% TOCS: Overall: -6.4% AA: -0.2% RCMS: Overall: -2.2% EL: -4.6%
1.6	Drop Outs Total Count CALPADS report 8.1	EOY 23/24 Overall: 1	EOY 24/25 Overall: 3	EOY 25/26 Overall: 0	Overall: 0	Overall: -1
1.7	Suspension Percentage CA Dashboard	2023 District: Overall 3.9% FY: 7.4% EL: 2.1% SED: 4.4% SWD: 5.3%	2024: District: Overall 4.2% FY: 3.6% EL: 3.1% SED: 4.4% SWD: 5.5%	2025: District: Overall 3.6% FY: 6.9% EL: 0.7% SED: 4% SWD: 4.6%	District: Overall 2.5% FY: 2.5% EL: 3.0% SED: 2.5% SWD: 2.5% HY: 2.5%	District: Overall -0.3% FY: -0.5% EL: -1.4% SED: -0.4% SWD: -0.7% HY: +3.8%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		HY: 3.2% RCMS: Overall 10.9% AA: 19.6% SED: 12.7% SWD: 12.1%	HY: 7.2 RCMS: Overall 8% AA: 11.3% SED: 4.9% SWD: 8.5%	HY: 7% RCMS: Overall 6.1% AA: 10.3% SED: 6.4% SWD: 5.8%	RCMS: Overall: 6.0% AA: 7.0% SED: 7.0% SWD: 7.0%	RCMS: Overall -4.8% AA: -9.3% SED: -6.3% SWD: -6.3%
1.8	Expulsion Total Count DataQuest	2022-23 Overall: 0	2023-24 Overall: 0	2024-25: Overall: 3	Maintain overall: 0	+3
1.9	Sense of Safety (Students) % Agreed or Strongly agreed- "I feel safe at school" Grades 3-8 only Local Climate Survey	2024 Survey: CES: 71% LAES: 79.2% TOCS: 71.6% RCMS: 60.5%	2025 Survey: CES: 94% LAES: 94% TOCS: 95% RCMS: 91%	2026 Survey: CES: 81% LAES: 77% TOCS: 71% RCMS: 81%	CES: 85% LAES: 85% TOCS: 85% RCMS: 75%	CES: +10% LAES: -2.2% TOCS: -0.6% RCMS: +20.5%
1.10	Sense of Connectedness (Parent) % Agreed or Strongly agreed- "I agree that the district continues to provide effective parent/school connection?" Local Climate Survey	2024 Survey: Overall: 71%	2025 Survey: Overall: 80%	2026 Survey: Overall: 88%	Overall: 90%	+17%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.11	Sense of Safety (Parents) % Agreed or Strongly agreed- "I feel my student is safe at school." Local Climate Survey	2025 Survey: Overall: 90%	2025 Survey: Overall: 90%	2026 Survey: Overall: 91%	Overall: 90%	+1%
1.12	Sense of Connectedness (Students) % Agreed or Strongly agreed- "I agree that the district continues to provide effective parent/school connection?" Grades 3-8 only Local Climate Survey	2025 Survey: Overall: 80%	2025 Survey: Overall: 80%	2026 Survey: Overall: 70%	Overall: 90%	-10%
1.13	Sense of Safety (Staff) % Agreed or Strongly agreed- "I feel safe at school" Local Climate Survey	2025 Survey: Overall: 91%	2025 Survey: Overall: 91%	2026 Survey: Overall: 94%	Overall: 90%	+3%
1.14	Sense of Connectedness (Staff) % Agreed or Strongly agreed- "I agree that the district continues to provide effective	2025 Survey: Overall: 91%	2025 Survey: Overall: 91%	2026 Survey: Overall: 76%	Overall: 90%	-15%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	parent/school connection?" Local Climate Survey					

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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 Cucamonga School District demonstrated strong progress in implementing Goal 1, which focuses on partnering with families to promote student and family engagement throughout the educational journey by cultivating an inclusive school community. Of the five actions within this goal, three were fully implemented as planned (Actions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.4), one was fully implemented with a substantive difference (Action 1.3), and one was partially implemented (Action 1.5).

Action 1.1 (Site Parent Community Support) was fully implemented as planned with no substantive differences. The district experienced notable successes, including securing new community donors to support families and the strong relationship-building efforts of the Parent/Community Liaisons. Challenges included maintaining a steady Parent Liaison at The Ontario Center School, supporting families who may feel embarrassed or ashamed about their circumstances, and the lack of additional federal funding.

Action 1.2 (Parent/Community Communication and Participation Supports) was fully implemented as planned with no substantive differences. Efforts to enhance engagement were successfully executed, ensuring active and accessible communication channels, with no significant challenges reported.

Action 1.3 (District/Site Website Communication Support) was fully implemented; however, there was a substantive difference in how the action was carried out. Instead of the District Services Assistant maintaining the district website as originally planned, the responsibility shifted to the Educational Services Department due to the elimination of the District Services Assistant position. Additional Ed Services staff were hired and assigned specific sections to update and maintain the district and school websites.

Action 1.4 (Improve Attendance and Chronic Absenteeism) was fully implemented as planned with no substantive differences. Key successes included the establishment of a District Attendance Review Board, conducting empathy interviews with chronically absent African American students at each site, and creating informational materials for families on the importance of attendance. Challenges included finding time to develop targeted strategies to support chronically absent students.

Action 1.5 (Lower Suspension Rates) was partially implemented. The district initiated conversations and developed a team to refine the MTSS process; however, tiered-engagement interventions for student behaviors have not yet been implemented districtwide. It was

implemented at the middle school, RCMS, as a pilot program before pushing it out district-wide. A key challenge was that site administration and teachers reported feeling overwhelmed by the volume and types of student behaviors observed at school sites.

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.

Action 1.2 - The district received additional material donations that reduced our need to charge this action causing less expenditure for 25-26.

Action 1.5 - The material difference is due to a post-adoption collective bargaining agreements and rising healthcare costs. Specifically, the implementation of a 6% on-schedule salary increase, a 2% one-time off-schedule payment, and a concurrent rise in statutory and health benefit costs increased the actual fiscal investment required to sustain this action. While these mid-year compensation adjustments caused actual expenditures to exceed original budget projections, they represent the increased cost of retaining the qualified personnel necessary to maintain services rather than a change in the actual scope of delivery. Consequently, while the financial inputs increased, the qualitative level and percentage of improved services delivered to targeted students remained stable, effective, and fully aligned with original plan goals.

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

Actions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3, focused on parent and educational partner engagement, have demonstrated effectiveness in expanding outward communication and improving overall family perceptions compared to the baseline. However, because disaggregated results are not available related to English Learner families, the district is not able to fully determine the specific effectiveness of the actions related to English Learners. These actions increased participation in district surveys and improved family feedback. Parent participation in the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) survey increased from 73 participants to 335 participants (Metric 1.1), an increase of 262 participants. Educational partner participation increased from 141 participants to 1,410 participants (Metric 1.2), exceeding the target of 200 participants. Parent connectedness increased from 71% to 88% (Metric 1.10), and parent perceptions of safety increased from 90% to 91% (Metric 1.11), exceeding the district target of 90%. Participation among parents of Students with Disabilities decreased slightly from 95% to 94% (Metric 1.3), indicating a need for continued focus in this area. Moving forward, the district will strengthen data collection for parent engagement metrics to include English Learner family participation so the effectiveness of actions principally directed toward English Learners can be more accurately evaluated.

Action 1.4, addressing attendance and chronic absenteeism through data-based tiered-engagement interventions, demonstrated notable effectiveness. Chronic absenteeism decreased districtwide from 29.6% to 24.1% (Metric 1.5). Improvements were seen among English Learners, whose chronic absenteeism rate decreased from 27.3% to 20.0%; Foster Youth, whose rate decreased from 20.8% to 9.5%; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, whose rate decreased from 31.9% to 26.0%; and Students with Disabilities, whose rate decreased from 36.8% to 27.8%. African American students also improved from 33.5% to 32.2%. Average Daily Attendance increased at every school site (Metric 1.4). CES increased from 92.19% to 94.48%, LAES increased from 93.57% to 93.77%, TOCS increased from 92.58% to 93.19%, and RCMS increased from 92.81% to 93.32%.

Action 1.5, targeting suspension rates through tiered behavioral interventions, has shown effectiveness in lowering suspensions. The district suspension rate decreased from 3.9% to 3.6% (Metric 1.7). Suspension rates improved for English Learners, decreasing from 2.1% to 0.7%;

Foster Youth, decreasing from 7.4% to 6.9%; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, decreasing from 4.4% to 4.0%; and Students with Disabilities, decreasing from 5.3% to 4.6%. At RCMS, the overall suspension rate decreased from 10.9% to 6.1%. African American student suspensions at RCMS decreased from 19.6% to 10.3%, Students with Disabilities decreased from 12.1% to 5.8%, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students decreased from 12.7% to 6.4%. Foster Youth and Homeless both have shown improvement but require continuous implementation and monitoring. Implementation will be strengthened through the MTSS process with tiered engagement intervention.

Summary

Goal 1 shows progress in parent and educational partner engagement (Metrics 1.1 and 1.2) and in reducing chronic absenteeism across most student groups and school sites (Metric 1.5). Suspension rates also improved at RCMS and for several student groups districtwide, including English Learners, Foster Youth, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, and Students with Disabilities (Metric 1.7). However, areas of concern include increased suspension rates for Homeless Youth, declines in student sense of safety and connectedness (Metrics 1.9 and 1.12), declines in staff connectedness (Metric 1.14), and an increase in expulsions (Metric 1.8). Parent participation among families of Students with Disabilities also declined slightly (Metric 1.3).

To address these needs, the district will continue attendance monitoring through the District Attendance Review Board process; expand targeted attendance outreach for chronically absent students, Homeless Youth, and Students with Disabilities; provide staff training on relationship-building, restorative practices, and student engagement strategies; increase opportunities for student voice, leadership, and school connectedness activities; strengthen communication and engagement opportunities for families of Students with Disabilities and English Learners through targeted outreach, translation services, and parent education opportunities; and regularly review attendance, discipline, climate survey, and engagement data to identify student groups requiring additional support and intervention.

