

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8)

CDS Code: 01-61259-0130633

School Year: 2025-26

LEA contact information:

Rich Harrison


Chief Executive Officer

superintendent@lighthousecharter.org

510-988-7673

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

Budget Overview for the 2025-26 School Year




This chart shows the total general purpose revenue Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8) expects to receive in the coming year from all sources.

The text description for the above chart is as follows: The total revenue projected for Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8) is \$12,091,988, of which \$7805449 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), \$2941786 is other state funds, \$360778 is local funds, and \$983975 is federal funds. Of the \$7805449 in LCFF Funds, \$2060105 is generated based on the enrollment of high needs students (foster youth, English learner, and low-income students).

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

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



This chart provides a quick summary of how much Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8) plans to spend for 2025-26. It shows how much of the total is tied to planned actions and services in the LCAP.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8) plans to spend \$11,635,134 for the 2025-26 school year. Of that amount, \$4,315,684 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and \$7,319,450 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:


Not all budgeted expenditures are reflected in the LCAP as not all detailed items are tied to a specific LCAP goal. However, the resources not included in the LCAP are still critical to meeting the overall needs for the students' learning environment.

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

In 2025-26, Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8) is projecting it will receive \$2,060,105 based on the enrollment of foster youth, English learner, and low-income students. Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8) must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8) plans to spend \$2,085,648 towards meeting this requirement, as described in the LCAP.

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

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



This chart compares what Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8) budgeted last year in the LCAP for actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students with what Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8) estimates it has spent on actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students in the current year.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: In 2024-25, Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8)'s LCAP budgeted \$164806 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8) actually spent \$164806 for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2024-25.

Local Control and Accountability Plan

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

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Lighthouse Community Charter School (K-8)	Rich Harrison Chief Executive Officer	rich.harrison@lighthousecharter.org 510-988-7673

Plan Summary [2025-26]

General Information

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

Lighthouse Community Public Schools has stood as a beacon of academic excellence for Black and Brown students in East Oakland since its founding in 2002. With a commitment to community-centered educational justice, Lighthouse serves over 1,700 TK-12 students and families at its three LEAs, including Lighthouse Community Charter School (LCCS). LCCS is dedicated to providing quality education to its diverse student body, fostering academic success and empowering students to thrive in their educational journey. The LCCS program is designed to support students in getting to and through college with a college-preparation curriculum and crew to provide a sense of belonging and support with socio-emotional issues, and strong family involvement to support students throughout their academic careers.

Our Mission

The mission of Lighthouse Community Public Schools is to prepare a diverse K-12 student population for college and a career of their choice.

Our Vision

We believe that all young people have the potential to become lifelong changemakers who realize their unique vision—rooted in their identity, knowledge, and skills—to create equity in their own lives and in the community, leading to a healthier, more joyful world. We are an innovative model for public education that puts each child at the center of their own learning. The Lighthouse community is equal parts love and rigor where children discover their unique light within.

Our Core Values

Community: We are best when we respect, value and celebrate our diversity and strengthen our connections.

Integrity: We act on our shared and personal values, especially in the face of adversity.

Love: We extend ourselves so that all feel a sense of belonging and acceptance.

Social justice: We act with courage and commitment to move toward a just and equitable world.

Agency: We are empowered to pursue purposeful action as life-long changemakers.

Our Strategic Priorities and Vision for the Next Four Years

Lighthouse Community Public Schools is deeply committed to transforming the landscape of education. Serving a student population that has been historically underserved by the traditional school system in Oakland, LCPS knows that an exceptional education brings out each child's unique light and potential, but that inequity in public schools severely limits the potential of students, their families, and the future of Oakland.

LCPS has numerous successes and strengths to celebrate, including an emphasis on building and maintaining strong relationships across students, families, and staff; a robust approach to talent recruitment and staff retention; and the selection of rigorous and reputable curricula.

LCPS also has several areas of improvement to address, including strengthening an aligned vision for curriculum implementation and instructional best practices; enhancing professional development and coaching supports for staff; and refining decision making and communication structures across stakeholders.

To address these areas of opportunity, LCPS set quantitative goals to define its intended impact for students, families, staff, and the organization as a whole over the next 4 years.

Aligned to these goals, LCPS has identified 3 strategic priorities to guide its work:

1. All students deeply engage in high-quality curriculum and learning experiences, every day
2. Students, families, community partners, and staff collectively contribute to a thriving community school through shared power, voice, and trust
4. All staff members experience the clear, coherent, and world-class professional development and coaching they deserve

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

In the 24-25 School Year, the LEA continued to center student learning and achievement by implementing the Lighthouse Community Public Schools (LCPS) curricular model across its classrooms. The LEA also continued to track student growth in core content areas through the following actions: 1) LEA continued giving rigorous, standards-aligned interim assessments using the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments (ICAs and IABs) grades 3 and higher; 2) Continued giving NWEA MAP to track student growth in ELA and Math; 3) CAASPP as an external measure of college/career readiness in Grades 3-8, 11. ELA and Math: While the LEA is awaiting formal CAASPP data to be released in Summer 2025, the LEA anticipates that academic proficiency in ELA and Math are continued areas of focus for the LEA. Based on local data, less than 50% of students are proficient in these subject areas.

Suspensions and attendance: The LEA has a suspension rate of 2.9%, higher than its target of 1.5% and an increase from last year due mostly in part to two incidents in the middle school this year. We did begin a partnership midway through the year that focuses on bringing restorative justice practices to the middle school and have seen a decrease in suspensions during that time. This continues to be an area of concern for the LEA and we will continue to address it in the coming year. We will continue to focus on strong systems in tier one and an increase of direct skills teaching for students with tier two and three supports. Attendance and chronic absence will continue to be important areas to monitor and address for the 25-26 school year.

