

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
Inland Leaders Charter	Mike Gordon Executive Director	mgordon@inlandleaders.com 9094461100

Plan Summary 2022-23

General Information

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

Inland Leaders Charter School (ILCS) is a transitional kindergarten through 8th-grade site-based charter school in the heart of the City of Yucaipa in San Bernardino County operating at two separate sites: Bryant Street Campus (BSC) and California Street Campus (CSC). ILCS opened in August of 2007, with a total of 199 students and is devoted to its mission of "creating 21st century leaders." The school currently has approximately 1000 students enrolled and a waitlist of over 600 students. Enrollment is open to any student through a random public drawing each spring. ILCS continues to keep its class sizes low with approximately 24 to 1 kindergarten through third grade. ILCS limits its site-based class sizes to approximately 26 students in the fourth through eighth grades, which is highly attractive to many families. In addition, to the site-based students, ILCS maintains an independent study option for students whose parents wish to keep them at home for their education, but desire a solid curricular program. ILCS also offers a sports program that includes basketball, baseball, softball, football, soccer, track & field, cross country, and volleyball. Special education services are delivered through a full inclusion model at Inland Leaders and is overseen by the El Dorado SELPA.

Reflections: Successes

A description of successes and/or progress based on a review of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) and local data.

Inland Leaders is most proud of our positive survey data and academic achievement gains that demonstrate great satisfaction from educational partners, great progress toward student academic achievement, and closing the achievement gap for high needs students.

Survey data was administered to our educational partners (parents, students, staff). Survey results indicated extremely positive results. 99% of parents feel welcomed at ILCS, and 93% of 1st - 8th grade students feel welcomed, a 2% increase from the previous year for both. 99% of parents are happy their child(ren) attend(s) ILCS and 96% of staff (certificated/classified) like working at ILCS, a 1% increase. 94% of all staff feel valued by the administration, a 2% increase, and 98% of staff feel valued by their team members; a 7% increase. For classified staff, there was a significant increase in feeling that there is not a divide between classified and certificated. Results went from 63% to 91%.

ILCS is one of few schools that chose to administer the CAASPP test during the 2020 -2021 school year. Despite the pandemic, scores in ELA increased by 2% going from 73% to 75% proficient! Students with disabilities made significant gains with a 13% increase in ELA from 32% to 45%, and in math there was a 4% increase, from 39% to 43%. Redesignated English Language Learners (RFEPS) increased by 7% in ELA from 74% to 81% proficient.

Transitional Kindergarten data (Aug - Feb) shows academic gains in all areas from the previous year. For letter identification students scored 85% compared to the previous year of 80%. Letter sounds show a 5% increase going from 78% to 83%. In the area of counting, students showed a 1% gain going from 95% to 96% and number identification showed a 2%, going from 78% to 80%.

Kindergarten Data (Aug through Feb) indicates that for Letter Identification and Letter Sounds student averages remained the same for 2018-2022 (Letter Identification -99% - Letter Sounds - 98%). Foundational skills indicate a 3% increase from 85% to 88% and sight word recognition increased by 2% going from 45% to 47%. Letter teams showed a 3% increase from 58% to 61%. Numbers & Counting shows a 1% increase from 90% to 91%.

On the STAR assessment (1st - 8th grades) the majority of grades surpassed the expected grade equivalency:

1st grade - Average grade equivalency of 1st grade 9 months (1.9) compared to the expected equivalency of 1st grade 6 months (1.6). 3 months above the expected gain.

2nd grade - Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 2 months (3.2) compared to the expected equivalency of 2nd grade 6 months (2.6). 6 months above the expected gain.

3rd grade - Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 4 months (4.4) compared to the expected equivalency of 3rd grade 6 months (3.6). 8 months above the expected gain.

4th grade - Average grade equivalency of 5th grade 0 months (5.0) compared to the expected equivalency of 4th grade 6 months (4.6). 4 months above the expected gain.

6th grade - Average grade equivalency of 7th grade 2 months (7.2) compared to the expected equivalency of 6th grade 6 months (6.6). 6 months above the expected gain.

Although the following grades are below the expected grade equivalency, both grades are making expected incremental gains of 4 months (Aug to Dec).

7th - 6.3 to 7.1 - 8 months growth

8th - 7.1 to 7.6 - 5 months growth

Pre-Pandemic Gains

6th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 7th grade 2 months (7.2) compared to the expected equivalency of 6th grade 6 months (6.6). 6 months above the expected gain.

Gains: 8 months (.8) compared to 5 months (.5) average growth from the previous two years (2018-2020) which indicates no months of loss in academic gains.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: The average grade equivalency for 2018 - 2020 was 6 years 9 months (6.9) compared to 7th grade 2 months (7.2) which indicates a gain of 3 months (.3).

In the area of math, in analyzing Pearson math benchmark scores for grades 1st - 6th, several grades made gains or stayed the same. 1st grade had a 3% increase going from 76% to 79%. 4th grade stayed the same at 77% with no learning loss. 5th grade had a 5% increase going from 77% to 82%. 6th grade stayed the same at 73% with no learning loss.

Inland Leaders is in its 3rd year of implementation of Write From the Beginning (WFTB) program. Teachers worked hard to create clear scoring guides which include anchor papers along with consistent rubric scoring. The school continued to celebrate with award assemblies to foster, encourage, and celebrate student leadership.

Special Education (SPED) service minutes remained consistent including counseling and mental health supports in both the general education and SPED programs. Their program was expanded with an additional Education Specialist.

Interventions were offered before, during, and after school to students struggling academically which included Title 1 students and English Language Learners. Success Academy, taught by ILCS teachers, was offered to all students struggling academically. Reading Intervention along with language development was offered during and after school by our reading specialist/tutors.

Reflections: Identified Need

A description of any areas that need significant improvement based on a review of Dashboard and local data, including any areas of low performance and significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators, and any steps taken to address those areas.

There may be a need in the area of student culture. Survey data indicates students' perception of liking school (I like coming to school) has decreased. In elementary school 78% of students indicate liking school compared to the previous year of 84%, a 6% decrease. In middle school only 61% of students indicate liking school compared to the previous year of 73%, a 12% decrease. In the area of students being nice to each other, data indicates that 74% of elementary students feel students are nice, leaving 26% that do not believe students are nice.

For certificated staff, survey data indicated that adults at ILCS treating each other with respect dropped significantly. Results went from 98% the previous year to 77%, a 21% decrease.

In regards to the teacher's performance scale, 38% indicated they are excited about it in 20-21 compared 27% this current year, an 11% decrease. ILCS does a great job in retaining teachers - dropped by 14%, going from 83% to 69%.

The question regarding salaries, I feel my school has made an effort to stay competitive with salaries, dropped by 23%, going from 68% to 45%.

Pre-Pandemic/Pandemic

Transitional Kindergarten data reveals learning loss compared to pre-pandemic years in the areas of Letter Identification and Sounds (Aug to March). For letter identification, on average students scored 3 % less than previous years. (85% for 2022 compared to 88% for 2019-2020).

Kindergarten

For Foundational Skills, on average students scored 4% less than previous years. (88% for 2022 compared to 92% for 2018-2020). Sight word scores indicate a 10% loss on average (47% for 2022 compared to 57% for 2018-2020). For Letter Teams a 12% loss was revealed (61% for 2022 compared to 73% for 2018-2020). For reading (running record levels) students show a loss of one reading level (level "C" for 2022 compared to level "D" in 2020 (Reading A to Z Running Record Assessment) For counting & number recognition a 4% loss was revealed (91% for 2021 compared to 95% for 2018 - 2020).

STAR - whole - all students

The following data for grades, 5th, 7th, & 8th indicate below the expected gains:

5th grade - Average grade equivalency of 5th grade 5 months (5.5) compared to the expected equivalency of 5th grade 6 months (5.6). .1

month below the expected gain.

7th grade - Average grade equivalency of 7th grade 1 month (7.1) compared to the expected equivalency of 7th grade 4 months (7.4). .3 months below the expected gain.

8th grade - Average grade equivalency of 7th grade 6 months (7.6) compared to the expected equivalency of 8th grade 4 months (8.4). .8 months below the expected gain.

Pre-Pandemic/Pandemic - Whole School Data (DONE)

Although the majority of grades (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, & 6th) are above the expected grade equivalency, all grades except 6th grade had academic learning loss in comparing pre-pandemic data to pandemic data.

1st grade -Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 1st grade 9 months (1.9) compared to the expected equivalency of 1st grade 6 months (1.6). 3 months above the expected gain.

Gain (Aug to March scores) 3 months (.3) gains compared to 1 year (1) average growth from the three previous years (2017-2020) which indicates a 7 month loss of academic gains.

Grade equivalency expectation: The average grade equivalency for 2018-2020 was 2nd grade 7 months (2.7) compared to 1st grade 9 months which equates to an 8 month (.8) loss.

2nd grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 2 months (3.2) compared to the expected equivalency of 2nd grade 6 months (2.6). 6 months above the expected gain.

Gains (Aug. to March scores) 6 months (.6) gained compared to 1year (1) average growth from the three previous years (2017-2020) which indicates a 4 months loss of academic gains.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: The average grade equivalency for 2017-2020 was 3rd grade 9 months (3.9) compared to 3rd grade 2 months (3.2) which equates to a 7 month (.7) loss.

3rd grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 4 months (4.4) compared to the expected equivalency of 3rd grade 6 months (3.6). 8 months above the expected gain.

Gains (Aug. to March scores) 7 months (.7) gained compared to 1 years (1.0) average growth from the three previous years (2017-2020) which equates to 3 months (.3) learning loss.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: The average grade equivalency for 2017-2020 was 4th grade 7 months (4.7) compared to 2022 of 4th grade 4 months which equates to 3 months (.3) learning loss.

4th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 5th grade 0 months (5.0) compared to the expected equivalency

of 4th grade 6 months (4.6). 4 months above the expected gain.

Gains (Aug. to March scores) 7 months (.7) gain compared to 9 months (.9) average growth from the three previous years (2017-2020) which indicates a 2 month (.2) loss of academic gains.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: The average grade equivalency 2017-2020 was 5 years 3 months (5.3) compared to 2022 of 5th grade 0 months which equates to a 3 month (.3) loss.