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.

Action 1.3 (District/Site Website Communication Support): The responsibility for maintaining and updating district and school websites was revised from a specific role (District Services Assistant) to a broader Educational Services responsibility. This change was made to expand the scope of the work to include parent information portals and communication platforms, improving consistency, accessibility, and overall engagement.

Metric 1.7 (Suspension): AA student group was added due to 2025 DA determination

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	Site Parent Community Support	CSD will enhance parent engagement by providing site parent resource centers and Parent/Community Liaisons, principally directed to support English Learner students as measured by metrics 1.1, 1.2, 1.10.	$95,545.00	Yes
1.2	Parent/ community communication and participation supports	Ed Services will maintain communication resources to increase opportunities for parent input and participation to allow parents to respond (i.e. texts, phone calls, emails and/ or flyers) to provide effective and efficient school to home communication.	$534.00	No
1.3	District/Site website communication support.	Ed Services will maintain and update school and district website parent information portals and parent communication platforms to address parent engagement.	$24,372.00	No
1.4	Improve Attendance and Chronic Absenteeism	The Director of Student Services will coordinate with district and school personnel to implement tiered-engagement interventions to address attendance and chronic absenteeism using various data-based tools in order to increase communication with parents, increase attendance, and lower chronic absenteeism for all students, including African American students as measured by metrics 1.4 and 1.5	$34,800.00	No
1.5	Lower Suspension Rates	The Pupil and Personnel Services department will coordinate with district and school personnel to implement tiered-engagement interventions for student behaviors in order to decrease suspension rates as measured by metrics 1.7.	$279,735.00	No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Enhance student achievement by developing competency in critical thinking and problem solving, information, communication, technology literacy and social and cross-cultural skills.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Cucamonga School District (CSD) has developed the goal to enhance student achievement by focusing on critical thinking, problem solving, information, communication, technology literacy, and social and cross-cultural skills to ensure that students are well-prepared for the demands of the 21st century. In a rapidly evolving global landscape, these competencies are essential for students to navigate complex challenges, engage in meaningful problem-solving, and communicate effectively in diverse environments.

Compared to the district's average distance from standard (DFS) of -48.4 in ELA, African American (AA), English Learners (EL), students with disabilities (SWD), and socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students have even lower DFS values at -59.7, -74.5, -116.5, and -53.9 respectively, indicating that these groups are underperforming relative to the district average. Similarly, Compared to the district's average distance from standard (DFS) of -84 in Math, African American (AA), English Learners (EL), students with disabilities (SWD), and socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students have even lower DFS values at -98.9, -101.7, -147.9, and -89.6 respectively, indicating underperformance relative to the district average. This trend persists at TOCS and RCMS, where EL, SED, and SWD students also exhibit lower DFS values compared to the district. Additionally, only 18% of 5th and 8th graders meet or exceeds standard in Science. The data used to develop this goal provided a clear snapshot of ELA and math proficiency across the district. By fostering these skills, the LEA aims to equip students with the tools necessary for academic success, career readiness, and active citizenship. Additionally, emphasizing these areas helps bridge the gap between traditional education and the skills required in a technology-driven world, promoting lifelong learning and adaptability in a multicultural society.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	CAASPP ELA	2023 Dashboard District:	2024 Dashboard District:	2025 Dashboard District:	District: All: -34 DFS AA: -34 DFS	District: All: +3.8 DFS AA: +1.2 DFS

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Distance from Standard (DFS) Grades 3-8 only CA Dashboard	All: -48.4 DFS AA: -59.7 DFS EL: -74.5 DFS HY: -75.3 DFS SED: -53.9 DFS SWD: -116.5 DFS 2024 Dashboard LTEL: -111.6 DFS 2023 Dashboard TOCS EL: -88.9 DFS SED: -71.8 DFS RCMS: EL: -87.3 DFS SWD: -119.5 DFS	All: -54.7 DFS AA: -67 DFS EL: -77.7 DFS HY: -80.3 DFS LTEL: -111.6 DFS SED: -59.8 DFS SWD: -127.8 DFS TOCS EL: -114.3 DFS SED: -70.9 DFS RCMS: EL: -75 DFS SWD: -124.7 DFS	All: -44.6 DFS AA: -58.5 DFS EL: -58.7 DFS HY: -42.7 DFS LTEL: -88.9 DFS SED: -49.2 DFS SWD: -118.6 DFS TOCS EL: -73.2 DFS SED: -61 DFS RCMS: EL: -50.6 DFS SWD: -110 DFS	EL: -34 DFS HY: -34 DFS LTEL: -90 DFS SED: -34 DFS SWD: -34 DFS TOCS EL: -50 DFS SED: -50 DFS RCMS: EL: -50 DFS SWD: -50 DFS	EL: +15.8 DFS HY: +32.6 DFS LTEL: +22.7 DFS SED: +4.7 DFS SWD: -2.1 DFS TOCS EL: +15.7 DFS SED: +10.8 DFS RCMS: EL: +36.7 DFS SWD: +9.5 DFS
2.2	CAASPP MATH Distance from Standard (DFS) Grades 3-8 only CA Dashboard	2023 Dashboard District: All: -84 DFS AA: -98.9 DFS EL: -101.7 DFS HY: -99.3 DFS SED: -89.6 DFS SWD: -147.9 DFS 2024 Dashboard LTEL: -171.8 DFS 2023 Dashboard TOCS: SWD: -126.4 DFS RCMS: All: -97.7 DFS	2024 Dashboard District: All: -83.9 DFS AA: -105.4 DFS EL: -99.1 DFS HY: -109.9 DFS LTEL: -171.8 DFS SED: -90.7 DFS SWD: -151.8 DFS TOCS: SWD: -151.9 DFS RCMS: All: -96 DFS AA: -118.4 DFS EL: -111.7 DFS	2025 Dashboard District: All: -77.7 DFS AA: -98.8 DFS EL: -90.2 DFS HY: -86.7 DFS LTEL: -169.5 DFS SED: -82.4 DFS SWD: -145.8 DFS TOCS: SWD: -116.7 DFS RCMS: All: -85.9 DFS AA: -114.3 DFS EL: -101.9 DFS	District: All: -59 DFS AA: -59 DFS EL: -59 DFS HY: -59 DFS LTEL: -150 DFS SED: -59 DFS SWD: -59 DFS TOCS: SWD: -60 DFS RCMS: All: -68 DFS AA: -68 DFS EL: -68 DFS Hispanics: -68 DFS SED: -68 DFS	District: All: +6.3 DFS AA: + 0.1 DFS EL: + 11.5 DFS HY: + 12.6 DFS LTEL: +2.3 DFS SED: +7.2 DFS SWD: +2.1 DFS TOCS: SWD: +9.7 DFS RCMS: All: +11.8 DFS AA: +7.2 DFS EL: +26.7 DFS Hispanics: +14.1 DFS SED: +13.3 DFS

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		AA: -121.5 DFS EL: -128.6 DFS Hispanics: -101.7 DFS SED: -104.1 DFS SWD: -167.6 DFS	Hispanics: -100.2 DFS SED: -103.3 DFS SWD: -164.6 DFS	Hispanics: -87.6 DFS SED: -90.8 DFS SWD: -165.4 DFS	SWD: -68 DFS	SWD: +2.2 DFS
2.3	California Science Test (CAST) % Meet or Exceeds Standard Grades 5 & 8 only CAASPP	2022-23: Grade 5: 15.27% Grade 8: 18.99%	2023-24: Grade 5: 20.97% Grade 8: 24.55%	2024-25: Grade 5: 21.40% Grade 8: 19.92%	Grade 5: 30% Grade 8: 30%	Grade 5: +6.13% Grade 8: +0.93%
2.4	Physical Fitness Test Percentage Grades 5 & 7 only SIS report	2023-2024: Aerobic Capacity- 93.1% Abdominal Strength- 95.4% Trunk Strength- 96.0% Upper Body- 95.3% Flexibility- 95.4%	2024-2025: Aerobic Capacity- 96.9% Abdominal Strength- 97.4% Trunk Strength- 97.8% Upper Body- 97.2% Flexibility- 97.8%	2025-2026: Aerobic Capacity- 97% Abdominal Strength- 97% Trunk Strength- 95.8% Upper Body- 97.8% Flexibility- 97.6%	Aerobic Capacity- 97% Abdominal Strength- 97% Trunk Strength- 97% Upper Body- 97% Flexibility- 97%	Aerobic Capacity: +3.9% Abdominal Strength: 1.6% Trunk Strength: -0.2% Upper Body: +2.5% Flexibility: +2.2%
2.5	EL Proficiency % Making progress towards English language proficiency CA Dashboard	2023 Dashboard District- EL: 48.3% 2024 Dashboard LTEL: 58.3% TOCS- EL: 43.2%	2024 Dashboard District- EL: 53.4% LTEL: 58.3% TOCS- EL: 63.3%	2025 Dashboard District EL: 47.3% LTEL: 72.4% TOCS- EL: 61.8%	District EL: 60% LTEL: 60% TOCS- EL: 60%	District EL: -1% LTEL: +14.1% TOCS- EL: +18.6%
2.6	EL Reclassify	2023-24:	2024-25:	2025-26:	Maintain 20%	+4.5%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Percent of EL students reclassified CALPADS report 2.17	Overall: 20%	Overall: 18.3%	Overall: 24.5%		
2.7	iReady Math % at Mid, Above, or Early on Grade Level iReady Diagnostic Results Kindergarten only	23-24 Grade K: 41% EL: 11%	24-25 Grade K: 55% EL: 30%	25-26 Grade K: 46% EL: 30%	Grade K: 50% EL: 45%	Grade K: +5% EL: +19%
2.8	iReady ELA % at Mid, Above, or Early on Grade Level iReady Diagnostic Results Kindergarten only	24-25 Grade K: 73% EL: 51%	24-25 Grade K: 73% EL: 51%	25-26 Grade K: 68% EL: 59%	Grade K: 80% EL: 60%	Grade K: -5% EL: +8%
2.9	Professional Development Certificated Participation Rate Local Attendance Sheets	2024-2025 Math: 60% Ed Tech: 31% Science: 15% ELA: 63%	2024-2025 Math: 60% Ed Tech: 31% Science: 15% ELA: 63%	2025-2026 Math: 85% Ed Tech: 85% Science: 85% ELA: 85%	Math: 65% Ed Tech: 40% Science: 25% ELA: 75%	Math: +25% Ed Tech: +54% Science: +70% ELA: +22%

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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.

