



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
Santa Rosa City Schools	Anna Trunnell Superintendent	atrunnell@srcs.k12.ca.us (707) 890-3800

Plan Summary [2024-25]

General Information

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

Santa Rosa City Schools (SRCS) is focused on ensuring that all students are prepared for college, career, and life. We are located in Sonoma County and are the largest school district in the county, welcoming nearly 14,500 students and employing over 1,600 certificated and classified staff. We serve a diverse community, with students and families that speak 49 languages, although the majority speak English and/or Spanish. We have 24 schools: 9 elementary schools, four middle schools, five comprehensive high schools, one continuation high school, and four dependent charter schools.

Our Mission, Vision, and Priorities comprise the principles that guide our work with students, described as follows:

- Priority 1 - Life Ready Learners
- Priority 2 - Whole Person Focus
- Priority 3 - High-Quality Staff
- Priority 4 - Teaching and Learning Environment and Resources
- Priority 5 - Equity and Excellence
- Priority 6 - Family Engagement and Community Partnerships

Priority 7 - Sustainable Funding

The 23-24 school year marks the opportunity to revise and update these strategic priorities.

The Theory of Action for SRCS, embedded within our Mission, Vision, and Priorities, defines and guides all of our work. We value the whole student and endeavor to send students into the world empowered to find purpose, think critically, embrace diversity, work together, adapt to our changing planet, and live healthy and fulfilling lives. We strive to serve all students by providing equitable access to a transformative educational experience grounded in the assets of our students, staff, and community.

As we work to demonstrate that we value students' individual and cultural wealth, equity and access guide our teaching and learning approaches. SRCS engages in initiatives such as Ethnic Studies and foundational literacy skills programs. These provide staff opportunities to learn strategies to explicitly teach students reading skills that serve all students. This is especially important as we work to serve our nearly 3,152 Multilingual Learners and 7,214 Ever English Learners districtwide, recognizing the cultural and linguistic wealth they bring to the community. When our students reach high school, they have a variety of learning opportunities, including work-based learning, 18 Career Technical Education programs, and four Specialized Programs: Early College Magnet, University Center, ArtQuest, and International Baccalaureate.

Given our focus on the whole student, we understand that learning readiness begins with healthy students and families. To that end, we partner with community organizations to provide extra-curricular services such as parent education, mental health services, counseling, and restorative services. Our district has significantly expanded our school-based mental health services at each campus. Our Integrated Wellness approach also supports families who cannot access vital mental health services. Over the last several years and in our efforts to serve the whole student and family, we have also worked across the district and community to create a Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS) that has become foundational to how we support our students and families and their varying needs.

As part of SRCS' mission to focus on the whole student, creating equitable opportunities for our diverse learning community is a matter of importance. The development of new alternative education programs and schools is seen as an area of need. Through the input of various stakeholder groups, SRCS developed and recommended further alternative options for a student body population with diverse learning needs and desires. Areas of need that can be addressed through alternative education include but are not limited to academic readiness, school culture and climate, and student engagement.

In the 2022-2023 school year, Santa Rosa City Schools experienced a spike in incidents related to behavior and a tragic incident resulting in loss of life. During the stakeholder engagement process, a consistent theme arose, asking for more attention to be placed on the culture and climate of school sites. This priority can be viewed through continued stakeholder engagement in the Safety Advisory Roundtable as well as prioritization of safety in community and climate surveys during the 23-24 school year.

More specifically, stakeholder respondents regularly expressed the need to increase focus on safety and security and behavioral support for students. As a result, the 23-24 LCAP was revised to increase restorative specialists to provide 1.0 staff at each elementary and middle school and 2.0 staff at each high school. This work also increased campus supervision of safety-related personnel.

SRCS engaged its students in CAASPP testing for ELA, Math, and Science this academic year, showing a gain overall in the district in both English Language Arts (ELA) and Math. From the 2021/22 school year to the 2022/23 school year, the overall district gain for ELA was 1.82% (from 30.48% to 32.30%) and for Math was 2.23% (from 22.37% to 24.60%).

Efforts to work with schools that qualified for differentiated assistance over the past few years have paid off. In the coming 2024-25 school year:

9 schools exited Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) status

4 schools remained out of ATSI/Comprehensive School Improvement (CSI) status

6 schools showed no change/remained in ATSI status

2 schools remain in CSI status

2 new schools became CSI-eligible

1 school exited CSI.

SRCS plans to continue to engage our staff in quality professional development and peer collaboration, with a focus on academic areas of greatest need. This includes providing two professional development days district wide, in which staff can work on building up global skills and approaches while also utilizing site based planning and collaboration. Overall, SRCS is committed to ongoing professional learning for adults so they can more effectively address student learning and the areas for greatest improvement.

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

The collaborative nature of the LCAP review and reflection process allows our community to recognize and celebrate both new and continuing initiatives, as well as everyone who contributed to these successes.

In the area of English Language Arts for the 2022-23 Dashboard, all schools, with the exception of SRHS, SLES, and SRMS, made growth on state and local assessments. Through the continued focus on early literacy and the science of reading, students received targeted instruction to meet their individual needs, demonstrating growth. Sites were provided support by teachers on special assignments (TOSAs) at the elementary level, along with offering training for middle and high school staff focusing on literacy strategies.

In the category of socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils for the 2022-23 Dashboard, students with disabilities that did not meet expected standards in ELA and were eligible for differentiated assistance for SRCS as a whole and at EAHS, SRHS, BHES, PTES, HSMS, and RVMS. In response, the district continued its focus on early literacy, and the science of reading was central to the work in elementary schools this year. Those trained included district administration, site and district TOSAs, and classroom teachers.

Literacy Focus

As a result of ongoing training in the Orton Gillingham (OG) approach for structured literacy strategies, staff began including the methodology in their teaching practice focusing on differentiation by providing small group instruction tailored to the unique needs of each student.

Recognizing the importance of unifying our practice for all students, staff advocated for a separate stand alone curriculum to better address these needs. As a result, we launched a pilot curriculum initiative this academic year, with plans for full adoption and implementation in the upcoming academic year to align our practices on how to teach reading following the Science of Reading. Using the Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA) to partner with staff demonstrating lessons in the area of reading, being elbow partners with classroom teachers to plan and implement lessons inside their classroom and using the method of slow release provided the support needed to be able to differentiate inside their classrooms based on student need.

District and site leadership in partnership with TOSAs, led and facilitated the Walk to Read model at elementary sites. Students were assessed with a baseline phonics screener to determine reading skill level and then grouped for differentiation. TOSAs collaborated with teachers to provide just right reading instruction focusing on foundational skills, vocabulary, and comprehension to small groups of students, including foster and homeless youth, English learners, and newcomers.

Beginning and Middle of the Year phonics screener data for 2nd grade students shows that students made growth in most sub groups of reading instruction. By the end of second grade the aim is for students to have mastered the skills needed to read multisyllabic words. The end of the year phonics screener data will be collected in May.

Understanding the importance of providing teachers and students with a structured framework, we are diligently working to establish a clear scope and sequence. This ensures that both educators and learners have a cohesive pathway for instruction and skill development.

Literacy Secondary

Careful study and review of the English Language Arts (ELA) scores on the California School Dashboard, along with various local data points, reveals a need for continued study, reflection, and action in our secondary schools (grades 7-12). In summary, the most recent test score data from 2022-2023 indicated that 38.7% of All Students in the district met or exceeded the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment in English Language Arts. Assessment results for All Students (met or exceeded standards) by grade level are shown below:

Grade 7: 29.9%

Grade 8: 29.1%

Grade 11: 48.1%

Additionally, analysis of the percentage of students at Above Standard on the 4 literacy domains (Reading, Writing, Listening, and Research/Inquiry - all making up an individual's total ELA score) for All Students by grade level shows the following:

Reading

Grade 7: 11.0%

Grade 8: 11.1%

Grade 11: 22.0%

Writing

Grade 7: 10.5%

Grade 8: 9.9%

Grade 11: 22.0%

Listening

Grade 7: 9.9%

Grade 8: 11.2%

Grade 11: 13.5%

Research/Inquiry

Grade 7: 11.5%

Grade 8: 11.1%

Grade 11: 19.4%

Note: Scaling for these domain sub-scores groups student results into 3 categories: Above Standard, Near Standard, and Below Standard. Summarizing the major observations from this chart (available via this CDE link), we conclude that: 1) there is a pronounced and pervasive dip in all 4 domains in middle years (grades 7 & 8); 2) there is a moderate rebound from this dip by 11th grade; 3) generally speaking, while Above Standard percentages are low for all grades, a relative strength for is the Reading domain; and finally 4) the lowest Above Standard percentage for all grades is in the Listening domain.

Drilling down further into the dataset helps us to analyze the grade level results for important student groups in our district, including our 1) Special Education students (SPED), 2) Hispanic student populations, and 3) Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students (SED). The percentage of students who met or exceeded the ELA standard scores for these target populations are highlighted below (for additional details, please click the CDE links):

SPED Students:

Grade 7: 2.8%

Grade 8: 4.7%

Grade 11: 15.4%

Hispanic Students:

Grade 7: 18.4%

Grade 8: 15.7%

Grade 11: 34.9%

SED Students:

Grade 7: 18.7%

Grade 8: 17.8%

Grade 11: 36.9%

A review of these state-wide standardized assessment results for ELA (for all students and by target groups), together with the district's internal formative ELA metrics taken during the 23-24 SY, underscores the need for continued investment in our curricular and pedagogical practices. We remain cautiously optimistic going forward that nascent reforms (including a return to student-centered approaches, the formalization of instructional rounds at sites, an emphasis on Tier 1 interventions within classrooms, and continued development and build-out of our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)), together with an emphasis on Science of Reading (phonics based) approaches and curricular materials, will work to strengthen the ELA scores and support all our students.

Math Focus

At the elementary level, in addition to the Math Mindset and Authentic Communication professional development, teachers continued to be supported through twice-yearly grade-level release days. At these sessions, district office staff prioritized mathematics on the meeting agendas, focusing on supporting positive math mindsets in our students through the use of low-floor/high-ceiling math tasks, inviting warm-ups, math games, and group work, including visuals and multiple pathways to solving problems. Teachers engaged in reading of math research, including Jo Boaler's "Fluency Without Fear," as well as group tasks on mapping of multiplication, providing a visual representation of the pathway to understanding multiplication from TK-6th grade. These sessions focused on modeling and use of the strategies for classroom instruction. Elementary administrators and teachers on special assignments worked with Jo Boaler's "Math Mindsets" to begin correlating our adopted math curriculum, Everyday Math, with big ideas. See example below:

Math Redesign

SRCS saw increases in mathematics performance (+5.5 pts) as measured by the distance from the standard for all student groups (African American, English Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, American Indian, Foster, Hispanic, Current English Learners, English Only, Asian, White, and Two+ Races). There was, however, a slight decline in performance for recently reclassified English Learners and for Homeless youth. The overall percent of students proficient in math remained at 24% compared to the previous year, with a slight increase for Elementary of 1.69% and a slight decrease in the High School District of 1.93%. 15 out of 24 schools showed an increase in the percentage of proficient students on the CAASPP Math test as compared to the previous year. Additional metrics were used to measure baseline student identity and growth mindset through student survey data along with teacher survey and observational data on implementation processes along with teacher-identified high-leverage supports and needs. Qualitative data generated from surveys were used to support teacher professional learning. Increased opportunities for teacher collaboration, expanded professional learning to 1st- 12th grades across all schools, and increased support to math leaders across all schools and TOSAs is being provided in the 2023-24 school year as a result. Additionally, professional learning now includes a direct focus on strategies for Building Thinking Classrooms as they are aligned with Dr. Boaler's strategies for a growth mindset and the launch of the new California Math Framework.

Multilingual Services

According to the California School Dashboard, 43.3% of Multilingual learners during 2022-2023 made academic progress, but there was a decrease of 2% compared to the previous CAASPP data that was reported. Multilingual services have expanded, increasing the number of positions supporting school sites in delivering effective instruction through differentiation and scaffolding from three districtwide positions to six. Additionally, support is provided through LCAP Counselors, an English Learner TOSA, and a Dual Language Immersion TOSA districtwide. Before the increase in support personnel to the school sites Brook Hill Elementary School saw a significant improvement of 10 points or more in academic performance in the CAASPP for their Multilingual learners compared to the previous school year. Luther Burbank also showed an increase in their Multilingual learners' performance levels on the CAASPP. Several other schools also demonstrated increased student performance; others maintained or experienced declines. Efforts have been concentrated on monthly Multilingual Learner collaboratives, where elementary and secondary staff collaborate on best first instructional strategies and activities to enhance student academic performance. Furthermore, strategic professional development opportunities are continually offered for staff to support the educational success of all Multilingual learners.

Suspensions

Annual suspensions increased by 3% from 2021-22 to the 2022-23 school year, with 8.2% of students earning at least 1 suspension as measured by the California Academic Dashboard. Of our 13 statistical subgroups, nine are in the red (African American, (12.3%) American Indian (14.5%), English Learners (8.8%), Foster Youth (15.9%), Hispanic (9.4%), Homeless (13.4%), Pacific Islander (15.5%), Economically Disadvantaged (9.9%), and Students with Disabilities (11.9%)), and four are in orange (Asian (2.7%), Filipino (5.8%), Two or More Races (7.2%), and White (6.2%)). In order to address this area of need, SRCS increased supervision staffing at all middle and high school campuses to include the new implementation of 1.0 FTE of campus supervisors at each middle school and increased FTE for campus supervisors to reach 4.0 FTE and increased the restorative specialist staffing to include 1.0 FTE at all SRCS elementary and middle schools, and 2.0 FTE at each of the five high schools. Increased training for administrators has addressed culturally responsive and restorative practices, updated understanding of changes in the California Education Codes, and calibration of practices across campuses.

Absenteeism

Chronic absenteeism declined by 4.1% from 2021-22 to 2022-23, totaling 35.6% of the SRCS student population being deemed chronically absent. Two of our subgroups are in the red: African American (37%) and Pacific Islander (41%). Five of our subgroups are in Orange: American Indian (63%), Asian (19.7%), Foster Youth (44.9%), Homeless (63.6%) and White (28%). Six of our subgroups are in Yellow, with English Learners (40.9%), Filipino (19.5%), Hispanic (39%), Two or More Races (31%), Socially Economically Disadvantaged (41.3%), and Students with Disabilities (46.2%). To address student engagement, SRCS is exploring various alternative education models with the involvement of various stakeholder groups. As a goal, SRCS wants to implement further possible alternative education options with a variety of learning atmospheres. Part of the intent of new programs is to increase engagement from students who have disengaged from traditional school models. To lead and supervise this work and future implementation, SRCS has added the position of Coordinator of Alternative Education and launched an Alternative Education Committee to develop recommendations for the board of education in Spring 2024.

Graduation Rate

The graduation rate improved by 2.20% over a two-year period from 2020-21 to 2022-23, totaling 82.7% of the SRCS student population as graduated. SRCS continues to see lower graduation rates for its Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, English Learners, and Socioeconomically disadvantaged populations. Graduation rates for many of those groups are in the 70% percent range, with English Learners specifically graduating at a much lower rate, in the 60%percent range over the last two years. The larger difference in graduation rates between all students and English learners is also seen in the significant over-identification of English learners for special education services as well as in SRCS, and this indicates a deeper challenge for educators in responding to language learners in general. Educators will need to enhance, refine, and implement stronger integrated and differentiated ELD in classrooms at the Tier 1 instructional level to change the trajectories of these outcomes. SRCS is dedicated to meeting the variety of needs of the diverse student populations. SRCS will continue to refine and deepen its academic systems and is dedicated to a renewed Tier 1 instruction focus, especially in regards to English Learners through both culturally relevant and sustaining pedagogy coupled with better differentiated and integrated ELD. SRCS will also work to begin increasing a variety of alternative offerings for students struggling with Tier 1 classroom learning so they can reach graduation successfully. The plan is to focus these efforts at the middle school level, re-engaging students who would otherwise slowly fade into non-graduation status in high school. The intent is to help middle school students disengaging from education to become more successful and prepared for high school so they see better outcomes by 12th grade. The creation and development of new alternative pathways to graduation will, in-turn, further increase student engagement and allow for equitable opportunities for all, increasing the graduation rate of the district. The percentage of graduating students meeting A-G increased 7.1% over 1 year and 19.6% over two years. The percentage of students meeting A-G increased from 14.2% to 33.8% from 2020-21 to 2022-23. Increases are consistent across most student groups, including increases from 2021-22 to 2022-23 for most student groups: African American 2.8% increase; Latino 4% increase, Socioeconomically disadvantaged 3.5% increase, and English Learners 3% increase; and Asian 24.4% increase. Additional work needs to be done to increase overall A-G success as well as to increase the success of targeted student groups such as Black, Latino, English Learners, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students that still have significantly lower A-G rates.

College and Career

Per the state dashboard, 27.3% of students were considered prepared, with English Learners, Foster Youth, Homeless, and Students with Disabilities having the lowest performance level. The Twelve Elements of a High-Quality CTE Program is utilized to identify areas of strength and growth needed for Career Technical Education (CTE) programs. Two new CTE Programs were implemented this school year, with two more being developed to implement at the start of the next school year. Four additional articulation agreements were established with the Santa Rosa Junior College (SRJC), which provides students in a CTE Program the opportunity to earn early college credit through a Credit By Exam process. A College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Grant was secured to support the development of CCAP agreements with the SRJC to support the development of dual enrollment opportunities for students. Professional development to support Work-based Learning as an instructional strategy was held for all CTE teachers, and funding also supported CTE TOSAs' participation in a WBL Community of Practice. A Women in Construction Camp was offered last year, with fifteen students completing the camp and earning an industry certification. A district-wide Career Day for over 900 8th-grade students was held in the Spring. According to the Race to Submit Dashboard, last year 60% of Santa Rosa City Schools students submitted a FAFSA/CA Dream Act Application, which is a 13% increase from the prior year (California Student Aid Commission, June 2023).

In regards to Advanced Placement (AP) courses for College and Career Readiness, enrollment has stayed fairly steady while passing rates with a 3 or higher on the AP exams have increased. Enrollment in AP courses went from a baseline of about 1,025 students enrolled in AP Courses to a number of 1,062 enrolled in the 2023-2024 school year. The intent was to increase student access to a broad course of study that was A-G aligned so that students would see academic increases and more students would access AP Courses. The enrollment has not gone up in AP Courses as much as was hoped, only seeing about a 1-2% increase overall. On the other hand, for those students enrolled in AP Courses and choosing to take the exams, SRCS has seen student performance at the 3 level or higher increasing from a baseline of about 58% of students to about 68% of students passing with a 3 or higher, which exceeds the goal established in the baseline year.

For A-G completion, SRCS moved up to having 33.80% of the graduating seniors meeting A-G completion with the Class of 2023. This was about an 8% increase from the baseline percentage but less than the 15% SRCS set itself as a target. Movement in the right direction is occurring, and programmatic implementation is supporting students in the growth of this metric. Moving forward, SRCS will need to continue its focus on the key areas of literacy, multilingual learners, Ethnic Studies implementation, CTE and integrated programmatic growth, mathematics improvement, and aligned MTSS Tier 1 approaches and strategies.

The CA State Seal of Biliteracy has been a celebrated accomplishment for students in our district, serving as a recognition of students' linguistic assets. Post-COVID-19, the achievement level requirements for "standard met" on the SBAC were waived, offering many students the opportunity to obtain this recognition. However, in the 22-23 school year, the "standard met" requirement for the English Language Arts portion of the assessment was reinstated, leading to a decrease in recipients. For the 2023-2024 school year, 239 students have been identified as candidates to receive this recognition.

The increase of alternative educational opportunities will create further opportunities for students to graduate on time, can increase involvement in dual enrollment programs as well as advanced courses, and can engage students who are previously disconnected from their school settings. These changes can lead to higher levels of success on standardized tests, more involvement in CTE pathways and completion of them, and higher graduation rates. SRCS' commitment to exploring and implementing new alternative education opportunities can help support further success in the area of college and career readiness.

Elementary teachers continue to implement FOSS Next Generation Science along with the use of Mystery Science as a supplemental resource to support hands-on, engaging instruction for students.

Advanced Learner Program and Services (ALPS)

The district offered opportunities for staff to attend professional development focusing on advanced learners.

In fall of 2023, the district was able to identify students through the use of SBAC scores. In the spring of 2024, using the Raven, the district TOSA and site based TOSA's continued to test 3rd graders as well as any students new to our district. Families of newly identified students were notified and a parent night was held.

We continued the ALPS Advisory Committee meetings during the year during which we continued reviewing the description and made revisions and renamed the plan the "Advanced Learner Identification Plan." In addition to the Advisory Committee meetings, we held a parent education night focused on recognizing and supporting the unique social-emotional needs of Advanced Learners and two night time events for students and families..

For Tier 1 SEL Elementary, counselors continued with Toolbox lessons for their students, supplementing with Kimochis for learning the feeling words. Elementary counselors log all contacts into Aeries and work with Elementary principals on their Tier II teams to facilitate Tier II and Tier III interventions. They also consult with SBTs and school psychologists with regard to social/emotional counseling and support. Middle School Counselors had Why Try? Curriculum, suited for middle school classroom guidance and assemblies, intended to develop social-emotional skills and to prevent the need for more intensive support, like referrals to the Tier 2 team for small groups or 1:1 support or Tier 3 referrals to school-based therapists. This school year, the MTSS Intervention Counselor position expanded to include a shared MTSS Intervention Counselor position at the middle school level to provide early targeted support and interventions for identified students. One middle school MTSS Intervention Counselor position, was filled mid-year, and the second one is still vacant.

Secondary Programs

Efforts continued to focus on providing engaging opportunities for secondary students to complete graduation requirements outside of the normal school day. While virtual credit recovery and repetition of failed courses continue to be an option during the school day, this action item has been strategically used to provide schools with in-person credit recovery courses after school. Programs were designed in collaboration with high school teams and implemented based on student scheduling and academic needs. Flexible scheduling and localized programs were identified as key components of these classes. As a result, each school site that offered these courses did so with its own unique factors. These courses not only served the graduation needs of our students but also engaged our own SRCS teachers and did not require any outsourcing of the instructional work. The hiring of SRCS teachers to facilitate learning with our students helps to ensure the continuity of the curriculum. During the 2023/2024 school year, the expenditures for these programs exceeded the budgeted amount due to student needs and the number of schools offering courses. During the Spring of 2024, over 350 students and 16 teachers were involved in these programs across 3 high school sites.

Expanded Learning Opportunities Programs

The Expanded Learning Opportunity grant monies have resulted in significant increases in direct services and support for students. Specifically, the district has been able to expand offerings to our afterschool and summer school programs to address students' academic and social development. As a result of the supplemental funding, over the last 3-year period, the district has witnessed a 2x expansion in the number of students participating in afterschool programs (from 740 to 1565 students, representing ~112% increase). Additionally, the district has also been able to increase the number of sites with daily afterschool programming (from 8 to 12 in the same 3-year time period).