5th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 5th grade 5 months (5.5) compared to the expected equivalency of 5th grade 6 months (5.6). .1 months below the expected gain.

Gains: (Aug. to March scores) 4 months (.4) gains compared to 8 months (.8) average growth from the pre-pandemic years (2017-2020) which indicates 4 months (.4) of loss in academic gains.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: The average grade equivalency for 2017-2020 was 6th grade 1 month (6.1) compared to 5th grade 0 months (5.0) which equates to a 1 year 1 (1.1) month learning loss.

7th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 7th grade 1 month (7.1) compared to the expected equivalency of 7th grade 4 months (7.4). .3 months below the expected gain.

Gain: (Aug. to Dec scores) 6th grade 3 months (6.3) to 7th grade 1 month (7.1) - 8 month gain

Grade Equivalency Comparison: The average grade equivalency for 2019-2020 7th grade 7 months (7.7) compared to 7th grade 1 month (7.1) which indicates a 6 month learning loss.

8th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 7th grade 6 months (7.6) compared to the expected equivalency of 8th grade 4 months (8.4). .8 months below the expected gain.

Gain: (Aug. to Dec scores) 7th grade 1 month (7.1) to 7th grade 6 months (7.6) - 5 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: The average grade equivalency for 2019-2020 was 8th grade 1 month (8.1) compared to 7th grade 6 months (7.6) which indicates 5 months learning loss.

Low Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students 2022 - STAR

All SES students in grades 1st - 8th are below the grade equivalent expectation (except for 1st), are behind their grade equivalent peers, but have made the expected gains of 4 to 6 months (8th grade).

1st grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 1st grade 7 months (.6) compared to the expected equivalency of 1st grade 6 months (1.6). 1 month above the expected gain.

Gains: (Aug. to March scores) 9 months (.9) to 1st grade 7 months (1.7) - 8 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 1st grade average for all students grade equivalency for 2022 is 1st grade 9 months (1.9) indicating SES students are 2 months behind their peers.

2nd grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 2nd grade 4 months (2.4) compared to the expected equivalency of 2nd grade 6 months (2.6). Below the expected gain by 2 months (.6).

Gains: (Aug. to March scores) 2nd grade 4 months (2.4) to 3rd grade 1 month (3.1) - 7 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 2nd grade average for all students grade equivalency for 2022 is 3rd grade 3 months (2.3) indicating SES students are 2 months behind their peers.

3rd grade Grade Equivalency Expectation: average grade equivalency is 3rd grade 9 months (3.9) compared to the expected equivalency of 3rd grade 6 months (3.6)

indicating SES students are 3 month above the expected gain of of 3.6.

Gain: (Aug. to March scores) 4th grade 1 month (4.1) to 3rd grade 9 months (3.9) -2 month loss.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 3rd grade average for all students grade equivalency for 2022 is 4th grade 4 month (4.4) indicating SES students are 5 months (.5) behind their peers.

4th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 8 months (3.8) compared to the expected gain of 4th grade 6 months (4.6) which is 8 month (8) behind the expected equivalency.

Gain: 3rd grade 8 months (3.8) to 4th grade 3 months (4.3) - 5 months gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 4th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 5 years 0 months (5.0) indicating SES 7 months (1.5) behind their peers.

5th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 8 months (4.8) compared to the expected gain of 5th grade 6 months (5.6) which is 8 month (.8) below the expected equivalency.

Gain (Aug. to March scores) 4th grade 8 months (4.8) to 5th grade 2 months (5.2) - 4 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 5th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 5th grade 5 months (5.5) indicating SES students are 3 month (.3) months behind their peers.

6th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 5th grade 4 months (6.4) compared to the expected gain of 6th grade 6 months (6.6) which is 2 months below the expected equivalency.

Gain: (Aug. to March scores) 5th grade 4 months (5.4) to 5th grade 9 months (5.9) - 5 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 6th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 7th grade 2 months (7.2) indicating SES students are 1 year 3 month (1.3) behind their peers.

7th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 5th grade 4 months (5.4) compared to the expected gain of 7th grade 4 months (7.4) which is 2 years 4 below the expected equivalency.

Gain: (Aug. to Dec scores) 5th grade 4 months (5.4) to 5th grade 8 months - 4 months gain

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 7th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 7th grade 1 months (7.1) indicating SES students are 1 year 3 months (1.3) behind their peers.

8th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 6th grade 3 months (6.3) compared to the expected gain of 8th grade 4 months (8.4) which is 2 years 1 month below the expected equivalency.

Gain: (Aug. to March scores) 6th grade 3 months (6.3) to 6th grade 6 month (6.6) - 3 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 8th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 7th grade 6 months (7.6) indicating SES students are 1 year behind (1.0) behind their peers.

Title 1 Students 2022 - STAR (DONE)

All Title 1 students in grades 1st - 8th are below the grade equivalent expectation (except for 3rd), are behind their grade equivalent peers, but have made the expected gains of 4 to 6 months (except 1st & 6th grades).

1st grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 0 grade 6 months (.6) compared to the expected equivalency of 1st grade 6 months (1.6). 1 year below the expected gain.

Gains: (Aug. to March scores) 4 months (.4) to 6 months (.6) - 2 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 1st grade average for all students grade equivalency for 2022 is 1st grade 9 months (1.9) indicating Title 1 students are 1 year 3 months behind their peers.

2nd grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 2nd grade 0 months (2.0) compared to the expected equivalency of 2nd grade 6 months (2.6). Below the expected gain by 6 months (.6).

Gains: (Aug. to March scores) 1st grade 0 months (1.0) to 2nd grade 0 months (2.0) - 1 year gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 2nd grade average for all students grade equivalency for 2022 is 3rd grade 3 months (2.3) indicating Title 1 students are 1 year and 3 months behind their peers.

3rd grade Equivalency Expectation: average grade equivalency is 3rd grade 7 months (3.7) compared to the expected gain of 3rd grade 6 months (3.6). 1 month above the expected gain.

Gain: (Aug. to March scores) 2nd grade 4 months (2.4) to 3rd grade 7 months (3.7) - 1 year 3 months gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 3rd grade average for all students grade equivalency for 2022 is 4th grade 4 month (4.4) indicating Title 1 students are 7 months (.7) behind their peers.

4th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 5 months (3.5) compared to the expected gain of 4th grade 6 months (4.6) which is 1 year and 1 month (11) behind the expected equivalency.

Gain: 2nd grade 3 months (2.3) to 3rd grade 5 months (3.5) - 1 year 2 months gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 4th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 5 years 0 months (5.0) indicating Title 1 students are 1 year 5 months (1.5) behind their peers.

5th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 4 months (4.4) compared to the expected gain of 5th grade 6 months (5.6) which is 1 year 2 month (1.2) below the expected equivalency.

Gain (Aug. to March scores) 3rd grade 6 months (3.6) to 4th grade 4 months (4.4) - 8 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 5th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 5th grade 5 months (5.5) indicating Title 1 students are 1 year 1 month (1.1) years behind their peers.

6th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 1 months (4.1) compared to the expected gain of 6th grade 6 months (6.6) which is 2 years 5 months below the expected equivalency.

Gain: (Aug. to March scores) 4th grade 4 months (4.4) to 4th grade 1 month - negative results - 3 month decrease.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 6th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 7th grade 2 months (7.2) indicating Title 1 students are 2 years 1 month (2.1) behind their peers.

7th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 5th grade 0 months (5.0) compared to the expected gain of 7th grade 4 months (7.4) which is 2 years 4 month below the expected equivalency.

Gain: (Aug. to Dec scores) 4th grade 5 months (4.5) to 5th grade 0 months - 5 months gain

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 7th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 7th grade 1 months (7.1) indicating Title 1 students are 2 years 4 month (2.4) behind their peers.

8th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 5th grade 2 months (5.2) compared to the expected gain of 8th grade 4 months (8.4) which is 3 years 2 months below the expected equivalency.

Gain: (Aug. to March scores) 4th grade 7 months (4.4) to 5th grade 2 month (5.2) - 5 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 8th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 7th grade 6 months (7.6) indicating Title 1 students are 2 years 4 month (2.4) behind their peers.

English Language Learners 2022

All English Language Learners in all grades are behind the grade equivalency expectation (except 2nd grade), behind their peers (except 2nd grade), but made the expected 4 to 6 months gain (except 1st, 6th, & 8th)

EL 2022 Done

1st grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 1st grade 0 months (1.0) compared to the expected equivalency of 1st grade 6 months (1.6). 6 months below the expected gain.

Gains: (Aug. to March scores) 1st grade 0 months (1.0) to 1st grade 2 months (1.2) - 2 months gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 1st grade average for all students grade equivalency for 2022 is 1st grade 9 months (1.9) indicating EL students are 7 months behind their peers.

2nd grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 5 months (3.5) compared to the expected equivalency of 2nd grade 6 months (2.6). 9 months (.9) above the expected gain.

Gains: (Aug. to March scores) 2nd grade 4 months (2.4) to 3rd grade 5 months (2.0) - 1 year 1 months gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 2nd grade average for all students grade equivalency for 2022 is 3rd grade 2 months (3.2) indicating EL students are 3 months ahead of their peers.

3rd grade Grade Equivalency Expectation: Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 2 months (3.2) compared to the expected equivalency of 3rd grade 6 months (3.6). 4 months behind the expected gains.

Gains: (Aug. to March scores) 2nd grade 4 months (2.4) to 3rd grade 2 months (3.2) 8 months gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 3rd grade average for all students grade equivalency for 2022 is 4th grade 4 month (4.4) indicating EL students are 1 year 2 months (1.2) behind their peers.

4th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 4 months (3.4) compared to the expected gain of 4th grade 6 months (4.6) which is 1 year and 2 month (1.2) behind the expected equivalency.

Gain: 2nd grade 4 months (2.4) to 3rd grade 4 months (3.4) - 1 year gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 4th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 5 years 0 months (5.0) indicating EL students are 1 year 6 months (1.6) behind their peers.

5th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 2 months (4.2) compared to the expected gain of 5th grade 6 months (5.6) which is 1 year 4 month (1.4) below the expected equivalency.