Enhance student achievement by developing competency in critical thinking and problem solving, information, communication, technology literacy, and social and cross-cultural skills.

The Cucamonga School District demonstrated strong implementation of Goal 2 during the 2025–26 school year through the continuation of professional learning systems, instructional supports, technology integration, and targeted student services designed to strengthen student achievement.

Fully Implemented Actions:
Nine of the eleven actions were fully implemented as planned, including Action 2.1 (Personalized Professional Learning Model Support), Action 2.2 (Full Day TK/K), Action 2.3 (Library Resources), Action 2.4 (Site Technology Support), Action 2.5 (Extra Instructional Support), Action 2.7 (Monitor and Support LCAP), Action 2.8 (Educational Technology Support), Action 2.10 (Improving Student Achievement in ELA and Math), and Action 2.11 (Enrichment Program Support). No substantive differences were reported for these actions; however, some implementation challenges impacted consistency in execution at certain sites or within specific components of actions.

Partially Implemented Actions:
Action 2.6 (English Learner Support and Resources) was partially implemented. While certificated staff participated in Essential Learning professional development and English Learner resources, targeted supports, and data-informed interventions were maintained, implementation differed from the original plan in several areas. First, supports for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) were more fully developed at the middle school level and were not implemented with the same level of intentionality at elementary sites. Second, implementation of English Language Development (ELD) standards remained concentrated primarily within ELA and mathematics and was not consistently expanded across all content areas as intended. This year, we focused on partnering with the county to train our ELRTs and implementing our actions at RCMS as a pilot school. Additionally, Action 2.9 (English Learner Professional Development) was partially implemented. Substitute staffing shortages limited opportunities for instructional aides to participate in ELD-focused training, resulting in incomplete implementation of professional learning supports for all staff serving English Learners. The district also engaged in ongoing collaboration with county partners around English Learner Roadmap (ELR) implementation to strengthen internal capacity and support future staff training efforts.

Successes

The district demonstrated consistent implementation of Goal 2 through the continuation of key structures, staffing, and instructional supports across actions. Under Action 2.1 (Personalized Professional Learning Model), staff participated in scheduled professional learning opportunities that included model lessons, coaching cycles, pedagogical supports, and opportunities for instructional reflection aligned to district priorities. For Action 2.2 (Full Day TK/K), the district maintained full-day Transitional Kindergarten and Kindergarten programs and utilized a comprehensive assessment system to monitor student progress and early learning milestones. Under Action 2.3 (Library Resources), libraries and multimedia resources remained operational and staffed at each school site, ensuring continued student and staff

access to instructional materials. Action 2.4 (Site Technology Support) was implemented through the maintenance of dedicated site technology support personnel to assist with devices, systems, and instructional technology needs.

For Action 2.5 (Extra Instructional Support), the district continued to provide an additional 30 minutes of instructional time daily at all school sites to support intervention, enrichment, and academic reinforcement. Under Action 2.7 (Monitor and Support LCAP), quarterly progress monitoring meetings and implementation reviews were conducted to assess alignment to district goals and monitor action progress. Action 2.8 (Educational Technology Support) included the continued implementation of technology-based instructional programs and digital tools to support core curriculum access and classroom instruction. For Action 2.9 (English Learner Professional Development), teachers participated in ongoing professional learning connected to integrated curriculum resources, including structured supports embedded within ELA and mathematics programs. Under Action 2.10 (Improving Student Achievement in ELA and Math), districtwide professional learning, common instructional language, and curriculum-aligned supports were maintained across grade levels to support instructional consistency. Action 2.11 (Enrichment Program Support) continued to provide students with access to enrichment opportunities during the instructional day, including rotational elementary enrichment offerings and middle school elective opportunities.

For Action 2.6 (English Learner Support and Resources), a notable implementation success included ongoing collaboration with county partners to build internal capacity around English Learner Roadmap (ELR) implementation. Teachers participated in Essential Learning professional development, and targeted English Learner supports, resources, and data review processes were maintained. However, due to substitute staffing shortages, not all instructional aides were able to participate in ELD-focused professional development, limiting full implementation of training supports across all staff groups.

Challenges

For Action 2.6 (English Learner Support and Resources), implementation was partially realized. While certificated staff received Essential Learning professional development and targeted English Learner supports were maintained, substitute staffing shortages limited opportunities for instructional aides to participate in ELD-focused training. As a result, ELD instructional practices were not consistently reinforced across all staff supporting English Learners. Additionally, implementation of ELD standards remained concentrated primarily in ELA and mathematics rather than being systematically expanded across all content areas as originally intended. Targeted supports for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) were more fully developed at the middle school level and were not implemented with the same level of consistency at elementary sites.

For Action 2.9 (English Learner Professional Development), teachers experienced challenges implementing small-group instruction and differentiated supports for English Learners within daily classroom practice. Although professional learning and curriculum supports were provided, classroom implementation of strategies varied, resulting in inconsistent application of instructional practices across grade levels and classrooms compared to the intended model of integrated support.

For Action 2.10 (Improving Student Achievement in ELA and Math), the district identified a need for additional coaching and embedded support to help teachers apply newly learned instructional strategies in real-time classroom settings. While professional learning opportunities occurred as planned, implementation varied in practice, and some teachers required additional modeling and feedback to consistently apply district instructional expectations.

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, 2.4 and 2.7 - The material difference is due to a post-adoption collective bargaining agreements and rising healthcare costs. Specifically, the implementation of a 6% on-schedule salary increase, a 2% one-time off-schedule payment, and a concurrent rise in statutory and health benefit costs increased the actual fiscal investment required to sustain this action. While these mid-year compensation adjustments caused actual expenditures to exceed original budget projections, they represent the increased cost of retaining the qualified personnel necessary to maintain services rather than a change in the actual scope of delivery. Consequently, while the financial inputs increased, the qualitative level and percentage of improved services delivered to targeted students remained stable, effective, and fully aligned with original plan goals.

2.9 - The proposed training attendance did not occur due to sub staffing shortages.

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

Action 2.1, focused on providing the Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM), model lessons, and pedagogical practices for all instructional staff, has an overall effective rating that is successful, as the Year 2 teacher participation rates (Metric 2.9) show growth across every subject area. In math, teacher participation rose from a 60% baseline up to 85% (a net improvement of +25%), and in ELA, it rose from a 63% baseline up to 85% (a net improvement of +22%). The most substantial growth was realized in Ed Tech and science instruction, where Ed Tech participation climbed from 31% to 85% (a net improvement of +54%) and science grew from 15% to 85% (a net improvement of +70%), proving this action was highly effective in expanding professional development engagement for our instructional staff.

Action 2.2, aimed at running the refined full-day TK/Kindergarten program with early intervention to build foundational skills, demonstrated partial effectiveness. Under this action, early math performance on the iReady diagnostic (Metric 2.7) rose significantly, with the percentage of
kindergarten students performing at mid, above, or early on grade level climbing from a 41% baseline up to 46% overall (a net increase of +5%), while English Learners grew substantially from 11% at baseline to 30% on grade level (a net increase of +19%). Kindergarten performance on the iReady ELA diagnostic (Metric 2.8) showed mixed results when comparing year 2 data back to the baseline. For English Learners, the percentage of students performing at mid, above, or early on grade level rose from a 51% baseline up to 59% (a net improvement of +8%). Conversely, overall kindergarten performance dropped from a 73% baseline down to 68% (a net decrease of -5%). As a result of this data the district will continue to strengthen the implementation of early intervention to build foundational skills and address the standards.

Action 2.3, which focuses on maintaining school libraries and media resources to increase student literacy, demonstrated clear effectiveness in supporting general academic growth and expanding access across the district. Providing these updated literacy-rich environments and reading materials contributed to a positive upward shift in student reading outcomes. When compared back to the baseline data on the state assessment, district-wide CAASPP ELA scores (Metric 2.1) successfully rose from a baseline of -48.4 DFS up to -44.6 DFS overall, showing a net growth of +3.8 DFS toward the standard.

Action 2.4, which focuses on maintaining site-based tech support positions to ensure network stability and manage learning devices, has demonstrated sustained effectiveness as verified by the district's ability to maintain and deliver digital assessments and technology-enhanced instruction across all sites. This technical support was effective in allowing schools to consistently administer and utilize iReady

diagnostics, educational technology resources, and computerized state testing. The stability provided by this action indirectly supported the broader academic gains realized across the district, including the +6.13% baseline growth on the 5th-grade CAST science assessment (Metric 2.3) and the district-wide improvements achieved on the CAASPP math and language arts assessments (metric 2.1 & 2.2).

Action 2.7, which targets the centralized monitoring and support of the LCAP to ensure services remain primarily directed toward unduplicated student groups, demonstrated overall effectiveness in driving steady academic gains compared to the baseline metrics. This centralized monitoring ensured that resources remained aligned with targeted student needs, which resulted in positive district-wide shifts across the CAASPP California Dashboard. In CAASPP ELA (Metric 2.1), the district-wide average improved from -48.4 DFS to -44.6 DFS (a net growth of +3.8 DFS), while the district-wide CAASPP Math average (Metric 2.2) improved from -84 DFS to -77.7 DFS (a net growth of +6.3 DFS). Centralized oversight through this action also successfully supported growth across multiple unduplicated student groups compared to their baselines, such as English Learners improving by +15.8 DFS in ELA and +11.5 DFS in math, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students improving by +4.7 DFS in ELA and +7.2 DFS in math.