Initial ELPAC results indicate that most students are demonstrating growth in English language proficiency, with a noticeable shift from Level 1 to Levels 2 and 3 as students advance in grade level. However, a relatively small proportion of students are reaching Level 4, the highest level of proficiency. While overall upward movement is evident, there appears to be a plateau at Level 3. Lighthouse K-8 remains committed to targeted English Language Development (ELD) interventions to support continued progress and ensure students are on track to attain Level 4 proficiency across all grade levels.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

N/A

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

Schools Identified

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

N/A

Support for Identified Schools

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

N/A

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

N/A

Engaging Educational Partners

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

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

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

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

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
LCCS Teachers and Staff	Staff survey given in December and Staff Focus Groups conducted in March.
LCCS Parents	Parent Survey given in March (CHKS Survey). Student-led conferences which take place three times per school year. Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings which take place 4 times a year. Lodestar will continue to collaborate with and invite all parents and family members annually to take an active role by participating in student led conferences, during which they establish academic and character goals for their students, by monitoring their student's learning through understanding of our school's grading policy and system, available instructional supports and programs, and available Extended Learning opportunities.
LCCS Administrators	Focus group and 1 on 1 meetings.

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

The LCAP goals and actions were informed from both surveys and focus groups with our educational partners this school year.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	Ensure rigorous, student-centered learning in all classrooms, for all students	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 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)
 Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Lighthouse Community Public Schools believes all students must be deeply engaged in high-quality curriculum and learning experiences, every day. We will ensure rigorous, student-centered learning in all classrooms, for all students by exceeding the CA state average in math and ELA proficiency by 2028; diagnosing, differentiating, and accelerating academic growth through tiered supports for all scholars; driving consistent english language development for emerging bilingual students - especially our newcomers and earliest learners; providing exemplar supports for students with disabilities, especially those requiring more intensive services

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	In grades 3-8, LCPS students' ELA proficiency rates meet or exceed the CA state average, both in the aggregate and across all student groups	LHK-8: 62.5 points below standard; CA: 13.6 points below standard	Data available in summer		LCPS students' ELA proficiency rates meet or exceed the CA state average, both in the aggregate and across all student groups	
1.2	In grades 3-8, LCPS students' math	LHK-8: 94.9 points below standard	Data available in summer		LCPS students' math proficiency	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	proficiency rates meet or exceed the CA state average, both in the aggregate and across all student groups	CA: 49.1 points below standard			rates meet or exceed the CA state average, both in the aggregate and across all student groups	
1.3	60% of Emerging Bilingual students advance at least 1 EPLI level or maintain a level 4	48%	Data available in summer		60%	
1.4	85% of 2nd grade students are in the 25th percentile or higher on the Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) portion of AimsWeb (equivalent to 6% growth annually off of 2024 baseline)	47%	Data available in summer		85%	
1.5	Student with disabilities, on average, exceed the CA SWD average on CAASPP scale score growth	81st percentile (ELA); 15th percentile (math)	Data available in summer		60%	

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

Overall Implementation and Progress

In the 2024–25 school year, we made meaningful progress toward our goal of ensuring rigorous, student-centered learning across all classrooms, with several areas of success and ongoing challenges. Our focus on aligned interim assessments, instructional walkthroughs, and professional development on high-quality instructional materials helped strengthen classroom practice. However, full implementation fidelity and instructional consistency varied across campuses, grade levels, and content areas. Substantive initiatives like shared walkthroughs and data protocols grounded in our Teacher/Leader Development and Evaluation Framework (TDEF/LDEF) contributed to alignment around academic expectations (Initiative 1B). Meanwhile, our internalization series for EL Education Modules and the rollout of high-quality instructional materials began laying the groundwork for more consistent instructional experiences (Initiative 1D). These efforts were recognized positively in staff and leadership feedback, but progress on academic outcomes remains mixed.

Substantive Differences from the Plan

Scope of Assessment Implementation: Our plan emphasized common formative assessment cycles, but consistency in execution and use of results varied significantly across grade levels and campuses.

Curriculum Internalization Support: Although EL Education PD launched, teachers and leaders indicated a need for deeper, more tailored support to internalize materials effectively and differentiate for student needs.

Communication with Families: We aimed to strengthen communication about academic progress with families, but feedback indicated this remains an area for growth—especially around grading transparency and intervention plans.

Conclusion

While we’ve laid strong foundations toward rigorous, student-centered instruction, implementation challenges persist in assessment practices, differentiated supports, and instructional consistency—particularly in the middle grades and for key student subgroups. These findings are driving adjustments to our strategies, including deeper support for teachers, targeted interventions for ELs and SPED students, and tighter data-driven instructional planning. Continued focus on coherence, capacity-building, and responsiveness will be critical to meeting our goals in the year ahead.

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

No Material differences

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

Most Effective/Strenths:

Early Literacy Gains: Our investment in foundational literacy practices and the Science of Reading is beginning to show results, especially in 3rd grade ICA scores across both campuses.

Instructional Culture: Teachers and leaders are more aligned in a shared vision of academic rigor and instructional quality, particularly at the high school level. Survey data confirmed this shift in mindset and practice.

Targeted Grade-Level Growth: At Lighthouse, 3rd grade showed strength in both Reading and Math; at Lodestar, both 3rd and 4th grades demonstrated encouraging performance trends.

Least Effective/Area for Growth:

Inconsistent Interim Performance: Despite growth in Math (+6% over prior data), only 21.5% of students met or exceeded standards in ELA, with only 55% (ELA) and 45% (Math) of students showing 50+ point growth—well below our internal targets.

Instructional Effectiveness: Evaluation data showed that only 75% of teachers were effective in Domains 1 and 2, and just 41% in Domains 3–5, reflecting continued need for coaching and support around engagement and assessment practices.

Middle Grades & Lighthouse K-8: Middle school performance at Lighthouse is an area of significant concern, with 7th and 8th grade ELA and Math trending red.

Support for Student Subgroups: Our ability to meet the needs of English Learners (ELs) will be an area for continued growth as the number of newcomer ELs has doubled over three years, now making up 10% of our student body. Our interventions have not consistently met the academic needs of this growing population.

Assessment and Grading Systems: Implementation gaps in common assessments and grading practices hindered our ability to fully calibrate and communicate student learning outcomes, as highlighted in Initiative 1B.