Importantly, as part of the expansion, the district has been able to strengthen the strategic alignment of these supports together with the goals and objectives described in the LCAP. In this regard, together with the interventions and supports described, and in conjunction with our teachers and partners, the increased services have helped to address the academic needs of our students and those of our broader community.

And finally, we have been able to grow out our summer school programs. In the past three year period, the district increased total student summer school enrollment by ~55% (from 1646 in 2020 to 2554 in 2023). In Summer, 2024 the district is tentatively scheduled to offer 15 unique programs, and has an enrollment target of 3000 students. We're keen to continue to build out and grow opportunities for our students and families!

Baseline Data (from CDE DataQuest - 5.14.2024)

Graduation Rate: All (82.7%), Hispanic (77.8%), SPED (63.6%), SED (79.4%)
CAASSP English: All (-53.8 points), Hispanic (-85.2 points), SPED (-149 points), SED (-81.1 points)
CAASSP Math: All (-102.6 points), Hispanic (-131.4 points), SPED (-186.1 points), SED (-127.1 points)
CAASSP Science: All grades (18%); 5th grade (21%), 8th grade (12%), 11th grade (25%)
Chronic absenteeism: All (35.6%), Hispanic (39.4%), SPED (46.2%), SED (41.3%)
English Learner progress: All (43.3%).

Social-Emotional Wellness

The 23-24 school year continued to prioritize social-emotional support for students, staff, and our community. Schools administered the Panorama wellness survey in October of 2023, and the survey collected wellness information from 82% of all K-3 students and 72% of all students grades 4-12. In the K-3 survey, topics such as Supportive Relationships, Classroom Effort, and Self-efficacy showed no change; Positive Feelings and Challenging Feelings demonstrated a small drop since the Fall 2022 survey administration. In the 4-12 survey, four topic areas showed incremental improvement: Supportive Relationships, Positive Feelings, Challenging Feelings, and Self Efficacy. Only the area of Classroom Effort showed a small decline of 2 points from the Fall 2022 survey. This information was released in November 2023, and sites have been using this information both to search and serve individual students as well as to guide site decision-making.

In the Social-Emotional realm we continued with administration of the Panorama Survey. The Panorama staff survey was administered for a second year, with 47% of SRCS staff participating. In this survey, staff identified areas of incremental improvement in the areas of Classroom Effort, Challenging Feelings, and Self Efficacy, with Self Efficacy showing the greatest improvement of 5 points since the Spring 2023 survey implementation.

SRCS plans an additional Spring 2024 survey for schools. The goal will be to improve our Spring survey response rates, as the survey participation in Spring of 2023 was markedly lower than our fall participation.

The Panorama Playbook offered activities tailored to data, as well as Wayfinder activities for grades 7-12. Wayfinder offers both SEL curriculum as well as a Purposeful Leadership program. Maria Carillo High School uses the Wayfinder Purposeful Leadership program for their freshman Global Perspectives program. Wayfinder professional development was offered in November, 2023. Due to usage statistics, only the Wayfinder Purposeful Leadership program will be continued.

MTSS Counselors utilize Panorama data to provide targeted support and interventions for identified students.

Social Emotional Learning

For Tier 1 SEL Elementary, counselors continued with Toolbox lessons for their students, supplementing with Kimochis for learning the feeling words. Elementary counselors log all contacts into Aeries and work with Elementary principals on their Tier II teams to facilitate Tier II and Tier III interventions following the MTSS models. They also consult with SBTs and school psychologists with regard to social/emotional counseling and support. Middle School Counselors had Why Try? Curriculum, suited for middle school classroom guidance and assemblies, intended to develop social-emotional skills and to prevent the need for more intensive support, like referrals to the Tier 2 team for small groups or 1:1 support or Tier 3 referrals to school-based therapists.

Middle School Counselors had Why Try? Curriculum, suited for middle school classroom guidance and assemblies, intended to develop social emotional skills and to prevent the need for more intensive support: like referrals to the Tier 2 team for small group or 1:1 support, or Tier 3 referrals to school based therapists.

Restorative Practices

In connection with stakeholder priorities as expressed through Panorama wellness and Youth Truth climate surveys, as well as stakeholder participation in the Safety Advisory Round Table, there is a continued focus on the need and benefit of connection and community building through restorative practices. In the January 2022 administration of the Youth Truth survey, 54% of high school students and 51% of middle school students reported a decline in feeling safe at school. High school survey responses dropped from 54% percent positive to 48% percent positive, and middle school survey responses dropped from 51% percent positive to 45% percent positive. In addition, in the Panorama Survey, SRCS saw a steady response to the question about having supportive relationships at school and at home, with 86% of students reporting a positive result. However, when compared against other schools participating in the Panorama survey, this result puts SRCS at 30% nationally. In response to this data, School staffing was increased for the 23-24 school year, with one full-time restorative specialist hired at each elementary and middle school, and two full-time restorative specialists hired at each high school. During the 2023-24 school year, a commitment began to active data collection of restorative interventions, both proactive and responsive. This new data collection process creates a baseline to be used for program monitoring. Restorative Specialists continue to support the proactive and responsive parts of the Restorative Process, K-12.

A Restorative Practices refresher for Assistant Principals took place in June 2023. All administrators were invited and additional training is scheduled for all administration, using the scheduled 2023-24 Emergency Days. Onboarding Training was offered to all new restorative specialists, and refreshers for existing restorative specialists during the 23-24 school year. Additionally, employees are offered restorative

solutions to staff conflicts when staff are willing to participate. Restorative community resources are shared with all sites to participate in Tier 2 and Tier 3 conferencing.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

SRCS has scaled up its Ethnic Studies programmatic implementation to the point where it currently offers 11 different courses to about 1,800 students. The limited journal and peer-reviewed studies about Ethnic Studies suggest that a robust programmatic implementation of Ethnic Studies will result in higher core academic achievement, better attendance, and more positive behaviors. Overall, ELA and mathematics have shown slight increases in the 2023 student CAASPP metrics, though the College and Career Readiness indicators have remained the same from the previous year. While quantitative academic metrics do not show large growth, SRCS also facilitates yearly focus groups, surveys, and individual interviews with students to gather qualitative feedback about Ethnic Studies in SRCS. In this qualitative information, students report being more engaged in school, attending more regularly, and having learning experiences they have never had before that they want more of. The qualitative data is unequivocal, and shows clearly, that student learning is greatly enhanced by a quality Ethnic Studies program in SRCS.

Furthermore, Ethnic Studies is a SRCS graduation requirement starting with the class of 2025. Thus, the scale up, professional development, and course creation needed to properly serve students so they have enough courses and opportunities to meet the graduation requirement mandates continued actions and monies directed to supporting programmatic implementation on a large scale.

Dual Immersion Programs at CCLA and EAHS

There has been a lot of collaborative work with regard to this action. This action supports the specific needs of this school site by supporting a seven period day to ensure students have access to elective courses. The Dual Language Immersion pathway began in the 2023-2024 school year with a small number of students, which will incrementally increase yearly, with students participating in the expansion of the Spanish Dual Immersion program at the high school level. A DLI TOSA position has been focusing on bridging the needs of students, staff, and families to support the programmatic success of this program. There has been intentional work on the revision and addition of Career Technical Education offerings to include Public and Community Health and Educational pathways for students to have a variety of college and career choices for all students.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

Differentiated Assistance (DA) or Direct technical assistance (DTA) provided over the past three years in order to help Santa Rosa City Schools (SRCS) address underlying causes that lead to low student outcomes while strengthening and the evaluation of effective strategies and programs (and adjustment, if necessary) has been critical in the work underway regarding Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), and other district-wide initiatives to increase student achievement.

Data over the past two years which qualifies the district for DA/DTA shows that pupil achievement is very low in both English Language Arts (ELA) and Math, while pupil engagement/chronic absenteeism and suspensions (School Climate) is very high, for the following students:

- English Learners
- Students with Disabilities
- African American
- American Indian
- Foster Youth
- Hispanic
- Homeless Youth
- Pacific Islander
- Socio-economically Disadvantaged

SRCS has met standards for

- The Basics: Teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities
- Implementation of Academic Standards
- Parent and Family Engagement
- Local Climate Survey
- Access to a Broad Course of Study

And recent efforts in supporting Foster Youth have resulted in an increased graduation rate of 7% from 2022 (59%) to 2023 (65%).

SRCS engaged its students in CAASPP testing for ELA, Math, and Science this academic year, showing a gain overall in the district in both English Language Arts (ELA) and Math. From the 2021/22 school year to the 2022/23 school year, the overall district gain for ELA was 1.82% (from 30.48% to 32.30%) and for Math was 2.23% (from 22.37% to 24.60%).

Efforts to work with schools who qualified for differentiated assistance over the past few years have paid off. In the coming 2024-25 school year:

- 9 schools exited Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) status
- 4 schools remained out of ATSI/Comprehensive School Improvement (CSI) status
- 6 schools showed no change/remained in ATSI status
- 2 schools remain in CSI status
- 2 new schools became CSI-eligible
- 1 school exited CSI.

The Sonoma County Office of Education (SCOE) has provided DA thru technical assistance over the past three years in a variety of ways:

- Countywide Collaboration for Continuous Improvement Teams met quarterly at SCOE
- On-site Customized Collaboration and Support focusing on systems development and implementation
- Access to SCOE Professional Development

In the 2022-23 school year, SCOE provided a fully-funded Math Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) for the district and provided support by working with continuous improvement teams to determine root cause analysis and other professional development regarding the CA Dashboard, LCAP, etc.

In the 2023-24 school year, SCOE continued funding of the Math TOSA from the previous year and also provided funding for an alternative education coordinator. This Coordinator was hired in January 2024 after posting from the previous year and is working with district leadership and the Board to determine viable options for alternative education.

Recommendations from SCOE moving forward include the continuation of continuous improvement teams that have representatives from district and site leadership, classified and certificated, as well as staff who work directly with Homeless and Foster Youth and Students with Disabilities.

Other SRCS district-wide work related to technical assistance includes:

The continuation of identifying best practices of Tier I instructional practices for all students that provide the most impact, leverage, and readiness and are shared with principals for site implementation.

The implementation of a-g aligned Common Core throughout the district to provide an array of courses, to increase equity and access, and to allow for more options in college and career next steps.

The continuation of a Collaborative Curriculum Design (CCD) team of grade-level teacher cohorts, TOSAs, and district leadership that revises and updates coursework with current, relevant resources and pedagogy. Designated ELD work has focused on 1) formative and summative assessment, 2) differentiation strategies and tools; 3) culturally affirming and responsive literature and texts; and 4) expanding showcase options.

Continuation of staff training in Orton Gillingham (OG) approach for structured literacy strategies to build strong language and literacy skills and access to all academic content areas. In the 2022-23 school year, 3 additional cohorts of staff were trained, and teachers found these practices worked very well with their students. Through the 22-23 school year, additional cohorts were trained with 73 teachers, TOSAs, Reading Teachers, District Administrators, and EL Specialists. The first cohort of teachers who attended the full OG training attended a follow-up training in morphology.

Continuation of Language Essentials for Teacher of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) training, Year 2, for Elementary TOSAs, EL Specialists, the district English Learner TOSA, and Migrant Ed TOSA.

Continued work to integrate the teaching and learning of foundational literacy skills through a structured literacy approach into broader ELA curriculum (e.g., CCD, Wonders, Lucy Calkins Writing); the district understands the need to identify an appropriate scope & sequence so that teachers and students have a clear pathway for teaching and learning. We also recognize the need to identify, document, and teach the unique literacy skills needed for success in other content areas, such as mathematics, history/social science, science, and visual/performing arts.

A continued focus on supporting core content teachers with Integrated ELD strategies to support EL students through strategies that will increase students' oral and written language across content.

Monthly Multilingual Learner collaborative meetings that encourage staff to review learning modules and strategies to support ELs.

In regards to English Language Development (ELD), the 2022 CA Dashboard results for ELs (the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)) showed 46.3% of students making progress toward English language proficiency. 19.4% of students showed a decrease of at least one level in the ELPI, and 34.3% percent maintained their most recent ELPI level. The district has begun to make efforts to monitor both English learners and RFEP students to identify supports and interventions and an increase in professional development for Integrated and

Designated English Language Development. The purchase of ELlevation software has made such monitoring more accessible. School sites regularly meet in Language Acceleration Review Committee meetings to work with ELs in data analysis and identification of professional development needs. Ongoing support from English Learner Specialists, SOLL Counselors, and EL TOSAs through the site, grade level, and monthly collaborative meetings help to identify and provide targeted support needed.

Professional development around Specialized Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies has been initiated and continues to happen throughout the 2023-24 school year for elementary and secondary cohorts.

Continuation of Language Acceleration Review Committees (LARC) at each site to meet regularly with the purpose of analyzing student data and determining a student's readiness for the reclassification process or to make decisions about student supports needed to help accelerate language proficiency.

Supporting Newcomer students through the leadership of the Multilingual Services and State and Federal Programs departments via a new Newcomer Center at a local high school, parent engagement via parent attendance to conferences, Newcomer Summer School, etc.

The adoption of high-quality curricula Everyday Mathematics 4th Edition (KA-5) and College Preparatory Math (6) that provides teachers with curricular tools aligned to the California State Standards and addresses data in the 2022 CA Dashboard showing a "very low" status for several subgroups.

District-funded TOSA teams that focus on best mathematical practices to support classroom instruction, including continuing work around mathematical mindset in the primary grades as a continuation of the training and collaboration offered with Dr. Jo Boaler in previous years.

Continued professional learning that focuses on math and continues the work with Dr. Boaler and Cathy Williams on restructuring learning opportunities for students in a manner that supports a growth mindset and positive math identity in students. Such training supports teachers through course-alike Math Cohorts emphasizing instructional strategies that connect math concepts along big ideas, assessment for learning, relevant, rich math tasks that provide increased access to students in heterogeneous classrooms, strategies that promote multidimensional learning, complex instruction strategies to promote cooperative learning, math competence, and study team strategies to promote increased discourse and access to math concepts. We are providing additional professional learning and support to teachers in utilizing their adopted text along with worthwhile math tasks to better support their students with learning math concepts through the Educator Effectiveness Grant. Expanded intervention and support will be provided to students across sites through the use of the A-G Grant. The district uses the A-G Completion Grant to provide extra FTE to each high school so they can provide math intervention for students missing credits, struggling in mathematics overall, or having to repeat courses.

The expansion of math pathways and course offerings, such as AP Precalculus alongside AP Statistics and AP Calculus.

Continued services via the district-paid Math TOSA will continue to help support the focus on mathematics data, instructional practices, lesson development and collaboration that will help us best serve our students through their mathematical journey in SRCS.

Build upon the the work done with NGSS and the secondary Science textbook adoption and curriculum work done in previous years to develop greater coherence through collaborative planning using West Ed's 5 Characteristics for designing evidence based NGSS aligned science experiences for students along with systems of assessment for measuring multidimensional science learning. Additionally,

Professional Learning options were provided specific to strategies to better support emergent bilingual students in the science classroom.

Continuation of the 3Rs curriculum that was piloted as part of the state-required California Healthy Youth Act (CHYA), as well as continued collaborative efforts with community partners such as Kaiser Health and Positive Images to support implementation efforts specific to CHYA compliance. Additionally, opportunities were provided to families to view the curriculum, and informational sessions were provided to outline policy and curriculum contents. Continued professional learning is being provided to teachers specific to any program recommendation that is made to the Board for adoption.

Collaborative professional learning community work amongst Social Science department chairs to identify academic skills impacted by the pandemic (such as primary document analysis, the ability to write a clear thesis statement, etc.) and to collectively consider how to improve instructional practices in relation to it.

Continued professional development cohorts with the Acosta Educational Partnership, collaborating with the California Indian Museum and Cultural Center and scaling up the amount of courses offered at each site to continue Ethnic Studies implementation.

Maintaining and expanding a Career Technical Education (CTE) District Advisory Committee that is made up of a diverse and inclusive group of stakeholders, including local industry, that reflect the student and community population to ensure continued alignment with identified student and community priorities while paying attention to local labor market needs.

Increasing participation rates in CTE through social media marketing and career awareness activities at the middle school that are aligned with high school CTE Programs.

Conducting an annual self-review of High-Quality Career Technical Education Program Evaluation to identify areas of strength and growth that are shared with site principals, CTE Department Chairs, College and Career Support Team, and the District CTE Advisory Committee.

Continuing to refine CTE coursework and participation through professional development, course sequencing and review/redesign, and work-based learning opportunities and career-connected experiences.

Maintaining and expanding a College and Career Center Support Collaborative, which consists of College and Career Counselors and post-secondary and community partners to support financial aid application completion and preparing students for college, career, and life.

Additionally, K-12 resources will continue to be identified and developed to increase college and career readiness.

Continuing to provide and increase site team participation in Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), including participation in the Summer Institute. Increasing articulation between AVID feeder schools is also being explored. Data shows that 100% of AVID students graduated in all a-g courses. Further, AVID students have higher and more diverse enrollment in Honors and Advanced courses and increased entry to post-secondary education.

Prioritizing the development of a rich and sustainable Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) program/strategic plan that enhances equitable access to VAPA classes for students across all campuses.

Assessing and making decisions about various district wide learning platforms and applications in the interest of selecting those that are most used and that align to the district's priorities. Exploring professional learning for staff to ensure these applications have the most impact on student learning and success.

Continued implementation of PBIS and Restorative Practices in all schools, along with continued monitoring and reduction of disproportionality in disciplinary actions, to address "high" suspension rates noted in the CA Dashboard.

Increasing student engagement to reduce chronic absenteeism by creating a Wellness and Engagement department, focusing on relevant curriculum and instruction, providing more social-emotional training and restorative support, investing in Keeping Kids in School mentors, etc. Continuing the implementation of the Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) to ensure all staff members understand the basics of MTSS, where their work falls into the tiers, and supporting students in the key categories of Academics, Attendance, and Conduct & Social-Emotional.

Maintaining the foundation of Equity, Empathy, & Engagement, as well as Culture, Community & Connections to have a school climate conducive to student success by including student voice in the MTSS Tier 1 site level teams at each school, collaboratively identifying Tier 1 interventions for classroom and school-wide support, continued collaboration to begin basic foundational learnings of the 4 pillars of California's MTSS model, beginning self-assessment of the SRCS MTSS work through the SWIFT Schools' Fidelity, Integrity Assessment (FIA).

Continuing use of the Panorama and Wayfinder SEL platforms. By continuing to use the Panorama student social-emotional screener in grades 4-12, we have data to support school-wide programs and targeted mental health support for students. In grades K-3, teachers

continue to complete a student screener, which also provides data for the Tier 2 teams to examine trends and needs and to organize support school-wide for small groups and individual students. Also, the district is better preparing staff to use both the Panorama Moves in the “Playbook” SEL curriculum in the upcoming school year.

Implementing Wayfinder activities for grades 7-12, providing access to the Wayfinder Activity Library for all staff in those grade levels. This additional tool directly addresses and implements SEL curriculum and approaches in daily practice. Refresher Toolbox training for elementary staff and intro courses for new elementary staff help continue the Toolbox work.

Continuing district work with Universal Prekindergarten (UPK) and Universal Transitional Kindergarten (UTK).

Following up on a 5-year strategic plan started in the 2020-21 school year and developed by the SRCS Libraries Strategic Plan Committee to review library services, staff training, and collections districtwide.

Expanding opportunities and offerings that meet student needs after school and during the summer, including increased access to child-care and afterschool programs at several schools, implementing after-school tutoring for K-6 students to strengthen student literacy and mathematics skills, expanding learning experiences during school recesses (winter and spring break STEM and Arts camps), and offering additional, academic-based summer school and camp programs.

Helping to provide supplemental support to off-track high school students who are missing credits by offering in-person, high school evening school sessions.

Hiring additional TOSAs to support CSI schools to intentionally support ELs with their ability to access math and ELA.

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.

Cesar Chavez Language Academy
Elsie Allen High School
Santa Rosa Middle School
Herbert Slater Middle School

Support for Identified Schools

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

Santa Rosa City School’s (SRCS) Educational Services Division collaborates as a team to work together in supporting its eligible comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) schools in developing a CSI plan that includes school-level needs assessment, evidence-based interventions, and the identification of any resource inequities to be addressed through the implementation of the CSI plan.

In support and planning meetings with each principal, supervising directors and other staff have reviewed criteria under which schools are eligible and provided guidance for how to integrate their CSI status into the school's plan for student achievement. Site plans are connected to the district's plan and align with its vision (to send students into the world empowered to find purpose, think critically, embrace diversity, work together, adapt to our changing planet, and live healthy and fulfilling lives), mission, objectives, priorities and requirements, and include a comprehensive needs assessment, root cause analysis, identification of resource inequities, selection of effective research-based interventions, and involvement of educational partners.

Throughout the school year, principals participate in ongoing, formal training for continuous school improvement at least three times a year in Fall, Winter, and Spring. This training, provided by the coordinator and senior secretary of State and Federal Programs, also includes information and resources for principals to successfully continue the integration of CSI requirements into serving students, such as allowable expenses, budget oversight and management, data analysis, plan development and revision, Free & Reduced Program information, involving, collecting and analyzing stakeholder participation and data, etc.

The SRCS School Board of Education meets at least monthly throughout the school year and invites community members to attend, inform, and comment on current issues while considering state and federal requirements. In addition, other opportunities for community members to be involved in planning and key decision-making include LCAP Community Feedback meetings, School Site Council meetings, English Language Advisory Committee meetings, staff and community surveys, family engagement activities and staff, and other ongoing community outreach strategies and activities.

As part of the ongoing continuous improvement process, each site's leadership team of administrators and teachers analyzes data and needs from the school using Dashboard data, the School Accountability Report Card, and local assessment results from testing such as ELPAC and CAASPP, as well as local data and assessments (i.e., Panorama, YouthTruth) to determine priorities for student achievement as they align to the district's priorities.

Specific to CSI support, sites that are eligible use school-level needs assessment data to analyze possible root causes through protocols such as 5 Whys: Root Cause Analysis to identify underlying factors or causes and to determine the best strategies to address resource inequities. Other support from CDE and SCOE has also been provided to help teams determine the best evidence-based strategies and interventions to implement.

Amongst all CSI schools, assessments identified individualized gaps in student proficiency, particularly in English Language Arts and Math for English Learners, Students with Disabilities, Homeless and Foster Youth, and Hispanic students at both elementary and secondary levels.

As a result of this feedback and assessment process, and in alignment with district priorities, district leadership prioritized the support of centralized Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) at all 4 CSI schools as reflected in the School Plans for Student Achievement (SPSAs).

Cesar Chavez Language Academy (CCLA) and Elsie Allen High School (EAHS) will share a centralized CSI Dual Language Immersion TOSA in order to fortify the dual-immersion program between these two CSI schools, to strengthen the community and school culture, and to strengthen a "feeder-like pattern" between them.