Actions 2.5, 2.8, and 2.10, focused on providing 30 minutes of extra daily Tier 1 and Tier 2 academic instruction, educational technology resources, and ELA and mathematics Teacher on Special Assignment support, demonstrated effectiveness across both core content areas. In mathematics (Metric 2.2), these actions were effective in moving students closer to standard districtwide, shifting the average from -84.0 DFS at baseline to -77.7 DFS in Year 2, an increase of +6.3 DFS. English Learners improved from -101.7 DFS to -90.2 DFS, an increase of +11.5 DFS, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students improved from -89.6 DFS to -82.4 DFS, an increase of +7.2 DFS. At the site level, TOCS Students with Disabilities improved by +9.7 DFS over the baseline. In ELA (Metric 2.1), these actions were also effective in raising overall district achievement from -48.4 DFS at baseline to -44.6 DFS in Year 2, an increase of +3.8 DFS. English Learners showed stronger growth, improving from -74.5 DFS to -58.7 DFS, an increase of +15.8 DFS, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students improved from -53.9 DFS to -49.2 DFS, an increase of +4.7 DFS. Site-level results also showed progress: at TOCS, English Learners improved by +15.7 DFS and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students improved by +10.8 DFS in ELA, while at RCMS, English Learners improved by +36.7 DFS and Students with Disabilities improved by +9.5 DFS compared to the baseline. These results indicate that the combination of additional instructional time, technology-supported academic practice, and teacher training/coaching contributed to improved academic outcomes for the student groups the actions are principally directed to serve. However, because English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students remain below standard in both ELA and mathematics, the district will continue refining implementation to strengthen differentiated instruction, targeted intervention, progress monitoring, and access to grade-level standards.

Actions 2.6 and 2.9, targeting English Learner achievement through specialized standards-based training, ELD curriculum, and professional development strategies, demonstrated mixed effectiveness. At the district level for English language acquisition (Metric 2.5), the overall percentage of English Learners making progress toward language proficiency dropped from a 48.3% baseline down to 47.3% on the 2025 Dashboard, showing a net decrease of -1%. However, The percentage of Long Term English Learners (LTEL) making progress toward proficiency grew by +14.1% across the district compared to the baseline, and at TOCS, local language supports contributed to a massive increase from a 43.2% baseline up to 61.8% proficiency (a net gain of +18.6%). The district's language reclassification rate (Metric 2.6) also showed considerable progress in year 2 with 24.5% reclassified compared to the baseline of 20%.

Action 2.11, which focuses on maintaining during-the-school-day enrichment programs, demonstrated broad effectiveness across multiple student subgroups when compared directly to historical baselines. While overall academic baselines started low, the implementation of these daily programs directly coincided with positive academic growth for marginalized groups on state assessments. In CAASPP ELA (Metric 2.1),

the presence of these enrichment programs supported notable progress among historically vulnerable groups, with English Learners moving up by +15.8 DFS and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students improving by +4.7 DFS over the baseline at the district level. This effectiveness was mirrored in CAASPP Math (Metric 2.2), where English Learners improved by +11.5 DFS, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged improved by +7.2 DFS and Students with Disabilities improved by +2.1 DFS over their baseline metrics, demonstrating that maintaining daily enrichment programming effectively supported a positive trend in unduplicated student achievement.

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.

Metric 2.8 (DIBELS ELA – Kindergarten Only) was discontinued for the 2024–2025 school year because the district determined it no longer aligned with broader TK–8 instructional priorities; consequently, kindergarten literacy progress will now be monitored through iReady assessments, resulting in a shift where the active metrics for Action 2.2 are now designated as Metrics 2.7 and 2.8.

Metric 2.9 (iReady ELA) and Metric 2.10 (Professional development), are now 2.8 and 2.9 respectively.

Action 2.1 (Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM) Support): The description of this action was expanded to include opportunities for growth and reflection for instructional staff. Additionally, the focus was broadened from primarily targeting English Learner and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged student groups to supporting all students, while still maintaining emphasis on identified groups. This refinement ensures a more inclusive approach to improving instructional practices and student achievement. Also, we change the action to be measured by metric 2.1, 2.2, and 2.9 which is directly related to certificated staff participation in professional development.

Action 2.5 (Extra Instructional Support): The description of this action was refined to provide greater specificity regarding instructional practices. The updated language identifies the use of Tier 1 and Tier 2 academic instruction and emphasizes differentiated support in English Language Arts and Mathematics to better address student learning needs. The description was changed to represent the action will be partially funded with LREBG funding.

Action 2.6 (English Learner Support and Resources): The metrics used to measure progress toward this goal were revised to better align with the intended action and outcomes. We will now use metric 2.5 & 2.6 to measure this action.

Action 2.9 (English Learner Professional Development): The description of this action was refined to focus more clearly on outcomes. The updated language emphasizes ensuring that all teachers are trained in English Language Development strategies to support academic success for English Learners and Long-Term English Learners.

Actions 2.10, 2.11: The description was changed to represent the actions will be partially funded with LREBG funding.

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	Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM) support	The Educational Services department will continue to provide Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM) and model lessons, pedagogical practices, and opportunity for growth and reflection for all instructional staff in ELA, math, ed tech, and science instruction that is directed to impact all students, principally directed to EL and SED, as measured by metric 2.1, 2.2, and 2.9.	$24,118,351.00	Yes
2.2	Full day TK/K	The Educational Services department will refine and continue full day TK/Kindergarten program with early intervention to build foundational skills to address the standards, which is principally directed for EL and SED students as measured by metrics 2.7, 2.8.	$1,213,231.00	Yes
2.3	Library Resources	The Educational Services Department will maintain libraries and media resources to provide access and resources for schools to increase student literacy for all students.	$476,443.00	No
2.4	Site Tech Support	The Educational Services department will maintain tech support positions at each site to support the network and added devices which support instruction of all students.	$496,843.00	No
2.5	Extra Instructional Support	CSD will maintain 30 minutes daily of extra TIER 1 and 2 academic instruction for EL and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students to address differentiated academic needs in math and ELA as measured by metrics 2.1, 2.2. Partially funded by LREBG $44,487.00	$1,589,983.00	Yes
2.6	English Learner support and resources	The Educational Services Department will provide comprehensive resources and targeted support that empowers instructional staff to effectively implement ELD standards across all subject areas through data-informed interventions that also address the specific needs of LTELs,	$1,177,519.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		which principally directs the impact of academic achievement for English Learners and LTELs as measured by metrics 2.5 & 2.6.		
2.7	Monitor and Support LCAP	The Educational Services department will continue to monitor and support the implementation of the LCAP plan to ensure that academic services and access to the curriculum are primarily directed toward the achievement of unduplicated student groups.	$463,814.00	No
2.8	Ed Tech Support	The Educational Services department will provide ed tech resources and programs to support and enhance instructional environments that principally directs the impact of academic achievement for EL and SED students as measured by metrics 2.1 and 2.2.	$581,221.00	Yes
2.9	English learner professional development	The Educational Services Department, in collaboration with site administration and ELRT's will ensure that all teachers are trained in ELD strategies that optimize academic success for EL and LTEL as measured by metrics 2.5 and 2.6.	$6,650.00	Yes
2.10	Improving Student's achievements in ELA and Math	Through the Educational Services department, the ELA and Math Teachers on Special Assignment will provide training to teachers on core curriculum content and provide support in the implementation of tiered-engagement strategies in order to increase all student achievement in ELA and math, principally directed to EL and SED, as measured by metrics 2.1 & 2.2. Partially funded by LREBG $58,156.00.	$122,484.00	Yes
2.11	Enrichment Programs support	The Educational Services department will provide enrichment programs during the school day that are principally directed to increase achievement of EL and SED student groups, as measured by metrics 2.1 and 2.2. Partially funded by LREBG $10,000.00.	$1,124,151.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	Enhance student initiative and self-direction to build critical thinking, problem-solving skills, creativity, and innovation by maintaining access to standards-aligned materials, qualified staff, diverse courses, tailored enriching programs and a safe and well-maintained learning environment.	Maintenance of Progress Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Cucamonga School District (CSD) has developed the goal to foster student initiative and self-direction to build critical thinking, problem-solving skills, creativity, and innovation because these attributes are essential for students' personal and academic growth. By providing access to standards-aligned materials, qualified staff, diverse courses, tailored enriching programs, and a safe and well-maintained learning environment, the LEA aims to create a holistic educational experience that empowers students to take charge of their learning journey. This approach ensures that students are not only absorbing knowledge but are also actively engaging in the learning process, developing the ability to think independently, solve complex problems, and innovate. A supportive and resource-rich environment nurtures their creativity and initiative, preparing them to thrive in an ever-changing world and to become proactive, lifelong learners capable of adapting to new challenges and opportunities. These actions will sustain the progress exemplified by the related metrics.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Teacher Misassignment Total Count CalSAAS	22-23: Overall: 9	23-24: Overall: 0	24-25 Overall: 8	Overall: 3	-1
3.2	Facilities	22-23: CES: 96.6% LAES: 97.59%	23-24: CES: 93.97% LAES: 97.95%	24-25: CES: 95.54% LAES: 96.31%	CES: 99.0% LAES: 99.0% TOCS: 99.0%	CES: -1.06% LAES: -1.28% TOCS: -2.24%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	% Meet or Exceeds Standard FIT reports	TOCS: 99.01% RCMS: 96.54%	TOCS: 99.27% RCMS: 96.13%	TOCS: 96.77% RCMS: 95.01%	RCMS: 99.0%	RCMS: -1.53%
3.3	Access to Standards-aligned % Meets Standard Local Indicator: William's Quarterly Uniform Report	23-24: Overall: 100%	24-25: Overall: 100%	25-26: Overall: 100%	Maintain overall: 100%	Maintained
3.4	Academic Content % Meets Standard Local Indicator: William's Quarterly Uniform Report	23-24: Overall: 100%	24-25: Overall: 100%	25-26: Overall: 100%	Maintain overall: 100%	Maintained
3.5	EL Access to Standards and Curriculum % Meet Standard Local Indicator: William's Quarterly Uniform Report	23-24: Overall: 100%	24-25: Overall: 100%	25-26: Overall: 100%	Maintain overall: 100%	Maintained
3.6	Student Access to Broad Courses % Meet Standard Local Indicator: William's Quarterly Uniform Report	23-24: Overall: 100%	24-25: Overall: 100%	25-26: Overall: 100%	Maintain overall: 100%	Maintained

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.7	EL and FY Access to Programs and Services % Meet Standard Local Indicator: William's Quarterly Uniform Report	23-24: Overall: 100%	24-25: Overall: 100%	25-26: Overall: 100%	Maintain overall: 100%	Maintained
3.8	SWD Access to Programs and Services % Meet Standard Local Indicator: William's Quarterly Uniform Report	23-24: Overall: 100%	24-25: Overall: 100%	25-26: Overall: 100%	Maintain overall: 100%	Maintained

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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 Cucamonga School District successfully implemented all three actions under Goal 3, which focuses on enhancing student initiative and self-direction by maintaining access to standards-aligned materials, qualified staff, diverse courses, tailored enriching programs, and a safe and well-maintained learning environment. All three actions — Action 3.1 (Enrichment Opportunities Support), Action 3.2 (Health, SEL and Mental Wellbeing Support), and Action 3.3 (School Climate and Safety Custodial Support) — were fully implemented as planned with no substantive differences between planned and actual implementation.