Lower Grade Instructional Gaps: While 3rd grade performance improved, 1st and 2nd grade support has not met benchmark targets, signaling a need for increased professional learning and targeted coaching

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

No changes made to the planned goal

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

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.1	Student Support and Services	Refine our Tier 1 student support aligned to EL Education character development framework anchored in LCPS core values. This includes an aligned crew curriculum, 3-5 consistent culture routines, and explicit instruction on SEL and behavior so that students are supported socially, academically, and emotionally.	\$0.00	No Yes
1.2	Student Support and Services	As a part of the MTSS process, Utilize universal screener and social-emotional/behavior data systems to identify students in need of additional supports and provide access to effective tiered interventions.	\$692,198.00	Yes
1.3	.			
1.7	Data and Assessment	Monitor student proficiency and growth in reading and math courses through course grades, triennial interim assessments, and norm-referenced assessments; refine and leverage data management systems to identify and support students in need of interventions using multiple measures.	\$9,152.00	Yes
1.8	Instructional Development and Support	Identify a common set of high-leverage instructional practices observed across all LCPS classrooms as measured by weekly walkthrough data.		Yes
1.10	English Language Development	Provide Newcomers and English Language Learners Integrated and Designated ELD instruction that is targeted toward their proficiency level, aligned to the ELD standards, and designed to support their content-area achievement; Support ELD instruction through monthly ELD meetings and the implementation of ELLevation to track data, communication, and evaluation of our program.	\$131,296.00	Yes
1.11	Special Education	Refine moderate-severe programming balances inclusion with increased opportunities for direct instruction targeting individualized goals in support of building independent living skills and student's post-secondary access.		Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Strengthen multi-generational opportunities as a model community school.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)
 Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
 Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
 Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Lighthouse Community Charter school will amplify strong and enduring community partnerships in order to maximize access to - and enrichment of - learning. Lodestar will build enduring advocacy and investment in our community through strategic parent and alumni empowerment efforts. Lodestar will welcome all students daily to joyful, inclusive, and anti-racist spaces for learning. Lodestar will better prepare all students for an opportunity-rich future through an exemplary TK program and robust college and career readiness supports.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	Reduce chronic absenteeism rates to less than 20% by 2027.	27.9%	29%		20%	
2.2	Reduce suspension rates across all student groups to <1.5% for at least 2 consecutive years	.7%	2.9%		Less than 1.5% for 2 years	
2.3	90%+ families attend at least 2 school sponsored events./workshops annually	70%	82%		90%	

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

Overall Implementation and Progress

In the 2024-25 school year, we made notable progress toward becoming a model community school through stronger systems for inclusive decision-making, improved communication, increased family engagement, and promising early student retention outcomes. Implementation efforts were rooted in a commitment to collaborative leadership and multi-generational voice, supported by targeted grants and community partnerships.

We exceeded our student retention targets, enhanced our staff decision-making and communication systems, and laid the groundwork for deeper engagement with families and community organizations. However, our efforts to fully develop student voice opportunities and reduce chronic absenteeism fell short of our year-end targets, highlighting areas for continued focus.

Substantive Differences from the Plan

Student Engagement: The original plan envisioned robust student participation in shaping school decisions. In practice, we focused more heavily on family voice and staff systems, and will need to accelerate our planning and investment in student-facing leadership structures next year.

Absenteeism Support Structures: While the plan aimed for targeted absenteeism reduction, the launch of our Oakland Natives Give Back partnership became a pivot point toward long-term systems analysis and design rather than short-term impact—delaying expected results but providing a more sustainable approach.

Communications Strategy Execution: Our improved communication strategy, including streamlined staff memos and aligned in-person messaging, was successfully launched and positively received, despite not being fully in place at the start of the year.

Conclusion

This year marked a strong launch toward becoming a model community school, especially in the areas of family engagement, retention, and collaborative leadership. While key foundational pieces are in place—such as the RAPID decision-making framework, growing community partnerships, and improved staff communication—more work is needed to amplify student voice, reduce chronic absenteeism, and ensure full staff participation in feedback systems. Our focus in the coming year will be to deepen multi-generational involvement, refine our community school systems, and apply data from our new partnerships to support students and families more holistically.

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

No Material Differences

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

Most Effective/Successful:

Student Retention: We significantly outperformed our 90% year-over-year student retention goal, with a 97.9% Intent to Return rate, and actual retention rates between 94–98% across schools. This reflects growing confidence from families in our model and offerings.

Decision-Making Structures (Initiative 2A): We implemented the RAPID decision-making framework organization-wide, improving alignment and clarity. Staff survey results indicate 87% of staff agree that decision-making is timely and inclusive, meeting our goal.

Inclusive Communication (Initiative 2B): Organizational communications have improved, reflected in a 4.0 average rating (up 0.4 from last year) on staff surveys, and 92% of staff agreeing that communication is timely and inclusive.

Family Engagement (Initiative 2C): Family participation grew through consistent engagement events such as PAC, Coffee Tuesdays, and Lit for Literacy. Participation goals in decision-making groups like ELAC and SSC were met or on track across schools.

Community Partnerships (Initiative 2D): We launched or expanded partnerships with Oakland Natives Give Back (chronic absenteeism study), Youth Alive! (violence prevention), Higher Ground (afterschool & RJ), and Families in Action (parent literacy workshops), helping to build holistic supports for students and families.

Least Effective/Areas for Growth:

Chronic Absenteeism: Although absenteeism improved slightly from the previous year (down from 32.8% to 28.5%), we remain well above our <15% goal. Seasonal illness in January and February contributed to spikes in absenteeism. We have responded with a deeper, three-year study (via LCSSP grant) into patterns and root causes by student group and grade level.

Student Voice Opportunities: While family participation structures were strengthened, student engagement in key decisions was not fully developed this year. Additional structures and routines will be needed to meet this core part of our community school vision.

Staff Participation: While staff sentiment improved, only 82% of staff participated in our biannual survey—just below our 90% target.

Increasing participation is essential to ensuring representative feedback and inclusive decision-making.

Framework Implementation Consistency: While RAPID and RACI frameworks were introduced and generally well-received, our implementation lacked full integration across leadership teams and school sites. Additional scaffolding and training are needed to embed these tools within everyday practice.