Gain (Aug. to March scores) 3rd grade 6 months (3.6) to 4th grade 2 months (4.2) - 6 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 5th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 5th grade 5 months (5.5) indicating EI students are 1 year 3 month (1.3) years behind their peers.

6th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 2 months (4.2) compared to the expected gain of 6th grade 6 months (6.6) which is 2 years 4 months below the expected equivalency.

Gain: (Aug. to March scores) 3rd grade 9 months (3.9) to 4th grade 2 month (4.2) - 3 months gain

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 6th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 7th grade 2 months (7.2) indicating EL

students are 3 years behind their peers.

7th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 7 months (3.7) compared to the expected gain of 7th grade 4 months (7.4) which is 3 years 7 months month below the expected equivalency.

Gain: (Aug. to Dec scores) 3rd grade 3 months (4.5) to 3rd grade 7 months - 4 months gain

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 7th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 7th grade 1 months (7.1) indicating EL students are 2 years 9 month (2.9) behind their peers.

8th grade - Grade Equivalency Expectation: Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 2 months (4.2) compared to the expected gain of 8th grade 4 months (8.4) which is 4 years 2 months below the expected equivalency.

Gain: (Aug. to Dec scores) 4th grade 1 month (4.1) to 4th grade 2 month (4.2) - 1 month gain.

Grade Equivalency Comparison: 8th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2022 is 7th grade 6 months (7.6) indicating EL students are 3 years 4 month (3.4) behind their peers.

In the area of math, in analyzing Pearson math benchmark scores for grades 1st - 6th 2nd & 3rd grade were slightly behind from the previous year. 2nd grade - 2021-68% - 2022 - 66% -a 2% decrease. 3rd grade - 2021-73% - 2022 - 72% which is a 1% decrease.

Overall, the analysis of data revealed there is a need to create a system for data to be compared over time for middle school and sub-groups.

Survey results indicated there are needs in the following areas of Professional Development: Support teachers in training their students to assess their own learning with a rubric and setting personal learning goals.

Professional Development:

For grades 1st - 8th grades there was a significant increase in teachers training their students to assess their own learning with a rubric from 47% to 84% - A 37% increase. We recognize there is a need to formalize what students assessing their own learning means, and add questions to the student survey regarding their understanding of self-reported grading.

There was an increase in teachers talking about 8 key strategies as indicated by students. Data went from 30% to 44%. A 14% increase. There is a need to continue training in this area. For recess coaches there was only a 1% increase going from 19% to 20%. Recess coaches were trained, however there is a high turnover rate of these employees.

70% of our 1st - 8th grade students indicated, I like going to school, which is a decrease from 79%, a 9% decrease.

There is a need for support in reading comprehension according to teacher surveys. 51% of teachers indicated professional development support.

"I feel provided interventions are effective" decreased from 68% to 59%, a 9% decrease.

90% proficiency dropped by 10% from 77% to 67% teachers who believe we can get to 90% proficiency.

ILCS teachers explored the website Commonsense.org through the lens of digital literacy. There is a need to clearly define the components of what the schools' meaning of 21st century skills are and the next steps in evaluating and implementing the need. Past survey data has included critical thinking, collaboration, and other components. WASC visiting committee also identified the following critical needs during the school's self-study in 2018: 1)

Administration and instructional staff need to continue to develop teacher capacity and training through the use of the Pillars Performance System, PLCs and/or other identified system(s) in order to continue to support and advance the entire school's program and increase student outcomes. (WASC) 2) Administration and instructional staff need to identify and implement instructional strategies, curriculum and interventions in order to improve outcomes for English Learners (EL) and any other identified underperforming student groups. (WASC) 3) Administration and instructional staff need to be trained in and implement 21st Century Skills for critical thinking, global thinking, and writing in order to improve student outcomes and prepare students for transition into their next educational environment. (WASC) 4) Administration and staff need to implement Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) schoolwide to prepare students for the new standards including curricular, instructional and assessment components to ensure student achievement of standards. Additionally, administration and staff need to implement any other newly identified standards when adopted, such as Social Studies. (WASC) 5) Administration, staff, and educational partners need to develop middle school-specific initiatives that support academics, healthy relationships, and student engagement/ownership of the program and to meet student academic and socio-emotional needs. (WASC)

LCAP Highlights

A brief overview of the LCAP, including any key features that should be emphasized.

The school utilized an extensive use of surveys for all educational partners, various community meetings, and the extension of LCAP conversations to special interest groups beyond the stipulated LCAP requirements. The school finance committee comprised of parents, staff, administration and board members continue to analyze the educational partners LCAP data, the state dashboard, determine appropriate actions, and assign monetary amounts to the budget to support actions and services. In addition, the finance committee meets monthly to monitor current year LCAP expenses and determine if expenses are occurring at site and district levels. THRIVE committees met

to monitor our LCAP goals, actions, and services. The team created and analyzed survey data. THRIVE committees will be an on-going support to the LCAP process that provide feedback and recommendations to the finance and ILCS Board. These committees provide greater educational partner participation as compared to the past.

ILCS administered the CAASPP assessment by choice as it was not required for the 2020 - 2021 school year. A 2% gain was made in the area of ELA for schoolwide data.

Data was available to analyze and compare from pre-pandemic to the current year. This provided the information necessary to make instructional decisions on closing the achievement gaps.

Other highlights include the system in which our school staff set professional targets aligned to school wide LCAP goals. Each teacher is required to set class goals/targets in one of the 4 LCAP goals; Retain and Train Teachers; 90% proficiency for all students; technology and leadership culture. Professional Learning Communities (weekly teacher groups) have aligned their work with LCAP goals to ensure unity of professional development, goals, and actions moving forward. These targets and goals are aligned to our new three LCAP Goals which are: Innovate systems, programs and practices to provide greater access and options to improve student learner outcomes; Accelerate 90% of all students to proficiency in content areas on standardized assessments to close the achievement gap; and Cultivate a safe and structured environment building strong partnerships with parents and community members to ensure all sites have a positive school culture focused on leadership and high standards. Staff survey data reveal overall satisfaction and effectiveness of the school program encompassing school culture, student achievement, 21st century schools, and teacher retention indicating approximately 96% satisfaction.

As a school of choice, very few families have chosen to exit our program from year to year and less than 1% indicate any dissatisfaction with instructional programs. Our parent surveys demonstrate that the overwhelming majority of parents and staff feel the school is safe, well organized, and care for their student. Other highlights include our positive behavior intervention system (PBIS) called ROAR. We used on-going data to leverage student/classroom behavior resulting in each classroom and grade level setting goals for improvement.

ILCS has adopted "8 Key Strategies" to support students with purpose and personal responsibility in all grade levels. Targeted classes with the school's leadership coach were started to support student leadership for at risk populations and create a closer connection among students who struggle to make friends and feel motivated to attend school. Community service continues to be a school wide focus in which all grade levels participate in service projects. As students recognize the impact that their love and energy can have on others around the world, it builds confidence and the capacity for them to strive to help others through their own learning. Ultimately, they are working and learning for a purpose. "Write from the Beginning" professional development is in its 2nd year of implementation which compliments the Thinking Maps program which is in its 4th year of implementation. Teachers were trained in the Path to Proficiency for English Language Learners to support the academic achievement gaps of our EL students. A Title 1 Literacy Parent night was held to teach parents how to support their child at home.

The Electives Program was reinstated 2nd trimester. Several electives were offered which included, Chinese, Tennis, Yoga, Theater, Art, Entrepreneurship, Leadership. In-Person assemblies, Sports, and our electives programs were offered. Parent Volunteers were able to participate in classes and school events.

An LVN was added to the Bryant Street Campus to support student needs.

Nutrition services offered free for all student lunches and was able to support the capacity of student lunches which significantly increased.

ILCS is extremely proud of the return to offering on campus award assemblies, activities including grade level trips, science and leadership camps, overnight leadership events, 8th grade Cotillion, and dances to encourage, and celebrate student leadership.

Other highlights from the LCAP include a visual/graphic image of the LCAP goals for our educational partners along with a "Tree" graphic that demonstrates how the LCAP, school philosophy, student learner outcomes and the mission/vision interact and coincide. In sum, the LCAP process has been a part of the school culture of strategic planning, parent collaboration, and targeted budgeting since the school's inception. ILCS continues to demonstrate strong student performance in a safe and caring environment that educational partners trust and respect.

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.

Not applicable

Support for Identified Schools

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

Not applicable

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

Not applicable

Engaging Educational Partners

A summary of the process used to engage educational partners and how this engagement was considered before finalizing the LCAP.

The school involved educational partners through a variety of communication methods and strategies. The main focus for engagement included the THRIVE committees. The THRIVE committees consist of 3 teams; Accelerate, Cultivate, and Innovate. The teams/committees which consisted of staff and parents met and created surveys to disseminate to students, parents, and staff. Survey results were collected and analyzed to create the school's goals, outcomes, actions, and services. The committees included representation from all educational partners. ILCS has concluded that surveys are the most effective mode of gathering honest and timely feedback from the majority of our educational partners. Parent meetings and forums are held during the year but tend to lack participation even when outreach is provided, but surveys are completed by our partners with a high participation rate. In addition, the charter school authorizer visited the site as part of their oversight on three different occasions to review the school's program regarding Human Resources, Curriculum/Instruction and Business/Governance. These visits and conversations with the authorizer were also used as input for the LCAP planning for the next school year. The authorizer's feedback reinforced our planned actions and services already embedded in the LCAP.

A summary of the feedback provided by specific education partner groups.

Survey Data results from the THRIVE committees indicated both success and needs results. Survey data was administered to all parents, students, and staff. Survey results indicated very positive results. 98% of parents feel welcome at ILCS and 91% of 1st - 8th-grade students feel welcome. 99% of parents are happy their child/ren attend ILCS. 96% of staff (certificated/classified) like working and ILCS, and 70% of 1st-8th grade students like going to school. 95% of all staff feel valued by the administration and their team members. Gains have been made in the area student school culture compared to previous years with students being nice to each other and respecting each other. An

average of 77% of students feel students are nice in grades 1st - 8th grades and 84% of students respect each other. Great gains have been made in the area of classified staff feeling there is a divide between certificated staff. In 2020-2021 37% indicated a divide, for 2021-2022 only 9% indicate a divide.