For Action 3.1, the Educational Services Department maintained personnel, instructional time, and expanded elective course offerings to ensure students had access to a broad course of study.

For Action 3.2, the district maintained 100% access to programs and services for English Learners, Foster Youth, and Students with Disabilities. The Educational Services and Pupil Services departments successfully maintained access to health technicians, counselors, psychologists, social service liaisons, and district-wide behavior support systems, ensuring all students receive the support they need to thrive academically and emotionally.

For Action 3.3, the district continued to provide sufficient custodial services in order to maintain safe and well-maintained facilities across all school sites.

There were no challenges with the implementation of any of these actions.

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.

No material differences in the implementation of Goal 3.

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

Action 3.1, focused on maintaining personnel, instructional time, and increased course offerings to boost student electives, participation, and engagement, was effective in maintaining access metrics when comparing final outcomes to the baseline. This operational support ensured full student access across all educational programs. On the William's Quarterly Uniform Report local indicators, the district successfully achieved a perfect record of 100% and completely maintained its baseline across multiple key access areas. This includes maintaining 100% for academic content (Metric 3.4), 100% for student access to broad courses (Metric 3.6), 100% for English Learner access to standards and curriculum (Metric 3.5), 100% for English Learner and Foster Youth access to programs and services (Metric 3.7), and 100% for Students with Disabilities access to programs and services (Metric 3.8). These sustained scores prove that this action was fully effective in guaranteeing open, equitable course offerings and program access for every student group in the district. However, while these access percentages remained perfectly stable, Metric 3.1 highlights an ongoing area of concern regarding staffing, as the district still has 8 teacher misassignments. While this is a slight improvement from the baseline of 9, it indicates that further refinement is needed under this action to fully resolve staffing challenges and ensure all courses are taught by properly authorized personnel.

Action 3.2, was effective in maintaining student access to health, SEL, mental health, counseling, and behavioral support services. Metric 3.7, English Learner and Foster Youth Access to Programs and Services, was maintained at 100% in 2025-26. Metric 3.8, Students with Disabilities Access to Programs and Services, was also maintained at 100% in 2025-26. Both outcomes met the district's target to maintain 100% access. Additional aligned climate and engagement metrics from Goal 1 show mixed impact. Suspension rates decreased overall from 3.9% to 3.6% and decreased for English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, and Students with Disabilities, suggesting that student support systems contributed to improved behavior outcomes. Student sense of safety also improved at Cucamonga Elementary and Rancho Cucamonga Middle School. However, student connectedness declined from 80% to 70%, and staff connectedness declined from 91% to 76%, indicating that continued refinement of SEL, behavioral, and mental health supports is needed. Overall, Action 3.2 was effective in maintaining access to support services and contributed to some positive school climate outcomes, particularly reduced suspension rates. Moving forward, the district will continue strengthening the supports and services offered through the action.

Action 3.3, which tasks student services with maintaining a safe, clean, and conducive learning environment through effective custodial services, demonstrated clear ineffectiveness when evaluated against baseline standards. According to the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT) reports (Metric 3.2), the percentage of school facilities meeting or exceeding cleanliness and maintenance standards dropped across every single campus in the district compared to their baselines. Specifically, CES dropped by -1.06% from its 96.6% baseline down to 95.54%, LAES dropped by -1.28% from its 97.59% baseline down to 96.31%, RCMS dropped by -1.53% from its 96.54% baseline down to 95.01%,

and TOCS suffered the largest decline, dropping by -2.24% from its 99.01% baseline down to 96.77%. Every school site fell below the Year 3 target of 99.0%, proving that current custodial operations and maintenance strategies have been ineffective at keeping our school buildings up to optimal standards. Based on this data, the district will strengthen this action moving forward by increasing the monitoring of custodial services, establishing more frequent facility walkthroughs, and adjusting maintenance schedules to ensure all campuses return to meeting standard requirements.

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.

After thorough review and reflection on the implementation and outcomes of Goal 3, Cucamonga School District has determined that no changes are necessary to the planned goal, metrics, target outcomes, or actions for the coming year. Although, there are no changes to the action descriptions, the district will strengthen implementation of the actions to better support all student groups.

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	Enrichment Opportunities support	The Educational Services Department will maintain personnel, time and increased course offerings for students electives and impacts the participation and engagement of all students.	$688,791.00	No
3.2	Health, SEL and Mental wellbeing support	The Educational Services and Pupil Services departments will continue and maintain access to health care providers, counselors, psychologists, social service liaisons, community resources and district-wide behavior support systems. In-School Solutions and counseling services will be maintained (Metric 1.9 and 1.12). Partially funded by LREBG $51,142.00.	$1,708,366.00	No
3.3	School Climate and Safety Custodial Support	The Ed. services department will continue to maintain a safe, clean, and conducive learning environment by ensuring effective and efficient custodial services, thereby promoting the well-being and academic success of all students and staff.	$2,143,967.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing

Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students [2026-27]

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant
$7,900,641.00	$915,271

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
28.735%	0.000%	$0.00	28.735%

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
1.1	**Action:** Site Parent Community Support **Need:** Only 2% of our EL parents participated in the 2024 local LCAP survey and less than 1% of EL parents regularly participate in the engagement activities. Education partner also expressed that the parent resource centers and community liaison are important to them and helps keep them informed. This data	Through educational partner feedback, it was determined that our Site Parent Community Liaisons would support and improve two-way communication with all parents aiming to enhance parent engagement across the district. Parent Liaisons will operate a parent resource center, fostering communication and relationships between school, community, and home, offering community resources to families, and providing clerical support principally directed to increase parent engagement of English Learners.	1.1, 1.2, 1.10

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
	supports the need to provide site based community support in order to enhance parent engagement. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Although it is principally directed to EL students, this action is being offered on an LEA-wide basis, as research shows having a centralized source available to all parents makes it easier for EL parents to access information and builds stronger ties with communities. Many families, especially those from marginalized communities, face barriers accessing educational resources. Parent resource center bridge the gap by providing culturally sensitive information, and empowering all families to support their children learning effectively to ensure equity.	
2.1	**Action:** Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM) support **Need:** In the District, EL has a -74.5 DFS in ELA while SED students scored -53.9 DFS, underperforming compared to the overall student population (-48.4 DFS) by -26.1 points and -5.5 DFS respectively. At TOCS, EL and SED underperform by -40.5 DFS and -23.4 DFS compared to the overall district in ELA. Additionally, EL and SED exhibit a performance deficit in mathematics of -17.7 DFS and -5.6 DFS, respectively, compared to the overall district average. At RCMS, EL and SED students underperform by -44.6 DFS and -20.1 DFS, respectively, relative to the overall district average in math. Educational partners and teachers shared that additional PD specific to the needs of EL and	CSD is dedicated to enhancing student achievement by focusing on essential skills for the 21st century, such as critical thinking, problem solving, information, communication, technology literacy, and social and cross-cultural skills. These skills are crucial for helping students face complex challenges, solve problems effectively, and communicate well in diverse settings. Our goal is to ensure that all students are well-prepared for the future. Currently, some groups of students are underperforming in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math compared to the district average. For instance, African American, English Learners, students with disabilities, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students have lower scores. This trend is also seen in Science, where only 18% of 5th and 8th graders meet or exceed the standard. These gaps highlight the need for targeted support to help all students succeed.	2.1, 2.2, 2.9

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
	SED students will help improve ELA and math scores. The data shows a need for support and training to all teachers in effectively catering to the diverse learning needs of students, especially those from unique student demographics. These students may benefit from targeted strategies and interventions to access rigorous academic standards and achieve success. **Scope:** LEA-wide	To address these challenges, our Educational Services department will continue offering the Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM). This model provides customized training and support for teachers in reading, math, educational technology, and science. The focus is on improving teaching strategies to better support English learners, long-term English learners, foster youth, and low-income students. By enhancing teacher skills, we aim to improve student outcomes in these critical areas. ELA, math, and Ed Tech TOSAs provide year round trainings through our PPLM as well as pushing into classrooms to support teaching and learning for our EL and SED students and closing the achievement gap . This model will also benefit all students. Providing the Personalized Professional Learning Model LEA-wide allows all instructional staff to receive aligned professional learning, coaching, model lessons, and opportunities for reflection in ELA, mathematics, educational technology, and science. This approach ensures that teachers across all sites are prepared to implement strategies that principally benefit English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students while also improving instruction for all students. Because these student groups are enrolled throughout the district, limiting the action to individual sites or classrooms would not adequately address the districtwide nature of the need.	