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

No changes made to planned goals

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

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.1	Family & Community Engagement	Hold twice yearly “State of the School” and “Family/School Advocacy” meetings with families (led by Site Administrators) around areas of school focus to share data and get family and community input.		Yes
2.2	Family and Community Engagement	Organize SSC, ELAC, and empowering parent learning events based on parent interest, need, and school goals, and support school events such as Student-Led Conferences, Black and Brown excellence events, and community experiences.	\$66,092.00	Yes
2.3	Operations	Implement operational procedures to support student learning, including training staff on operational procedures regarding health and safety protocols, ordering materials, and maintaining materials (books, supplies) necessary to support strong school operations.	\$66,707.00	No
2.4	Family and Community Engagement	Train families in use of Family Portals of our SIS and LMS systems and provide access to and training around student data to better keep families informed of student progress, grade level updates, and school and community events.	\$12,672.00	Yes
2.5	Family and Community Engagement	Provide bilingual translation at all parent meetings and Student-Led Conferences as needed. —Provide translation and interpretation services.	\$34,066.00	Yes
2.6	Technology Support Systems	Support technology systems and infrastructure (including hardware, software, and data systems) that support student learning, including: 1:1 chromebook access, home internet connectivity, SIS systems, LMS systems, Independent Study platforms, and other EdTech platforms and programs; with a specific focus on ensuring that 100% of all LCPS families have accessibility to devices with internet access and complete necessary technology trainings to access, monitor, and engage in their children’s academic progress.	\$95,203.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.7	Technology Support Systems	Hire technology staff to support family, students, and staff with technology systems and infrastructure.	\$158,435.00	No
2.8	Special Education	Provide transition planning and services that begin in 9th grade and move through high school and/or age 22 (when appropriate) done in collaboration with Department of Rehabilitation and other outside agencies; clearly articulated pathway to graduation for participating in certificates of completion.		No
2.9	Family and Community Engagement	Train staff to engage and support families including a McKinney Vento liaison.	\$62,269.00	Yes
2.10	Attendance	Align attendance procedures and identify and support students at risk of chronic absence to ensure high attendance and reduce chronic absenteeism.	\$264,431.00	No
2.11	Food Service	Promote access to Food Service programs, with a focus on nutrition and meeting goals for 90% to 100% of student meal participation.	\$374,762.00	No
2.12	Facilities	Maintain facilities that support high quality student learning; Improve learning spaces to support ongoing health & safety guidance.	\$124,057.00	No
2.13	Expanded Learning	Run high-quality after-school programs aligned to increase academic achievement, student well-being, and extracurricular activities.	\$1,128,865.00	No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	Deeply Invest in our Educators and Leaders -Our Greatest Asset	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
 Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)
 Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Lighthouse will deeply invest in our teachers and leaders -our greatest asset. We will recruit and retain teachers and leaders who are committed to and reflective of our community. We will deliver the world-class professional development and coaching that our teachers and leaders deserve. We will foster a collaborative and cohesive leadership team that removes barriers for, supports, and celebrates its teachers. We will grow and strengthen our teacher and leadership pipelines

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	On average, retain 85%+ educators and leaders YoY with <10% variance across sites	78%	74%		85% or higher	
3.2	Maintain >75% of LCPS staff identifying as BIPOC	77%	82%		75% or higher	
3.3	Across all demographic groups, 80% of staff are “engaged” according to LCPS internal survey	55%	51%		80% or higher	

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

Overall Implementation and Progress

During the 2024-25 school year, LCPS made meaningful progress in implementing foundational structures to support educator and leader development. We maintained strong staff participation in professional development and coaching systems, secured new funding to sustain these efforts, and reinforced the culture of support and collaboration that underpins high-quality learning environments for adults.

However, gaps remain in ensuring our professional development is fully differentiated and aligned to role-specific needs. In addition, while many staff feel supported by managers and coaches, we identified the need to clarify our organizational theory of action for professional learning and to better equip leaders to provide consistent and effective support.

Substantive Differences from the Plan

Delay in Articulating a Theory of Action: A major component of Initiative 3A was the development of a clear, unified theory of action for professional learning. This was not completed as planned during the first semester, and its development timeline has been extended.

Inconsistent PD Quality by Role: While the original plan envisioned PD as aligned and differentiated, in practice, whole-group sessions did not meet the needs of all staff, particularly teachers who wanted more targeted instructional strategies and access to skilled coaches.

Leadership Support Variability: The initial plan assumed baseline leadership capacity to facilitate high-quality PD and coaching. However, variation in site leadership effectiveness emerged as a key barrier, particularly around communication and team management.

Conclusion

This year marked important progress in creating a culture of professional learning and support, with strong participation in PD structures, evidence of positive staff-manager relationships, and new investments in coaching and collaboration. However, the year also surfaced critical next steps: defining a coherent theory of action, improving the quality and differentiation of PD, and equipping leaders with the skills and tools to effectively support their teams.

Going forward, LCPS will focus on:

- Finalizing and socializing a clear theory of action for adult learning
- Differentiating PD by staff role and experience level
- Investing in leadership development for managers and site administrators
- Addressing resource, time, and workload barriers that impact staff capacity to fully engage in professional growth
- With these improvements, we are well-positioned to deepen our investment in educators and leaders—our greatest asset—and ensure they are empowered to grow, lead, and thrive within our community.

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

No Material Differences

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

Most Effective/Successes:

Staff Participation in Professional Learning: We met our participation target, with 90%+ of staff engaging in 90% of professional development structures (PD sessions, PLCs, coaching). This reflects strong systems and norms around regular learning for staff.

Manager and Coach Support: Staff reported feeling supported and valued, with survey responses indicating high levels of trust and appreciation:

-“I feel valued, appreciated, seen, supported and that my voice & opinions matter at work.”

-“Receiving regular and consistent support by my supervisor and/or site leadership team.”

These sentiments were echoed in our staff survey rating of 4.0 for regular check-ins and coaching conversations.

Collaborative Team Culture: Staff reported that relationships with colleagues and mentors contributed significantly to their growth and satisfaction. Many commented positively on the “supportive and collaborative team” and noted that recent gains in staff retention helped stabilize and strengthen team dynamics.