In addition to TOSA staffing, CCLA will also use CSI funds to cover .2 FTE of an AVID Coordinator through their charter LCAP for the 2024-2025 school year.

To inform decisions about these district gaps, all CSI schools in the district address requirements through:

The school site plan to identify needs, goals, activities, resources, and progress,

The use of a collaborative, inquiry-based process to build teacher efficacy with a focus on foundational literacy skills that address close reading and writing needs

Incorporate the Orton Gillingham approach designed to help struggling readers along with differentiated instruction,

Coaching and PLC structures that analyze student work from within MTSS and ELD to support ongoing learning and analysis of evidence from teaching and student learning to determine growth and effective implementation,

The intent to hire a Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) to support these efforts in leading and overseeing activities to serve students,

A focus on Tier 1 MTSS interventions and small group instruction,

Teacher teams who identify essential standards-based curriculum mapping and

Other site-specific strategies and activities to address student needs.

Each site's School Site Council (SSC) of the principal, teachers, classified staff, parents, students, and community partners as applicable reviews the site plan, needs, data, goals, strategies and progress each month to provide thoughts and feedback and shares feedback and suggestions with other site groups such as the school's English Learner Advisory Councils (ELAC) and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO).

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

Santa Rosa City Schools monitors and evaluates CSI-eligible schools' plans in the district that support student and school improvement through several measures, including but not limited to:

Regular meetings between CSI-school principals and supervising directors to revisit CSI plan, discuss goals and activities and their progress, and revise accordingly,

Three formal trainings throughout the year focused on continuous improvement through site plans,

Monitoring expenditures through requisitions and purchases that require the identification of specific site plan goals and activities as they relate to CSI,

Regular communication with site principals and State & Federal Programs to provide resources, information, and support toward addressing CSI-related goals in site plans,

Ongoing collaboration with educational partners to locally gather feedback and/or develop, implement, and monitor the CSI plan,

Staff who lead and oversee CSI-related activities and progress (i.e., principal, TOSA),

Training for and development of an annual schoolwide plan that includes CSI efforts, data, and analysis and is overseen by the coordinator of State & Federal Programs, who reviews all plans and works with teams as necessary for revisions,

School Board approval of all site plans, and

Partnering with CDE as part of the Federal Program Monitoring (FPM) process.

Engaging Educational Partners

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

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

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

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

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
Teachers	In developing the LCAP, all statutorily required educational partners were consulted for their community input. It is the philosophy of Santa Rosa City Schools that engaging our educational partners is critical to the success of students and that their input influences district priorities and spending for student achievement. Understanding staff, student, and parent perceptions about school is linked to academic outcomes, so it’s beneficial to know what our educational partners are experiencing in our schools and classrooms. SRCS strives to create multiple opportunities for educational partners to provide feedback via various modalities over several days and times. For teachers, as well as for the entire community, it was deemed beneficial to hold additional meetings this year, as a new LCAP was being written. This would serve as a way to provide baseline fiscal information that might serve to deepen meaningful conversations. This series of in-person and virtual LCAP “budget roadshows,” provided throughout the months of November and December, that highlighted the purpose, detail, and funding associated with the LCAP. Staff from the district and the Educational Services division presented to community members at various school sites in the evening with a visual presentation and time for questions. LCAP Community Engagement Meetings included a presentation that covered the purpose of the LCAP, what the last three years of SRCS’

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	LCAP were focused on in terms of goals, priorities, and sample activities along with data and focus questions. Staff from the Educational Services division served as co-facilitators to both present and to take notes; note-taking documents were also posted, and community members were invited to address them directly if they chose to. Upon completion of the meetings, all notes were compiled, and individual School Site Councils, along with the lead team of the Educational Services division, examined them for common themes and findings. Site Principals invited community members via a Community Input letter that included the invitation, purpose and all dates and times of meetings, and was available in both English and Spanish. Meetings and information was also posted on the district's website and via various social media and communication platforms such as Instagram, Facebook, ParentSquare, etc. Meetings were primarily held in February (with follow-up meetings of a summary of the February meetings held in April) and spread out over a 2-3 week period for the best access and availability. Days and times varied according to access and location so that educational partners could attend at times that worked for them, and Zoom meetings were scheduled later in the evening. Once all feedback is considered and the LCAP is further developed with this feedback in mind, a draft of the LCAP is presented to the School Board and is available for public comment as part of that process. Notwithstanding any revisions deemed necessary, the draft will then be considered for final approval by the School Board at the 6/26 Board meeting. Abraham Lincoln Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, ?, 5/22 ELAC: 9/21, 10/19, 11/16, 12/21, 1/18, 2/15, 3/21, 4/18, 5/16 SSC: 9/28, 10/26, 11/30, 2/21, 3/28, 4/25, 5/23 PFO: 9/14, 10/12, 11/9, 12/14, 1/11, 2/8, 3/14, 4/11, 5/9

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Albert Biella Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/12, 8/28, 9/11, 9/25, 10/23, 11/13, 12/11, 1/8, 1/22, 2/12, 2/26, 3/12, 3/26, 4/9, 4/23, 5/14, 5/18 ELAC: 9/12, 11/14, 2/13, 3/12, 4/9 SSC: 9/25, 10/23, 1/22, 3/25, 4/22, 5/20 PTA: 9/18, 10/16, 11/6, 1/23, 2/5, 3/4, 4/8, 5/14 Brook Hill Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 10/11, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 2/14, 3/13, 4/10, ?, 5/29, 6/12 ELAC: 9/14, 10/12, 11/13, 1/8, ?, 3/14, 4/17 SSC: 9/21, 10/19, 1/18, 3/28, 4/18, 5/16 PFO: 9/21, 10/19, 11/29, 1/31, 2/28, 3/27, 4/29 Helen Lehman Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 11/29, 12/20, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 9/11, 10/9, 11/13, 12/11, 1/3 2/5 3/11, 4/8, 5/13 SSC: 9/11, 10/9, 1/22, 2/28, 3/11, 4/8, 4/29 PTA: 9/11, 9/25, 10/3, 3/12, 5/3 Hidden Valley Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/12, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, ?, 5/22 ELAC: 10/12, 11/14, 12/6, 2/16, 2/20, 3/26, 4/9, 5/16 SSC: 10/12, 11/15, 2/13, 3/6, 4/17, 5/15 PFO: 8/31, 9/28, 10/26, 11/30, 1/25, 2/29, 3/28, 4/25, 5/29 James Monroe Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 9/22, 10/13, 11/13, 12/12, 1/17, 2/21, 3/26, 4/30 SSC: 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/31, 2/21, 4/17, 5/15 PFO: 9/26, 10/24, 11/6, 12/20, 1/12, 5/2 Luther Burbank Elementary:

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/28, 9/11, 9/25, 10/9, 10/23, 11/13, 11/27, 12/11, 1/22, 2/5, 2/26, 3/11, 3/25, 4/8, 4/22, 5/6, 5/20 ELAC: 11/29, 1/25, 4/18, 5/16 SSC: 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/31, 2/21, 4/17, 5/15 PFO: 11/3, 11/15, 2/21, 4/3 Proctor Terrace Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/23, 9/6, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 11/22, 12/13, 12/27, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 9/8, 10/30, 2/8, 4/11 SSC: 9/21, 11/16, 1/25, 3/14, 4/25 PFO: 9/19, 10/17, 12/19, 1/16, 2/20, 3/19, 4/16, 5/21 Steele Lane Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 10/18, 11/15, 1/17, 2/21, 3/20, 4/14, 5/15 SSC: 10/26, 11/13, 1/25, 2/22, 3/28, 4/25, 5/23 PFO: 10/17, 12/5, 12/19, 1/9, 2/13, 3/5, 3/26, 4/8, 5/7 Hilliard Comstock Middle Staff Meetings: 9/20, 10/18, 11/29, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/22, 6/6 ELAC: 9/14, 10/19, 11/16, 1/18, 2/15, 4/18, SSC: 10/10, 1/18, 2/13, 4/18, 5/23 PFO: N/A Rincon Valley Middle: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/15 ELAC: 9/14, 10/16, 11/20, 12/18, 1/22, 2/26, 3/25, 4/23, 5/20 SSC: 9/27, 10/25, 11/29, 1/31, 2/28, 3/27, 4/24, 5/29 PFO: 9/6, 10/4, 11/1, 12/6 Santa Rosa Middle: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/24, 2/26, 3/27, 4/17, 5/2 ELAC: 9/13, 10/11, 11/15, 1/17, 2/28, 3/27, 4/17

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	SSC: 9/6, 11/1, 2/28, 5/1 PFO: 10/12, 11/9, 12/14, 1/11, 2/8, 3/14, 4/11, 5/9 Herbert Slater Middle: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 9/13, 10/11, 11/15, 12/13, 1/10, 2/14, 3/27, 4/10 ELAC: 1/25, 2/8, 3/7, 4/4, 5/2 SSC: 10/18, 11/29, 1/31, 2/21, 4/17, 5/22 PFO: 8/21, 11/6, 1/1, 2/5, 3/4, 5/6, 6/3 Elsie Allen High: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 9/13, 10/11, 11/15, 1/10, 2/14, 3/13, 4/10, 5/8 ELAC: 9/21, 10/4, 11/1, 12/6, 1/10, 2/7, 3/6, 4/3, 5/1 SSC: 10/26, 11/16, 12/21, 1/25, 2/15, 3/28, 4/18, 5/9 PFO: N/A Maria Carrillo High: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/15 ELAC: 8/10, 10/18, 11/15, 12/13, 1/17, 2/21, 3/13, 4/17, 5/15 SSC: 9/11, 10/9, 11/13, 1/8, 2/13, 3/11, 4/18, 5/13 PFO: 8/22, 9/12, 10/10, 11/14, 12/12, 1/9, 2/13, 3/12, 4/9, 5/14 Montgomery High: Staff Meetings: 9/27, 10/25, 11/29, 12/15, 1/24, 2/28, 3/27, 4/24, 5/24 ELAC: 9/27, 10/11, 11/8, 1/24, 2/15, 3/13, 4/10, 5/15 SSC: 9/13, 10/11, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 2/14, 3/13, 4/10, 5/8 MEF: 9/14, 10/12, 11/9, 12/14, 1/11, 2/8, 3/14, 4/11, 5/9 Piner High: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/15 ELAC: 9/21, 10/12, 11/9, 1/11, 3/14, 4/11, 5/16 SSC: 9/27, 10/25, 11/29, 1/31, 2/28, 3/28, 4/24, 5/22 PFO: 10/4, 11/1, 1/10, 2/7, 3/6, 4/3, 5/12 Ridgway Continuation High: Staff Meetings: 8/24, 9/18, 10/16, 11/20, 1/22, 2/19, 4/16, 5/21 ELAC: 11/8, 12/13, 1/25, 2/15, ?, 4/25, 5/7

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	SSC: 10/11, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 2/7, 3/13, 4/10, 5/8 PFO: N/A Santa Rosa High: Staff Meetings: 8/24, 9/18, 10/16, 11/20, 1/22, 2/19, 4/16, 5/21, ELAC: 8/31, 9/28, 10/25, 11/29, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/24, 5/29 SSC: 8/30, 9/28, 10/26, 11/30, 1/26, 2/29, 3/28, 4/25, 5/30 STP: 9/7, 10/12, 11/9, 12/7, 1/4, 2/1, 3/7, 4/4, 5/2
Principals	In developing the LCAP, all statutorily required educational partners were consulted for their community input. It is the philosophy of Santa Rosa City Schools that engaging our educational partners is critical to the success of students and that their input influences district priorities and spending for student achievement. Understanding staff, student, and parent perceptions about school is linked to academic outcomes, so it's beneficial to know what our educational partners are experiencing in our schools and classrooms. SRCS strives to create multiple opportunities for educational partners to provide feedback via various modalities over several days and times. For the entire community, it was deemed beneficial to hold additional meetings this year, as a new LCAP was being written. This would serve as a way to provide baseline fiscal information that might serve to deepen meaningful conversations. This series of in-person and virtual LCAP "budget roadshows," provided throughout the months of November and December, that highlighted the purpose, detail, and funding associated with the LCAP. Staff from the district and the Educational Services division presented to community members at various school sites in the evening with a visual presentation and time for questions. Site Principals invited community members via a Community Input letter that included the invitation, purpose and all dates and times of meetings, and was available in both English and Spanish. Meetings and information was also posted on the district's website and via

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	various social media and communication platforms such as Instagram, Facebook, ParentSquare, etc. LCAP Community Engagement Meetings included a presentation that covered the purpose of the LCAP, what the last three years of SRCS' LCAP were focused on in terms of goals, priorities, and sample activities along with data and focus questions. Staff from the Educational Services division served as co-facilitators to both present and to take notes; note-taking documents were also posted, and community members were invited to address them directly if they chose to. Upon completion of the meetings, all notes were compiled, and individual School Site Councils, along with the lead team of the Educational Services division, examined them for common themes and findings. Meetings were primarily held in February (with follow-up meetings of a summary of the February meetings held in April) and spread out over a 2-3 week period for the best access and availability. Days and times varied according to access and location so that educational partners could attend at times that worked for them, and Zoom meetings were scheduled later in the evening. Once all feedback is considered and the LCAP is further developed with this feedback in mind, a draft of the LCAP is presented to the School Board and is available for public comment as part of that process. Notwithstanding any revisions deemed necessary, the draft will then be considered for final approval by the School Board at the 6/26 Board meeting. Abraham Lincoln Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, ?, 5/22 ELAC: 9/21, 10/19, 11/16, 12/21, 1/18, 2/15, 3/21, 4/18, 5/16 SSC: 9/28, 10/26, 11/30, 2/21, 3/28, 4/25, 5/23 PFO: 9/14, 10/12, 11/9, 12/14, 1/11, 2/8, 3/14, 4/11, 5/9 Albert Biella Elementary:

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Staff Meetings: 8/12, 8/28, 9/11, 9/25, 10/23, 11/13, 12/11, 1/8, 1/22, 2/12, 2/26, 3/12, 3/26, 4/9, 4/23, 5/14, 5/18 ELAC: 9/12, 11/14, 2/13, 3/12, 4/9 SSC: 9/25, 10/23, 1/22, 3/25, 4/22, 5/20 PTA: 9/18, 10/16, 11/6, 1/23, 2/5, 3/4, 4/8, 5/14 Brook Hill Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 10/11, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 2/14, 3/13, 4/10, ?, 5/29, 6/12 ELAC: 9/14, 10/12, 11/13, 1/8, ?, 3/14, 4/17 SSC: 9/21, 10/19, 1/18, 3/28, 4/18, 5/16 PFO: 9/21, 10/19, 11/29, 1/31, 2/28, 3/27, 4/29 Helen Lehman Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 11/29, 12/20, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 9/11, 10/9, 11/13, 12/11, 1/3 2/5 3/11, 4/8, 5/13 SSC: 9/11, 10/9, 1/22, 2/28, 3/11, 4/8, 4/29 PTA: 9/11, 9/25, 10/3, 3/12, 5/3 Hidden Valley Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/12, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, ?, 5/22 ELAC: 10/12, 11/14, 12/6, 2/16, 2/20, 3/26, 4/9, 5/16 SSC: 10/12, 11/15, 2/13, 3/6, 4/17, 5/15 PFO: 8/31, 9/28, 10/26, 11/30, 1/25, 2/29, 3/28, 4/25, 5/29 James Monroe Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 9/22, 10/13, 11/13, 12/12, 1/17, 2/21, 3/26, 4/30 SSC: 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/31, 2/21, 4/17, 5/15 PFO: 9/26, 10/24, 11/6, 12/20, 1/12, 5/2 Luther Burbank Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/28, 9/11, 9/25, 10/9, 10/23, 11/13, 11/27, 12/11, 1/22, 2/5, 2/26, 3/11, 3/25, 4/8, 4/22, 5/6, 5/20 ELAC: 11/29, 1/25, 4/18, 5/16

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	SSC: 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/31, 2/21, 4/17, 5/15 PFO: 11/3, 11/15, 2/21, 4/3 Proctor Terrace Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/23, 9/6, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 11/22, 12/13, 12/27, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 9/8, 10/30, 2/8, 4/11 SSC: 9/21, 11/16, 1/25, 3/14, 4/25 PFO: 9/19, 10/17, 12/19, 1/16, 2/20, 3/19, 4/16, 5/21 Steele Lane Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 10/18, 11/15, 1/17, 2/21, 3/20, 4/14, 5/15 SSC: 10/26, 11/13, 1/25, 2/22, 3/28, 4/25, 5/23 PFO: 10/17, 12/5, 12/19, 1/9, 2/13, 3/5, 3/26, 4/8, 5/7 Hilliard Comstock Middle Staff Meetings: 9/20, 10/18, 11/29, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/22, 6/6 ELAC: 9/14, 10/19, 11/16, 1/18, 2/15, 4/18, SSC: 10/10, 1/18, 2/13, 4/18, 5/23 PFO: N/A Rincon Valley Middle: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/15 ELAC: 9/14, 10/16, 11/20, 12/18, 1/22, 2/26, 3/25, 4/23, 5/20 SSC: 9/27, 10/25, 11/29, 1/31, 2/28, 3/27, 4/24, 5/29 PFO: 9/6, 10/4, 11/1, 12/6 Santa Rosa Middle: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/24, 2/26, 3/27, 4/17, 5/2 ELAC: 9/13, 10/11, 11/15, 1/17, 2/28, 3/27, 4/17 SSC: 9/6, 11/1, 2/28, 5/1 PFO: 10/12, 11/9, 12/14, 1/11, 2/8, 3/14, 4/11, 5/9

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Herbert Slater Middle: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 9/13, 10/11, 11/15, 12/13, 1/10, 2/14, 3/27, 4/10 ELAC: 1/25, 2/8, 3/7, 4/4, 5/2 SSC: 10/18, 11/29, 1/31, 2/21, 4/17, 5/22 PFO: 8/21, 11/6, 1/1, 2/5, 3/4, 5/6, 6/3 Elsie Allen High: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 9/13, 10/11, 11/15, 1/10, 2/14, 3/13, 4/10, 5/8 ELAC: 9/21, 10/4, 11/1, 12/6, 1/10, 2/7, 3/6, 4/3, 5/1 SSC: 10/26, 11/16, 12/21, 1/25, 2/15, 3/28, 4/18, 5/9 PFO: N/A Maria Carrillo High: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/15 ELAC: 8/10, 10/18, 11/15, 12/13, 1/17, 2/21, 3/13, 4/17, 5/15 SSC: 9/11, 10/9, 11/13, 1/8, 2/13, 3/11, 4/18, 5/13 PFO: 8/22, 9/12, 10/10, 11/14, 12/12, 1/9, 2/13, 3/12, 4/9, 5/14 Montgomery High: Staff Meetings: 9/27, 10/25, 11/29, 12/15, 1/24, 2/28, 3/27, 4/24, 5/24 ELAC: 9/27, 10/11, 11/8, 1/24, 2/15, 3/13, 4/10, 5/15 SSC: 9/13, 10/11, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 2/14, 3/13, 4/10, 5/8 MEF: 9/14, 10/12, 11/9, 12/14, 1/11, 2/8, 3/14, 4/11, 5/9 Piner High: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/15 ELAC: 9/21, 10/12, 11/9, 1/11, 3/14, 4/11, 5/16 SSC: 9/27, 10/25, 11/29, 1/31, 2/28, 3/28, 4/24, 5/22 PFO: 10/4, 11/1, 1/10, 2/7, 3/6, 4/3, 5/12 Ridgway Continuation High: Staff Meetings: 8/24, 9/18, 10/16, 11/20, 1/22, 2/19, 4/16, 5/21 ELAC: 11/8, 12/13, 1/25, 2/15, ?, 4/25, 5/7

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	SSC: 10/11, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 2/7, 3/13, 4/10, 5/8 PFO: N/A Santa Rosa High: Staff Meetings: 8/24, 9/18, 10/16, 11/20, 1/22, 2/19, 4/16, 5/21, ELAC: 8/31, 9/28, 10/25, 11/29, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/24, 5/29 SSC: 8/30, 9/28, 10/26, 11/30, 1/26, 2/29, 3/28, 4/25, 5/30 STP: 9/7, 10/12, 11/9, 12/7, 1/4, 2/1, 3/7, 4/4, 5/2
Other school personnel	In developing the LCAP, all statutorily required educational partners were consulted for their community input. It is the philosophy of Santa Rosa City Schools that engaging our educational partners is critical to the success of students and that their input influences district priorities and spending for student achievement. Understanding staff, student, and parent perceptions about school is linked to academic outcomes, so it's beneficial to know what our educational partners are experiencing in our schools and classrooms. SRCS strives to create multiple opportunities for educational partners to provide feedback via various modalities over several days and times. For teachers, as well as for the entire community, it was deemed beneficial to hold additional meetings this year, as a new LCAP was being written. This would serve as a way to provide baseline fiscal information that might serve to deepen meaningful conversations. This series of in-person and virtual LCAP "budget roadshows," provided throughout the months of November and December, that highlighted the purpose, detail, and funding associated with the LCAP. Staff from the district and the Educational Services division presented to community members at various school sites in the evening with a visual presentation and time for questions. LCAP Community Engagement Meetings included a presentation that covered the purpose of the LCAP, what the last three years of SRCS' LCAP were focused on in terms of goals, priorities, and sample activities along with data and focus questions. Staff from the Educational Services division served as co-facilitators to both present

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	and to take notes; note-taking documents were also posted, and community members were invited to address them directly if they chose to. Upon completion of the meetings, all notes were compiled, and individual School Site Councils, along with the lead team of the Educational Services division, examined them for common themes and findings. Site Principals invited community members via a Community Input letter that included the invitation, purpose and all dates and times of meetings, and was available in both English and Spanish. Meetings and information was also posted on the district's website and via various social media and communication platforms such as Instagram, Facebook, ParentSquare, etc. Meetings were primarily held in February (with follow-up meetings of a summary of the February meetings held in April) and spread out over a 2-3 week period for the best access and availability. Days and times varied according to access and location so that educational partners could attend at times that worked for them, and Zoom meetings were scheduled later in the evening. Once all feedback is considered and the LCAP is further developed with this feedback in mind, a draft of the LCAP is presented to the School Board and is available for public comment as part of that process. Notwithstanding any revisions deemed necessary, the draft will then be considered for final approval by the School Board at the 6/26 Board meeting. Abraham Lincoln Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, ?, 5/22 ELAC: 9/21, 10/19, 11/16, 12/21, 1/18, 2/15, 3/21, 4/18, 5/16 SSC: 9/28, 10/26, 11/30, 2/21, 3/28, 4/25, 5/23 PFO: 9/14, 10/12, 11/9, 12/14, 1/11, 2/8, 3/14, 4/11, 5/9 Albert Biella Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/12, 8/28, 9/11, 9/25, 10/23, 11/13, 12/11, 1/8, 1/22, 2/12, 2/26, 3/12, 3/26, 4/9, 4/23, 5/14, 5/18