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 focusing on these key skills, CSD is helping students bridge the gap between traditional education and the demands of a technology-driven world. Our goal is to promote lifelong learning and adaptability in a multicultural society, ensuring that all students are prepared for the future.	
2.2	**Action:** Full day TK/K **Need:** According to our local assessments, in 2024 EL students in Kindergarten underperformed by 30% in math and 12% in ELA. Although we do not have academic data related to SED students in TK/K, research shows that SED students often start schools with lower levels of vocabulary and literacy skills compared to their more affluent peers. Educational partners also expressed that providing full-day TK/K would help provide more educational time to students who need more support. The data and circumstances shows a need to provide programs for EL and SED students that will give the foundational skills and experiences that promote social, emotional, and academic development. Given the disparities in the data, offering full-day kindergarten is crucial to provide EL and SED students with increased instructional time and targeted support, which research shows can significantly improve language acquisition, early literacy skills, and overall academic	The full day TK/Kindergarten program aims to build foundational skills in young learners, focusing on early intervention strategies that address the specific needs of English learners, foster youth, and low-income students. Early intervention in these programs includes targeted support in literacy and numeracy, social-emotional development, and language acquisition. Enhancing student achievement by developing critical thinking, problem solving, information and technology literacy, and social and cross-cultural skills. These skills are integrated into the curriculum to prepare students for the demands of the 21st century, ensuring they are equipped to handle complex challenges and diverse environments. Providing these programs and interventions on a schoolwide basis ensures that all students, regardless of their background, have access to the necessary resources and support to succeed. By addressing the needs of unduplicated pupils (English learners, foster youth, and low-income students) across the entire district, the LEA ensures that these vulnerable groups are not left behind. The emphasis on early intervention and foundational skills is critical for closing the	2.7, 2.8

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
	achievement (Cooper, Allen, Patall, & Dent, 2010; Walston & West, 2004). **Scope:** Schoolwide	achievement gap between unduplicated pupils and their peers. A schoolwide approach allows for consistent application of best practices and resources, ensuring that all schools can implement these strategies effectively. By implementing the full day TK/Kindergarten program with early intervention on a schoolwide basis, Cucamonga School District ensures that all students, particularly unduplicated pupils, receive the foundational skills and support necessary for success. This equitable approach helps bridge the gap between traditional education and the skills required in the 21st century, promoting academic achievement, career readiness, and active citizenship for all students.	
2.5	**Action:** Extra Instructional Support **Need:** The identified need is additional instructional time for EL and SED students. In the District, EL students scored -74.5 DFS in ELA, while SED students scored -53.9 DFS, underperforming by -26.1 and -5.5 DFS points respectively compared to the overall student population with a DFS of -48.4. At TOCS, EL and SED students underperform the overall district average in ELA by -40.5 and -23.4 DFS points, respectively. Additionally, EL and SED students exhibit a performance deficit in mathematics of -17.7 and -5.6 DFS points, respectively, compared to the overall district average. At RCMS, EL and SED students underperform in mathematics by -44.6 and -	Extra instructional time addresses the academic needs of English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students by providing 30 additional minutes of daily Tier 1 and Tier 2 academic instruction focused on English Language Arts and mathematics. These student groups continue to perform below standard in ELA and mathematics, demonstrating the need for additional instructional time, differentiated support, small-group instruction, intervention, and academic reinforcement. This action is provided LEA-wide because English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students are enrolled across all district schools and grade levels, and the identified academic needs are not limited to a single site or classroom. Providing additional instructional time districtwide ensures consistent access to targeted academic support regardless of school assignment. Although	2.1, 2.2

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
	20.1 DFS points, respectively, relative to the overall district average. Educational partners also expressed that providing extra instructional time would help provide more educational time to students who need more support. **Scope:** LEA-wide	all students may benefit, the action is principally directed toward English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students because the instruction is designed to address their identified performance gaps in ELA and mathematics. Effectiveness will be monitored through CAASPP ELA and mathematics outcomes, including results for English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	
2.8	**Action:** Ed Tech Support **Need:** In the District, EL students scored -74.5 DFS in ELA, while SED students scored -53.9 DFS, underperforming by -26.1 and -5.5 DFS points respectively compared to the overall student population with a DFS of -48.4. At TOCS, EL and SED students underperform the overall district average in ELA by -40.5 and -23.4 DFS points, respectively. Additionally, EL and SED students exhibit a performance deficit in mathematics of -17.7 and -5.6 DFS points, respectively, compared to the overall district average. At RCMS, EL and SED students underperform in mathematics by -44.6 and -20.1 DFS points, respectively, relative to the overall district average. The data shows there is a critical need for enhanced educational technology support to improve academic outcomes. Implementing targeted educational technology interventions	The Cucamonga School District (CSD) aims to improve student achievement by focusing on key skills like critical thinking, problem solving, technology literacy, and social skills. These skills are essential for students to succeed in the 21st century, where they will face complex challenges and need to communicate effectively in diverse environments. By emphasizing these areas, CSD prepares students for academic success, future careers, and active participation in society. To develop this action, the district looked at data on students' proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) and math. This data helped identify areas where students need support. By focusing on critical skills, the district hopes to give students the tools they need to do well in school and beyond. This approach also helps close the gap between traditional education and the skills needed in today’s technology-driven world. The Educational Services department will provide educational technology resources and programs to enhance learning environments, especially for	2.1, 2.2

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
	can help bridge academic gaps and support EL and SED students in achieving better academic performance. Educational partners also expressed that providing educational technology resources and programs would help to enhance learning environments for the students. **Scope:** LEA-wide	English learners and low-income students. These resources include tools and programs that help teachers create engaging and effective lessons. This support is crucial for students who might face additional challenges in their learning journey. This action is provided LEA-wide because English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students are enrolled across all district schools and grade levels, and consistent access to instructional technology is needed across classrooms to support academic achievement. Providing educational technology resources districtwide ensures that students in these groups have access to tools that allow teachers to differentiate instruction, monitor progress, and provide targeted practice based on student need. This approach helps to level the playing field, for students to have a fair chance to succeed. The goal is to ensure that students, regardless of their background, have access to high-quality education and the skills they need for the future. In summary, CSD's goal to enhance student achievement by focusing on critical 21st-century skills is designed to prepare students for the demands of the modern world. By providing targeted support to English learners and low-income students, the district ensures that every student has the opportunity to succeed and thrive in a rapidly evolving global landscape.	
2.10	**Action:** Improving Student's achievements in ELA and Math **Need:**	TOSA will provide training, as well as individual strategic support in tier one strategies, for our students specifically directed in support of our EL and low income students.	2.1, 2.2

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
	In the District, EL students scored -74.5 DFS in ELA, while SED students scored -53.9 DFS, underperforming by -26.1 and -5.5 DFS points respectively compared to the overall student population with a DFS of -48.4. At TOCS, EL and SED students underperform the overall district average in ELA by -40.5 and -23.4 DFS points, respectively. Additionally, EL and SED students exhibit a performance deficit in mathematics of -17.7 and -5.6 DFS points, respectively, compared to the overall district average. At RCMS, EL and SED students underperform in mathematics by -44.6 and -20.1 DFS points, respectively, relative to the overall district average. The data shows there is a critical need to provide training to teachers on core curriculum content to help increase all student achievement in ELA and math. By providing support and trainings on the implementation of tiered-engagement strategies can help bridge academic gaps and support EL and SED students in achieving better academic performance. Educational partners also expressed that providing training to teachers on core curriculum content would help increase all student achievement in ELA and math. **Scope:** LEA-wide	This action is provided LEA-wide because English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students are enrolled across all district schools, and consistent instructional support is needed across classrooms to address districtwide academic gaps. Although all students may benefit, the action is principally directed toward English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students because the training and support are designed to increase access to grade-level ELA and mathematics instruction, differentiation, intervention, and academic language development aligned to their needs. By providing targeted training and support through the Educational Services department, the district ensures that all teachers, regardless of the school site, have the necessary tools and strategies to meet the diverse learning needs of students, especially English Learners (EL) and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students. Implementing tiered-engagement strategies is essential to differentiate instruction and provide equitable access to the curriculum for all students. This action helps to create a consistent and cohesive approach across the district, ensuring that best practices are not isolated to individual schools but are applied universally. This consistency is particularly important in addressing achievement gaps and ensuring that all students, regardless of their background, have the opportunity to succeed academically. The focus on increasing student achievement in ELA and math is driven by the need to meet	

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
		specific metrics (2.1 & 2.2) that likely measure student performance and progress in these critical areas. By implementing this action LEA-wide, the district is taking a proactive approach to address systemic challenges, enhance instructional quality, and ultimately improve outcomes for all students, with a particular emphasis on supporting the success of EL and SED students. Research showed that TOSAs who provide targeted professional development on inclusive practices and differentiation strategies positively impact the academic achievement of EL students.	
2.11	**Action:** Enrichment Programs support **Need:** In 2024, EL has a -74.5 DFS in ELA CAASPP scores while SED students scored -53.9 DFS, underperforming compared to the overall student population (-48.4 DFS) by -26.1 points and -5.5 DFS respectively. Additionally, EL and SED exhibit a performance deficit in the math CAASPP scores of -17.7 DFS and -5.6 DFS, respectively, compared to the overall district average. Educational partners expressed that providing Enrichment Programs support is a need. The data shows there is a critical need for Enrichment Programs support. Providing Enrichment Programs can help bridge academic gaps and support EL and SED students in achieving better academic performance and social development.	To address the academic and engagement needs of English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students the district will provide enrichment programs during the school day, which include engaging, hands-on learning opportunities that supplement the core curriculum in English Language Arts and mathematics for English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. This action is provided LEA-wide because English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students are enrolled across the district and need consistent access to enrichment opportunities that build background knowledge, academic vocabulary, oral language, writing, problem solving, collaboration, critical thinking, and standards-aligned application of skills. Providing enrichment during the school day ensures that students in these groups can access these opportunities regardless of family resources, transportation, or after-school availability. Although all students may benefit, the action is principally	2.1, 2.2

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Educational partners also expressed that providing Enrichment Programs would help students learn new things and develop skills they will find helpful in real life. **Scope:** LEA-wide	directed toward English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students because it increases access to academic enrichment and engagement supports aligned to their identified opportunity and achievement gaps. Effectiveness will be monitored through CAASPP ELA and mathematics outcomes, including outcomes for English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. By continuing the implementation of enrichment programs during the school day across all schools in the district, the district ensures that every EL and SED student, regardless of their school site, has the opportunity to benefit from these additional supports. These programs are strategically designed to supplement the core curriculum, offering students enrichment opportunities that can help close achievement gaps, reinforce learning, and foster a deeper engagement with their education. Implementing this action LEA-wide is crucial for maintaining consistency in educational opportunities and outcomes. Without a districtwide approach, some students might miss out on these vital programs simply because of the school they attend. By ensuring that enrichment programs are available at all schools, the district is taking a proactive step to address disparities and provide all EL and SED students with the support they need to succeed, as measured by metrics 2.1 & 2.2, which likely focus on key indicators of student achievement.	