Retention Progress: While final retention data will be presented in April, staff perception of improved retention and stronger team culture suggests we're on track to meet our 85% retention goal (for staff asked to return).

Funding and Resources: LCPS secured new local and state grant funding (~\$75K) to support PD and coaching initiatives under this priority, in addition to grants supporting related strategic goals.

Least Effective/Area for Growth:

Theory of Action for Professional Learning (Initiative 3A): We did not meet our first semester milestone of establishing a clear, org-wide theory of action for professional development. Leaders lacked clarity on ownership and vision until later in the semester, delaying alignment and coherence in PD design and execution.

Differentiated PD (Initiative 3B): While team-based PD (e.g., grade level and department collaborations) were seen as effective, whole-staff Wednesday PD was viewed as too generic or misaligned with role-specific needs, particularly by instructional staff.

Instructional PD effectiveness was rated 3.3 (below goal), and

Non-instructional PD rated 3.6, suggesting moderate impact but room for improvement.

Leadership Development Needs: Staff feedback revealed that some managers were perceived as overly top-down, lacking consistency in communication or facilitation. Specific feedback highlighted a need for better collaboration between site and Special Education leadership, as well as more targeted support for managing challenging student needs.

Workload and Resources: Staff cited a need for more prep time, better materials (especially for science and intervention), and stronger systems to support students with IEPs or behavioral needs—conditions which impact overall job satisfaction and growth.

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

No changes made to the planned goals

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

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.1	Curriculum and Professional Development	In partnership with EL Education, provide professional development for the implementation of EL curriculum and program components, leadership core practices, and Student Engaged Assessment (SEA) practices.	\$23,936.00	No
3.2	Teacher/Staff Effectiveness and Impact	Refine and implement teacher retention bonuses and stipends.	\$118,368.00	No
3.3	Curriculum and Professional Development	Support teacher knowledge of CCSS-aligned curriculum through Professional Development in the following ways: LCPS Curriculum Institutes, publisher training, coaching, observation and feedback cycles, and Professional Learning Communities to continually improve curriculum implementation and standards alignment.	\$119,425.00	No
3.4	Curriculum and Professional Development	Focus on K-12 literacy programming through professional development around the science of reading, structured literacy practices, and early literacy dyslexia screening.	\$3,495.00	No
3.5	Instructional Development and Support	Provide professional development for all teachers on MTSS, and provide and assess targeted interventions for students identified as needing additional support through MTSS on a monthly basis.	\$144,755.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.6	Special Education	Provide professional development around inclusion so that students are supported through increased collaboration with general education teachers and involvement in lesson planning & data analysis, opportunities to provide direct instruction aligned to the curriculum students are learning and in support of individualized IEP goals, personalized, student-specific, direct intervention.	\$5,183.00	No
3.7	Student Support and Services	Teach and implement restorative justice practices as a way of preventing and responding to social-emotional and behavior needs, which includes aligning discipline procedures to support consistent application of restorative actions and consequences.	\$298,289.00	No
3.8	Instructional Development and Support	Leverage the Leadership Teams to focus on deep support of Math and ELA instruction through coaching; systemize data meetings and student work analysis; aligned professional development, and academic progress monitoring (APM) leadership meetings.	\$37,312.00	No
3.9	Instructional Development and Support	Teachers with Preliminary credentials are provided with Induction training and an Induction mentor to ensure they clear their credentials within the term of licensure.	\$38,650.00	No
3.10	Teacher/Staff Effectiveness and Impact	Support LCPS's equitable outcomes through Diversity, Equity and Inclusion PD, active recruitment of Teacher residents, and the development of a teacher evaluation and career pathways framework / leadership performance management system.	\$131,648.00	No
3.11	Human Resources	Provide Professional Development in support of non-instructional roles.	\$174,418.00	No

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

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant
\$2060105	\$225292

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
37.721%	100.000%	\$164,806.00	137.721%

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	<p>Action: Student Support and Services</p> <p>Need: Creating an environment in which all feel safe, respected, and bring their authentic selves through consistent implementation of the Crew curriculum.</p> <p>Scope:</p>	The vast majority of the LEA's students (80%+) are foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income students. These actions explicitly address disproportionate outcomes in achievement for these student groups and are aligned with evidence-based practices for school improvement.	The LEA will monitor Student Progress through course grades, interim assessments, and norm-referenced assessments, assess student reading and math achievement triennially to monitor student proficiency and growth and identify students in need of

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		interventions; Refine and utilize data meetings, student and family communications, and data management systems to track student progress toward proficiency in relation to multiple measures of student achievement.
1.2	<p>Action: Student Support and Services</p> <p>Need: A community-centered vision for instructional excellence for all students in all classrooms.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p>	Post-pandemic, our chronic absenteeism rates have been above 30%. In order to bring these rates down to pre-pandemic response levels close to 15%, we must have multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) to identify and intervene.	We will monitor chronic absenteeism and attendance rates for low-income and ELD students as well as entire student population.
1.7	<p>Action: Data and Assessment</p> <p>Need: Our teachers implement research-based, content-specific instructional strategies & practices aligned to the vision</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide Schoolwide</p>	The vast majority of the LEA's students (80%+) are foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income students. These actions explicitly address disproportionate outcomes in achievement for these student groups and are aligned with evidence-based practices for school improvement.	By 2028, 85% of 2nd grade students are in the 25th percentile or higher on the Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) portion of AimsWeb (equivalent to 6% growth annually off of 2024 baseline)
1.8	<p>Action: Instructional Development and Support</p>	We will deliver the world-class professional development and coaching that our teachers and leaders deserve that also enables our schools to	

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
	<p>Need: Our teachers implement research-based, content-specific instructional strategies & practices aligned to the vision</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide Schoolwide</p>	recruit and retain teachers and leaders who are committed to and reflective of our community.	
1.10	<p>Action: English Language Development</p> <p>Need: Our teachers authentically internalize high-quality instructional materials daily & our leaders ensure equity in student experiences across all classrooms through systems of support & accountability</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide Schoolwide</p>	Increased focus on our Integrated and Designated ELD programs, including professional development for staff and focus on progress monitoring for students, directly serves our English learner students. SEL supports, discipline procedures, and MTSS systems address the needs of English learners, low income students, and foster youth, student subgroups that require access to tiered supports in order to be successful academically at school after a year and a half of distance learning.	60% of Emerging Bilingual students advance at least 1 EPLI level or maintain a level 4.
1.11	<p>Action: Special Education</p> <p>Need: Our teachers authentically internalize high-quality instructional materials daily & our leaders ensure equity in student experiences across all classrooms through systems of support & accountability</p> <p>Scope:</p>		Students with disabilities, on average, exceed the CA SWD average on CAASPP scale score growth by year 4 of our strategic plan.