A summary of the feedback provided by specific educational partners.

The feedback from educational partners includes data/information from the school's THRIVE committees which include the following three teams: Innovate, Accelerate, and Cultivate. The Innovate team recommends continuing to provide training to support student achievement and the 8 Key Strategies for recess coaches. Both the Accelerate and Innovate teams recommend creating committees which represent all grade levels to support Pillars, and other committees necessary. Both the Innovate and Cultivate teams believe there is a need for a student ambassador program to support students struggling academically along with new students to ILCS. They also recommend days for staff to build relationships and teams (Cultivate Days).

A description of the aspects of the LCAP that were influenced by specific input from educational partners.

The creation of the Thrive Committees which align with the three goals in the LCAP (Innovate, Accelerate, Cultivate) are a function of the total collection of survey and educational partner feedback that indicated these three areas were the major ideals or themes to address in the LCAP. The administration carefully reviewed the data from our partners and noticed a clear message; the need for Innovative practices, the need to increase and accelerate student learning, and to cultivate a safe campus based on leadership. Hence the three committees were then formed and given the liberty to collect data from educational partners and design actions and services to address the needs. In sum, educational partners were a key role in designing the process for the LCAP in addition to the content of the LCAP.

Specifically for the 2022-2023 revisions to the LCAP, both the Cultivate and Innovate teams recommended a Mentoring (Ambassador) Program - Older students support younger students with emotional and/or academics. They also believe there is a need to support new students to ILCS in the onboarding program. The Cultivate team recommends time for staff to build relationships and teams (Cultivate Days and Mental Health Check-in). The Accelerate and Innovate team recommends revisiting Pillar's performance system and forming a committee to create greater clarity and understanding of the evaluation process. The Innovate team recommends training for teachers at conferences to address the 21st-century skills gap found in the school.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
Goal 1	Innovate systems, programs and practices to provide greater access and options to improve student learning outcomes.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The vision of the Inland Leaders is to sustain a high-quality community charter school founded upon innovative instruction and character education to create 21st-century leaders. ILCS' mission states ILCS is "committed to providing a world-class education for students that will equip them with the critical 21st Century Skills necessary to be successful leaders in life." These past few years, in particular the pandemic period, have demonstrated the importance of innovation in our schools.

In addition, the school is currently in mid-cycle for WASC accreditation. One specific WASC critical need cited that administration and instructional staff need to be trained in and implement 21st Century Skills for critical thinking, global thinking, and writing in order to improve student outcomes and prepare students for transition into their next educational environment. In addition, the transition to distance/hybrid learning models during the pandemic demonstrated the obvious need for our students and staff to develop new 21st-century skills that were never required of them in the past. Although this goal has been a part of the ILCS strategic plans of the past, it has become a major focus for the school program.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023-24
----------	----------	----------------	----------------	----------------	-----------------------------

<p>-Hybrid Learning enrollment and attendance records - Device and internet access records - Academic student achievement for students enrolled in the Distance Learning program: state and local assessments</p>	<p>-3rd-6th grades currently have a hybrid program enrollment of zero students for the 2020-2021 school year (except for pandemic-related hybrid students). - Hybrid student achievement data baseline is not available since no students are enrolled in the program during the 2019-2020 year. - Hybrid enrollment and attendance will be determined in Year 1 of its implementation - Device and internet access is currently is above 90%</p>	<p>-Hybrid Program Data -Total number of students enrolled in the hybrid program: 18 students. - Attendance: 100% (Indep study coursework turned in and accounted for to claim attendance) -All students offered devices/internet access: 89% of students utilized a school computer and 6% utilized a internet device - ELA grade level benchmark: 55% at grade level -Math grade level benchmark: 35% at grade level</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>-Hybrid enrollment of 100 students - Average ILCS academic growth and proficiency scores to demonstrate that student achievement progress is comparable to the site-based program. -Basic one year of academic growth for hybrid students on STAR assessment and local benchmarks.</p>
---	---	--	------------------------------	------------------------------	---

<p>-21st Century Skills assessment tool - Teacher and student survey data -Evidence of 21st century skills implementation will be shown in Professional Learning Community (PLC) notes. -Principal observation and walk through surveys indicating implementation and demonstration of 21st century learning in classes.</p>	<p>-21st Century Skills implementation to include new survey questions for staff and students. Baseline data to be determined in the 2022 -2023 school year. -Evidence of 21st Century Skills implementation will be shown in Professional Learning Community (PLC) notes as well as admin walk-through forms/notes.</p>	<p>-Teacher Survey Data: Average percent of teaching staff implementing 21st Century Skills 44%. The percentage stayed the same at 44%. - New questions are being developed to maintain relevancy and clarity -New baseline and new outcome for 2022-2023 -Principal walkthrough forms were not implemented this current LCAP year. Will be implemented in 2022-2023.</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>-75% of instructional staff indicate on surveys that they are implementing 21st Century Skills in their classrooms and are well trained to do so. -90% of principal walk-through forms show a demonstration of 21st-century skills during class visits.</p>
<p>-Number of Hot Spots Available - needs met per request - Computers/iPads - 1 to 1 including staff and students with updated equipment to handle higher-level processing</p>	<p>10 hotspots available</p>	<p>10 Hotspots available 7 students utilized hotspots; no students denied a hotspot who requested one.</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>-100% up-to-date technology & devices -Hotspots available to any unduplicated student requesting the support</p>

This outcome is not needed	Not Needed	Not Needed	[Intentionally Blank]	[Intentionally Blank]	Not Needed
----------------------------	------------	------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds Contributing	
Action #1	21st Century Skills Implementation	Teacher collaboration time and training of 21st Century Skills and implementation in the classroom to improve student achievement. Expenses include substitutes for teaching staff for collaboration time and peer observations.	\$3,500.00	No
Action #2	Student and teacher technology devices and support	Provide one to one technology devices and technology support for students and teachers. Purchase of updated IPADS, Chromebooks, document cameras, smartboards and other classroom devices to handle higher-level learning processes. This action also includes purchasing internet hotspots for unduplicated students in need of reliable internet access at home. Expenses to include purchase of new devices, technology coordinator salary, hotspots, and internet subscriptions.	\$91,928.00	Yes
Action #3	Hybrid Learning program materials, stipends, training and equipment	Hybrid program in which students attend school in person for 1-2 days a week and participate on Zoom from home during the rest of the week. Purchase of hybrid learning materials, professional development, teacher stipends, hybrid/independent study coordinator salary, and class equipment to support the hybrid program.	\$88,400.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds Contributing	
Action #4	Professional Development	Professional Development for instructional staff to develop innovative 21st-century practices in their classrooms to include conferences (CUE & others), embedded time on PLC days, and specific strategies with high effect sizes as documented by Hattie, Fisher, and Frey. Expenses include fees for conferences/workshops, professional development materials, travel-related expenses for conferences.	\$7,500.00	No

Goal Analysis 2021-22

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

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

ILCS made a concerted effort to implement all actions to innovate systems, programs and practices to provide greater access and options to improve student learning outcomes. A few actions are not fully implemented. Teachers were not specifically trained to utilize commonsense.org to teach 21st Century Skills and digital literacy to K-8 students including materials to support the digital literacy program. Teachers did start to get familiar with the lessons by utilizing the website and incorporating one lesson into their class by June of 2022.

Global learning initiatives have not occurred yet, but will be revisited during the 2022-2023 school year. The middle school did implement an advanced technology curriculum into their program as part of the 21st-century skills initiative and critical thinking workshops were provided by the administration of ILCS which did not incur any additional costs.

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.

ILCS accounted for a total of \$258,030 for the 2021-2022 school year for Goal 1 and had budgeted only 106,297. The material differences involve the changed commitment on the part of the school to replace old Chromebooks that needed updating for our students. This increased the amount necessary for action 3.

An explanation of how effective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal.

Overall, the actions and services were effective to improve student outcomes toward our goal of Innovating systems, programs, and practices to provide greater access and options for student achievement. Teachers were introduced to commonsense.org but not directly trained to teach 21st Century Skills and digital literacy to K-8 students which include materials to support the digital literacy program. Technology devices were provided to students and teachers that are updated to handle higher-level learning processes including internet hotspots for students without reliable internet. Hybrid materials were purchased, professional development was offered, teacher stipends were given, and equipment to support the new instructional hybrid program was given. Professional Development for instructional staff to develop innovative practices in their classrooms was offered for self-reported grading which includes personalizing student education and effective instructional strategies as documented by Hattie, Fisher and Frey. Several teachers attended the CUE conference. Specific training focused on English Learner support and included the Path to Proficiency training. The administration (Executive Director) provided critical thinking workshops for staff as well and no extra cost was incurred.

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

21st Century implementation will include work on defining the definition of "21st century" for classrooms. It will also include expanding the training and workshops on and off-campus. ILCS will change the staff survey to provide greater insight and clarity in regards to what teachers are experiencing as challenges and hurdles to innovative practices. Create school initiatives embedded in PLC's and professional development days. The baseline for outcome 2, Stakeholder survey 21st Century Skills tools will need to shift due to 21st Century Skills being redefined.

Global learning initiatives are not a focus at this time.

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.

Goal

Goal #	Description
Goal 2	Accelerate 90% of all students to proficiency in content areas on standardized assessments to close the achievement gap.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Pre-pandemic the school was well on its way toward the 90% proficiency mark. Outcome 3 & 4 indicates previous results along with scores during the pandemic which indicate a clear learning loss. There is a need to accelerate students who are currently experiencing the achievement gap. Student academic achievements indicate learning loss due to the pandemic. Both Transitional Kindergarten and Kindergarten reveal learning loss in the area of reading and a need to address ELA in the primary grade levels. English Learner reading scores also demonstrate the need to focus intervention efforts on the higher grade levels as the achievement gap become even more evident.

Additionally, STAR reading scores indicate that all grade levels, except third, scored below their average growth from previous years and progress was slower than normal. Third grade demonstrated average growth scores compared to previous years.