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	ELAC: 9/12, 11/14, 2/13, 3/12, 4/9 SSC: 9/25, 10/23, 1/22, 3/25, 4/22, 5/20 PTA: 9/18, 10/16, 11/6, 1/23, 2/5, 3/4, 4/8, 5/14 Brook Hill Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 10/11, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 2/14, 3/13, 4/10, ?, 5/29, 6/12 ELAC: 9/14, 10/12, 11/13, 1/8, ?, 3/14, 4/17 SSC: 9/21, 10/19, 1/18, 3/28, 4/18, 5/16 PFO: 9/21, 10/19, 11/29, 1/31, 2/28, 3/27, 4/29 Helen Lehman Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 11/29, 12/20, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 9/11, 10/9, 11/13, 12/11, 1/3 2/5 3/11, 4/8, 5/13 SSC: 9/11, 10/9, 1/22, 2/28, 3/11, 4/8, 4/29 PTA: 9/11, 9/25, 10/3, 3/12, 5/3 Hidden Valley Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/12, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, ?, 5/22 ELAC: 10/12, 11/14, 12/6, 2/16, 2/20, 3/26, 4/9, 5/16 SSC: 10/12, 11/15, 2/13, 3/6, 4/17, 5/15 PFO: 8/31, 9/28, 10/26, 11/30, 1/25, 2/29, 3/28, 4/25, 5/29 James Monroe Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 9/22, 10/13, 11/13, 12/12, 1/17, 2/21, 3/26, 4/30 SSC: 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/31, 2/21, 4/17, 5/15 PFO: 9/26, 10/24, 11/6, 12/20, 1/12, 5/2 Luther Burbank Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/28, 9/11, 9/25, 10/9, 10/23, 11/13, 11/27, 12/11, 1/22, 2/5, 2/26, 3/11, 3/25, 4/8, 4/22, 5/6, 5/20 ELAC: 11/29, 1/25, 4/18, 5/16 SSC: 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/31, 2/21, 4/17, 5/15 PFO: 11/3, 11/15, 2/21, 4/3

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Proctor Terrace Staff Meetings: 8/14, 8/23, 9/6, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 11/22, 12/13, 12/27, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 9/8, 10/30, 2/8, 4/11 SSC: 9/21, 11/16, 1/25, 3/14, 4/25 PFO: 9/19, 10/17, 12/19, 1/16, 2/20, 3/19, 4/16, 5/21 Steele Lane Elementary: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/13, 9/27, 10/11, 10/25, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/13, 3/27, 4/10, 4/24, 5/8, 5/22 ELAC: 10/18, 11/15, 1/17, 2/21, 3/20, 4/14, 5/15 SSC: 10/26, 11/13, 1/25, 2/22, 3/28, 4/25, 5/23 PFO: 10/17, 12/5, 12/19, 1/9, 2/13, 3/5, 3/26, 4/8, 5/7 Hilliard Comstock Middle Staff Meetings: 9/20, 10/18, 11/29, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/22, 6/6 ELAC: 9/14, 10/19, 11/16, 1/18, 2/15, 4/18, SSC: 10/10, 1/18, 2/13, 4/18, 5/23 PFO: N/A Rincon Valley Middle: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/15 ELAC: 9/14, 10/16, 11/20, 12/18, 1/22, 2/26, 3/25, 4/23, 5/20 SSC: 9/27, 10/25, 11/29, 1/31, 2/28, 3/27, 4/24, 5/29 PFO: 9/6, 10/4, 11/1, 12/6 Santa Rosa Middle: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/24, 2/26, 3/27, 4/17, 5/2 ELAC: 9/13, 10/11, 11/15, 1/17, 2/28, 3/27, 4/17 SSC: 9/6, 11/1, 2/28, 5/1 PFO: 10/12, 11/9, 12/14, 1/11, 2/8, 3/14, 4/11, 5/9 Herbert Slater Middle: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 9/13, 10/11, 11/15, 12/13, 1/10, 2/14, 3/27, 4/10

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	ELAC: 1/25, 2/8, 3/7, 4/4, 5/2 SSC: 10/18, 11/29, 1/31, 2/21, 4/17, 5/22 PFO: 8/21, 11/6, 1/1, 2/5, 3/4, 5/6, 6/3 Elsie Allen High: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 9/13, 10/11, 11/15, 1/10, 2/14, 3/13, 4/10, 5/8 ELAC: 9/21, 10/4, 11/1, 12/6, 1/10, 2/7, 3/6, 4/3, 5/1 SSC: 10/26, 11/16, 12/21, 1/25, 2/15, 3/28, 4/18, 5/9 PFO: N/A Maria Carrillo High: Staff Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/15 ELAC: 8/10, 10/18, 11/15, 12/13, 1/17, 2/21, 3/13, 4/17, 5/15 SSC: 9/11, 10/9, 11/13, 1/8, 2/13, 3/11, 4/18, 5/13 PFO: 8/22, 9/12, 10/10, 11/14, 12/12, 1/9, 2/13, 3/12, 4/9, 5/14 Montgomery High: Staff Meetings: 9/27, 10/25, 11/29, 12/15, 1/24, 2/28, 3/27, 4/24, 5/24 ELAC: 9/27, 10/11, 11/8, 1/24, 2/15, 3/13, 4/10, 5/15 SSC: 9/13, 10/11, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 2/14, 3/13, 4/10, 5/8 MEF: 9/14, 10/12, 11/9, 12/14, 1/11, 2/8, 3/14, 4/11, 5/9 Piner High: Staff Meetings: 8/14, 9/20, 10/18, 11/15, 12/20, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/17, 5/15 ELAC: 9/21, 10/12, 11/9, 1/11, 3/14, 4/11, 5/16 SSC: 9/27, 10/25, 11/29, 1/31, 2/28, 3/28, 4/24, 5/22 PFO: 10/4, 11/1, 1/10, 2/7, 3/6, 4/3, 5/12 Ridgway Continuation High: Staff Meetings: 8/24, 9/18, 10/16, 11/20, 1/22, 2/19, 4/16, 5/21 ELAC: 11/8, 12/13, 1/25, 2/15, ?, 4/25, 5/7 SSC: 10/11, 11/8, 12/13, 1/10, 2/7, 3/13, 4/10, 5/8 PFO: N/A Santa Rosa High: Staff Meetings: 8/24, 9/18, 10/16, 11/20, 1/22, 2/19, 4/16, 5/21,

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	ELAC: 8/31, 9/28, 10/25, 11/29, 1/24, 2/21, 3/27, 4/24, 5/29 SSC: 8/30, 9/28, 10/26, 11/30, 1/26, 2/29, 3/28, 4/25, 5/30 STP: 9/7, 10/12, 11/9, 12/7, 1/4, 2/1, 3/7, 4/4, 5/2
Local bargaining units of the LEA	In developing the LCAP, all statutorily required educational partners were consulted for their community input. It is the philosophy of Santa Rosa City Schools that engaging our educational partners is critical to the success of students and that their input influences district priorities and spending for student achievement. Understanding staff, student, and parent perceptions about school is linked to academic outcomes, so it's beneficial to know what our educational partners are experiencing in our schools and classrooms. SRCS strives to create multiple opportunities for educational partners to provide feedback via various modalities over several days and times. The process for engaging these educational partners included continuing the practice of holding LCAP Community Engagement Meetings as has been done in the past with great success. This year, community engagement meetings were preceded by a series of in-person and virtual LCAP "budget roadshows," provided throughout the months of November and December, that highlighted the purpose, detail, and funding associated with the LCAP. Staff from the district and the Educational Services division presented to community members at various school sites in the evening with a visual presentation and time for questions. Site Principals invited community members via a Community Input letter that included the invitation, purpose and all dates and times of meetings, and was available in both English and Spanish. Meetings and information was also posted on the district's website and via various social media and communication platforms such as Instagram, Facebook, ParentSquare, etc. Meetings were primarily held in February (with follow-up meetings of a summary of the February meetings held in April) and spread out over a 2-3 week period for the best access and availability. Days and

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	times varied according to access and location so that educational partners could attend at times that worked for them, and Zoom meetings were scheduled later in the evening. We continue to look for opportunities to work with our bargaining partners in the development of the LCAP. This year we were able to have question and answer sessions, and look forward to receiving additional feedback on how to better collaborate. Community Engagements: February 13, 2024 February 15, 2024 February 20, 2024 February 21, 2024 February 22, 2024 February 28, 2024 February 29, 2024 Additional Consultation with Employee Organizations (CSEA & SRTA): May 7, 2024 May 14, 2024 May 31, 2024 June 4, 2024
Parents, and Students	In developing the LCAP, all statutorily required educational partners were consulted for their community input. It is the philosophy of Santa Rosa City Schools that engaging our educational partners is critical to the success of students and that their input influences district priorities and spending for student achievement. Understanding staff, student, and parent perceptions about school is linked to academic outcomes, so it's beneficial to know what our educational partners are experiencing in our schools and classrooms. SRCS strives to create multiple opportunities for educational partners to provide feedback via various modalities over several days and times.

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	The process for engaging these educational partners included continuing the practice of holding LCAP Community Engagement Meetings as has been done in the past with great success. This year, community engagement meetings were preceded by a series of in-person and virtual LCAP “budget roadshows,” provided throughout the months of November and December, that highlighted the purpose, detail, and funding associated with the LCAP. Staff from the district and the Educational Services division presented to community members at various school sites in the evening with a visual presentation and time for questions. Family Engagement Facilitators were present at all meetings to support families with interpretation and dialogue, and childcare was provided free of charge. To significantly enhance our connection with families, we transformed the model of our translation department. We doubled the number of translators and located them separately from the group, so that they could engage in side conversations with families, who often have multiple questions about fiscal or educational terms being reviewed in conversations. We term this intentional shift from translation to “interpretation to engagement”. LCAP Community Engagement Meetings included a presentation that covered the purpose of the LCAP, what the last three years of SRCS’ LCAP were focused on in terms of goals, priorities, and sample activities along with data and focus questions. Staff from the Educational Services division served as co-facilitators to both present and to take notes; note-taking documents were also posted, and community members were invited to address them directly if they chose to. Upon completion of the meetings, all notes were compiled, and individual School Site Councils, along with the lead team of the Educational Services division, examined them for common themes and findings. As SSCs were explicitly invited, it was heartening to see students present and providing feedback at many of the sessions scheduled. Site Principals invited community members via a Community Input letter that included the invitation, purpose and all dates and times of meetings, and was available in both English and Spanish. Meetings

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	and information was also posted on the district's website and via various social media and communication platforms such as Instagram, Facebook, ParentSquare, etc. This year's meetings - held in both English and Spanish, both virtually and in person - were conducted through School Site Councils (wherein representative educational partners participate) and were open to all. Zoom meetings - one in Spanish and one in English - have been included for educational partners who would like to attend, or attend again, from any community. Meetings were primarily held in February (with follow-up meetings of a summary of the February meetings held in April) and spread out over a 2-3 week period for the best access and availability. Days and times varied according to access and location so that educational partners could attend at times that worked for them, and Zoom meetings were scheduled later in the evening. In addition to these engagement strategies, other strategies were also implemented to ensure as many community voices were heard as possible. School Site Councils worked with other school-based groups such as ELAC and PTO to share their experience and feedback and to collect these groups' feedback as well. Surveys such as a needs assessment for unhoused parents and students as well as certificated and classified staff who support these families were distributed in January. Once all feedback is considered and the LCAP is further developed with this feedback in mind, a draft of the LCAP is presented to the School Board and is available for public comment as part of that process. Notwithstanding any revisions deemed necessary, the draft will then be considered for final approval by the School Board at the 6/26 Board meeting. Community Engagements: February 13, 2024 February 15, 2024 February 20, 2024

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	February 21, 2024 February 22, 2024 February 28, 2024 February 29, 2024

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

Based on the following feedback provided by educational partners in community engagement meetings and strategies, the LCAP was revised and adopted by the district via the School Board with information that was influenced by our educational partners:

Differentiated instruction materials and professional development,
 Academic support, such as tutoring and after-school intervention programs,
 Job shadowing for CTE,
 Targeted supports for mathematics,
 Increased support for English Learners and their ability to access the curriculum,
 Continued support of the arts and varied enrichment opportunities for students,
 Increased FTE by two additional Campus Supervisors at each high school, one new campus supervisor position at each middle school, and one additional campus supervisor at Ridgway,
 Increased FTE for school-based therapists to staff each secondary school,
 Increased FTE for Family Engagement Facilitators to staff each school,
 Increased FTE for Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Intervention Counselors to include .50 FTE at each middle school,
 Increased FTE for Restorative Response Specialists to 1.0 FTE at each school, and an additional 1.0 FTE for comprehensive high schools,
 Continuation of two Keeping Kids in School (KKIS) mentors and 2 family engagement facilitators to support continued improved student engagement, attendance, and truancy concerns.

As the LCAP is a living and breathing document, the work to implement and monitor actions and services continues to deepen through the feedback provided by our educational partners. Consultation and conversations continue to expand, and revisions are made as appropriate.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	SRCS will provide student-centered teaching and learning opportunities by increasing programs and services that maximize student growth toward meeting or exceeding standards with an emphasis in the areas of English Language Arts and Math. Qualifier: SRCS will provide student-centered teaching and learning opportunities through strengthening services that maximize student growth by aligning quality first instruction for all students (Tier 1 Instruction), to meet the needs of our diverse learners while focusing on an asset-based approach to maximize potential for all students and disrupt the influence of economic status on outcomes. This will include a focus on specific student groups, particularly in the areas of English Language Arts and Math, and guiding our students toward promising postsecondary pathways.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning) Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning) Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes) Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement) Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement) Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning) Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)
--

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

To enhance the quality of education, we are taking a comprehensive approach to recalibrating classroom instruction, guided by California Dashboard data and local indicators. Feedback from our stakeholders is integral to this process, ensuring that the voices of our community are heard and valued. Our SRCS MVP (Mission, Vision, and Priorities) emphasizes a focus on best first instruction, aiming to deliver the most effective teaching strategies from the outset. By integrating satellite and street-level data, we can obtain a multi-faceted understanding of our students' needs, allowing us to tailor our instructional methods more precisely and effectively.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) ELPAC Improvement Reclassification Rate A-G Completion Percentage of D's and F's per subject Progress Towards A-G Completion CTE Completion Ethnic Studies Completion Graduation Rate High School Readiness Rate (8th grade to 9th grade) Dual Enrollment Early College Credit Reduction in English Learners referred to special education Reduction in English Learners identified as special education Suspension percentage rate Work-based Learning (state)	ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40%			ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grade 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grade 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25%			Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grade 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grade 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grade 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject			Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grade 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		ELA: Overall 33.3%, Latinx 42.9% Math: Overall 40.5%, Latinx 49.9% History: Overall 35.6%, Latinx 45.6% Science: Overall 36.5%, Latinx 46.2% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% CTE Completion: Overall 4.7%, Latinx 3.1% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 63.7%, Latinx - 55% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 80.8%, Secondary Latinx 71.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 18.6%, Latinx - 11.8% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9%			Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Work-based learning (state) - 2%, 2.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students			Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 27.3%, Latinx 33.9% Math: Overall 34.5%, Latinx 40.9% History: Overall 29.6%, Latinx 35.6% Science: Overall 30.5%, Latinx 37.2% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% CTE Completion: Overall 7.7 - 8.7%, Latinx 6.1% - 7.1% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 88%, Latinx - 86% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% High School Readiness Rate:	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Secondary Overall 86.8%, Secondary Latinx 80.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 30.6%, Latinx - 29.8% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Work-based learning (state) - 5%, 5.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students	
1.2	ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) ELPAC Improvement IB/AP Access AP Pass Rate Reclassification Rate Grade Point Average Percentage of D's and F's per subject A-G Completion	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%)			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Progress Towards A-G Completion CTE Completion Seal of Biliteracy Recipients Ethnic Studies Completion Graduation Rate High School Readiness Rate (8th grade to 9th grade) Dual Enrollment Early College Credit Reduction in English Learners referred to special education Reduction in English Learners identified as special education Suspension percentage rate Work-based Learning (state) Chronic Absenteeism	Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%)			Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grade 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grade 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%)			Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grade 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grade 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grade 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% IB/AP Participation: Overall Sec. 9.5% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 5.9% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4%			Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grade 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 33.3%, Latinx 42.9% Math: Overall 40.5%, Latinx 49.9% History: Overall 35.6%, Latinx 45.6% Science: Overall 36.5%, Latinx 46.2% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% CTE Completion: Overall 4.7%, Latinx 3.1% Seal of Biliteracy: 10.5% Ethnic Studies Completion: Overall - 63.7%, Latinx - 55% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 80.8%, Secondary Latinx 71.8%			Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% IB/AP Participation: Overall Sec. 12.5% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 11.9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Dual Enrollment: Overall - 18.6%, Latinx - 11.8% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Work-based learning (state) - 2%, 2.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students			AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 27.3%, Latinx 33.9% Math: Overall 34.5%, Latinx 40.9% History: Overall 29.6%, Latinx 35.6% Science: Overall 30.5%, Latinx 37.2% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% CTE Completion: Overall 7.7 - 8.7%, Latinx 6.1% - 7.1% Seal of Biliteracy: 16.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 88%, Latinx - 86%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 86.8%, Secondary Latinx 80.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 30.6%, Latinx - 29.8% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Work-based learning (state) - 5%, 5.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.3	ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) ELPAC Improvement Grade Point Average Percentage of D's and F's per subject A-G Completion Graduation Rate High School Readiness Rate (8th grade to 9th grade) Early College Credit Reduction in English Learners referred to special education Reduction in English Learners identified as special education Suspension percentage rate Chronic Absenteeism rate	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 8 Foster Youth:N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grace 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grace 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grace 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0%			Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grace 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grace 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grace 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 8 Foster Youth:N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grace 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grace 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grace 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8%			Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grace 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grace 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth:9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grace 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 33.3%, Latinx 42.9% Math: Overall 40.5%, Latinx 49.9% History: Overall 35.6%, Latinx 45.6% Science: Overall 36.5%, Latinx 46.2% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 80.8%, Secondary Latinx 71.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 18.6%, Latinx - 11.8% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year:			Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students			Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 27.3%, Latinx 33.9% Math: Overall 34.5%, Latinx 40.9% History: Overall 29.6%, Latinx 35.6% Science: Overall 30.5%, Latinx 37.2% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 86.8%, Secondary Latinx 80.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 30.6%, Latinx - 29.8% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students	
1.4	ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) ELPAC Improvement IB/AP Access AP Pass Rate Reclassification Rate Grade Point Average Percentage of D's and F's per subject A-G Completion Progress Towards A-G Completion CTE Completion	ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2%			ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Seal of Biliteracy Recipients Ethnic Studies Completion Graduation Rate High School Readiness Rate (8th grade to 9th grade) Dual Enrollment Early College Credit Reduction in English Learners referred to special education Reduction in English Learners identified as special education Suspension percentage rate Work-based Learning (state)	Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grade 6 ELs: 4.5%			Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grade 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grade 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grade 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2%			Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grade 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grace 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% IB/AP Participation: Overall Sec. 9.5% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 5.9% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 33.3%, Latinx 42.9% Math: Overall 40.5%, Latinx 49.9% History: Overall 35.6%, Latinx 45.6% Science: Overall 36.5%, Latinx 46.2%			Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grade 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% CTE Completion: Overall 4.7%, Latinx 3.1% Seal of Biliteracy: 10.5% Ethnic Studies Completion: Overall - 63.7%, Latinx - 55% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 80.8%, Secondary Latinx 71.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 18.6%, Latinx - 11.8% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25%			Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% IB/AP Participation: Overall Sec. 12.5% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 11.9% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Work-based learning (state) - 2%, 2.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students			ELA: Overall 27.3%, Latinx 33.9% Math: Overall 34.5%, Latinx 40.9% History: Overall 29.6%, Latinx 35.6% Science: Overall 30.5%, Latinx 37.2% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% CTE Completion: Overall 7.7 - 8.7%, Latinx 6.1% - 7.1% Seal of Biliteracy: 16.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 88%, Latinx - 86% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					86.8%, Secondary Latinx 80.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 30.6%, Latinx - 29.8% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Work-based learning (state) - 5%, 5.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students	
1.5	ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) ELPAC Improvement Reclassification Rate A-G Completion Percentage of D's and F's per subject Progress Towards A-G Completion CTE Completion Ethnic Studies Completion	ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1%			ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Graduation Rate High School Readiness Rate (8th grade to 9th grade) Dual Enrollment Early College Credit Reduction in English Learners referred to special education Reduction in English Learners identified as special education Suspension percentage rate Work-based Learning (state)	Grace 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4%			Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grade 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grace 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth:N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grace 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grace 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4%			Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grade 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth:9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 33.3%, Latinx 42.9% Math: Overall 40.5%, Latinx 49.9% History: Overall 35.6%, Latinx 45.6% Science: Overall 36.5%, Latinx 46.2% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% CTE Completion: Overall 4.7%, Latinx 3.1%			Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grade 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 63.7%, Latinx - 55% Graduation rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 80.8%, Secondary Latinx 71.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 18.6%, Latinx - 11.8% Suspension rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Work-based learning (state): 2%, 2.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students			Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 27.3%, Latinx 33.9% Math: Overall 34.5%, Latinx 40.9% History: Overall 29.6%, Latinx 35.6% Science: Overall 30.5%, Latinx 37.2%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% CTE Completion: Overall 7.7 - 8.7%, Latinx 6.1% - 7.1% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 88%, Latinx - 86% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 86.8%, Secondary Latinx 80.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 30.6%, Latinx - 29.8% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Work-based learning (state) - 5%, 5.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students	
1.6	ELA CAASPP Proficiency Math CAASPP Proficiency ELPAC Improvement IB/AP Access AP Pass Rate Reclassification Rate Grade Point Average 2.66 Percentage of D's and F's per subject A-G Completion Progress Towards A-G Completion CTE Completion Seal of Biliteracy Recipients 10.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall 63.7%, Latinx 55% Graduation Rate High School Readiness Rate (8th grade to 9th grade) Dual Enrollment Suspension percentage rate	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Work-based Learning (state) Chronic Absenteeism Reduction in English Learners identified as special education Graduation Rate for Students with IEPs Progress Toward Graduation for Students with 504 Plans	Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grace 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth:N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grace 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grace 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grace 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0%			Grace 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grace 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grace 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%)	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth:N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grace 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grace 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%)			Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grace 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grace 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grace 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth:9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grace 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% IB/AP Participation: Overall Sec. 9.5% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 5.9% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 33.3%, Latinx 42.9% Math: Overall 40.5%, Latinx 49.9% History: Overall 35.6%, Latinx 45.6% Science: Overall 36.5%, Latinx 46.2% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% CTE Completion: Overall 4.7%, Latinx 3.1%			Grace 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grace 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grace 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%)	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Seal of Biliteracy: 10.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 63.7%, Latinx - 55% Graduation rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 80.8%, Secondary Latinx 71.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 18.6%, Latinx - 11.8% Suspension rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Work-based learning (state) - 2%, 2.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students			Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% IB/AP Participation: Overall Sec. 12.5% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 11.9% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 27.3%, Latinx 33.9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Math: Overall 34.5%, Latinx 40.9% History: Overall 29.6%, Latinx 35.6% Science: Overall 30.5%, Latinx 37.2% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% CTE Completion: Overall 7.7 - 8.7%, Latinx 6.1% - 7.1% Seal of Biliteracy: 16.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 88%, Latinx - 86% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					86.8%, Secondary Latinx 80.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 30.6%, Latinx - 29.8% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Work-based learning (state) - 5%, 5.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students	
1.7	ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6,) Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6,) ELPAC Improvement Reclassification Rate Suspension percentage rate	ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1%			ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grace 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grace 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grace 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grace 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4%			Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grace 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grace 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grace 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grace 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth:N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grace 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grace 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4%			Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grade 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth:9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% Reclassification Rate: Suspension rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25%			Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grade 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% Reclassification Rate: Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22%	
1.8	ELA CAASPP Proficiency Math CAASPP Proficiency ELPAC Improvement IB/AP Access AP Pass Rate	ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8%			ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Reclassification Rate Grade Point Average 2.66 Percentage of D's and F's per subject A-G Completion Progress Towards A-G Completion CTE Completion Seal of Biliteracy Recipients 10.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Graduation Rate High School Readiness Rate (8th grade to 9th grade) Dual Enrollment Reduction in English Learners identified as special education Suspension percentage rate Work-based Learning (state) Chronic Absenteeism	Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3%			Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grade 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grade 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grade 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5%			Grade 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grade 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%)	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% IB/AP Participation: Overall Sec. 9.5% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 5.9% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject			Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grade 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%)	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		ELA: Overall 33.3%, Latinx 42.9% Math: Overall 40.5%, Latinx 49.9% History: Overall 35.6%, Latinx 45.6% Science: Overall 36.5%, Latinx 46.2% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% CTE Completion: Overall 4.7%, Latinx 3.1% Seal of Biliteracy: 10.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 63.7%, Latinx - 55% Graduation rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 80.8%, Secondary Latinx 71.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 18.6%, Latinx - 11.8% Suspension rate for the 2022-2023 school year:			Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% IB/AP Participation: Overall Sec. 12.5% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 11.9% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Work-based learning (state) - 2%, 2.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students			Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 27.3%, Latinx 33.9% Math: Overall 34.5%, Latinx 40.9% History: Overall 29.6%, Latinx 35.6% Science: Overall 30.5%, Latinx 37.2% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% CTE Completion: Overall 7.7 - 8.7%, Latinx 6.1% - 7.1% Seal of Biliteracy: 16.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 88%, Latinx - 86% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 86.8%, Secondary Latinx 80.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 30.6%, Latinx - 29.8% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Work-based learning (state) - 5%, 5.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students	
1.9	ELA CAASPP Proficiency Math CAASPP Proficiency ELPAC Improvement IB/AP Access AP Pass Rate	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Reclassification Rate Grade Point Average 2.66 Percentage of D's and F's per subject A-G Completion Progress Towards A-G Completion CTE Completion Seal of Biliteracy Recipients 10.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Graduation Rate High School Readiness Rate (8th grade to 9th grade) Dual Enrollment Reduction in English Learners identified as special education Suspension percentage rate Work-based Learning (state) Chronic Absenteeism	Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33%			ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grade 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grade 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0%			Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grade 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grace 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grace 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% IB/AP Participation: Overall Sec. 9.5% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 5.9%			Grace 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grace 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grace 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 33.3%, Latinx 42.9% Math: Overall 40.5%, Latinx 49.9% History: Overall 35.6%, Latinx 45.6% Science: Overall 36.5%, Latinx 46.2% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% CTE Completion: Overall 4.7%, Latinx 3.1% Seal of Biliteracy: 10.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 63.7%, Latinx - 55% Graduation rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 80.8%,			Grace 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grace 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grace 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Secondary Latinx 71.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 18.6%, Latinx - 11.8% Suspension rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Work-based learning (state) - 2%, 2.2% Hispanic/Latino Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students			IB/AP Participation: Overall Sec. 12.5% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 11.9% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% Percentage of Ds and Fs per subject ELA: Overall 27.3%, Latinx 33.9% Math: Overall 34.5%, Latinx 40.9% History: Overall 29.6%, Latinx 35.6% Science: Overall 30.5%, Latinx 37.2% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% CTE Completion: Overall 7.7 - 8.7%, Latinx 6.1% - 7.1%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Seal of Biliteracy: 16.5% Ethnic Studies Completion Overall - 88%, Latinx - 86% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% High School Readiness Rate: Secondary Overall 86.8%, Secondary Latinx 80.8% Dual Enrollment: Overall - 30.6%, Latinx - 29.8% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Work-based learning (state) - 5%, 5.2% Hispanic/Latino	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Middle School Dropout Count = 7 students	