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		This action also aligns with the district's broader goals of promoting equity and excellence in education, ensuring that all students, regardless of their background, have access to the resources and opportunities necessary to achieve their full potential.	

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
2.6	**Action:** English Learner support and resources **Need:** The identified need is additional EL support and resources. 48.3% of all English Learners district-wide are making progress towards English language proficiency. Only 43.2% English learners at TOCS made progress towards English language proficiency, which is 5.1% less than the overall in the district. Additionally, 20% of all English Learners were reclassified in the 23-24 school year. This need was identified by educational partner during our LCAP meetings who mentioned that providing support, training and resources in the implementation of the ELD standards would help the academic achievement of EL students.	This action is broader in scope, encompassing not only support and training but also the provision of resources and the maintenance of intervention strategies. It targets all instructional staff (which may include teachers, instructional aides, and other support staff) and emphasizes both the implementation of ELD standards and the continuation of intervention programs through push-in and pull-out models. English learners often face additional challenges that can impact their academic performance. By providing instructional staff with training and resources to implement ELD standards across all subject areas, the district ensures that English learners receive tailored instruction that meets their language acquisition needs. This approach helps in bridging language barriers and enhancing comprehension in all academic subjects.	2.5, 2.6

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Scope: Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Demonstrating effective teaching strategies through model lessons can improve teachers' ability to deliver ELD content, thereby directly benefiting ELs by ensuring consistent and high-quality instruction. Intervention Models (Push-in and Pull-out) Push-in Model: This approach involves specialists working with students within their regular classrooms. This model supports ELs by allowing them to stay in the mainstream classroom while receiving additional help, promoting inclusion and providing contextually relevant support. Pull-out Model: This approach involves taking students out of their regular classrooms for specialized instruction. This method is beneficial for intensive, focused instruction on language skills or specific academic areas where students need the most help.	
2.9	**Action:** English learner professional development **Need:** The identified need is additional professional development to teachers. 48.3% of all English Learners district-wide are making progress towards English language proficiency. Only 43.2% English learners at TOCS made progress towards English language proficiency, which is 5.1% less than the overall in the district. Additionally, only 20% of all English Learners were reclassified in the 23-24 school year. This was an identified by educational partner during our	The primary focus is on providing professional development to teachers specifically for the implementation of the ELD standards. This action emphasizes training and model lessons aimed directly at teachers to enhance their ability to integrate ELD standards into all subject areas. The goal is to equip teachers with the skills and knowledge necessary to effectively teach EL students, thereby impacting their academic achievement. English learners often face additional challenges that can impact their academic performance. By providing instructional staff with training and resources to implement ELD standards across all subject areas, the district ensures that English	2.5, 2.6

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	LCAP meetings. Educational partners identified professional developments to support EL as a need. The data shows there is a critical need for additional professional development to teachers specifically focused on the learning needs of EL students, which could help bridge academic gaps and support EL students in achieving better academic performance. Educational partners also expressed that additional professional development would help to enhance learning environments for EL students. **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	learners receive tailored instruction that meets their language acquisition needs. This approach helps in bridging language barriers and enhancing comprehension in all academic subjects. Demonstrating effective teaching strategies through model lessons can improve teachers' ability to deliver ELD content, thereby directly benefiting ELs by ensuring consistent and high-quality instruction. Intervention Models (Push-in and Pull-out) Push-in Model: This approach involves specialists working with students within their regular classrooms. This model supports ELs by allowing them to stay in the mainstream classroom while receiving additional help, promoting inclusion and providing contextually relevant support. Pull-out Model: This approach involves taking students out of their regular classrooms for specialized instruction. This method is beneficial for intensive, focused instruction on language skills or specific academic areas where students need the most help.	

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.

Cucamonga School District (CSD) has strategically utilized additional concentration grant funds to retain librarians, art teachers, and music teachers, ensuring enhanced direct services for unduplicated students across the district. Through the 2025–26 LCAP engagement process, Educational Partners emphasized the ongoing need to maintain and expand access to enrichment and academic support services for Low-Income, English Learners, and Foster Youth.

To increase student literacy for all students, CSD is leveraging these funds to retain librarians at multiple school sites (Goal 2, Action 3). These professionals support student literacy development, provide research and technology guidance, and foster a love of reading—critical components of academic success. In addition, the district has prioritized continued investment in the arts by maintaining Music and Art teachers at each elementary site (Goal 2, Action 11), ensuring students benefit from a well-rounded education that supports cognitive and creative development.

These actions align with the district's broader commitment to equity and whole-child development. By investing in enrichment programs and academic support services, CSD is ensuring that students who face the greatest barriers receive high-quality, engaging learning opportunities that contribute to improved academic outcomes and long-term success.

Cucamonga School District receives the concentration grant add-on and has no comparison schools, as all schools serve student populations with an unduplicated percentage greater than 55%.

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	No comparison schools, therefore, not applicable	No comparison schools, therefore, not applicable
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	No comparison schools, therefore, not applicable	No comparison schools, therefore, not applicable

2026-27 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	$27,494,513.00	7,900,641.00	28.735%	0.000%	28.735%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$29,166,522.00	$5,795,052.00	$544,500.00	$840,726.00	$36,346,800.00	$33,232,919.00	$3,113,881.00

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	Site Parent Community Support	English Learners	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$95,056.00	$489.00	$95,545.00			$0.00	$95,545.00	
1	1.2	Parent/ community communication and participation supports	All	No			All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$534.00	$0.00	$534.00				$534.00	
1	1.3	District/Site website communication support.	All	No			All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$0.00	$24,372.00	$24,372.00				$24,372.00	
1	1.4	Improve Attendance and Chronic Absenteeism	All	No			All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$0.00	$34,800.00	$34,800.00				$34,800.00	
1	1.5	Lower Suspension Rates	All	No			All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$279,735.00	$0.00	$279,735.00				$279,735.00	
2	2.1	Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM) support	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$23,555,751.00	$562,600.00	$19,587,143.00	$4,451,134.00		$80,074.00	$24,118,351.00	
2	2.2	Full day TK/K	English Learners Low Income	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Cucamonga Elementary SchoolLos Amigos Elementary School The Ontario Center	2026-2027 school year	$1,213,231.00	$0.00	$1,213,231.00				$1,213,231.00	
2	2.3	Library Resources	All	No			All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$338,794.00	$137,649.00	$476,443.00				$476,443.00	
2	2.4	Site Tech Support	All	No			All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$496,843.00	$0.00	$496,843.00				$496,843.00	
2	2.5	Extra Instructional Support	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$1,589,983.00	$0.00	$1,545,496.00	$44,487.00			$1,589,983.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
2	2.6	English Learner support and resources	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$1,158,788.00	$18,731.00	$935,037.00			$242,482.00	$1,177,519.00	
2	2.7	Monitor and Support LCAP	All	No			All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$437,112.00	$26,702.00	$463,814.00				$463,814.00	
2	2.8	Ed Tech Support	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$0.00	$581,221.00	$36,721.00		$544,500.00		$581,221.00	
2	2.9	English learner professional development	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$0.00	$6,650.00	$6,650.00				$6,650.00	
2	2.10	Improving Student's achievements in ELA and Math	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$0.00	$122,484.00	$64,328.00	$58,156.00			$122,484.00	
2	2.11	Enrichment Programs support	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$1,105,469.00	$18,682.00	$782,256.00	$341,895.00			$1,124,151.00	
3	3.1	Enrichment Opportunities support	All	No			All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$198,084.00	$490,707.00	$319.00	$688,472.00			$688,791.00	
3	3.2	Health, SEL and Mental wellbeing support	All	No			All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$1,483,724.00	$224,642.00	$979,288.00	$210,908.00		$518,170.00	$1,708,366.00	
3	3.3	School Climate and Safety Custodial Support	All	No			All Schools	2026-2027 school year	$1,279,815.00	$864,152.00	$2,143,967.00				$2,143,967.00	

2026-27 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
$27,494,513.00	7,900,641.00	28.735%	0.000%	28.735%	$24,266,407.00	0.000%	88.259 %	**Total:**	$24,266,407.00
								LEA-wide Total:	$22,111,489.00
								Limited Total:	$941,687.00
								Schoolwide Total:	$1,213,231.00

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
1	1.1	Site Parent Community Support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	All Schools	$95,545.00	
2	2.1	Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM) support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$19,587,143.00	
2	2.2	Full day TK/K	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Cucamonga Elementary School The Ontario Center	$1,213,231.00	
2	2.5	Extra Instructional Support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$1,545,496.00	
2	2.6	English Learner support and resources	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$935,037.00	
2	2.8	Ed Tech Support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$36,721.00	
2	2.9	English learner professional development	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated	English Learners	All Schools	$6,650.00	

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 (%)
				Student Group(s)				
2	**2.10**	Improving Student's achievements in ELA and Math	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$64,328.00	
2	**2.11**	Enrichment Programs support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$782,256.00	

2025-26 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$30,163,702.00	$36,205,872.46

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**	Site Parent Community Support	Yes	$88,488.00	83,852.13
1	**1.2**	Parent/ community communication and participation supports	No	$534.00	336.04
1	**1.3**	District/Site website communication support.	No	$24,987.00	23,386.96
1	**1.4**	Improve Attendance and Chronic Absenteeism	No	$34,800.00	$34,800.00
1	**1.5**	Lower Suspension Rates	No	$217,087.00	$267,929.00
2	**2.1**	Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM) support	Yes	$17,935,709.00	$24,029,699.16
2	**2.2**	Full day TK/K	Yes	$1,445,415.00	$1,189,072.01
2	**2.3**	Library Resources	No	$508,518.00	$491,716.07
2	**2.4**	Site Tech Support	No	$389,018.00	$488,420.00
2	**2.5**	Extra Instructional Support	Yes	$1,508,391.00	$1,544,896.64
2	**2.6**	English Learner support and resources	Yes	$1,056,683.00	$1,192,422.89