Achievement data analyzed was from August of 2020 to February of 2021 in order to capture the most recent student assessments given.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023-24
----------	----------	----------------	----------------	----------------	-----------------------------

<p>Teacher Surveys Questions to be monitored for improvement: Do Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) help support students academic achievement? Do I believe I have the strategies to get our students to 90% proficiency? Professional development notes and agendas will be monitored for implementation and student achievement.</p>	<p>Baseline to be determined in 2022-2023 due to new questions being administered on surveys. Questions regarding the success of professional development at ILCS to be developed and asked in future years</p>	<p>PLC Question: Overall the gains: 5%, -70% to 75%. Elementary -67% to 77%. The middle school level: 50% to 57%. Special programs 97% to 87%. 90% Proficiency Question - overall stayed the same at 73%. Elementary: decreased by 3% - 73% to 70%. Middle school level: 7% increase - 50% to 57%. Special program: increased 6% - 86 to 92%. PLC notes indicated weekly meetings and conversations regarding student achievement. 90% Proficiency mark dropped from 77% to 67%, a 10% drop.</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>Desired outcome to be determined 2022 -2023 regarding baseline of Professional Learning Communities, and 90% Proficiency. 80% of the teachers indicate that professional development was valuable.</p>
--	---	--	------------------------------	------------------------------	---

Human Resources data system - Highly Qualified Teachers	97% of all staff credentialed/licensed as highly qualified under state law.	98% of all staff credentialed as highly qualified under state laws.	[Intentionally Blank]	[Intentionally Blank]	100% of all staff credentialed/licensed as highly qualified under state law.
Teacher surveys - Are students being trained to assess their own learning? Students are utilizing self-reported grading to assess their progress. Further survey questions to be developed by subject area and self reported grading	Currently, 47% of students are students being trained to assess their own learning with a rubric according to the teachers' surveys. Self-reported grading questions on surveys to be developed.	Teacher survey indicates a significant increase in students being trained to assess their own learning going from 47% to 84% a 36% gain. Self-reported grading questions need to be developed.	[Intentionally Blank]	[Intentionally Blank]	77% of students are students being trained to assess their own learning with a rubric? 77% of teachers indicated students are utilizing self-reported grading.
3% more students proficient in math, ELA, and science on state assessments and 3% or one-grade level growth on local benchmarks. Increase student proficiency for EL and low SES students by 3% or 1 year growth Grades K-8 writing benchmark	Transitional Kindergarten - Letter Identification and Sounds (August 2020 - March 2021). For Letter Identification, on average 81% & Letter sounds 73%. Kindergarten - Foundational Skills - 85%. Sight - 45%. Letter Teams - 58%. For	CAASPP - 2% gain in ELA -73% (2018 - 2019) to 75% (2020-2021). Math - a decrease by 6% going from 73% (2018-2019) to 67% (2020-2021). The 3% outcome expectation not met. STAR - All grades on target to meet the 1 year gain with the exception of 5th	[Intentionally Blank]	[Intentionally Blank]	9% more students proficient in math, ELA, and science on state assessments and 9% or one-grade level average growth each year on local benchmarks Improve EL levels to the yellow color on the state dashboard for EL student

reading - running
 recored level
 average "C". STAR
 data reveals
 learning loss for
 several grade (1st
 - 8th) levels on
 average: From
 August to February
 (6 months)
 students gained a
 grade equivalent
 of: 1st grade - 3
 months (.3)
 compared to 1
 year (1) average
 growth from the
 three previous
 years (2017-2020)
 which indicates a 7
 month loss of
 academic gains.
 1st grade average
 grade equivalency
 for 2021 is 1st
 grade 9 months
 (1.9) which is 3
 months above the
 expected 1st grade
 6 month (1.6)
 growth. The
 average grade

and 8 grades.
 SAAVAS (Pearson)
 1st & 5th grade
 met the 3%
 outcome - All other
 grades 1st - 6th
 decreased. TK -
 Met the 3%
 outcome in all
 areas except for
 counting. Kinder -
 Met the 3%
 outcome in all
 areas except sight
 words and
 Counting/Numbers

performance in
 math and ELA
 Grades K-8 overall
 local writing
 benchmark
 proficiency at 75%

equivalency for 2018-2020 was 2nd grade 7 months (2.7) which equates to an 8 month (.8) loss. 2nd grade - 5 months (.5) compared to 1year (1) average growth from the three previous years (2017-2020) which indicates a 5 months loss of academic gains. 2nd grade average grade equivalency for 2021 is 3rd grade 3 months (3.3) which is 7 months above the expected 2nd grade 6 months (2.6) growth. The average grade equivalency for 2017-2020 was 3rd grade 9 months (3.9) which equates to a 6 month (.6) loss. 4th

grade - 7 months (.7) compared to 9 months (.9) average growth from the three previous years (2017-2020) which indicates a 2 month (.2) loss of academic gains. 4th grade average grade equivalency for 2021 is 5 years 5 months (5.5) which is 9 months above the expected 4 years 6 months (4.6) growth. The average grade equivalency 2017-2020 was 5 years 3 months (5.3) which equates to a 2 month (.2) gain. 5th grade - 6 months (.6) compared to 8 months (.8) average growth from the three previous years

(2017-2020) which indicates 2 months (.2) of loss in academic gains. 5th grade average grade equivalency for 2021 is 6th grade 2 months (6.2) which is 6 months above the expected 5th grade 6 months (5.6) growth. The average grade equivalency 2017-2020 was 6th grade 1 months (6.1) which equates to a 1 month (.1) gain. 6th grade - 5 months (.5) compared to 5 months (.5) average growth from the previous two years (2018-2020) of which indicates no months of loss in academic gains. However, the

expected growth is 6 months, so there they are 1 month behind the expected gain. 6th grade average grade equivalency for 2021 is 6th grade 8 months (6.8) which is 2 months above the expected 6th grade 6 months (6.6) growth. The average grade equivalency for 2018 - 2020 was 6 years 9 months (6.9) which equates to a 1 month (.1) loss. 7th grade - A negative 1 year 2 months (1.2) compared to 5 months (.5) average growth from the previous year (2019 - 2020) of which indicates 7 months (.7) of loss in academic gains. The grade

equivalency is 6th grade 1 month (6.1) for 2020 - 2021 compared to 7th grade 7 months (7.7) which equates to 1 year and 6 months (1.6) loss. 8th grade - 6 months (.6) average growth for 2021 which meets the expected growth of 6 months (.6). The average grade equivalency was 8th grade 1 month (8.1) which is below the expected grade equivalency of 8th grade 6 months (8.6). Math TK - Numbers recognition - 78%. Kindergarten - Counting & number recognition - 90% Year long average Pearson benchmark scores: 1st grade - 76%

	2nd grade -68% 3rd grade - 76% 4th grade - 74% 5th grade - 71% 6th grade - 68%				
Increase student proficiency for EL students by 3% or 1 year growth Grades K-8 writing benchmark	English Language Learner STAR scores grade equivalency on average shows a deficit for grades 3 - 8 for the 2020-2021 school year. 1st grade - Average grade equivalency of 1st grade 9 months (1.9) compared to the expected equivalency of 1st grade 6 months (1.6). 3 months above the expected gain. 2nd grade - Average grade equivalency of 2nd grade 7 months (2.7) compared to the expected equivalency of 2nd	CAASPP - 2% decrease in ELA -27% (2018 - 2019) to 25% (2020-2021). Math - a decrease by 2% going from 27% (2018-2019) to 25% (2020-2021). The 3% outcome expectation not met.	[Intentionally Blank]	[Intentionally Blank]	9% more students proficient in math, ELA, and science on state assessments and 9% or one-grade level average growth each year on local benchmarks Improve EL levels to the yellow color on the state dashboard for EL student performance in math and ELA Grades K-8 overall local writing benchmark proficiency at 75%

grade 6 months (2.6). 3rd grade - Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 1 month (3.1) compared to the expected gain of 3rd grade 6 months (3.6) which is 5 months (.5) below the expected equivalency. 4th grade - Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 7 months (3.7) compared to the expected gain of 4th grade 6 months (4.6) which is 9 months (.9) below the expected equivalency. 5th grade - Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 2 months (4.2) compared to the expected gain of 5th grade 6

	<p>months (6.6) which is 1 year and 4 months (1.4) below the expected equivalency. 6th grade - Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 4 months (4.4) compared to the expected gain of 6th grade 6 months (6.6) which is 2 years and 2 months (2.2) below the expected equivalency. 7th grade - Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 3 months (4.3) compared to the expected gain of 7th grade 6 months (7.6) which is 3 years and 3 months (3.3)</p>				
<p>Increase student proficiency for low SES students by 3% or 1</p>	<p>Socio-economically Disadvantaged STAR scores</p>	<p>CAASPP SES Students - 1% increase in ELA -62% (2018 - 2019)</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>9% more students proficient in math, ELA, and science on state</p>

<p>year growth Grades K-8 writing benchmark</p>	<p>grade equivalency on average shows 1st grade - Average grade equivalency of 1st grade 5 months (1.5) compared to the expected equivalency of 1st grade 6 months (1.6). 1 months below the expected gain. 1st grade average for all students grade equivalency for 2021 is 1st grade 9 months (1.9) indicating SES students are 4 months behind their peers. 2nd grade - Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 1 months (3.1) compared to the expected equivalency of 2nd grade 6 months (2.6). Above the expected gain by 5</p>	<p>to 63% (2020-2021). Math - a decrease by 9% going from 60% (2018-2019) to 51% (2020-2021). The 3% outcome expectation not met.</p>			<p>assessments and 9% or one-grade level average growth each year on local benchmarks Maintain or improve SES levels at green or to blue on the state dashboard for SES student performance in math and ELA. Grades K-8 overall local writing benchmark proficiency at 75%</p>
---	---	---	--	--	--

months (.5). 2nd grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2021 is 3rd grade 3 months (3.3) indicating SES students are 2 months behind their peers. 3rd grade - Average grade equivalency of 3rd grade 8 month (3.8) compared to the expected gain of 3rd grade 6 months (3.6) which is 2 months (.5) above the expected equivalency. 4th grade - Average grade equivalency of 4th grade 7 months (4.7) compared to the expected gain of 4th grade 6 months (4.6) which is 1 month (.1) above the

expected
equivalency. 4th
grade average for
all student's grade
equivalency for
2021 is 5 years 5
months (5.5)
indicating SES
students are 8
months (.8) behind
their peers. 5th
grade - Average
grade equivalency
of 5th grade 5
months (5.5)
compared to the
expected gain of
5th grade 6
months (5.6) which
is 1 month (.1)
below the
expected
equivalency. 5th
grade average for
all student's grade
equivalency for
2021 is 6th grade 2
months (6.2)
indicating 7
months (.7) behind
their peers. 6th
grade - Average