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 Schoolwide		
2.1	<p>Action: Family & Community Engagement</p> <p>Need: Our leaders codify a collaborative leadership approach with a clear network model, meeting structure, and inclusive decision making process.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide Schoolwide</p>	Increasing impactful family engagement enables our parents and community members to be more integrated and collaborative partners in their children's education.	90%+ families attend at least 2 school sponsored events/workshops annually.
2.2	<p>Action: Family and Community Engagement</p> <p>Need: Our leaders codify a collaborative leadership approach with a clear network model, meeting structure, and inclusive decision making process.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide Schoolwide</p>	Increasing impactful family engagement enables our parents and community members to be more integrated and collaborative partners in their children's education.	90%+ families attend at least 2 school sponsored events/workshops annually.
2.4	<p>Action: Family and Community Engagement</p> <p>Need: Our leaders codify a collaborative leadership approach with a clear network model, meeting</p>	Increasing impactful family engagement enables our parents and community members to be more integrated and collaborative partners in their children's education.	90%+ families attend at least 2 school sponsored events/workshops annually.

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
	<p>structure, and inclusive decision making process.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide Schoolwide</p>		
2.5	<p>Action: Family and Community Engagement</p> <p>Need: Our leaders codify a collaborative leadership approach with a clear network model, meeting structure, and inclusive decision making process.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide Schoolwide</p>	Increasing impactful family engagement enables our parents and community members to be more integrated and collaborative partners in their children's education.	90%+ families attend at least 2 school sponsored events/workshops annually.
2.9	<p>Action: Family and Community Engagement</p> <p>Need: Our leaders codify a collaborative leadership approach with a clear network model, meeting structure, and inclusive decision making process.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide Schoolwide</p>	Increasing impactful family engagement enables our parents and community members to be more integrated and collaborative partners in their children's education.	90%+ families attend at least 2 school sponsored events/workshops annually

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
-------------------	--------------------	---	------------------------------------

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.

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

2025-26 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	5461374	2060105	37.721%	100.000%	137.721%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	\$2,085,647.00	\$1,649,705.00	\$78,935.00	\$501,397.00	\$4,315,684.00	\$2,801,272.00	\$1,514,412.00

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	Student Support and Services	All English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	No Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00				\$0.00	
1	1.2	Student Support and Services	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			\$348,208.00	\$343,990.00	\$210,230.00	\$448,528.00		\$33,440.00	\$692,198.00	
1	1.3	.														
1	1.7	Data and Assessment	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			\$0.00	\$9,152.00	\$9,152.00				\$9,152.00	
1	1.8	Instructional Development and Support	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income										
1	1.10	English Language Development	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			\$129,712.00	\$1,584.00	\$131,296.00				\$131,296.00	
1	1.11	Special Education	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income										
2	2.1	Family & Community Engagement	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income										
2	2.2	Family and Community Engagement	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide School	English Learners Foster Youth			\$0.00	\$66,092.00				\$66,092.00	\$66,092.00	

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
					wide	Low Income										
2	2.3	Operations	All	No			All Schools		\$66,707.00	\$0.00	\$66,707.00				\$66,707.00	
2	2.4	Family and Community Engagement	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			\$0.00	\$12,672.00	\$12,672.00				\$12,672.00	
2	2.5	Family and Community Engagement	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			\$0.00	\$34,066.00	\$34,066.00				\$34,066.00	
2	2.6	Technology Support Systems	All	No			All Schools		\$0.00	\$95,203.00	\$95,203.00				\$95,203.00	
2	2.7	Technology Support Systems	All	No			All Schools		\$158,435.00	\$0.00	\$158,435.00				\$158,435.00	
2	2.8	Special Education	Students with Disabilities	No			All Schools									
2	2.9	Family and Community Engagement	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			\$62,269.00	\$0.00		\$62,269.00			\$62,269.00	
2	2.10	Attendance	All	No			All Schools		\$264,431.00	\$0.00	\$264,431.00				\$264,431.00	
2	2.11	Food Service	All	No			All Schools		\$0.00	\$374,762.00		\$187,381.00		\$187,381.00	\$374,762.00	
2	2.12	Facilities	All	No			All Schools		\$0.00	\$124,057.00	\$124,057.00				\$124,057.00	
2	2.13	Expanded Learning	All	No			All Schools		\$1,128,865.00	\$0.00		\$914,381.00		\$214,484.00	\$1,128,865.00	
3	3.1	Curriculum and Professional Development	All	No			All Schools		\$0.00	\$23,936.00	\$23,936.00				\$23,936.00	
3	3.2	Teacher/Staff Effectiveness and Impact	All	No			All Schools		\$118,368.00	\$0.00	\$118,368.00				\$118,368.00	
3	3.3	Curriculum and Professional Development	All	No			All Schools		\$116,081.00	\$3,344.00	\$3,344.00	\$37,146.00	\$78,935.00		\$119,425.00	
3	3.4	Curriculum and Professional Development	All	No			All Schools		\$0.00	\$3,495.00	\$3,495.00				\$3,495.00	