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**	Monitor and Support LCAP	No	$388,863.00	$492,401.90
2	**2.8**	Ed Tech Support	Yes	$686,041.00	$607,253.56
2	**2.9**	English learner professional development	Yes	$14,100.00	$5,748.58
2	**2.10**	Improving Student's achievements in ELA and Math	Yes	$114,125.00	$116,162.30
2	**2.11**	Enrichment Programs support	Yes	$949,297.00	$1,096,828.41
3	**3.1**	Enrichment Opportunities support	No	$684,841.00	$667,990.55
3	**3.2**	Health, SEL and Mental wellbeing support	No	$2,116,069.00	$1,824,076.82
3	**3.3**	School Climate and Safety Custodial Support	No	$2,000,736.00	$2,048,879.44

2025-26 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

6. Estimated LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	7. Total Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	8. Total Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)
$7,837,938.00	$19,490,546.00	$24,638,053.52	($5,147,507.52)	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	1.1	Site Parent Community Support	Yes	$86,678.00	$78,375.11		
2	2.1	Personalized Professional Learning Model (PPLM) support	Yes	$14,375,185.00	$19,799,984.68		
2	2.2	Full day TK/K	Yes	$1,445,415.00	$1,189,072.01		
2	2.5	Extra Instructional Support	Yes	$1,508,391.00	$1,544,896.64		
2	2.6	English Learner support and resources	Yes	$911,528.00	$954,279.83		
2	2.8	Ed Tech Support	Yes	$298,141.00	$176,498.90		
2	2.9	English learner professional development	Yes	$14,100.00	$5,748.58		
2	2.10	Improving Student's achievements in ELA and Math	Yes	$114,125.00	$116,162.30		
2	2.11	Enrichment Programs support	Yes	$736,983.00	$773,035.47		

2025-26 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)
$26,995,720.00	$7,837,938.00	0%	29.034%	$24,638,053.52	0.000%	91.267%	$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, Statues 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 2026-27, 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 32627(d), to provide the information identified above or to include actions funded with LREBG funds within the 2026-27, 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 32627(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:

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants

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

Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover — Percentage

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

LCFF Carryover — Dollar

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

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

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

Required Descriptions:

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

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

- As stated above, conclusory statements that a service will help achieve an expected outcome for the goal, without an explicit connection or further explanation as to how, are not sufficient.
- Further, simply stating that an LEA has a high enrollment percentage of a specific student group or groups does not meet the increased or improved services standard because enrolling students is not the same as serving students.

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

Limited Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

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

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

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

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

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

Provide the following descriptions, as applicable to the LEA:

- An LEA that does not receive a concentration grant or the concentration grant add-on must indicate that a response to this prompt is not applicable.

- Identify the goal and action numbers of the actions in the LCAP that the LEA is implementing to meet the requirement to increase the number of staff who provide direct services to students at schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent.

- An LEA that does not have comparison schools from which to describe how it is using the concentration grant add-on funds, such as a single-school LEA or an LEA that only has schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, must describe how it is using the funds to increase the number of credentialed staff, classified staff, or both, including custodial staff, who provide direct services to students at selected schools and the criteria used to determine which schools require additional staffing support.

- In the event that an additional concentration grant add-on is not sufficient to increase staff providing direct services to students at a school with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, the LEA must describe how it is using the funds to retain staff providing direct services to students at a school with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent.

Complete the table as follows:

- Provide the staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students with a concentration of unduplicated students that is 55 percent or less and the staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, as applicable to the LEA.
    - The LEA may group its schools by grade span (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and High Schools), as applicable to the LEA.
    - The staff-to-student ratio must be based on the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff and the number of enrolled students as counted on the first Wednesday in October of each year.
- Provide the staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is 55 percent or less and the staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, as applicable to the LEA.
    - The LEA may group its schools by grade span (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and High Schools), as applicable to the LEA.
    - The staff-to-student ratio must be based on the number of FTE staff and the number of enrolled students as counted on the first Wednesday in October of each year.

Action Tables

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

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

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

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

Total Planned Expenditures Table

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

- **LCAP Year**: Identify the applicable LCAP Year.
- **1. Projected LCFF Base Grant**: Provide the total amount estimated LCFF entitlement for the coming school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant program, the former Home-to-School Transportation program, and the Small School District Transportation program, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). Note that the LCFF Base Grant for purposes of the LCAP also includes the Necessary Small Schools and Economic Recovery Target allowances for school districts, and County Operations Grant for COEs.

  See *EC* sections 2574 (for COEs) and 42238.02 (for school districts and charter schools), as applicable, for LCFF entitlement calculations.
- **2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants:** Provide the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants estimated on the basis of the number and concentration of unduplicated students for the coming school year.
- **3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year:** This percentage will not be entered; it is calculated based on the Projected LCFF Base Grant and the Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). This is the percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the coming LCAP year.
- **LCFF Carryover — Percentage:** Specify the LCFF Carryover — Percentage identified in the LCFF Carryover Table from the prior LCAP year. If a carryover percentage is not identified in the LCFF Carryover Table, specify a percentage of zero (0.00%).
- **Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year:** This percentage will not be entered; it is calculated based on the Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year and the LCFF Carryover —

Percentage. ***This is the percentage by which the LEA must increase or improve services for unduplicated pupils as compared to the services provided to all students in the coming LCAP year.***

- **Goal #**: Enter the LCAP Goal number for the action.
- **Action #**: Enter the action's number as indicated in the LCAP Goal.
- **Action Title**: Provide a title of the action.
- **Student Group(s)**: Indicate the student group or groups who will be the primary beneficiary of the action by entering "All," or by entering a specific student group or groups.
- **Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?:** Type "Yes" if the action **is** included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement; OR, type "No" if the action is **not** included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement.
- If "Yes" is entered into the Contributing column, then complete the following columns:
    - **Scope**: The scope of an action may be LEA-wide (i.e., districtwide, countywide, or charterwide), schoolwide, or limited. An action that is LEA-wide in scope upgrades the entire educational program of the LEA. An action that is schoolwide in scope upgrades the entire educational program of a single school. An action that is limited in its scope is an action that serves only one or more unduplicated student groups.
    - **Unduplicated Student Group(s)**: Regardless of scope, contributing actions serve one or more unduplicated student groups. Indicate one or more unduplicated student groups for whom services are being increased or improved as compared to what all students receive.
    - **Location**: Identify the location where the action will be provided. If the action is provided to all schools within the LEA, the LEA must indicate "All Schools." If the action is provided to specific schools within the LEA or specific grade spans only, the LEA must enter "Specific Schools" or "Specific Grade Spans." Identify the individual school or a subset of schools or grade spans (e.g., all high schools or grades transitional kindergarten through grade five), as appropriate.
- **Time Span**: Enter "ongoing" if the action will be implemented for an indeterminate period of time. Otherwise, indicate the span of time for which the action will be implemented. For example, an LEA might enter "1 Year," or "2 Years," or "6 Months."
- **Total Personnel**: Enter the total amount of personnel expenditures utilized to implement this action.
- **Total Non-Personnel**: This amount will be automatically calculated based on information provided in the Total Personnel column and the Total Funds column.

- **LCFF Funds**: Enter the total amount of LCFF funds utilized to implement this action, if any. LCFF funds include all funds that make up an LEA's total LCFF target (i.e., base grant, grade span adjustment, supplemental grant, concentration grant, Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant, and Home-To-School Transportation).
    - **Note:** For an action to contribute towards meeting the increased or improved services requirement, it must include some measure of LCFF funding. The action may also include funding from other sources, however the extent to which an action contributes to meeting the increased or improved services requirement is based on the LCFF funding being used to implement the action.
- **Other State Funds**: Enter the total amount of Other State Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
    - **Note:** Equity Multiplier funds must be included in the "Other State Funds" category, not in the "LCFF Funds" category. As a reminder, Equity Multiplier funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, funding provided to Equity Multiplier schoolsites for purposes of the LCFF, the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP. This means that Equity Multiplier funds must not be used to replace funding that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement LEA-wide actions identified in the LEA's LCAP or that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement provisions of the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP.
- **Local Funds**: Enter the total amount of Local Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
- **Federal Funds**: Enter the total amount of Federal Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
- **Total Funds**: This amount is automatically calculated based on amounts entered in the previous four columns.
- **Planned Percentage of Improved Services**: For any action identified as contributing, being provided on a Limited basis to unduplicated students, and that does not have funding associated with the action, enter the planned quality improvement anticipated for the action as a percentage rounded to the nearest hundredth (0.00%). A limited action is an action that only serves foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income students.
    - As noted in the instructions for the Increased or Improved Services section, when identifying a Planned Percentage of Improved Services, the LEA must describe the methodology that it used to determine the contribution of the action towards the proportional percentage. The percentage of improved services for an action corresponds to the amount of LCFF funding that the LEA estimates it would expend to implement the action if it were funded.

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Annual Update Table

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

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

- **9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant**: Provide the total amount of estimated LCFF Target Entitlement for the current school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant program,

the former Home-to-School Transportation program, and the Small School District Transportation program, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). Note that the LCFF Base Grant for purposes of the LCAP also includes the Necessary Small Schools and Economic Recovery Target allowances for school districts, and County Operations Grant for COEs. See *EC* sections 2574 (for COEs) and 42238.02 (for school districts and charter schools), as applicable, for LCFF entitlement calculations.

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

Calculations in the Action Tables

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

Contributing Actions Table

- **4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)**
    - This amount is the total of the Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) column.
- **5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services**
    - This percentage is the total of the Planned Percentage of Improved Services column.
- **Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the coming school year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)**
    - This percentage is calculated by dividing the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4) by the Projected LCFF Base Grant (1), converting the quotient to a percentage, and adding it to the Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (5).

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

- **6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and Concentration Grants**

- This is the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants the LEA estimates it will actually receive based on 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