Goal Analysis [2023-24]

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

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.1	Assessment Systems TK-12	"Implement a comprehensive data system integrating formative, interim, and summative assessments, including tools like TK, Online Testing Platform (Letter Naming Fluency), DIBELS, DRA, district, state and local assessments, to inform practices and supports that enhance student achievement and address disproportionality. Utilize this system to build Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) structures for targeted analyses and action planning, ensuring students receive the necessary support to succeed academically. Support this implementation by providing release	\$751,139.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		days for teachers (three days for grades 3-6 and four days for grades K-2), supporting a comprehensive assessment program for grades 7-12, and employing a full-time instructional technology, data, and assessment specialist. Through a data-driven framework, ensure Multilingual Learners (MLs) receive personalized, effective support for language proficiency and academic success. Regularly collect and analyze data from various assessments and student work to identify specific literacy challenges and strengths, informing individualized learning plans and differentiated instruction. Provide ongoing professional development for educators on effective data use, fostering collaboration among teachers, administrators, and families to support literacy development. Continuously monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions to improve language proficiency, academic performance, and student engagement. Intervention Software will be provided (ie - Cyber High) targeting support to students including students who are identified as English learners, foster youth, and low-income. Software will also provide strategic intervention support for students in math and credit recovery to support the district goal of increasing the number of students meeting the UC/CSU entrance requirements."		
1.2	Curriculum Supports and College and Career Readiness	Enhance student learning through various initiatives, including developing and refining cross-curricular CCD units to deepen student understanding and encourage connections across disciplines, promoting real-world application of knowledge. Additionally, resources and training will be provided to bolster instructional literacy for developing readers utilizing the Sonday literacy system. Math Redesign efforts will focus on building district-wide coherence in grades 4th-12th through professional learning with an emphasis on teaching to big ideas, culturally relevant math modeling, Building Thinking Classrooms, formative assessment, and Boaler's strategies for growth mindset and positive math identity. Redesign efforts will include increased support to sites and leaders with a focus on implementation of the New California Math Framework. A 1.0 FTE College and Career Readiness Coordinator and 1.0 FTE College and Career Readiness Senior Secretary will support the development of integrated pathways, early college opportunities, work-based learning, and high-quality Career Technical Education programs. Efforts to promote equity	\$1,463,157.79	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		include the ongoing development of Ethnic Studies courses and continued support for co-taught classes. A 1.0 FTE College and Career Counselor at each comprehensive high school site and a part-time College and Career Counselor at the district's continuation school will also support college and career readiness initiatives and completion of financial aid applications. Provide funding to school libraries to update collections ensuring school library collections are developed in a culturally responsive and inclusive process, increasing student interest and access to books and other literature reflective of student interest, identity and needs.		
1.3	Expanded Learning Opportunities and Interventions through Summer School and Afterschool Programs	"Maintaining access to elementary afterschool and summer school programs for students, including afterschool tutoring, High School Credit Recovery, Migrant Education, Mike Hauser, Newcomer English, Math and Science Camp Middle Grades programs; all towards supporting a rigorous program of academic study (including increasing students' A-G course access, graduation rates, and college acceptance rates for historically underserved student groups - ELs, Latinx, AA, UPC students). Generally speaking, these offerings are designed to build and maintain academic skills, while providing additional experiences that enrich students, preparing them for the next level of their education while supporting their holistic development. Funding also required to help ensure safe and secure campuses during summer programs. Additionally, funding requested towards providing support to help build out related data/counseling supports. This is beginning 25/26 (summer 2025), and in 2025/26 will be contributing. Efforts include supporting Avance and Pasitos programs on several of our school campuses (5 sites), which includes hosting classes for targeted families in our community. And finally, providing ongoing support of supervision of Transitional Kindergarten and Kindergarten students (4.5 FTEs) between the end of the school day for TK/K and the end of the school day for 1-6."	\$3,790,011.62	Yes
1.4	School Based Support for SPSA	Decentralized funding for school sites to implement services to Foster Youth (FY), Low Income (LI), English Learners EL), and Special Education	\$2,300,767.95	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
	Actions and Implementation	students and families as described in their school site plans (SPSAs). Each school SPSA is aligned to the LCAP goals with a strategic focus on the site's specific needs. Progress monitoring of the SPSA goals will occur throughout the year.		
1.5	Multilingual Learners Site and Staff and Student Support	"SRCS will allocate resources to six full-time equivalent (FTE) English Language (EL) Specialists and one FTE Multilingual Learner Coordinator with a 1.0 FTE EL Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) paid through restricted funds to achieve the commitment of enhancing instructional support for a diverse student population, including multilingual learners, low-income students, and foster youth. The focus will be on implementing effective instructional strategies and curriculum tailored to meet the specific needs of these student groups. The roles of the EL Specialists and EL TOSA will encompass various aspects of professional development, including content area and grade-level training, Designated and Integrated English Language Development, utilization of assessment data, personalized modeling, and collaborative lesson studies. By targeting the unique needs of unduplicated pupils, we aim to enhance classroom instruction and promote academic success among multilingual learner students, low-income students, and foster youth. Addressing disparities in academic progress among multilingual learners, foster youth, and low-income students is a priority. By providing focused professional learning and instructional support, we anticipate improved engagement and academic outcomes for these student populations. Through additional learning opportunities, educators will be better equipped to address the diverse needs present in their classrooms as noted in the California English Learner Roadmap. The support provided by EL Specialists and EL TOSA will extend to both elementary and secondary school sites, encompassing professional development, access to materials, and specialized training. Additionally, the staff will collaborate with Language Acceleration Review Committees (LARCs) at each school site to refine and implement strategies to support multilingual learners. LARC meetings will involve	\$1,085,612.75	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		reviewing site data to inform decisions regarding student placement, assessment, readiness for reclassification, and interventions tailored to different learner typologies. Funding allocation will include funds for extended pay rates for certificated members participating in LARC activities. "		
1.6	Comprehensive and Collaborative Supports for Students	"Continued fiscal support of 0.5 FTE school psychologist position. The role includes developing, updating, and running 504 trainings for district staff, ensuring 504 materials are in compliance, and supporting school sites across the district with 504 compliance. Additionally, support students with materials and supplies to support specific 504 accommodations that are unique. 1 FTE Behavior Specialist to: 1. Provide New Teacher Training on at first start of school year and ongoing monthly to cover: Setting up a classroom for success with behavior and sensory regulation Evidenced-based Classroom Management Strategies 1 FTE Postion School Psychologist Assist MTSS / SST Teams on EL Overidentification Present at School Psych Staff meetings Act as point person to support case managers and program managers with the processes and documentation needed for reclassification of students served by an IEP Review all reclassification documentation in collaboration with the Multilingual Services/Special Services program technician to ensure compliance MTSS Intervention Counselors to continue to refine intervention systems and offer targeted support to identified students, which a focus on English learners, foster youth, and low income. A part-time MTSS Intervention Counselor at the high school sites and two shared MTSS Intervention Counselors to support the four middle schools."	\$1,512,964.46	Yes
1.7	Enrichment Music Programs for Students & Increased Opportunities for Collaboration	Utilize the elementary music program to foster cultural connections among students identified as Homeless, English learners, foster youth, and low-income by delivering continuous music education. Ensure students receive weekly music instruction, including both classroom-based and instrumental	\$1,140,171.03	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		lessons. Additionally, it provides elementary classroom teachers in grades 1-6 to their preparation time.. 8 FTE (Prep)		
1.8	New School Model Support	"To enhance educational opportunities at Elsie Allen High School, FTE for staff will be allocated to facilitate a 7-period school day. This adjustment aligns with the implementation of the New School Model, which prioritizes expanding access to a diverse range of electives such as Career Technical Education (CTE), Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA), World Languages, and early college credit programs. The aim is to provide increased opportunities for Multilingual Learners, Foster, and Homeless Youth, as well as Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. Additionally, a Dual Language Immersion Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) will be designated to support the expansion and ongoing development of the Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Approaches program at Elsie Allen High School and Cesar Chavez Language Academy. This role will focus on providing guidance and resources to further enrich the dual language immersion experience for students."	\$933,531.00	Yes
1.9	Supports for Increased Inclusive practices	Continue to support general education sections for math and ELA at the secondary level to support ideal ratios (1/3:2/3) in the co-taught classes. Compensate teachers for extra planning time and collaboration of co-teaching teams.	\$300,000.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	SRCS, in partnership with our community, commits to developing safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments to promote social-emotional wellness and address the physical needs of students, families, and staff. Qualifier: SRCS, in sustained collaboration with our community, is dedicated to creating safe, inclusive, and culturally responsive learning environments that foster social-emotional wellness. We are committed to cultivating a deep level of parent engagement, recognizing the importance of students' mindsets, assets, and identities, and providing comprehensive wraparound services and support to meet the physical and emotional needs of students, families, and staff. Our goal is to ensure institutional responsiveness to the cultural and linguistic needs of our students and their families. We aim to move beyond surface-level interactions to foster meaningful and intentional family engagement, empowering parents with agency and sustaining a collaborative community where every member feels valued and supported.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Santa Rosa City Schools has developed this goal based on insights from the California Dashboard, Panorama, Youth Truth, Street Data, and stakeholder feedback, emphasizing an asset-based approach. Due to an identified need to increase social-emotional support, improve school climate, and enhance cultural responsiveness, SRCS feels compelled to strengthen and enhance multidisciplinary tiered systems of support.
--

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	Metrics: attendance, suspension and expulsion rates, climate and wellness surveys, parent and student engagement. Short - Parent Engagement, Attendance. Middle - Attendance, on track to graduate, Long - Absenteeism (Chronic) Climate and wellness surveys, graduation rate	Chronic Absenteeism - Overall 35.6%, Latinx: 39.4%, UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9%, UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% UPC: N/A ELs: 61.9% SED: 79.0% Homeless: 53.6% Foster Youth: 57.1% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% UPC: 60.5% ELs: 45.5% SED: 63% Homeless: 40.9% Foster Youth: 57.1%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% UPC: N/A ELs: 67.3% SED: 84.4% Homeless: 59% Foster Youth: 62.5%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Climate and wellness safety modules - In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, 64% of all students surveyed reported a positive response School Safety. 61% of the Hispanic/Latinx students surveyed reported a positive response to School Safety. This places our district within the 70th percentile within the national ranking.			Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% UPC: 66.5% ELs: 51.5% SED: 69% Homeless: 46.9% Foster Youth: 63.1% School Safety Survey Results. Panorama/Youth Truth: All Students - 73% and Hispanic/Latinx - 70%; each group improves by 3%.	
2.2	"Metrics: attendance, suspension and expulsion rates, climate and wellness surveys, parent and student engagement. Short - Parent Engagement, Attendance. Middle - Attendance, on track to graduate, Long - Absenteeism (Chronic) Climate and wellness surveys, graduation rate "	Chronic Absenteeism - Overall 35.6%, Latinx: 39.4%, UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9%, UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% UPC: N/A ELs: 61.9% SED: 79.0% Homeless: 53.6% Foster Youth: 57.1% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% UPC: 60.5% ELs: 45.5% SED: 63% Homeless: 40.9% Foster Youth: 57.1% Climate and wellness safety modules - In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, 64% of all students surveyed reported a positive response School Safety. 61% of the Hispanic/Latinx students surveyed reported a positive response to School Safety. This places our district within the 70th percentile within the national ranking.			ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% UPC: N/A ELs: 67.3% SED: 84.4% Homeless: 59% Foster Youth: 62.5% Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% UPC: 66.5% ELs: 51.5% SED: 69% Homeless: 46.9% Foster Youth: 63.1% School Safety Survey Results. Panorama/Youth Truth: All Students - 73% and Hispanic/Latinx - 70%; each group improves by 3%.	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.3	Metrics: attendance, suspension and expulsion rates, climate and wellness surveys, parent and student engagement. Short - Attendance. Middle - Attendance, on track to graduate, Long - Absenteeism (Chronic) Climate and wellness surveys	Chronic Absenteeism - Overall 35.6%, Latinx: 39.4%, UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9%, UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% UPC: N/A ELs: 61.9% SED: 79.0% Homeless: 53.6% Foster Youth: 57.1% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% UPC: 60.5% ELs: 45.5% SED: 63% Homeless: 40.9% Foster Youth: 57.1%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% UPC: N/A ELs: 67.3% SED: 84.4% Homeless: 59% Foster Youth: 62.5%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Climate and wellness safety modules - In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, 64% of all students surveyed reported a positive response School Safety. 61% of the Hispanic/Latinx students surveyed reported a positive response to School Safety. This places our district within the 70th percentile within the national ranking.			Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% UPC: 66.5% ELs: 51.5% SED: 69% Homeless: 46.9% Foster Youth: 63.1% School Safety Survey Results. Panorama/Youth Truth: All Students - 73% and Hispanic/Latinx - 70%; each group improves by 3%.	
2.4	Metrics: attendance, suspension and expulsion rates, climate and wellness surveys, parent and student engagement. Short - Parent Engagement, Attendance. Middle - Attendance, on track to graduate, Long - Absenteeism (Chronic) Climate and wellness surveys, graduation rate	Chronic Absenteeism - Overall 35.6%, Latinx: 39.4%, UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9%, UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% UPC: N/A ELs: 61.9% SED: 79.0% Homeless: 53.6% Foster Youth: 57.1% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% UPC: 60.5% ELs: 45.5% SED: 63% Homeless: 40.9% Foster Youth: 57.1% Climate and wellness safety modules - In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, 64% of all students surveyed reported a positive response School Safety. 61% of the Hispanic/Latinx students surveyed reported a positive response to School Safety. This places our district within the 70th percentile within the national ranking.			ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% UPC: N/A ELs: 67.3% SED: 84.4% Homeless: 59% Foster Youth: 62.5% Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% UPC: 66.5% ELs: 51.5% SED: 69% Homeless: 46.9% Foster Youth: 63.1% School Safety Survey Results. Panorama/Youth Truth: All Students - 73% and Hispanic/Latinx - 70%; each group improves by 3%.	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.5	Metrics: attendance, suspension and expulsion rates, climate and wellness surveys, parent and student engagement. Short - Parent Engagement, Attendance. Middle - Attendance, on track to graduate, Long - Absenteeism (Chronic) Climate and wellness surveys, graduation rate	Chronic Absenteeism - Overall 35.6%, Latinx: 39.4%, UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9%, UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% UPC: N/A ELs: 61.9% SED: 79.0% Homeless: 53.6% Foster Youth: 57.1% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% UPC: 60.5% ELs: 45.5% SED: 63% Homeless: 40.9% Foster Youth: 57.1%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% UPC: N/A ELs: 67.3% SED: 84.4% Homeless: 59% Foster Youth: 62.5%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Climate and wellness safety modules - In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, 64% of all students surveyed reported a positive response School Safety. 61% of the Hispanic/Latinx students surveyed reported a positive response to School Safety. This places our district within the 70th percentile within the national ranking.			Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% UPC: 66.5% ELs: 51.5% SED: 69% Homeless: 46.9% Foster Youth: 63.1% School Safety Survey Results. Panorama/Youth Truth: All Students - 73% and Hispanic/Latinx - 70%; each group improves by 3%.	
2.6	Metrics: attendance, suspension and expulsion rates, climate and wellness surveys, parent and student engagement. Short - Parent Engagement, Attendance. Middle - Attendance, on track to graduate, Long-absenteeism (Chronic) Climate and wellness surveys, graduation rate	Chronic Absenteeism - Overall 35.6%, Latinx: 39.4%, UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9%, UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% UPC: N/A ELs: 61.9% SED: 79.0% Homeless: 53.6% Foster Youth: 57.1% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% UPC: 60.5% ELs: 45.5% SED: 63% Homeless: 40.9% Foster Youth: 57.1% Climate and wellness safety modules - In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, 64% of all students surveyed reported a positive response School Safety. 61% of the Hispanic/Latinx students surveyed reported a positive response to School Safety. This places our district within the 70th percentile within the national ranking.			ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% UPC: N/A ELs: 67.3% SED: 84.4% Homeless: 59% Foster Youth: 62.5% Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% UPC: 66.5% ELs: 51.5% SED: 69% Homeless: 46.9% Foster Youth: 63.1% School Safety Survey Results. Panorama/Youth Truth: All Students - 73% and Hispanic/Latinx - 70%; each group improves by 3%.	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.7	Metrics: attendance, suspension and expulsion rates, climate and wellness surveys, parent and student engagement. Short - Parent Engagement, Attendance. Middle - Attendance, on track to graduate, Long-Absenteeism (Chronic) Climate and wellness surveys, graduation rate	Chronic Absenteeism - Overall 35.6%, Latinx: 39.4%, UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9%, UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% UPC: N/A ELs: 61.9% SED: 79.0% Homeless: 53.6% Foster Youth: 57.1% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% UPC: 60.5% ELs: 45.5% SED: 63% Homeless: 40.9% Foster Youth: 57.1%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% UPC: N/A ELs: 67.3% SED: 84.4% Homeless: 59% Foster Youth: 62.5%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Climate and wellness safety modules - In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, 64% of all students surveyed reported a positive response School Safety. 61% of the Hispanic/Latinx students surveyed reported a positive response to School Safety. This places our district within the 70th percentile within the national ranking.			Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% UPC: 66.5% ELs: 51.5% SED: 69% Homeless: 46.9% Foster Youth: 63.1% School Safety Survey Results. Panorama/Youth Truth: All Students - 73% and Hispanic/Latinx - 70%; each group improves by 3%.	
2.8	Metrics: attendance, suspension and expulsion rates, climate and wellness surveys, parent and student engagement. Short - Parent Engagement, Attendance. Middle - Attendance, on track to graduate, Long - Absenteeism (Chronic) Climate and wellness surveys, graduation rate	Chronic Absenteeism - Overall 35.6%, Latinx: 39.4%, UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9%, UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% UPC: N/A ELs: 61.9% SED: 79.0% Homeless: 53.6% Foster Youth: 57.1% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% UPC: 60.5% ELs: 45.5% SED: 63% Homeless: 40.9% Foster Youth: 57.1% Climate and wellness safety modules - In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, 64% of all students surveyed reported a positive response School Safety. 61% of the Hispanic/Latinx students surveyed reported a positive response to School Safety. This places our district within the 70th percentile within the national ranking.			ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% UPC: N/A ELs: 67.3% SED: 84.4% Homeless: 59% Foster Youth: 62.5% Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% UPC: 66.5% ELs: 51.5% SED: 69% Homeless: 46.9% Foster Youth: 63.1% School Safety Survey Results. Panorama/Youth Truth: All Students - 73% and Hispanic/Latinx - 70%; each group improves by 3%.	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.9	SRCS Metrics Short-Term: Increase Student Participation/Attendance. Middle-Term: Student Participation/Attendance, Progress Toward Graduation Long-Term: Chronic Absenteeism, Graduation Rate, School Climate and Wellness Additional Metrics: Financial contribution, number of student athletes served, programs supported, percentage of total costs covered by LCFF funds, items/needs funded, total student athletes who utilized sports injury services, concussion cases reported.	Chronic Absenteeism - Overall 35.6%, Latinx: 39.4%, UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9%, UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% UPC: N/A ELs: 61.9% SED: 79.0% Homeless: 53.6% Foster Youth: 57.1% Progress Towards Graduation - 89.3% UPC: 60.5% ELs: 45.5% SED: 63% Homeless: 40.9% Foster Youth: 57.1%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% UPC: N/A ELs: 67.3% SED: 84.4% Homeless: 59% Foster Youth: 62.5%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Climate and wellness safety modules - In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, 64% of all students surveyed reported a positive response School Safety. 61% of the Hispanic/Latinx students surveyed reported a positive response to School Safety. This places our district within the 70th percentile within the national ranking. SRCS Financial Contribution: 0% Student Athletes Served (grades 7-12): 2,472 Interscholastic Programs Served: 26 Title IX Participation: 1,398 male / 1,070 female Sports Injury Cases: 327 Reported Concussion Cases: 66			Progress Towards Graduation - 95.3% UPC: 66.5% ELs: 51.5% SED: 69% Homeless: 46.9% Foster Youth: 63.1% School Safety Survey Results. Panorama/Youth Truth: All Students - 73% and Hispanic/Latinx - 70%; each group improves by 3%. Financial Contribution: 30% increase from Baseline Student Athletes Served (grades 7-12): 1-3% increase from Baseline Interscholastic Programs Served: 0-2% Increase from Baseline Title IX Participation: 1-3% increase from Baseline Sports Injury Cases: Relative to	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					student participation Reported Concussion Cases: Relative to student participation	