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	3.5	Instructional Development and Support	All	No			All Schools		\$144,755.00	\$0.00	\$144,755.00				\$144,755.00	
3	3.6	Special Education	All	No			All Schools		\$0.00	\$5,183.00	\$5,183.00				\$5,183.00	
3	3.7	Student Support and Services	All	No			All Schools		\$240,209.00	\$58,080.00	\$298,289.00				\$298,289.00	
3	3.8	Instructional Development and Support	All	No			All Schools		\$0.00	\$37,312.00	\$37,312.00				\$37,312.00	
3	3.9	Instructional Development and Support	All	No			All Schools		\$0.00	\$38,650.00	\$38,650.00				\$38,650.00	
3	3.10	Teacher/Staff Effectiveness and Impact	All	No			All Schools		\$23,232.00	\$108,416.00	\$131,648.00				\$131,648.00	
3	3.11	Human Resources	All	No			All Schools		\$0.00	\$174,418.00	\$174,418.00				\$174,418.00	

2025-26 Contributing Actions Table

1. Projected LCFF Base Grant	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)	Totals by Type	Total LCFF Funds
5461374	2060105	37.721%	100.000%	137.721%	\$397,416.00	0.000%	7.277 %	Total:	\$397,416.00
								LEA-wide Total:	\$397,416.00
								Limited Total:	\$0.00
								Schoolwide Total:	\$187,186.00

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
1	1.1	Student Support and Services	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income		\$0.00	
1	1.2	Student Support and Services	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income		\$210,230.00	
1	1.7	Data and Assessment	Yes	LEA-wide Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income		\$9,152.00	
1	1.8	Instructional Development and Support	Yes	LEA-wide Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			
1	1.10	English Language Development	Yes	LEA-wide Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income		\$131,296.00	
1	1.11	Special Education	Yes	LEA-wide Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			
2	2.1	Family & Community Engagement	Yes	LEA-wide Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth			

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 (%)
					Low Income			
2	2.2	Family and Community Engagement	Yes	LEA-wide Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			
2	2.4	Family and Community Engagement	Yes	LEA-wide Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income		\$12,672.00	
2	2.5	Family and Community Engagement	Yes	LEA-wide Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income		\$34,066.00	
2	2.9	Family and Community Engagement	Yes	LEA-wide Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income			

2024-25 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	\$4,254,940.00	\$0.00

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
1	1.1	Student Support and Services	No Yes	\$0.00	
1	1.2	Student Support and Services	Yes	\$683,141.00	
1	1.3	.			
1	1.7	Data and Assessment	Yes	\$8,800.00	
1	1.8	Instructional Development and Support	Yes		
1	1.10	English Language Development	Yes	\$131,120.00	
1	1.11	Special Education	Yes		
2	2.1	Family & Community Engagement	Yes		
2	2.2	Family and Community Engagement	Yes	\$64,872.00	
2	2.3	Operations	No	\$66,341.00	
2	2.4	Family and Community Engagement	Yes	\$12,320.00	

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)
2	2.5	Family and Community Engagement	Yes	\$33,066.00	
2	2.6	Technology Support Systems	No	\$94,203.00	
2	2.7	Technology Support Systems	No	\$154,999.00	
2	2.8	Special Education	No		
2	2.9	Family and Community Engagement	Yes	\$60,122.00	
2	2.10	Attendance	No	\$261,992.00	
2	2.11	Food Service	No	\$372,762.00	
2	2.12	Facilities	No	\$123,057.00	
2	2.13	Expanded Learning	No	\$1,126,865.00	
3	3.1	Curriculum and Professional Development	No	\$22,880.00	
3	3.2	Teacher/Staff Effectiveness and Impact	No	\$117,312.00	
3	3.3	Curriculum and Professional Development	No	\$115,729.00	
3	3.4	Curriculum and Professional Development	No	\$3,460.00	

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)
3	3.5	Instructional Development and Support	No	\$132,555.00	
3	3.6	Special Education	No	\$5,125.00	
3	3.7	Student Support and Services	No	\$294,089.00	
3	3.8	Instructional Development and Support	No	\$35,200.00	
3	3.9	Instructional Development and Support	No	\$33,440.00	
3	3.10	Teacher/Staff Effectiveness and Impact	No	\$127,776.00	
3	3.11	Human Resources	No	\$173,714.00	

2024-25 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

6. Estimated LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	7. Total Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	8. Total Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)
164806	\$164,806.00	\$0.00	\$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	Student Support and Services	Yes	\$0.00			
1	1.2	Student Support and Services	Yes	\$9,590.00			
1	1.7	Data and Assessment	Yes	\$8,800.00			
1	1.8	Instructional Development and Support	Yes				
1	1.10	English Language Development	Yes	\$131,120.00			
1	1.11	Special Education	Yes				
2	2.1	Family & Community Engagement	Yes				
2	2.2	Family and Community Engagement	Yes				
2	2.4	Family and Community Engagement	Yes	\$12,320.00			
2	2.5	Family and Community Engagement	Yes	\$2,976.00			
2	2.9	Family and Community Engagement	Yes				

2024-25 LCFF Carryover Table

9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 + Carryover %)	7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)	11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)	12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)	13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)
164806	164806		100.000%	\$0.00	0.000%	0.000%	\$164,806.00	100.000%

Local Control and Accountability Plan Instructions

[Plan Summary](#)

[Engaging Educational Partners](#)

[Goals and Actions](#)

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

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

Introduction and Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The revised LCAP template for the 2024–25, 2025–26, and 2026–27 school years reflects statutory changes made through Senate Bill 114 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 48, Statutes of 2023 and Senate Bill 153, Chapter 38, Statutes of 2024.

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

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

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

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

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

Plan Summary

Purpose

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

Requirements and Instructions

General Information

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

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

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

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

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

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

Schools Identified

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

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

Support for Identified Schools

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

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

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

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

Engaging Educational Partners

Purpose

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

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

Requirements

Requirements

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

- Teachers,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- For school districts, see [Education Code Section 52062](#);
 - **Note:** Charter schools using the LCAP as the School Plan for Student Achievement must meet the requirements of *EC* Section 52062(a).
- For COEs, see [Education Code Section 52068](#); and
- For charter schools, see [Education Code Section 47606.5](#).

- **NOTE:** As a reminder, the superintendent of a school district or COE must respond, in writing, to comments received by the applicable committees identified in the *Education Code* sections listed above. This includes the parent advisory committee and may include the English learner parent advisory committee and, as of July 1, 2024, the student advisory committee, as applicable.