	<p>grade equivalency of 6th grade 0 months (6.0) compared to the expected gain of 6th grade 6 months (6.6) which is 6 months below the expected equivalency. 6th grade average for all student's grade equivalency for 2021 is 6th grade 8 months (6.8) indicating 8 months (.8) behind their peers. Baseline writing data to be analyzed in future years once benchmarks are fully implemented.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds Contributing
----------	-------	-------------	--------------------------

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds Contributing	
Action #1	Hire and retain high quality instructional staff	ILCS is committed to hiring high quality credentialed/licensed staff as a primary initiative that leads to the success of students. Continue to hire highly qualified teachers with CLAD or EL instruction qualifications by ensuring new hires are: - credentialed -screened, interviewed and observed "teaching in action" prior to hire -participate in PLC with grade level prior to hire (WASC critical need 2)	\$2,982,000.00	No
Action #2	Professional Development	Targeted training for teachers to work with students experiencing learning loss, including high-needs students to scaffold common core and engage them in the learning process. This involves including effective Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), continued training and support in the areas of English Language Learners, and fully developed student self-reported grading/rubrics. All new teachers are to be trained in Thinking Maps & Write From the Beginning at the beginning of the school year. Pillars Rubric exposure to occur during Professional Learning Communities to support the understanding of the evaluation and teacher improvement system. Continued use and support of Fast Forward and Read Assist by MySciLearn to support sub-groups (EL & SES) of students. Visible Learning by Hattie, Fisher, Frey to be shared regarding the most beneficial effect sizes for academic achievement. Refine Teacher Survey Questions regarding Professional Learning Communities with teacher input. Two "master teachers" will be used to provide 1.5 hours a week of instructional support to classrooms.	\$12,500.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds Contributing	
Action #3	Curriculum and Assessment	Refine benchmark assessments and curriculum in core content to clearly align with state standards expectations. Purchase of assessments and curriculum to specifically support high-needs students in the core content. The focus will be on the Science and Social Studies benchmark assessments that will help monitor and track student progress.	\$32,550.00	Yes
Action #4	High Quality Interventions	Provide high-quality interventions (onsite and online) and curriculum that demonstrate a marked improvement in student achievement through data analysis and decrease subgroup achievement gaps with the support of an intervention specialist (Title 1), and through the use of teachers before, during, and after school and during summers and intercession periods. Involves the use of supplemental materials, curriculum, equipment, and software to improve learning for unduplicated students and students with disabilities. Also includes intervention teachers/tutors/aides (part-time) who assist core teachers in meeting the needs of students below proficiency in math and reading. Includes partial salary of the intervention coordinator. (WASC critical need #2)	\$220,568.00	Yes

Goal Analysis 2021-22

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

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

ILCS made a concerted effort to implement all actions and services to accelerate 90% of all students to proficiency in content areas on standardized assessments to close the achievement gap. However, some actions have not been accomplished yet. One component of Doug Fisher's Visibly Literacy along with John Hattie's effect size research was analyzed in PLCs. Staff training occurred on the use of

Aeries, our new data system, however using the system to analyze student achievement data has not happened yet. Benchmarks have not been refined but current data is sufficient to support student achievement at the elementary level. However, in middle school there is a need for benchmark refinement specifically in history content.

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 significant difference.

An explanation of how effective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal.

The actions and services to accelerate all students to 90% proficiency in content areas on standardized assessments to close the achievement gap were effective. ILCS recognizes we are not close to 90% yet, but expect 3% growth each year. To support this goal, ILCS is committed to hiring high-quality credentialed/licensed staff as a primary initiative that leads to the success of students. ILCS has continued to hire highly qualified teachers with CLAD or EL instruction qualifications by ensuring new hires are: credentialed, screened, interviewed, and observed (teaching in action) prior to hire.

Targeted training occurred for teachers to work with students with learning loss, including sub-groups to scaffold common core and engage them in the learning process including areas of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), English Learners via the Path to Proficiency Training, self-reported grading, and rubrics via Professional Learning Communities. All new teachers were trained in Thinking Maps & Write From the Beginning at the beginning of the school year. Education Specialist and General Education teachers with Special education student cohorts were trained in Co-teaching. The Path to Proficiency training was offered via Zoom to all teachers and all instructional staff was required to attend. Pillars Rubric and Refinement occurred in the area of the pay scale. 21st Century Skills training did not occur, but teachers reviewed the commonsense.org website and implemented lessons. Fast Forward and Read Assist by MySciLearn were purchased and implemented to support sub-groups (EL &SES) of students. It is an online program that offers pre and post-assessments along with a curriculum to support the outcome of the assessment data. High-quality interventions (onsite and online) and curriculum have been offered to decrease subgroup achievement gaps with the support of an intervention specialist (Title 1) and through the use of teachers before, during, and after school and during summers and intercession periods. Data Indicates all English Language Learners in all grades are behind the grade equivalency expectation (except 2nd grade), behind their peers (except 2nd grade), but made the expected 4 to 6 months gain (except 1st, 6th, & 8th). All low SES students in grades 1st - 8th are below the grade equivalent expectation (except for 3rd), are behind their grade equivalent peers, but have made the expected gains of 4 to 6 months (except 1st & 6th grades).

Supplemental materials, curriculum, equipment and software to improve learning for unduplicated students and students with disabilities were utilized. Fast Forward, Leveled Literacy Interventions, Smarty Ants. Also includes two associate intervention teachers (part-time) that are credentialed teachers who assist core teachers in meeting the needs of students below proficiency in math and reading.

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

Outcome 4 -ILCS amended the outcomes for EL and Low SES students to create separate actions and services to better meet the needs of student academic achievement. ILCS created a new outcome 5 for low SES students.

Outcome 1 - ILCS reframe the PLC Question: "Do you see PLC's impacting student achievement?" 90% proficiency - "Do you believe you have the training required to significantly improve student's academic performance (more than 1 years growth)?" "What is the most important piece to move student's achievement?" Parents, self-efficacy, expectation, interventions, support from outside. The baseline will need to be reset.

Outcome 3 - Student survey questions are needed for self-reported grading. Teacher survey questions needed: "What subject do students utilize self-reported grading?" Reading, writing, math, science, social studies, every piece of work. The metric and baseline will need to be reset.

Tool of measure for social studies and science to provide year to year growth data.

Title 1 parent engagement is ongoing throughout the year.

Ambassador/Student Achievement Mentors

Lengthening instructional minutes for future school years as an intervention of support.

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.

Goal

Goal #	Description
Goal 3	Cultivate a safe and structured environment harnessing strong partnerships with parents and community members to ensure all sites have a positive school culture focused on leadership and high standards.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Stakeholder input revealed parents are satisfied in all areas with ILCS. However, there is a continued need to provide a supportive and safe environment for students including social-emotional services.

It is noted that there is a need to offer options in innovative ways for families and schooling.

Student survey results indicated approximately 59% of students in grades 1st - 8th want to be in school, 25% want to be in school and Zoom from home, 10% want to Zoom from home only, and 6% do not want to attend school at all.

There may be a need in the area of student school culture with students being nice to each other and respecting each other. The data differs greatly from pre-pandemic to pandemic periods.

Pre-pandemic data for students in grades 1st - 6th data indicated that 71% of students felt students are nice and 70% felt that students respected each other. During the pandemic (April 2021) 89% of students feel students are nice and 88% stated students treat each other with respect. Pre-pandemic for middle school data indicated that 57% of students felt students are nice and 45% felt that students respected each other. During the pandemic (April 2021) 81% of students feel students are nice and 75% stated students treat each other with respect. This may be due to little interaction resulting from social distancing and few interactions during playtime that scores rose significantly.

There is a need to bridge the gap between classified and certificated personnel. 45% of classified staff indicated that they feel there is a divide between certificated and classified staff.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023-24
----------	----------	----------------	----------------	----------------	-----------------------------

Suspension rate Aeries behavior data	2019-2020: 8 students suspended	Total number of students suspended: 5 Total number of suspensions: 8 (1 student suspended 3 times & another student 2 times) Desired outcome: reduce by 1% - not met outcome, but number of students suspended dropped by 3.	[Intentionally Blank]	[Intentionally Blank]	Suspension rate reduced by 1% each year Major Behavior incidents reduced by 1% a year
Attendance rate data analyzed in Aeries Student Contract Accountability Meeting data recorded by action plans written during the meetings	Attendance rate 96% Student Contract Accountability Plan: number of families met with during the 2020-2021 school year: none held due to pandemic.	Attendance rate: 95.3% Student accountability Plan: number of families met with: BSC 3 - CSC - 7 Total of 10 Student Contract Accountability Meetings	[Intentionally Blank]	[Intentionally Blank]	98% attendance rate for 2023-2024 Student Contract Accountability Meetings reduced to a total of 5 families a year
School Culture Survey Schoolwide School Culture Middle School Teacher / Student Only Survey	Student Survey Question: Do you like coming to school 1st - 6th grade - Average pre-pandemic/post-	Student Survey Like coming to school? Elementary: 79% to 78%- M.S. - 63% to 61% Students nice?	[Intentionally Blank]	[Intentionally Blank]	Survey data will show a 10% positive increase for all questions. Middle School staff surveys reveal 80%

pandemic - 79% of students stated they like coming to school 7th & 8th grade - Average pre-pandemic/post-pandemic - 63% of students stated they like coming to school Question: Are students nice? 1st - 6th grade - Average pre-pandemic/post-pandemic - 80% of students stated they like coming to school 7th & 8th grade - Average pre-pandemic/post-pandemic - 69% of students stated they like coming to school Question: Students at my school respect each other 1st - 6th grade - Average pre-pandemic/post-