Goal Analysis [2023-24]

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

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.1	Panorama wellness survey and Youth Truth survey	SRCS administers the Panorama wellness survey bi-annually to students in grades 4-12 and staff, focusing on aspects like self-efficacy and supportive relationships. For grades K-3, teachers provide responses on behalf of students. The survey results inform tiered interventions, support	\$51,770.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		plans, and school programs, with the Panorama Playbook offering targeted activities. Additionally, the annual Youth Truth climate survey, jointly funded by the Sonoma County Office of Education and the Center for Effective Philanthropy, gathers input from students, families, and staff to assess school and district climate, aiding in goal-setting and program development. We will use the survey results to design programs and supports to improve the educational experience of Hispanic-Latinx, homeless and foster youth who are reporting fewer percent positive experiences in school. Survey results will also be included as part of our California Community Schools Partnership Program needs assessments at sites selected to implement the Community Schools model. Includes program/materials.		
2.2	Mental Health Supports	The Mental Health and Wellness Team comprises 14 School-Based Therapists who collaborate with school counselors, MTSS teams, and administrators to address student mental health needs. They support tiered interventions, offer suicide prevention training, and lead student groups to destigmatize mental health and advocate for student well-being. Priority consideration is given to bilingual candidates to enhance services for English learners, foster youth, and low-income students. Funding for this initiative covers the Director of Mental Health & Community School Development position, clinical supervision for therapists, and ensures compliance with reimbursement schedules. Success is gauged by providing licensed supervision for all school-based therapists, focusing on both general and special education settings, and meeting California's standards for mental health services. We will provide this service to provide increased access to school-based therapists for chronically absent students, socio-economically disadvantaged students, English Learners, homeless and foster youth, and students who are demonstrating a need for mental health support across all campuses.	\$1,327,030.31	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Includes staffing.		
2.3	SEL and Antibullying Materials and Curriculum	"To prioritize the social-emotional well-being of students in Santa Rosa City Schools, SRCS allocates resources for educators and staff. At the elementary level, funding supports both the implementation of Toolbox resources and professional development. Additionally, funds are directed towards the Panorama Playbook to tailor content and activities based on survey findings. Maria Carillo High School utilizes Project Wayfinder for their Freshman Global Perspectives course. Success metrics include improved social-emotional health markers measured through Panorama and Youth Truth surveys. Furthermore, the StopIT alert system provides an anonymous reporting tool for safety concerns, with funding allocated for promotional materials and data analysis to gauge increased usage and reduced incidents. Includes programs/materials."	\$20,600.00	Yes
2.4	Increased Campus Student Engagement staffing	"The district maintains a total of 24 FTE restorative support specialist positions across elementary, middle, and high schools to bolster school climate, discipline strategies, and social-emotional health. Additionally, funds sustain an increase to 14 FTE Student Safety Advisor/Campus Supervisors and campus supervision positions at secondary schools to enhance student connections and campus safety, with a goal of reducing suspension, expulsion, and acts of violence. Seven FTE employees oversee enrichment activities and programs for elementary students during recess, lunch, and after school, aiming to increase student engagement within the school community. Includes staffing."	\$3,668,660.96	Yes
2.5	Promoting Positive Attendance	"The district maintains funding for support staff targeting interventions for chronically absent and truant students, including 2 FTE Family	\$145,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Engagement Facilitators and a partnership with Seneca and Sonoma County Juvenile Probation, providing 1.0 FTE Keeping Kids In Schools case manager. These case managers work directly with SRCS students and families to improve attendance rates, with each manager handling 12-16 direct cases and outreach for 25-30 other students. Family Engagement Facilitators oversee the truancy process, including School Attendance Review Teams, aiming to reduce referrals to SARB and improve district attendance to 92% by monitoring site and case attendance rates. Includes staffing."		
2.6	Elementary Counselors	"Attend to the social, emotional health, and well-being of students who predominately represent English learners and/or are low income. 9 total 1.0 FTE Elementary Counselors support students in Tier 1 preventions, and Tier 2 & 3 interventions (one per school). Includes staffing."	\$1,453,386.17	Yes
2.7	Wellness & Engagement administration	"Maintain funding to continue 2.0 FTE SRCS administrators for Wellness & Engagement (1.0 FTE Executive Director & 1.0 FTE Coordinator) with the knowledge of education and the law, to resolve complex situations involving student behavior, campus safety, restorative practices, enrollment, attendance and truancy, multitiered systems of support and programs for youth at promise. Data for monitoring success includes monitoring improved student engagement through attendance and reduction of suspension/expulsion data, improved Youth Truth and Panorama metrics of engagement of students and families, sense of community safety and improved relationships. These positions target engagement strategies designed to re-engage students who are identified as English learners, homeless, foster youth, Hispanic-Latinx, American Indian, and socio-economically disadvantaged students who are reporting a lower engagement rate of other groups on campus. Includes staffing."	\$389,875.35	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.8	Family Engagement Facilitators and Multilingual Community Engagement	"To foster a more inclusive and supportive educational environment, the district implements a comprehensive approach, including bilingual staff presence, creating welcoming school atmospheres, and improving parent access to resources. Parent education and leadership programs will empower families to engage actively in their children's education. With 31 FTE Family Engagement Facilitators, adequately trained to engage with parents, and a tiered system of strategies and supports, communication between the district and families will be enhanced. By ensuring all schools have at least 1.0 FTE dedicated family engagement facilitator positions and allocating 2.0 FTEs for high schools, the district aims to strengthen the partnership between schools and families, enhancing the educational experience for all students. Additionally, 4 FTE positions will support districtwide specialized programs, including Multilingual Services, Migrant Education, and support for Homeless and Foster Youth. Includes both programs and staffing."	\$2,014,725.08	Yes
2.9	Extracurricular Wellness & Engagement	Funding is allocated to support extracurricular activities in grades 7-12, including interscholastic athletics, covering organization fees and operational costs. Additionally, funding is provided to bolster the health and wellness of student athletes, facilitating timely medical support by providing digital programs for assessment, medical supplies and equipment for first aid to address sports injuries, and agreements with local medical providers for consultation and referrals. These resources ensure Athletic Trainers can operate effectively within their scope of practice, enhancing care for student athletes.	\$95,000.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	SRCS commits to providing high-quality, relevant staff development that promotes professional growth and collaboration to increase student achievement. Qualifier: SRCS is committed to fostering professional growth to support student outcomes by being responsive to the needs of both certificated and classified staff and building on internal capacity. We aim to empower our staff with agency in their professional learning, ensuring access to supportive, culturally responsive learning opportunities. Through professional learning and collaboration, SRCS will create a robust environment for professional development. Additionally, we are dedicated to supporting parent agency and learning to enhance overall community engagement and student success.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

SRCS created this goal based on the California Dashboard and local survey data. We are a learning institution focused on continuous improvement to better serve our students. By working collaboratively with staff to support their professional development needs, we aim to positively change student outcomes. Teacher feedback indicates a strong desire for a greater voice in decision-making and an interest in leveraging internal expertise. Therefore, we commit to fostering an environment where educators can share their knowledge, contribute to the conversation, and receive the support they need to thrive in their roles.
--

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Professional development attendance rate for both certificated	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	and classified, PD opportunities, staff retention rates, graduation rate, attendance rate. ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) ELPAC Improvement AP Pass Rate Reclassification Rate A-G Completion Progress Towards A-G Completion Short - student attendance, PD opportunities provided and staff attendance rate Middle - chronic absenteeism, teaching efficacy rate Long - chronic absenteeism, graduation rate	Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%)			School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%)	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grade 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%)			Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grade 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grace 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grace 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grace 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement:			Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grace 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grace 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grace 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Professional Development Attendance Rate for both Certificated and Classified Average attendance by classified for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 26% of classified employees			Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		were absent/74% were present Average attendance by certificated for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 22% of certificated employees were absent/78% were present 2022 Panorama Reported Teacher Efficacy Rate: 67%			ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Professional Development Attendance - Classified = 86% present; Certificated = 90% present Improve Teaching Efficacy reported in Panorama Wellness Survey by 2% each survey administration	
3.2	Professional development attendance rate for both certificated and classified, PD opportunities, staff retention rates, graduation rate, attendance rate. ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) ELPAC Improvement AP Pass Rate Reclassification Rate A-G Completion Progress Towards A-G Completion Short - student attendance, PD opportunities provided and staff attendance rate	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Middle - chronic absenteeism, teaching efficacy rate Long - chronic absenteeism, graduation rate, implementation of best first instruction (Tier 1) strategies	Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4%			Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grade 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grace 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grace 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grace 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4%			Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grace 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grace 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grace 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year:			Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grade 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Professional Development Attendance Rate for both Certificated and Classified Average attendance by classified for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 26% of classified employees were absent/74% were present Average attendance by certificated for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 22% of certificated employees were absent/78% were present 2022 Panorama Reported Teacher Efficacy Rate: 67%			Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Professional Development Attendance - Classified = 86% present; Certificated = 90% present Improve Teaching Efficacy reported in Panorama Wellness Survey by 2% each survey administration.	
3.3	Professional development attendance rate for both certificated and classified graduation rate	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	ELA CAASPP Proficiency at RHS, Grace, and ISP Math CAASPP Proficiency at RHS, Grace, and ISP ELPAC Improvement at RHS, Grace, and ISP AP Pass Rate in ISP Reclassification Rate at RHS, Grace, and ISP Progress Towards A-G in ISP Short - chronic absenteeism, PD opportunities provided and staff attendance rate Middle - chronic absenteeism, teaching efficacy rate Long - chronic absenteeism, graduation rate	Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33%			ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grade 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grade 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0%			Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grade 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grace 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grace 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1%			Grace 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grace 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grace 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Professional Development Attendance Rate for both Certificated and Classified Average attendance by classified for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 26% of classified employees were absent/74% were present Average attendance by certificated for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 22% of certificated employees			Grace 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grace 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grace 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		were absent/78% were present 2022 Panorama Reported Teacher Efficacy Rate: 67%			AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Professional Development Attendance - Classified = 86%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					present; Certificated = 90% present Improve Teaching Efficacy reported in Panorama Wellness Survey by 2% each survey administration.	
3.4	Professional development attendance rate for both certificated and classified, PD opportunities, staff retention rates, graduation rate, attendance rate. Short - student attendance, PD opportunities provided and staff attendance rate Middle - chronic absenteeism, suspension rate Long - chronic absenteeism, graduation rate, implementation of best first instruction (Tier 1) strategies	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion:	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Professional Development Attendance Rate for both Certificated and Classified Average attendance by classified for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 26% of classified employees were absent/74% were present Average attendance by certificated for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 22% of certificated employees were absent/78% were present.			Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Professional Development Attendance - Classified = 86% present; Certificated = 90% present.	
3.5	Professional development attendance rate for both certificated and classified, PD opportunities, staff retention rates, graduation rate, attendance rate. Professional development attendance rate for both certificated and classified graduation rate ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11)	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%)	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) ELPAC Improvement AP Pass Rate Reclassification Rate A-G Completion Progress Towards A-G Completion Short - student attendance, PD opportunities provided and staff attendance rate Middle - chronic absenteeism, suspension rate Long - chronic absenteeism, graduation rate, implementation of best first instruction (Tier 1) strategies	Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0%			Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%)	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grade 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grade 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grade 5 ELs: 1.9%			Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grade 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grade 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All			Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grade 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Professional Development Attendance Rate for both Certificated and Classified Average attendance by classified for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 26% of classified employees were absent/74% were present Average attendance by certificated for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 22% of certificated employees were absent/78% were present 2022 Panorama Reported Teacher Efficacy Rate: 67%			Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Professional Development Attendance - Classified = 86% present; Certificated = 90% present Improve Teaching Efficacy reported in Panorama Wellness Survey by 2% each survey administration.	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.6	ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) ELPAC Improvement AP Pass Rate Reclassification Rate A-G Completion Progress Towards A-G Completion Short - student attendance, PD opportunities provided and staff attendance rate Middle - chronic absenteeism, teaching efficacy rate Long - chronic absenteeism, graduation rate	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 8 Foster Youth:N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grace 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grace 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grace 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0%			Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grace 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grace 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grace 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 8 Foster Youth:N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grace 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grace 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grace 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8%			Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grace 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grace 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth:9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grace 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Professional Development Attendance Rate for both Certificated and Classified			Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Average attendance by classified for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 26% of classified employees were absent/74% were present Average attendance by certificated for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 22% of certificated employees were absent/78% were present 2022 Panorama Reported Teacher Efficacy Rate: 67%			Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Professional Development Attendance - Classified = 86% present; Certificated = 90% present Improve Teaching Efficacy reported in Panorama Wellness Survey by 2% each survey administration.	
3.7	Professional development attendance rate for both certificated and classified, PD opportunities, staff retention rates, graduation rate, attendance rate. ELA CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) Math CAASPP Proficiency (3, 6, 8, 11) A-G Completion Graduation Rate Progress Toward Graduation Ethnic Studies Completion	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3%			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Short - student attendance, PD opportunities provided and staff attendance rate Middle - chronic absenteeism, teaching efficacy rate Long - chronic absenteeism, graduation rate	Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grade 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grade 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3%			Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grade 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grade 11 ELs: 13.1%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grade 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grade 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grade 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0%			Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grade 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grade 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4%			Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grade 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Professional Development Attendance Rate for both Certificated and Classified Average attendance by classified for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 26% of classified employees were absent/74% were present Average attendance by certificated for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 22% of certificated employees were absent/78% were present 2022 Panorama Reported Teacher Efficacy Rate: 67% Ethnic Studies Completion: Overall - 63.7%, Latinx - 55%			Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19% Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8% Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Professional Development Attendance - Classified = 86% present; Certificated = 90% present Improve Teaching Efficacy reported in Panorama Wellness Survey by 2% each survey administration Ethnic Studies Completion: Overall - 63.7%, Latinx - 55%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.8	Professional development attendance rate Graduation rate ELA CAASPP Proficiency (8, 11) Math CAASPP Proficiency (8, 11) ELPAC Improvement AP Pass Rate Reclassification Rate A-G Completion Progress Towards A-G Completion Metrics: attendance, suspension and expulsion rates, climate and wellness surveys, parent and student engagement. Short - Parent Engagement, chronic absenteeism Middle - chronic absenteeism, progress toward graduation Long - Chronic absenteeism, Climate and wellness surveys, graduation rate	Chronic Absenteeism for the 2022-23 School Year - 35.6% Overall, 32.2% Hispanic UPC: 34.6% ELs: 37% SED: 33.2% Homeless: 49.4% Foster Youth: 45% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 29.3% (H/L: 19.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 19.1% Grade 3 ELs: 8.9% Grade 3 SED: 22.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 40.6% (H/L: 29.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 26.1% Grade 6 ELs: 3.2% Grade 6 SED: 33.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 29.0% (H/L: 17.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.4% Grade 8 ELs: 1.2% Grade 8 SED: 19.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A			Chronic Absenteeism for the 2026-27 School Year- 15% Overall, 17.2% Hispanic UPC: 19.6% ELs: 22% SED: 18.2% Homeless: 34.4% Foster Youth: 30% ELA CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 38.3% (H/L: 28.5%) Grade 3 UPC: 28.1% Grade 3 ELs: 17.9% Grade 3 SED: 31.8% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 49.6% (H/L: 38.7%) Grade 6 UPC: 35.1% Grade 6 ELs: 12.2% Grade 6 SED: 42.3% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11: 50.4% (H/L: 37.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 34% Grace 11 ELs: 4.1% Grade 11 SED: 38.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 33% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 40% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 31.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 20.3% Grace 3 ELs: 12.0% Grade 3 SED: 24.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 3 Foster Youth: n/a Grade 6: 33.7% (H/L: 24.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 19.4% Grace 6 ELs: 4.5% Grade 6 SED: 23.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 33.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 0% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 8.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 8.2% Grace 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 8.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A			Grade 8: 38.0% (H/L: 26.6%) Grade 8 UPC: 26.4% Grace 8 ELs: 10.2% Grade 8 SED: 28.3% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 59.4% (H/L: 46.4%) Grade 11 UPC: 43% Grace 11 ELs: 13.1% Grade 11 SED: 47.2% Grade 11 Homeless: 42% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 49% Math CAASPP Proficiency Grade 3: 40.6% (H/L: 22.3%) Grade 3 UPC: 29.3% Grace 3 ELs: 21.0% Grade 3 SED: 33.3% Grade 3 Homeless: 42.3%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11: 24.9% (H/L: 11.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 11.6% Grade 11 ELs: 0.6% Grade 11 SED: 12.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 0% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 25% Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 27.1% (H/L: 11.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 13.9% Grade 5 ELs: 1.9% Grade 5 SED: 15.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 0% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 20.2% (H/L: 9.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 9.1% Grade 8 ELs: 0.4% Grade 8 SED: 10.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 0% Grade 8 Foster Youth: N/A Grade 11&12: 25.6% (H/L: 14.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 14.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 0% Grade 11&12 SED: 15.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 10%			Grade 3 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 6: 42.7% (H/L: 33.4%) Grade 6 UPC: 28.4% Grade 6 ELs: 13.5% Grade 6 SED: 32.1% Grade 6 Homeless: 42.3% Grade 6 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 8: 17.6% (H/L: 17.1%) Grade 8 UPC: 17.2% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 17.5% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11: 33.9% (H/L: 20.1%) Grade 11 UPC: 20.6% Grade 11 ELs: 9.6% Grade 11 SED: 21.6% Grade 11 Homeless: 9% Grade 11 Foster Youth: 34%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 40% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 38.6% Secondary: 31.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 70.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 62.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 7.4% Secondary: 4.4% A-G Completion: Overall 33.8%, Latinx 21.99% Graduation Rate for the 2022-23 school year: All Students - 82.6%, Latinx: 77.4% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 33.8%, Latinx - 22% Suspension Rate for the 2022-2023 school year: All Students- 7.7%. Hispanic: 8.9% UPC: 9.9% ELs: 8.9% SED: 9.8% Homeless: 21.7% Foster Youth: 25% Professional Development Attendance Rate for both Certificated and Classified Average attendance by classified for 11/1/23			Science CAST Proficiency Grade 5: 36.1% (H/L: 20.9%) Grade 5 UPC: 22.9% Grade 5 ELs: 10.9% Grade 5 SED: 24.5% Grade 5 Homeless: 9% Grade 5 Foster Youth: 100% Grade 8: 29.2% (H/L: 18.5%) Grade 8 UPC: 18.1% Grade 8 ELs: 9.4% Grade 8 SED: 19.2% Grade 8 Homeless: 9% Grade 8 Foster Youth: 9% Grade 11&12: 34.6% (H/L: 23.3%) Grade 11&12 UPC: 23.4% Grade 11&12 ELs: 9% Grade 11&12 SED: 24.8% Grade 11&12 Homeless: 19%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		and 1/26/24 = 26% of classified employees were absent/74% were present Average attendance by certificated for 11/1/23 and 1/26/24 = 22% of certificated employees were absent/78% were present 2022 Panorama Reported Teacher Efficacy Rate: 67% Climate and wellness safety modules - In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, 64% of all students surveyed reported a positive response School Safety. 61% of the Hispanic/Latinx students surveyed reported a positive response to School Safety. This places our district within the 70th percentile within the national ranking.			Grade 11&12 Foster Youth: 49% ELPAC Improvement: Elementary: 53.6% Secondary: 46.7% AP Pass Rate: Overall Sec. 73.1% Sec. Hispanic/Latino 68.1% Reclassification Rate: Elementary: 16.4% - 22.4% Secondary: 13.4 - 19.4% A-G Completion: Overall 45.8%, Latinx 36.99% Graduation Rate for the 2026-27 school year: All Students - 88%, Latinx: 86% Progress Towards A-G Completion: Overall - 45.8%, Latinx - 37% Suspension Rate for the 2026-2027 school year: All Students- 4.7%. Hispanic: 2.9% UPC: 6.9% ELs: 5.9% SED: 6.8%	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
					Homeless: 18.7% Foster Youth: 22% Professional Development Attendance - Classified = 86% present; Certificated = 90% present Improve Teaching Efficacy reported in Panorama Wellness Survey by 2% each survey administration School Safety Survey Results: Panorama/Youth Truth - All Students - 73% and Hispanic/Latinx - 70%; each group improves by 3%.	