Instructions

Respond to the prompts as follows:

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Educational Partners

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

Process for Engagement

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

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

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

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

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

Goals and Actions

Purpose

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

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

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

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

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

Requirement to Address the LCFF State Priorities

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

Respond to the following prompts, as applicable:

Focus Goal(s)

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

Description

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

Focus goals for Equity Multiplier schoolsites must address the following:

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

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

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

Broad Goal

Description

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

- The description of a broad goal will be clearly aligned with the expected measurable outcomes included for the goal.

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Maintenance of Progress Goal

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Measuring and Reporting Results:

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

- LEAs must identify metrics for specific student groups, as appropriate, including expected outcomes that address and reduce disparities in outcomes between student groups.
- The metrics may be quantitative or qualitative; but at minimum, an LEA’s LCAP must include goals that are measured using all of the applicable metrics for the related state priorities, in each LCAP year, as applicable to the type of LEA.
- To the extent a state priority does not specify one or more metrics (e.g., implementation of state academic content and performance standards), the LEA must identify a metric to use within the LCAP. For these state priorities, LEAs are encouraged to use metrics based on or reported through the relevant local indicator self-reflection tools within the Dashboard.
- **Required metrics for LEA-wide actions:** For each action identified as 1) contributing towards the requirement to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, including long-term English learners, and low-income students and 2) being provided on an LEA-wide basis, the LEA must identify one or more metrics to monitor the effectiveness of the action and its budgeted expenditures.
 - These required metrics may be identified within the action description or the first prompt in the increased or improved services section, however the description must clearly identify the metric(s) being used to monitor the effectiveness of the action and the action(s) that the metric(s) apply to.
- **Required metrics for Equity Multiplier goals:** For each Equity Multiplier goal, the LEA must identify:
 - The specific metrics for each identified student group at each specific schoolsite, as applicable, to measure the progress toward the goal, and/or
 - The specific metrics used to measure progress in meeting the goal related to credentialing, subject matter preparation, or educator retention at each specific schoolsite.
- **Required metrics for actions supported by LREBG funds:** To implement the requirements of *EC* Section 52064.4, LEAs with unexpended LREBG funds must include at least one metric to monitor the impact of each action funded with LREBG funds included in the goal.
 - The metrics being used to monitor the impact of each action funded with LREBG funds are not required to be new metrics; they may be metrics that are already being used to measure progress towards goals and actions included in the LCAP.

Complete the table as follows:

Metric #
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enter the metric number.
Metric

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

Baseline

- Enter the baseline when completing the LCAP for 2024–25.
 - Use the most recent data associated with the metric available at the time of adoption of the LCAP for the first year of the three-year plan. LEAs may use data as reported on the 2023 Dashboard for the baseline of a metric only if that data represents the most recent available data (e.g., high school graduation rate).
 - Using the most recent data available may involve reviewing data the LEA is preparing for submission to the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) or data that the LEA has recently submitted to CALPADS.
 - Indicate the school year to which the baseline data applies.
 - The baseline data must remain unchanged throughout the three-year LCAP.
 - This requirement is not intended to prevent LEAs from revising the baseline data if it is necessary to do so. For example, if an LEA identifies that its data collection practices for a particular metric are leading to inaccurate data and revises its practice to obtain accurate data, it would also be appropriate for the LEA to revise the baseline data to align with the more accurate data process and report its results using the accurate data.
 - If an LEA chooses to revise its baseline data, then, at a minimum, it must clearly identify the change as part of its response to the description of changes prompt in the Goal Analysis for the goal. LEAs are also strongly encouraged to involve their educational partners in the decision of whether or not to revise a baseline and to communicate the proposed change to their educational partners.
 - Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one- or two-year LCAP may identify a new baseline each year, as applicable.

Year 1 Outcome

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

Year 2 Outcome

- When completing the LCAP for 2026–27, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies.

- Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one-year LCAP may identify the Year 2 Outcome as not applicable when completing the LCAP for 2026–27 or may provide the Year 2 Outcome for 2026–27.

Target for Year 3 Outcome

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

Current Difference from Baseline

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

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

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

Goal Analysis:

Enter the LCAP Year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The reasons for the ineffectiveness, and
- How changes to the action will result in a new or strengthened approach.

Actions:

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

Action

- Enter the action number.

Title

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

Description

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

Total Funds

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

Contributing

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

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

Required Actions

For English Learners and Long-Term English Learners

- LEAs with 30 or more English learners and/or 15 or more long-term English learners must include specific actions in the LCAP related to, at a minimum:
 - Language acquisition programs, as defined in *EC* Section 306, provided to students, and
 - Professional development for teachers.
 - If an LEA has both 30 or more English learners and 15 or more long-term English learners, the LEA must include actions for both English learners and long-term English learners.

For Technical Assistance

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

For Lowest Performing Dashboard Indicators

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

For LEAs With Unexpended LREBG Funds

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

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

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

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

Purpose

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

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

Statutory Requirements

An LEA is required to demonstrate in its LCAP how it is increasing or improving services for its students who are foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income, collectively referred to as unduplicated students, as compared to the services provided to all students in proportion to the increase in funding it receives based on the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the LEA (*EC* Section 42238.07[a][1], *EC*

Section 52064[b][8][B]; 5 CCR Section 15496[a]). This proportionality percentage is also known as the “minimum proportionality percentage” or “MPP.” The manner in which an LEA demonstrates it is meeting its MPP is two-fold: (1) through the expenditure of LCFF funds or through the identification of a Planned Percentage of Improved Services as documented in the Contributing Actions Table, and (2) through the explanations provided in the Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students section.

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

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

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

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

For School Districts Only

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

Complete the tables as follows:

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

Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover — Percentage

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

LCFF Carryover — Dollar

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

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

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

Required Descriptions:

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

Limited Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

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

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

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

Provide the following descriptions, as applicable to the LEA:

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

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

Action Tables

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

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

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

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

Total Planned Expenditures Table

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Annual Update Table

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

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

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

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

Calculations in the Action Tables

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

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

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

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

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

California Department of Education
November 2024