Elementary: 80% to 74 -M.S. -69% to 80% Student respect each other: Elementary: 79% to 79% M.S. - 60% to 68% Teachers discuss 8 key strategies:Elementary: - 44% - 64% M.S. - 16% to 25% M.S Teacher Survey PLC's valuable? 33% to 57% I believe we can make 90% proficient: 50% to 57% I am supported with 504, IEP, SST, and EL interventions. 33% to 29% Teacher survey to be adjusted

satisfaction/approval ratings on instructional supports/ positive mindset and healthy relationships.

pandemic - 79% of students stated they like coming to school 7th & 8th grade - Average pre-pandemic/post-pandemic - 60% of students stated they like coming to school Question: Do your teachers talk about the 8 key strategies: 1st - 6th grade - 44% 7th & 8th grade - 16% Teacher Survey Question: How often do you refer to the 8 key strategies? - 70% daily/weekly Middle School Teacher Survey Question: Do you find PLC's valuable? 33% Question: I believe we can make our 90% proficient mark - 50% Question: I am

	<p>supported with 504, IEP, SST, and EL interventions. 33% Support Staff Survey Question: Do you feel there is a divide between certificated and classified staff - 45% classified staff indicated a divide Survey questions to be adjusted - New baseline for 2022-2023</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>Leadership Student Assessment</p>	<p>Assessment to be developed and administered to students in year 1 starting with grades 6-8. Currently, there are no formal leadership classes which would include lessons and assessments. This will be documented via new leadership classes provided to every grade level, lesson plans, and leadership assessment taken by students.</p>	<p>This is being developed but is not complete.</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>Leadership lessons and assessments developed for all grade levels with positive outcome data of at least 75% of students indicating proficiency on the assessments for leadership development.</p>
<p>Parent Survey Data Community outreach opportunities Parent Participation - Hybrid / Independent Study</p>	<p>Parent Survey Questions: My family feels welcomes at ILCS - 99% I feel ILCS does a good job with community building - 95% My voice matters at ILCS - 93% (2019-</p>	<p>My family feels welcomed at ILCS - 99% I feel ILCS does a good job with community building - 95% to 93% My voice matters at ILCS - 93% (2019-2020) to 91% The school</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>Maintain current parent satisfaction baseline data Parent satisfaction data on the distance learning program - 90% satisfaction. Community outreach</p>

	<p>2020) Do you feel there are volunteer opportunities in your child's classroom and/or school? - 93% (2019-2020) The school clearly communicates how to get involved - 98% (2019-2020) No data at current time for outreach opportunities or hybrid participation and satisfaction survey. The baseline will be developed for the 21-22 school year. Hybrid data will transition to full distance learning data Community outreach will include calendared events, notices sent home via parent square.</p>	<p>clearly communicates how to get involved - 98% (2019-2020) to 96% Hybrid students - 28% of families want to continue with hybrid. - Transitioning to full Distance Learning</p>			<p>opportunities - 3 events per year.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

<p>Parent Survey regarding safe schools & facilities Student Survey regarding safety</p>	<p>Survey Questions: Question: My Child's School is a safe place to be - 95% Question: How safe are the school's facilities? - 98% Question: How clean do you feel the facilities are? - 99% Student survey questions to be developed regarding safety</p>	<p>Survey Questions: Question: My Child's School is a safe place to be - 95% to 99% Question: How clean do you feel the facilities are? - 99% to 95%</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>[Intentionally Blank]</p>	<p>Maintain current baseline</p>
--	--	--	------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds Contributing	
Action #1	Student Well-being Initiatives	<p>-Provide mental health support for students in all grade levels. Costs to include Mental Health Counselors; Student Leadership Coach; School psychologists; English Learner Liaison -Provide physical health-related services: Costs to include School Nurse, LVN, health techs, health office supplies and equipment, PE teachers, PE assistants, PE supplies, and nutrition services - Attendance monitoring & student celebrations</p>	\$791,930.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds Contributing	
Action #2	Staff Well-being Initiatives	<p>-Provide celebrations and recognition events for classified and certificated employees -"Cultivate days" for staff-led and organized by the Thrive Cultivate Team -Provide a competitive health plan to cover employee medical and health needs. - Pulse survey checks on employee and their mental health - Provide opportunities for staff to participate in physical activity</p>	\$629,401.00	No
Action #3	Student Behavior/PBIS/ Leadership	<p>-Provide PBIS program enhancements in which students track their class and grade level behavior data and provide input as to solutions for student behavior issues -Develop a leadership rubric/assessment for each grade level -Refine and analyze middle school surveys to provide relevant data to include students and faculty input in solving "culture" issues. - Mentorship programs -Provide training to staff, students, and parents regarding the leadership programs (8 key strategies) - Onboarding program for new students to ILCS -Service-oriented leadership field trips/activities to engage students in our region and support the area's needs -Leadership coach with support from school staff to support the leadership initiative and teach leadership classes to all students in 1st - 8th grades. -Student council related expenses</p>	\$148,400.00	Yes
Action #4	Parent/Community Partnerships	<p>-Offer opportunities for parent involvement with participating in school events and decision-making processes. -Parent involvement to include support with student achievement - Activities Coordinator to create opportunities/events for community outreach -Parent Contract/Agreement signed yearly to support school goals -Parent/Student outreach coordinator to support student activities and leadership experiences -Focused Title 1 parent workshops to support student achievement</p>	\$1,800.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds Contributing	
Action #5	Safe and Clean Schools	-Security system upgrades to include new security cameras, network equipment, firewall, cybersecurity -Maintenance/ repair on sites and buildings -Cleaning and sanitation of school facilities -Updates to the comprehensive school safety plan to improve emergency protocols -Visitor screening program - Improve the security of school with extra fencing, barriers, and other security equipment	\$459,400.00	No

Goal Analysis 2021-22

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

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

Overall, the actions and services were implemented to cultivate a safe and structured environment harnessing strong partnerships with parents and community members to ensure all sites have a positive school culture focus on leadership and high standards. There were a few actions that did not happen or need improvement. Attendance monitoring did occur however student celebrations did not occur due to the pandemic. The following actions did not happen: staff-led "Cultivate days" organized by the Thrive Cultivate Team, and pulse survey checks on employees and their mental health. Opportunities for staff to participate in physical activity occurred but were more informal than formal. "Real-life" leadership field trips to engage students in our region and support the area's needs were not fully implemented.

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

Not as many employees participated in the school insurance plan as anticipated which accounted for the reduced actual expenses.

An explanation of how effective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal.

ILCS made a concerted effort to ensure all actions were implemented.

Mental health support for students in all grade levels was provided where needed. An intern psychologist was hired along with existing

positions of a Student Leadership Coach; School Psychologist & English Learner Liaison to support students. Physical health-related services were provided which include the school nurse, health tech, health office supplies and equipment, PE teachers, PE assistants, and PE supplies. A school nurse (LVN) was added to the Bryant Street Campus. Attendance was monitored closely. However, student celebrations did not occur due to COVID 19.

Celebrations and recognition events for classified and certificated employees occurred throughout the year. A competitive health plan to cover employee medical and health needs was provided. PBIS program enhancements in which students track their class and grade level behavior data and provide input as to solutions for student behavior issues continued to be implemented throughout the school. Weekly mindfulness videos were shared with students each Monday. Training to staff, students, and parents regarding the leadership programs (8 key strategies) occurred with classified and Middle School Staff. Field trips did occur, however, improvement needs to be made in the area of leadership as a focus. ILCS' Leadership Coach position supported the Cultivate Initiative by teaching leadership classes, and many other events. Parent workshops occurred including (Title 1 included) support for parents in reading and writing strategies. Security system upgrades included new security cameras, network equipment, firewall, cybersecurity and maintenance/ repair on sites and buildings, and cleaning/sanitation of school facilities. Continued updates were done to the comprehensive school safety plan to improve emergency protocols. Visitor screening program along with opportunities for parent involvement in school events and decision-making processes continued. Parents were involved with surveys and analysis along with being offered workshops to support student achievement including underrepresented families.

Staff was celebrated throughout the year with lunches and ROAR recognitions, however, "Cultivate days" organized by the Thrive Cultivate Team did not happen. Our yearly staff survey was administered, but we recognize the Pulse survey checks on employees and their mental health needs to happen throughout the year. ILCS was not effective in offering opportunities for staff to participate in physical activity or refining the leadership program to create intrinsic motivation and inspiration for students to lead in their communities and understand the value of life-long leadership. A leadership rubric is in the process of being developed for middle school and has not yet occurred for elementary. The middle school survey was shared with key teachers however, more refinement is required to provide relevant data to include students and faculty in solving leadership culture issues.

The Activities Director continued to support student activities, community outreach, and leadership experiences.

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

A Middle School Leadership Class to be added to include the Activities Director/Leadership Coach/PE Teachers.

Develop a Leadership/Mentoring Program - Middle school students mentoring younger students

School Accountability Plan - Action - Communication to educational partners with school expectations- Contract signed yearly

The following survey questions need to be amended:

Teacher question: "Are PLC's valuable?"

"I believe we can make 90% proficient." and

"I am supported with 504, IEP, SST, and EL interventions."

Leadership assessment - change the outcome - expectations and leadership lessons once a week

School will refocus on community outreach and student recruitment through the Activities Director

Outcome 5 - Add this question for baseline data: Do you feel there are volunteer opportunities in your child's classroom and/or school?

Outcome 3 - Reframe PLC Question: Do you see PLC's impacting student achievement. 90% proficiency - Do you believe you have the training required to significantly improve student's academic performance (more than 1 years growth). "What is the most important piece to move student's achievement?" Parents, self-efficacy, expectations, interventions, support from outside. Change the question, "I am supported with 504, IEP, SST, and EL interventions."

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.

Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students for 2022-23

Projected LCFF Base Grant	Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional LCFF Concentration Grant (15 percent)
\$8,714,812.00	\$532,998.00	\$0.00

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
6.12%	0%	\$0.00	6.01%

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

Required Descriptions

For each action being provided to an entire school, or across the entire school district or county office of education (COE), an explanation of (1) how the needs of foster youth, English learners, and low-income students were considered first, and (2) how these actions are effective in meeting the goals for these students.