Goal Analysis [2023-24]

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

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.1	PD for Safety, Discipline, and Restorative and Culturally Responsive Student Support	"Funds are allocated for annual professional development aimed at enhancing administration training in restorative practices, student engagement, safety strategies, and legal mandates like Title IX. This includes ongoing training on Restorative Practices for classified and certificated employees, as well as parents and students, fostering a culturally-responsive relational approach and enhancing community, relationships, and a sense of belonging. Additionally, resources support trainings for certificated and classified staff on student engagement, safety strategies, threat assessment, risk management, and other relevant topics. Includes programs/materials."	\$55,000.00	Yes
3.2	Teacher training and collaboration to develop and implement effective strategies for differentiating instruction, aligning instructional approaches, and	"Implement comprehensive professional development sessions, utilizing allocated release time, to provide educators with specialized training on explicit multisensory teaching techniques tailored for reading instruction. These sessions will prioritize data from district assessments to differentiate instruction strategies, addressing the diverse needs of student populations, including English learners, homeless students, foster youth, low-income students, and those with special education requirements. Additionally, ensure alignment with district tests and benchmarks while offering ongoing support. Offer a diverse range of professional development opportunities	\$240,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
	aligning literacy practices.	covering various instructional methodologies suitable for diverse student cohorts. Recognizing proficient reading skills as fundamental to academic success across all subjects, this investment in teachers' knowledge and skills aims to enhance student outcomes and foster a culture of literacy within schools. Prepare educators for the new California math framework by focusing on robust Elementary Math strategies, emphasizing supporting a positive math mindset, incorporating problem-solving activities, and utilizing technology to enhance math instruction. Foster collaboration between classroom teachers and educators to ensure alignment of instructional strategies and learning objectives, aiming for improved student engagement and achievement. In addition, support ongoing collaboration and professional development that enables teachers to effectively use these tools in their teaching and learning, with the goal of improved student engagement and achievement. In addition, support grades 7-12 ongoing collaboration and professional development that enables teachers to effectively use these tools in their teaching and learning, with the goal of improved student engagement and achievement. Finally, provide additional 7-12 meetings for department chair members (beyond the required 4 per year) focused on essential standards, scope and sequence, and integration of district initiatives like ethnic studies pedagogy. These meetings will continue to facilitate teacher leadership and the development of common systems and agreements around discipline-specific initiatives district-wide. Meetings will focus on activities that prompt action, dialogue, metacognition, and cooperation."		
3.3	Alternative Education Development and Programmatic Implementation	"Increase Alternative Education seats for students for SRCS students who are not finding success in a comprehensive school learning environment, with an emphasis on grade 7-12 students. The Alternative Education Committee will continue to meet following direction from the Board and Superintendent to develop further alternative education options. Direction was given to create alternative programs focused on middle school students who are struggling academically, with chronic absenteeism, and behaviorally, and expand upon Independent Study offerings. To increase seats in the Independent Study Program SRCS would hire certificated teachers between 1.0 - 2.0 FTE, with the current student to teacher ratio of	\$315,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		25:1 this will serve up to an additional 50 students. Expanding Independent Study would support students in grades 7-12, and reduce the number of students who request Independent Study and are kept on a waitlist for extended periods of time. The goal of a middle school program would be to have smaller class sizes with additional counseling support for students. This would entail hiring certificated teacher and counselor FTE, as well as additional classified clerical FTE and an administrator. In an effort to be more innovative and equitable in the development of new programs, and to support current leadership in developing a network of support, building new supports for students and staff at current alternative programs, and further developing best practices at current alternative programs professional development opportunities will be included. To support site and district leadership of alternative education in this effort, the continuation high school site administration and district personnel will attend various conferences. Cost to include conference registrations, travel, and expenses for conferences."		
3.4	Provide professional development for Staff	"Support professional development for classified staff. This may include district wide days focused on classified employee learning. As part of that, these days may include expanded learning & training (via site Tech Leads and stipends) on things such as: Google Suite (Mail, Docs, Sheets, etc.), Spanish, English, Math, SIS (Aeries and Illuminate), Staff Portal, BenefitsConnect, Frontline, ParentSquare, Work Safety Protocols, CPR/First Aid, Arbinger Institute, budget training, RESIG, CSEA, CVT, SCOE, ToolBox for all employees. Provide two additional calendar days for teacher PD to support best first instruction and supports for all students, reducing barriers to learning and increasing engagement to school. Provide training for board-approved academic and SEL curriculum and supplemental materials, pedagogies and instructional strategies, technology (functional and instructional), and MTSS.""	\$1,900,778.19	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.5	Maintain four Director positions at district level	"Maintain Executive Directors in Educational Services (1 FTE and .10 FTE) and Directors for Grades 7-12 (.40 FTE) and Multilingual Services (1.0 FTE). Directors focus on building capacity in district leadership in implementing a-g requirements, ALD roll-out, and additional counseling to address SEL. Professional development and support to increase the achievement of students who are identified as Multilingual learners, homeless, foster youth, and low-income."	\$589,839.68	Yes
3.6	"Multilingual Learners Curriculum Training, Collaboration and department Professional Development"	"Offering a diverse range of professional development opportunities covering instructional strategies for multilingual learners. This approach acknowledges that effective teaching requires a variety of strategies tailored to the unique needs of each student. As part of our commitment to continuous improvement, we will facilitate monthly collaborative professional development sessions for elementary and secondary teachers focused on Multilingual learners. Our goal is to enhance student outcomes and create an equitable environment where students thrive across all subjects. Multilingual Services staff members will attend professional development with organizations such as Californians Together, EL Rise, EPiCC, the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA), and the Center for Excellence for English Learners. Participation in this strategic professional development will support collaboration with administration and staff. This effort aims to deepen the understanding of the SRCS EL Master Plan, recognize and address the needs of all Multilingual learners, including various Multilingual learner typologies, and monitor the progress of Multilingual learners and Reclassified English learner proficient students at each school site. This will provide expanded access to student data, and increase academic achievement outcomes."	\$35,000.00	No
3.7	Ethnic Studies	Accelerate and deepen the development of Ethnic Studies through intentional site based implementation. This includes a site based Ethnic	\$200,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Studies Program Specialist working one full day a week at three high school sites and one middle school site, paid for by school site SPSAs. The district office will direct .2 FTE of the Ethnic Studies Program Specialist work to ensure every site across the district has access to support and to ensure district wide scaling efforts and implementation is approached in a comprehensive and systematic way, accelerating programmatic efficacy in a focused and coherent manner. In addition, multiple levels of professional development, focused on teacher understanding, instructional practices, and pedagogy will continue, along with dedicated professional development for administrative leadership to support site program implementation. SRCS will continue to support sites with new courses as they develop curriculum, oversee and coordinate paid collaboration time for teachers, and purchase materials. Finally, the Ethnic Studies Program Specialist will collaborate with consultants, organize and communicate with teachers regarding PD participation and release days and extended day pay, and work with our community partners and affinity groups in our Ethnic Studies Community Committee.		
3.8	Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Professional Development	Travel and registration costs for MTSS Intervention Counselors to attend professional development opportunities to strengthen student supports, as well as systems and structures, to serve identified students.	\$14,000.00	No

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

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant
\$20,816,649	\$1,003,297

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
12.525%	0.000%	\$0.00	12.525%

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: Assessment Systems TK-12 Need: See description for Action 1.1 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 1.1	See Goal 1 Metrics
1.2	Action:	See description for Action 1.2	See Goal 1 Metrics

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
	Curriculum Supports and College and Career Readiness Need: See description for Action 1.2 Scope: LEA-wide		
1.3	Action: Expanded Learning Opportunities and Interventions through Summer School and Afterschool Programs Need: See description for Action 1.3 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 1.3	See Goal 1 Metrics
1.4	Action: School Based Support for SPSA Actions and Implementation Need: See description for Action 1.4 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 1.4	See Goal 1 Metrics
1.5	Action: Multilingual Learners Site and Staff and Student Support	See description for Action 1.5	See Goal 1 Metrics

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Need: See description for Action 1.5 Scope: LEA-wide		
1.6	Action: Comprehensive and Collaborative Supports for Students Need: See description for Action 1.6 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 1.6	See Goal 1 Metrics
1.7	Action: Enrichment Music Programs for Students & Increased Opportunities for Collaboration Need: See description for Action 1.7 Scope: Schoolwide	See description for Action 1.7	See Goal 1 Metrics
1.8	Action: New School Model Support Need: See description for Action 1.8 Scope:	See description for Action 1.8	See Goal 1 Metrics

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
	Schoolwide		
1.9	Action: Supports for Increased Inclusive practices Need: See description for Action 1.9 Scope: Schoolwide	See description for Action 1.9	See Goal 1 Metrics
2.1	Action: Panorama wellness survey and Youth Truth survey Need: See description for Action 2.1 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 2.1	See Goal 2 Metrics
2.2	Action: Mental Health Supports Need: See description for Action 2.2 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 2.2	See Goal 2 Metrics
2.3	Action: SEL and Antibullying Materials and Curriculum Need:	See description for Action 2.3	See Goal 2 Metrics

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	See description for Action 2.3 Scope: LEA-wide		
2.4	Action: Increased Campus Student Engagement staffing Need: See description for Action 2.4 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 2.4	See Goal 2 Metrics
2.5	Action: Promoting Positive Attendance Need: See description for Action 2.5 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 2.5	See Goal 2 Metrics
2.6	Action: Elementary Counselors Need: See description for Action 2.6 Scope: Schoolwide	See description for Action 2.6	See Goal 2 Metrics

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
2.7	Action: Wellness & Engagement administration Need: See description for Action 2.7 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 2.7	See Goal 2 Metrics
2.8	Action: Family Engagement Facilitators and Multilingual Community Engagement Need: See description for Action 2.8 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 2.8	See Goal 2 Metrics
2.9	Action: Extracurricular Wellness & Engagement Need: See description for Action 2.9 Scope: Schoolwide	See description for Action 2.9	See Goal 2 Metrics
3.1	Action: PD for Safety, Discipline, and Restorative and Culturally Responsive Student Support Need: See description for Action 3.1	See description for Action 3.1	See Goal 3 Metrics

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Scope: LEA-wide		
3.2	Action: Teacher training and collaboration to develop and implement effective strategies for differentiating instruction, aligning instructional approaches, and aligning literacy practices. Need: See description for Action 3.2 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 3.2	See Goal 3 Metrics
3.3	Action: Alternative Education Development and Programmatic Implementation Need: See description for Action 3.3 Scope: Schoolwide	See description for Action 3.3	See Goal 3 Metrics
3.4	Action: Provide professional development for Staff Need: See description for Action 3.4 Scope:	See description for Action 3.4	See Goal 3 Metrics

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
	LEA-wide		
3.5	Action: Maintain four Director positions at district level Need: See description for Action 3.5 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 3.5	See Goal 3 Metrics
3.7	Action: Ethnic Studies Need: See description for Action 3.7 Scope: LEA-wide	See description for Action 3.7	See Goal 3 Metrics

Limited Actions

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

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.5	Action: Multilingual Learners Site and Staff and Student Support Need:	See description for Action 1.5	See Goal 1 Metrics

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	See description for Action 1.5 Scope: Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(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.

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.

Our focus has been on building strong relationships with students and enhancing the capacity of staff working with students. To achieve this, we have increased the number of classified staff to provide supplementary services. While teacher-to-student ratios are outlined in the CBA, SRCS supports unduplicated pupils through various classified roles such as instructional aides, restorative specialists, student engagement activity workers, and school-based therapists. Notably, the percentage of additional classified staff is greater in elementary and middle schools, whereas high schools benefit from a higher percentage of additional certificated staff.

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	Overall: 15.4 Elementary: 16.1 Middle: 11.9 High: 23.0 Charter: 8.6	Overall: 17.7 Elementary: 29.3 Middle: 46.5 High: 83.2 Charter: 21.7

Staff-to-student ratios by type of school and concentration of unduplicated students	Schools with a student concentration of 55 percent or less	Schools with a student concentration of greater than 55 percent
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	Overall: 46.6 Elementary: 29.3 Middle: 46.5 High: 83.2 Charter: 21.7	Overall: 47.1 Elementary: 28.2 Middle: 41.3 High: 90.1 Charter: 62.9

2024-25 Total Expenditures Table

LCAP Year	1. Projected LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Input Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)
Totals	166,197,608	20,816,649	12.525%	0.000%	12.525%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	\$20,816,649.00	\$2,972,030.31		\$2,004,342.03	\$25,793,021.34	\$25,657,071.34	\$135,950.00

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	Assessment Systems TK-12	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$751,139.00	\$0.00	\$601,139.00			\$150,000.00	\$751,139.00	
1	1.2	Curriculum Supports and College and Career Readiness	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$1,463,157.79	\$0.00	\$1,206,157.79	\$257,000.00			\$1,463,157.79	
1	1.3	Expanded Learning Opportunities and Interventions through Summer School and Afterschool Programs	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$3,790,011.62	\$0.00	\$472,011.62	\$1,991,000.00		\$1,327,000.00	\$3,790,011.62	
1	1.4	School Based Support for SPSA Actions and Implementation	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$2,300,767.95	\$0.00	\$2,300,767.95				\$2,300,767.95	
1	1.5	Multilingual Learners Site and Staff and Student Support	English Learners	Yes	LEA-wide Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools		\$1,085,612.75	\$0.00	\$1,085,612.75				\$1,085,612.75	
1	1.6	Comprehensive and Collaborative Supports for Students	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$1,512,964.46	\$0.00	\$1,417,964.46	\$95,000.00			\$1,512,964.46	
1	1.7	Enrichment Music Programs for Students & Increased Opportunities for Collaboration	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: All Elementary Schools		\$1,140,171.03	\$0.00	\$1,140,171.03				\$1,140,171.03	

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
							1-6									
1	1.8	New School Model Support	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Elsie Allen High School, Cesar Chavez Language Academy 7-12		\$933,531.00	\$0.00	\$754,531.00	\$179,000.00			\$933,531.00	
1	1.9	Supports for Increased Inclusive practices	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: All Middle and High Schools 7-12		\$300,000.00	\$0.00	\$300,000.00				\$300,000.00	
2	2.1	Panorama wellness survey and Youth Truth survey	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$45,420.00	\$6,350.00	\$6,350.00			\$45,420.00	\$51,770.00	
2	2.2	Mental Health Supports	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$1,327,030.31	\$0.00	\$1,281,000.00	\$46,030.31			\$1,327,030.31	
2	2.3	SEL and Antibullying Materials and Curriculum	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$0.00	\$20,600.00	\$15,600.00	\$5,000.00			\$20,600.00	
2	2.4	Increased Campus Student Engagement staffing	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$3,668,660.96	\$0.00	\$3,668,660.96				\$3,668,660.96	
2	2.5	Promoting Positive Attendance	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$145,000.00	\$0.00	\$145,000.00				\$145,000.00	
2	2.6	Elementary Counselors	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: All Elementary Schools TK-6		\$1,453,386.17	\$0.00	\$1,453,386.17				\$1,453,386.17	

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	2.7	Wellness & Engagement administration	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$389,875.35	\$0.00	\$182,953.32			\$206,922.03	\$389,875.35	
2	2.8	Family Engagement Facilitators and Multilingual Community Engagement	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$2,014,725.08	\$0.00	\$1,759,725.08			\$255,000.00	\$2,014,725.08	
2	2.9	Extracurricular Wellness & Engagement	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: All Middle and High Schools 7-12		\$0.00	\$95,000.00	\$95,000.00				\$95,000.00	
3	3.1	PD for Safety, Discipline, and Restorative and Culturally Responsive Student Support	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$55,000.00	\$0.00	\$20,000.00	\$15,000.00		\$20,000.00	\$55,000.00	
3	3.2	Teacher training and collaboration to develop and implement effective strategies for differentiating instruction, aligning instructional approaches, and aligning literacy practices.	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$240,000.00	\$0.00	\$70,000.00	\$170,000.00			\$240,000.00	
3	3.3	Alternative Education Development and Programmatic Implementation	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: All Middle and High Schools 7-12		\$315,000.00	\$0.00	\$300,000.00	\$15,000.00			\$315,000.00	
3	3.4	Provide professional development for Staff	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$1,900,778.19	\$0.00	\$1,900,778.19				\$1,900,778.19	
3	3.5	Maintain four Director positions at district level	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$589,839.68	\$0.00	\$589,839.68				\$589,839.68	
3	3.6	"Multilingual Learners Curriculum Training, Collaboration and department Professional Development"	Multilingual Learners	No			All Schools		\$35,000.00	\$0.00		\$35,000.00			\$35,000.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
3	3.7	Ethnic Studies	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$150,000.00			\$200,000.00	
3	3.8	Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Professional Development	All	No			Specific Schools: All Middle and High Schools 7-12		\$0.00	\$14,000.00		\$14,000.00			\$14,000.00	

2024-25 Contributing Actions Table

1. Projected LCFF Base Grant	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)	Totals by Type	Total LCFF Funds
166,197,608	20,816,649	12.525%	0.000%	12.525%	\$20,816,649.00	0.000%	12.525 %	Total:	\$20,816,649.00
								LEA-wide Total:	\$16,773,560.80
								Limited Total:	\$1,085,612.75
								Schoolwide Total:	\$4,043,088.20

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	Assessment Systems TK-12	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$601,139.00	
1	1.2	Curriculum Supports and College and Career Readiness	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$1,206,157.79	
1	1.3	Expanded Learning Opportunities and Interventions through Summer School and Afterschool Programs	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$472,011.62	
1	1.4	School Based Support for SPSA Actions and Implementation	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$2,300,767.95	
1	1.5	Multilingual Learners Site and Staff and Student Support	Yes	LEA-wide Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	\$1,085,612.75	

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	1.6	Comprehensive and Collaborative Supports for Students	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$1,417,964.46	
1	1.7	Enrichment Music Programs for Students & Increased Opportunities for Collaboration	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: All Elementary Schools 1-6	\$1,140,171.03	
1	1.8	New School Model Support	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Elsie Allen High School, Cesar Chavez Language Academy 7-12	\$754,531.00	
1	1.9	Supports for Increased Inclusive practices	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: All Middle and High Schools 7-12	\$300,000.00	
2	2.1	Panorama wellness survey and Youth Truth survey	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$6,350.00	
2	2.2	Mental Health Supports	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$1,281,000.00	
2	2.3	SEL and Antibullying Materials and Curriculum	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$15,600.00	
2	2.4	Increased Campus Student Engagement staffing	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$3,668,660.96	
2	2.5	Promoting Positive Attendance	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$145,000.00	
2	2.6	Elementary Counselors	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: All Elementary Schools TK-6	\$1,453,386.17	
2	2.7	Wellness & Engagement administration	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$182,953.32	

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
2	2.8	Family Engagement Facilitators and Multilingual Community Engagement	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$1,759,725.08	
2	2.9	Extracurricular Wellness & Engagement	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: All Middle and High Schools 7-12	\$95,000.00	
3	3.1	PD for Safety, Discipline, and Restorative and Culturally Responsive Student Support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$20,000.00	
3	3.2	Teacher training and collaboration to develop and implement effective strategies for differentiating instruction, aligning instructional approaches, and aligning literacy practices.	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$70,000.00	
3	3.3	Alternative Education Development and Programmatic Implementation	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: All Middle and High Schools 7-12	\$300,000.00	
3	3.4	Provide professional development for Staff	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$1,900,778.19	
3	3.5	Maintain four Director positions at district level	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$589,839.68	
3	3.7	Ethnic Studies	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	\$50,000.00	

2023-24 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	\$23,495,335.00	\$16,712,117.87

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	Data and reporting systems and tools Grades KA-6	Yes	\$280,000.00	\$222,675.55
1	1.2	Multilingual Learners Language Acceleration Review Committee (LARC) Site Support	Yes	\$46,000.00	\$32,363.12
1	1.3	Collaborative Curriculum Design (CCD) TK-6	Yes	\$80,000.00	\$8,494.39
1	1.4	KA-12 Supplemental Curriculum & Instructional Materials	Yes	\$245,000.00	\$85,242.53
1	1.5	Multilingual Learners Curriculum Training & Collaboration	Yes	\$30,000.00	\$26,210.30
1	1.6	Provide Secondary Counselors, reduce combo classes in Elementary	No	0.00	\$0.00
1	1.7	Ethnic Studies & Culturally Responsive Sustaining & Humanizing (CRSH) Education	Yes	\$30,000.00	\$8,225.62

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	1.8	Provide College Preparatory Assessmnets for Qualifying Students	Yes	\$25,000.00	\$0.00
1	1.9	Career Technical Education (CTE)	Yes	\$30,000.00	\$7,727.19
1	1.10	K-12 Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) Education	Yes	\$153,251.88	\$144,297.20
1	1.11	Extended Learning Opportunities	No	\$1,959,357.00	\$0.00
1	1.12	Math Redesign	Yes	\$150,800.00	\$183,964.45
1	1.13	AVID Growth	Yes	\$30,000.00	\$13,497.00
1	1.14	Multilingual Learners-Supporting Our Language Learners Counselors	Yes	\$315,081.36	\$310,973.99
1	1.15	Rooster Fellowship Participation/Student Voice & Problem of Practice Support through SCOE	Yes	\$0.00	\$0.00
1	1.17	Elementary Prevention & Intervention Systems/Models	Yes	\$75,000.00	\$63,172.22
1	1.18	College and Career Center Counselors	Yes	\$673,493.44	\$684,198.48
1	1.19	Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs)	No	\$1,300,000.00	\$135,836.31
1	1.20	Intervention Software	Yes	\$65,200.00	\$65,200.00

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
1	1.21	College Entrance Examination Preparation	Yes	\$0.00	\$0.00
1	1.22	Strengthen Multi-Tiered Systems of Support at secondary schools through MTSS Intervention Counselor work	Yes	\$621,892.35	\$801,324.84
1	1.23	Use Advanced Learner Program & Services Plan to guide action and to increase support for advanced learners	Yes	\$15,000.00	\$17,298.56
1	1.24	Multilingual Learner Support Systems	Yes	\$51,000.00	\$30,021.95
1	1.25	Individual School/SPSA Support	Yes	\$2,421,861.00	\$1,882,641.86
1	1.26	Licensed Child Care/Preschool	Yes	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00
1	1.27	Data and reporting systems and tools Grades 7-12	Yes	\$442,000.00	\$262,502.36
1	1.28	Collaborative Curriculum Design (CCD) 7-12	No	\$0.00	\$0.00
1	1.29	Structured-Literacy Tier 1 and 2 Intervention Curriculum	Yes	\$73,365.00	\$73,993.26
1	1.30	New School Model/ Dual Immersion Program Expansion	Yes	\$800,000.00	\$0.00
1	1.31	School Libraries Collections	No	\$30,000.00	\$27,631.36

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	1.32	1-6 Music Program	Yes	\$1,056,188.85	\$862,860.38
1	1.33	Kindergarten Childcare Classified Support	Yes	\$322,011.62	\$200,303.42
1	1.34	Multilingual Learners classroom support	Yes	\$650,616.00	\$948,154.34
1	1.35	Target support for elementary school students	Yes	\$150,000.00	\$98,201.50
1	1.36	Programs at Secondary Schools	Yes	\$350,000.00	\$1,954.63
1	1.37	Supports for Increased Inclusive practices	Yes	\$250,000.00	\$457,856.00
2	2.1	Multilingual Learners Community Outreach	Yes	\$20,000.00	\$11,510.32
2	2.2	CTE Collaborative Community	No	\$8,000.00	\$3,361.09
2	2.3	Family Engagement Facilitators	Yes	\$1,363,632.06	\$1,958,536.88
2	2.4	Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) as the structure to organize our work in response to student needs	Yes	\$20,000.00	\$1,812.74
2	2.5	Elementary Counselors	Yes	\$1,139,854.60	\$597,097.77
2	2.7	School-Based Therapists	Yes	\$1,000,000.00	\$0.00
2	2.8	Mental Health Clinical Supervisor	Yes	\$80,390.57	\$44,711.73

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	2.9	Social Emotional Learning supplies, curriculum and Professional Development	Yes	\$138,075.00	\$123,676.25
2	2.10	Maintain two 0.80 SAFE Coordinator/Director at District Office	Yes	\$342,847.58	\$298,653.83
2	2.11	Anti-bullying STOPit & related high school staffing	No	\$1,000.00	\$983.26
2	2.12	Support for Project-Based Learning at Learning House	No	\$0.00	\$0.00
2	2.13	Toolbox curriculum	No	\$0.00	\$0.00
2	2.14	Restorative Practices & Specialists	Yes	\$2,112,000.00	\$2,067,443.15
2	2.15	Elementary Student Engagement Activity Workers	Yes	\$598,788.80	\$365,358.61
2	2.16	Promote and Support Positive School Attendance	Yes	\$245,196.00	\$124,040.73
2	2.17	Panorama Survey	No	\$45,420.00	\$0.00
2	2.18	YouthTruth Survey	Yes	\$6,100.00	\$6,350.00
2	2.19	Improved Campus Supervision	Yes	\$840,856.05	\$244,338.40
2	2.20	Athletic/Sport Intervention	No	\$0.00	\$0.00
3	3.1	Avoid combo classes, maintain class sizes, provide secondary	No Yes	0	1,186,351

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)
		specialized programs, avoid staff reductions.			
3	3.2	Provide professional development for Classified Staff	Yes	\$236,750.00	\$5,490.79
3	3.3	Provide 2 days professional development for Certificated Staff, as negotiated between SRCS & SRTA	Yes	\$1,056,261.37	\$1,056,261.37
3	3.4	Maintain two Director positions at district level	Yes	\$413,596.52	\$425,161.46
3	3.5	Multilingual Services Department Professional Development	Yes	\$9,500.00	\$5,265.18
3	3.7	DRA (K-2) & DIBELS (3-6) Training	No	\$5,000.00	\$418.86
3	3.9	7-12 Steering Committee Meetings	No	\$5,000.00	\$1,331.99
3	3.10	Orton-Gillingham Training and The Science of Reading; Tier 1, 2 & 3 supports	Yes	\$50,000.00	\$54,651.51
3	3.12	Ethnic Studies & Culturally Responsive Sustaining & Humanizing (CRSH) Education	Yes	\$250,000.00	\$73,645.58
3	3.14	Offer of voluntary high level, confidential response to conflict between staff	No	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
3	3.15	Restorative Practices PD	Yes	\$15,000.00	\$12,485.00
3	3.17	Secondary Department Collaboration	Yes	\$132,000.00	\$6,021.74
3	3.18	Alternative Education Leadership	Yes	\$107,947.95	\$87,832.62
3	3.19	Elementary Grade Level Collaboration	Yes	\$127,000.00	\$62,473.10

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
3	3.20	Effective Strategies for Differentiating Instruction	Yes	\$150,000.00	\$77,030.10
3	3.21	Provide training and professional development for Credentialed Staff	Yes	\$100,000.00	\$0.00

2023-24 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

6. Estimated LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	7. Total Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	8. Total Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)
17,895,558	\$17,895,558.00	\$17,895,558.00	\$0.00	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
1	1.1	Data and reporting systems and tools Grades KA-6	Yes	\$280,000.00	\$222,675.55		
1	1.2	Multilingual Learners Language Acceleration Review Committee (LARC) Site Support	Yes	\$46,000.00	\$32,363.12		
1	1.3	Collaborative Curriculum Design (CCD) TK-6	Yes	\$80,000.00	\$8,494.39		
1	1.4	KA-12 Supplemental Curriculum & Instructional Materials	Yes	\$210,000.00	\$85,242.53		
1	1.5	Multilingual Learners Curriculum Training & Collaboration	Yes	\$30,000.00	\$26,210.30		
1	1.7	Ethnic Studies & Culturally Responsive Sustaining & Humanizing (CRSH) Education	Yes	\$30,000.00	\$8,225.62		
1	1.8	Provide College Preparatory Assessmnets for Qualifying Students	Yes	\$25,000.00	\$0.00		
1	1.9	Career Technical Education (CTE)	Yes	\$30,000.00	\$7,727.19		
1	1.10	K-12 Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) Education	Yes	\$153,251.88	\$144,297.20		

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	1.12	Math Redesign	Yes	\$50,800.00	\$183,964.45		
1	1.13	AVID Growth	Yes	\$30,000.00	\$13,497.00		
1	1.14	Multilingual Learners-Supporting Our Language Learners Counselors	Yes	\$315,081.36	\$310,973.99		
1	1.15	Rooster Fellowship Participation/Student Voice & Problem of Practice Support through SCOE	Yes	\$0.00	\$0.00		
1	1.17	Elementary Prevention & Intervention Systems/Models	Yes	\$75,000.00	\$63,172.22		
1	1.18	College and Career Center Counselors	Yes	\$673,493.44	\$684,198.48		
1	1.20	Intervention Software	Yes	\$65,200.00	\$65,200.00		
1	1.21	College Entrance Examination Preparation	Yes	\$0.00	\$0.00		
1	1.22	Strengthen Multi-Tiered Systems of Support at secondary schools through MTSS Intervention Counselor work	Yes	\$621,892.35	\$801,324.84		
1	1.23	Use Advanced Learner Program & Services Plan to guide action and to increase support for advanced learners	Yes	\$15,000.00	\$17,298.56		
1	1.24	Multilingual Learner Support Systems	Yes	\$51,000.00	\$30,021.95		
1	1.25	Individual School/SPSA Support	Yes	\$2,421,861.00	\$1,882,641.86		

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	1.26	Licensed Child Care/Preschool	Yes	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00		
1	1.27	Data and reporting systems and tools Grades 7-12	Yes	\$300,000.00	\$262,502.36		
1	1.29	Structured-Literacy Tier 1 and 2 Intervention Curriculum	Yes	\$73,365.00	\$73,993.26		
1	1.30	New School Model/ Dual Immersion Program Expansion	Yes	\$800,000.00	\$0.00		
1	1.32	1-6 Music Program	Yes	\$1,056,188.85	\$862,860.38		
1	1.33	Kindergarten Childcare Classified Support	Yes	\$322,011.62	\$200,303.42		
1	1.34	Multilingual Learners classroom support	Yes	\$540,616.00	\$948,154.34		
1	1.35	Target support for elementary school students	Yes	\$150,000.00	\$98,201.50		
1	1.36	Programs at Secondary Schools	Yes	\$350,000.00	\$1,954.63		
1	1.37	Supports for Increased Inclusive practices	Yes	\$100,000.00	\$457,856.00		
2	2.1	Multilingual Learners Community Outreach	Yes	\$20,000.00	\$11,510.32		
2	2.3	Family Engagement Facilitators	Yes	\$1,363,632.06	\$1,958,536.88		
2	2.4	Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) as the structure to organize our work in response to student needs	Yes	\$20,000.00	\$1,812.74		
2	2.5	Elementary Counselors	Yes	\$1,139,854.60	\$597,097.77		
2	2.7	School-Based Therapists	Yes		\$0.00		
2	2.8	Mental Health Clinical Supervisor	Yes	\$80,390.57	\$44,711.73		
2	2.9	Social Emotional Learning supplies, curriculum and Professional Development	Yes	\$138,075.00	\$123,676.25		

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)
2	2.10	Maintain two 0.80 SAFE Coordinator/Director at District Office	Yes	\$342,847.58	\$298,653.83		
2	2.14	Restorative Practices & Specialists	Yes	\$2,112,000.00	\$2,067,443.15		
2	2.15	Elementary Student Engagement Activity Workers	Yes	\$598,788.80	\$365,358.61		
2	2.16	Promote and Support Positive School Attendance	Yes	\$245,196.00	\$124,040.73		
2	2.18	YouthTruth Survey	Yes	\$6,100.00	\$6,350.00		
2	2.19	Improved Campus Supervision	Yes	\$840,856.05	\$244,338.40		
3	3.1	Avoid combo classes, maintain class sizes, provide secondary specialized programs, avoid staff reductions.	Yes	0	2,542,354		
3	3.2	Provide professional development for Classified Staff	Yes	\$236,750.00	\$5,490.79		
3	3.3	Provide 2 days professional development for Certificated Staff, as negotiated between SRCS & SRTA	Yes	\$480,261.37	\$1,056,261.37		
3	3.4	Maintain two Director positions at district level	Yes	\$413,596.52	\$425,161.46		
3	3.5	Multilingual Services Department Professional Development	Yes	\$9,500.00	\$5,265.18		
3	3.10	Orton-Gillingham Training and The Science of Reading; Tier 1, 2 & 3 supports	Yes	\$50,000.00	\$54,651.51		
3	3.12	Ethnic Studies & Culturally Responsive Sustaining & Humanizing (CRSH) Education	Yes	\$250,000.00	\$73,645.58		
3	3.15	Restorative Practices PD	Yes	\$15,000.00	\$12,485.00		

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
3	3.17	Secondary Department Collaboration	Yes	\$72,000.00	\$6,021.74		
3	3.18	Alternative Education Leadership	Yes	\$107,947.95	\$87,832.62		
3	3.19	Elementary Grade Level Collaboration	Yes	\$127,000.00	\$62,473.10		
3	3.20	Effective Strategies for Differentiating Instruction	Yes	\$150,000.00	\$77,030.10		
3	3.21	Provide training and professional development for Credentialed Staff	Yes	\$30,000.00	\$0.00		

2023-24 LCFF Carryover Table

9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 + Carryover %)	7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)	11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)	12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)	13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)
167,432,121	17,895,558	0%	10.688%	\$17,895,558.00	0.000%	10.688%	\$0.00	0.000%

Local Control and Accountability Plan Instructions

[Plan Summary](#)

[Engaging Educational Partners](#)

[Goals and Actions](#)

[Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students](#)

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

Introduction and Instructions

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

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

- **Comprehensive Strategic Planning:** The process of developing and annually updating the LCAP supports comprehensive strategic planning, particularly to address and reduce disparities in opportunities and outcomes between student groups indicated by the California School Dashboard (California *Education Code* [EC] Section 52064[e][1]). Strategic planning that is comprehensive connects budgetary decisions to teaching and learning performance data. LEAs should continually evaluate the hard choices they make about the use of limited resources to meet student and community needs to ensure opportunities and outcomes are improved for all students.
- **Meaningful Engagement of Educational Partners:** The LCAP development process should result in an LCAP that reflects decisions made through meaningful engagement (EC Section 52064[e][1]). Local educational partners possess valuable perspectives and insights about an LEA's programs and services. Effective strategic planning will incorporate these perspectives and insights in order to identify potential goals and actions to be included in the LCAP.
- **Accountability and Compliance:** The LCAP serves an important accountability function because the nature of some LCAP template sections require LEAs to show that they have complied with various requirements specified in the LCFF statutes and regulations, most notably:
 - Demonstrating that LEAs are increasing or improving services for foster youth, English learners, including long-term English learners, and low-income students in proportion to the amount of additional funding those students generate under LCFF (EC Section 52064[b][4-6]).
 - Establishing goals, supported by actions and related expenditures, that address the statutory priority areas and statutory metrics (EC sections 52064[b][1] and [2]).
 - **NOTE:** As specified in EC Section 62064(b)(1), the LCAP must provide a description of the annual goals, for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils identified pursuant to EC Section 52052, to be achieved for each of the state priorities. Beginning in 2023–24, EC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Plan Summary

Purpose

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

Requirements and Instructions

General Information

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

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

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

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

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

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

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

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

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

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

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

Schools Identified

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

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

Support for Identified Schools

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

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

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

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

Engaging Educational Partners

Purpose

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

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

Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Respond to the prompts as follows:

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Educational Partners

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

Process for Engagement

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

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

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

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

- A sufficient response to this prompt will provide educational partners and the public with clear, specific information about how the engagement process influenced the development of the LCAP. This may include a description of how the LEA prioritized requests of educational partners within the context of the budgetary resources available or otherwise prioritized areas of focus within the LCAP.
- An LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funds must include a description of how the consultation with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds influenced the development of the adopted LCAP.
- For the purposes of this prompt, this may also include, but is not necessarily limited to:
 - Inclusion of a goal or decision to pursue a Focus Goal (as described below)
 - Inclusion of metrics other than the statutorily required metrics
 - Determination of the target outcome on one or more metrics
 - Inclusion of performance by one or more student groups in the Measuring and Reporting Results subsection
 - Inclusion of action(s) or a group of actions
 - Elimination of action(s) or group of actions
 - Changes to the level of proposed expenditures for one or more actions
 - Inclusion of action(s) as contributing to increased or improved services for unduplicated students
 - Analysis of effectiveness of the specific actions to achieve the goal
 - Analysis of material differences in expenditures
 - Analysis of changes made to a goal for the ensuing LCAP year based on the annual update process
 - Analysis of challenges or successes in the implementation of actions

Goals and Actions

Purpose

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

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

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

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

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

Requirement to Address the LCFF State Priorities

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

Respond to the following prompts, as applicable:

Focus Goal(s)

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

Description

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

Focus goals for Equity Multiplier schoolsites must address the following:

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

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

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

Broad Goal

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Maintenance of Progress Goal

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Measuring and Reporting Results:

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Metric

- Enter the metric number.

Metric

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

Baseline

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

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

- If an LEA chooses to revise its baseline data, then, at a minimum, it must clearly identify the change as part of its response to the description of changes prompt in the Goal Analysis for the goal. LEAs are also strongly encouraged to involve their educational partners in the decision of whether or not to revise a baseline and to communicate the proposed change to their educational partners.
- Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one- or two-year LCAP may identify a new baseline each year, as applicable.

Year 1 Outcome

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

Year 2 Outcome

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

Target for Year 3 Outcome

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

Current Difference from Baseline

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

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

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

Goal Analysis:

Enter the LCAP Year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Action #

- Enter the action number.

Title

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

Description

- Provide a brief description of the action.

- For actions that contribute to meeting the increased or improved services requirement, the LEA may include an explanation of how each action is principally directed towards and effective in meeting the LEA's goals for unduplicated students, as described in the instructions for the Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students section.
- As previously noted, for each action identified as 1) contributing towards the requirement to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, including long-term English learners, and low-income students and 2) being provided on an LEA-wide basis, the LEA must identify one or more metrics to monitor the effectiveness of the action and its budgeted expenditures.
- These required metrics may be identified within the action description or the first prompt in the increased or improved services section; however, the description must clearly identify the metric(s) being used to monitor the effectiveness of the action and the action(s) that the metric(s) apply to.

Total Funds

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

Contributing

- Indicate whether the action contributes to meeting the increased or improved services requirement as described in the Increased or Improved Services section using a “Y” for Yes or an “N” for No.
 - **Note:** for each such contributing action, the LEA will need to provide additional information in the Increased or Improved Services section to address the requirements in *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5 [5 CCR] Section 15496 in the Increased or Improved Services section of the LCAP.

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

Required Actions

- LEAs with 30 or more English learners and/or 15 or more long-term English learners must include specific actions in the LCAP related to, at a minimum:
 - Language acquisition programs, as defined in *EC* Section 306, provided to students, and
 - Professional development for teachers.
 - If an LEA has both 30 or more English learners and 15 or more long-term English learners, the LEA must include actions for both English learners and long-term English learners.
- LEAs eligible for technical assistance pursuant to *EC* sections 47607.3, 52071, 52071.5, 52072, or 52072.5, must include specific actions within the LCAP related to its implementation of the work underway as part of technical assistance. The most common form of this technical assistance is frequently referred to as Differentiated Assistance.

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

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

Purpose

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

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

Statutory Requirements

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

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

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

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

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

For School Districts Only

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

Complete the tables as follows:

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants

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

Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover — Percentage

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

LCFF Carryover — Dollar

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

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

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

Required Descriptions:

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

Limited Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

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

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

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

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

Provide the following descriptions, as applicable to the LEA:

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

Complete the table as follows:

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

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

Action Tables

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

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

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

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

Total Planned Expenditures Table

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

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

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

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

- **2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants:** Provide the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants estimated on the basis of the number and concentration of unduplicated students for the coming school year.
- **3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year:** This percentage will not be entered; it is calculated based on the Projected LCFF Base Grant and the Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants, pursuant to 5 CCR Section 15496(a)(8). This is the percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the coming LCAP year.
- **LCFF Carryover — Percentage:** Specify the LCFF Carryover — Percentage identified in the LCFF Carryover Table from the prior LCAP year. If a carryover percentage is not identified in the LCFF Carryover Table, specify a percentage of zero (0.00%).
- **Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year:** This percentage will not be entered; it is calculated based on the Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year and the LCFF Carryover — Percentage. ***This is the percentage by which the LEA must increase or improve services for unduplicated pupils as compared to the services provided to all students in the coming LCAP year.***
- **Goal #:** Enter the LCAP Goal number for the action.
- **Action #:** Enter the action's number as indicated in the LCAP Goal.
- **Action Title:** Provide a title of the action.
- **Student Group(s):** Indicate the student group or groups who will be the primary beneficiary of the action by entering "All," or by entering a specific student group or groups.
- **Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?:** Type "Yes" if the action **is** included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement; OR, type "No" if the action is **not** included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement.
- If "Yes" is entered into the Contributing column, then complete the following columns:
 - **Scope:** The scope of an action may be LEA-wide (i.e., districtwide, countywide, or charterwide), schoolwide, or limited. An action that is LEA-wide in scope upgrades the entire educational program of the LEA. An action that is schoolwide in scope upgrades the entire educational program of a single school. An action that is limited in its scope is an action that serves only one or more unduplicated student groups.

- **Unduplicated Student Group(s):** Regardless of scope, contributing actions serve one or more unduplicated student groups. Indicate one or more unduplicated student groups for whom services are being increased or improved as compared to what all students receive.
- **Location:** Identify the location where the action will be provided. If the action is provided to all schools within the LEA, the LEA must indicate “All Schools.” If the action is provided to specific schools within the LEA or specific grade spans only, the LEA must enter “Specific Schools” or “Specific Grade Spans.” Identify the individual school or a subset of schools or grade spans (e.g., all high schools or grades transitional kindergarten through grade five), as appropriate.
- **Time Span:** Enter “ongoing” if the action will be implemented for an indeterminate period of time. Otherwise, indicate the span of time for which the action will be implemented. For example, an LEA might enter “1 Year,” or “2 Years,” or “6 Months.”
- **Total Personnel:** Enter the total amount of personnel expenditures utilized to implement this action.
- **Total Non-Personnel:** This amount will be automatically calculated based on information provided in the Total Personnel column and the Total Funds column.
- **LCFF Funds:** Enter the total amount of LCFF funds utilized to implement this action, if any. LCFF funds include all funds that make up an LEA’s total LCFF target (i.e., base grant, grade span adjustment, supplemental grant, concentration grant, Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant, and Home-To-School Transportation).
 - **Note:** For an action to contribute towards meeting the increased or improved services requirement, it must include some measure of LCFF funding. The action may also include funding from other sources, however the extent to which an action contributes to meeting the increased or improved services requirement is based on the LCFF funding being used to implement the action.
- **Other State Funds:** Enter the total amount of Other State Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
 - **Note:** Equity Multiplier funds must be included in the “Other State Funds” category, not in the “LCFF Funds” category. As a reminder, Equity Multiplier funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, funding provided to Equity Multiplier schoolsites for purposes of the LCFF, the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP. This means that Equity Multiplier funds must not be used to replace funding that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement LEA-wide actions identified in the LEA’s LCAP or that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement provisions of the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP.
- **Local Funds:** Enter the total amount of Local Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
- **Federal Funds:** Enter the total amount of Federal Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
- **Total Funds:** This amount is automatically calculated based on amounts entered in the previous four columns.
- **Planned Percentage of Improved Services:** For any action identified as contributing, being provided on a Limited basis to unduplicated students, and that does not have funding associated with the action, enter the planned quality improvement anticipated for the action as

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

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

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Annual Update Table

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

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

- **6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants:** Provide the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants estimated based on the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the current school year.
- **Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions:** Enter the total estimated actual expenditure of LCFF funds used to implement this action, if any.

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

LCFF Carryover Table

- **9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant:** Provide the total amount of estimated LCFF Target Entitlement for the current school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant program, the former Home-to-School Transportation program, and the Small School District Transportation program, pursuant to 5 CCR Section 15496(a)(8). Note that the LCFF Base Grant for purposes of the LCAP also includes the Necessary Small Schools and Economic Recovery Target allowances for school districts, and County Operations Grant for COEs. See *EC* sections 2574 (for COEs) and 42238.02 (for school districts and charter schools), as applicable, for LCFF entitlement calculations.
- **10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year:** This percentage will not be entered. The percentage is calculated based on the amounts of the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9) and the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (6), pursuant to 5 CCR Section 15496(a)(8), plus the LCFF Carryover – Percentage from the prior year. This is the percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the current LCAP year.

Calculations in the Action Tables

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

Contributing Actions Table

- **4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)**
 - This amount is the total of the Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) column.
- **5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services**
 - This percentage is the total of the Planned Percentage of Improved Services column.
- **Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the coming school year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)**

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

- This percentage is the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (6) divided by the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9) plus the LCFF Carryover – Percentage from the prior year.
- **11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)**
 - This percentage is the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (7) divided by the LCFF Funding (9), then converting the quotient to a percentage and adding the Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (8).
- **12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount LCFF Carryover (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)**
 - If the Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (11) is less than the Estimated Actual Percentage to Increase or Improve Services (10), the LEA is required to carry over LCFF funds.

The amount of LCFF funds is calculated by subtracting the Estimated Actual Percentage to Increase or Improve Services (11) from the Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (10) and then multiplying by the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9). This amount is the amount of LCFF funds that is required to be carried over to the coming year.
- **13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)**
 - This percentage is the unmet portion of the Percentage to Increase or Improve Services that the LEA must carry over into the coming LCAP year. The percentage is calculated by dividing the LCFF Carryover (12) by the LCFF Funding (9).

California Department of Education
November 2023