- 1). Foster youth, English Learners and low-income students (UPP) are considered as the "first focus" of every metric analyzed to determine if these populations of students are being well served and supported above and beyond other students. ILCS is transitioning to a new data analytics program that will support the effort to more closely disaggregate information for unduplicated pupils as well.
- 2). Actions and services for unduplicated pupils (UPP) are carefully researched and school intervention staff and administration determine what actions, and specific interventions, would be most effective for student progress. The school has transformed more of its traditional intervention strategies into more student-based strategies that include social-emotional support, counseling, parent collaboration, and instructional practices to provide greater access and increased resources such as one-to-one devices and universal free lunch/breakfast.

A description of how services for foster youth, English learners, and low-income students are being increased or improved by the percentage required.

Inland Leaders maintains less than the 55% unduplicated count for concentration funds and only receives supplemental funds. Expenses for the use of supplemental funds are noted in the LCAP actions and services sections of the document under the budget resources sections. Supplemental funds will be expensed at or over the percentage required to improve or increase services for unduplicated students.

Plans to increase services for the 2021-2022 school year include the expansion of our summer school program to include greater amounts of students and more days of summer instruction. Currently, the school provides summer school for 12 days for kindergarten through 8th grade. ILCS is working to provide additional days of summer school and an expansion of student participation for the 22-23 school year summer session. Increases in compensation to recruit summer school teachers.

ILCS currently provides wifi/internet hotspots for families who qualify as unduplicated pupil. Unduplicated pupils are also provided with one-to-one computing devices.

Additionally, ILCS recently was approved to receive Title 1 Part A funding to support unduplicated pupils in addition to supplemental state funding. ILCS has determined to use Title 1 funds in coordination with supplemental funds to provide a new intervention specialist to coordinate the intervention program as well as direct services to Title 1 students.

Additional expenses are planned to support parent workshops for unduplicated pupil families, before and after school interventions, educational software, books/materials, wifi hotspots, counseling, health services, and miscellaneous related expenses.

Supplemental funds are also used to support the EL population through the foreign language support positions that include teachers, office clerks and other positions to provide instructional support and translation services.

Funds will be utilized to continue to fund a Leadership Coach position that will work directly with families to assist unduplicated students who need additional support to be successful and onboarding for new students.

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.

Not 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	33.7 to 1	
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	16.8 to 1	

2022-23 Data Entry Table: Inclusion as part of the LCAP Template is optional

LCAP Year (Input)	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 %)
2022-23	\$8,714,812.00	\$532,998.00	6.12%	0.00%	6.12%

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span
1	1	21st Century Skills Implementation	All students	No			All Schools	On-going
1	2	Student and teacher technology devices and support	All	Yes	LEA-wide	Low SES, EL, Foster	All Schools	On-going
1	3	Hybrid Learning program materials, stipends, training and equipment	All students have access to enroll in hybrid	No			California Street Campus	ongoing

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span
1	4	Professional Development	All students	No	LEA-wide	EL students	All Schools	On-going
2	1	Hire and retain high quality instructional staff	All students	No			All Schools	On-going
2	2	Professional Development		Yes	LEA-wide	EL students, low SES	All Schools	On-going
2	3	Curriculum and Assessment		Yes	LEA-wide	Low SES; Foster; EL	All Schools	on-going
2	4	High Quality Interventions		Yes	LEA-wide	EL students, low SES, homeless, foster	All Schools	On-going
3	1	Student Well-being Initiatives		Yes	LEA-wide	Low SES; Foster Youth; English Learners	All Schools	On-going
3	2	Staff Well-being Initiatives	none	No			All Schools	On-going

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span
3	3	Student Behavior/PBIS/Leadership		Yes	LEA-wide	Low SES; Foster; EL	All Schools	on-going
3	4	Parent/Community Partnerships		Yes	LEA-wide	EL; foster; Low ses	All schools	on-going
3	5	Safe and Clean Schools	All students	No			All Schools	On-going

2022-23 Data Entry Table Continued

Goal #	Action #	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
1	1	\$3,500.00	\$0.00		\$3,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,500.00	0%
1	2	\$71,728.00	\$20,200.00	\$91,928.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$91,928.00	0%
1	3	\$88,400.00	\$0.00	\$88,400.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$88,400.00	0%
1	4	\$1.00	\$7,499.00		\$7,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,500.00	0%
2	1	\$2,982,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,982,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$2,982,000.00	0%
2	2	\$0.00	\$12,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$10,000.00			\$12,500.00	0%
2	3	\$0.00	\$32,550.00	\$32,550.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$32,550.00	0%
2	4	\$208,843.00	\$11,725.00	\$45,391.00		\$0.00	\$175,177.00	\$220,568.00	0%

Goal #	Action #	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
3	1	\$531,010.00	\$260,920.00	\$330,060.00	\$100,800.00	\$0.00	\$361,070.00	\$791,930.00	0%
3	2	\$629,401.00	\$0.00	\$546,000.00	\$60,701.00	\$0.00	\$22,700.00	\$629,401.00	0%
3	3	\$97,800.00	\$50,600.00	\$97,800.00	\$0.00	\$50,600.00		\$148,400.00	0%
3	4	\$0.00	\$1,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00	0%
3	5	\$155,000.00	\$304,400.00	\$459,400.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$459,400.00	0%

2022-23 Total Planned Expenditures Table

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-Personnel
Totals	\$4,676,029.00	\$182,501.00	\$50,600.00	\$560,747.00	\$5,469,877.00	\$4,767,683.00	\$702,194.00

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
1	1	21st Century Skills Implementation	All students	\$0.00	\$3,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,500.00
1	2	Student and teacher technology devices and support	All	\$91,928.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$91,928.00
1	3	Hybrid Learning program materials, stipends, training and equipment	All students have access to enroll in hybrid	\$88,400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$88,400.00
1	4	Professional Development	All students	\$0.00	\$7,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,500.00

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
2	1	Hire and retain high quality instructional staff	All students	\$2,982,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,982,000.00
2	2	Professional Development		\$2,500.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,500.00
2	3	Curriculum and Assessment		\$32,550.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$32,550.00
2	4	High Quality Interventions		\$45,391.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$175,177.00	\$220,568.00
3	1	Student Well-being Initiatives		\$330,060.00	\$100,800.00	\$0.00	\$361,070.00	\$791,930.00
3	2	Staff Well-being Initiatives	none	\$546,000.00	\$60,701.00	\$0.00	\$22,700.00	\$629,401.00
3	3	Student Behavior/PBIS/Leadership		\$97,800.00	\$0.00	\$50,600.00	\$0.00	\$148,400.00
3	4	Parent/Community Partnerships		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,800.00
3	5	Safe and Clean Schools	All students	\$459,400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$459,400.00

2022-23 Contributing Actions Tables

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)
\$8,714,812.00	\$532,998.00	6.12%	0.00%	6.12%	\$600,229.00	0.00%	6.89%

Totals by Type	Total LCFF Funds	Total Funds
Total:	\$600,229.00	\$1,299,676.00
LEA-wide Total:	\$600,229.00	\$1,299,676.00
Limited Total:	\$0.00	\$0.00
Schoolwide Total:	\$0.00	\$0.00

Goal Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
---------------	--------------	---	-------	-------------------------------	----------	--	---

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	2	Student and teacher technology devices and support	Yes	LEA-wide	Low SES, EL, Foster	All Schools	\$91,928.00	0%
2	2	Professional Development	Yes	LEA-wide	EL students, low SES	All Schools	\$2,500.00	0%
2	3	Curriculum and Assessment	Yes	LEA-wide	Low SES; Foster; EL	All Schools	\$32,550.00	0%
2	4	High Quality Interventions	Yes	LEA-wide	EL students, low SES, homeless, foster	All Schools	\$45,391.00	0%
3	1	Student Well-being Initiatives	Yes	LEA-wide	Low SES; Foster Youth; English Learners	All Schools	\$330,060.00	0%
3	3	Student Behavior/PBIS/ Leadership	Yes	LEA-wide	Low SES; Foster; EL	All Schools	\$97,800.00	0%

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
3	4	Parent/Community Partnerships	Yes	LEA-wide	EL; foster; Low ses	All schools	\$0.00	0%

2021-22 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Actual Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	\$5,631,556.00	\$5,336,573.00

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Action Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
1	1	21st Century Skills Implementation	No	\$3,499.00	\$12,107.00
1	2	Student and teacher technology devices (non-hybrid)	Yes	\$22,000.00	\$117,029.00
1	3	Hybrid program materials, stipends, training and equipment	No	\$66,000.00	\$125,866.00
1	4	Professional development	Yes	\$14,797.00	\$3,374.00
2	1	Hire and Retain High Quality Instructional Staff	No	\$3,960,002.00	\$3,659,751.00
2	2	Professional Development	Yes	\$25,000.00	\$16,322.00
2	3	Curriculum and Assessment	Yes	\$19,200.00	\$70,060.00
2	4	High Quality Interventions	Yes	\$112,000.00	\$155,694.00
3	1	Student well-being initiatives	Yes	\$364,999.00	\$342,035.00

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Action Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
3	2	Staff well-being initiatives	No	\$733,757.00	\$571,992.00
3	3	Student Behavior/PBIS/Leadership	Yes	\$113,500.00	\$5,598.00
3	4	Safe and clean schools	No	\$195,002.00	\$210,380.00
3	5	Parent/Community Partnerships	Yes	\$1,800.00	\$46,365.00

2021-22 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

Totals	6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 4 from 7)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)
Totals	\$504,427.00	\$673,296.00	\$603,190.00	\$70,106.00	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Action Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Total 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	Student and teacher technology devices (non-hybrid)	Yes	\$22,000.00	\$34,259.00	0.00%	0.00%
1	2	Professional development	Yes	\$12,997.00	\$0.00	0.00%	0.00%
2	1	Professional Development	Yes	\$20,000.00	\$10,423.00	0.00%	0.00%

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Action Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
2	2	Curriculum and Assessment	Yes	\$18,000.00	\$15,112.00	0.00%	0.00%
2	3	High Quality Interventions	Yes	\$10,000.00	\$140,249.00	0.00%	0.00%
3	1	Student well-being initiatives	Yes	\$344,999.00	\$264,137.00	0.00%	0.00%
3	2	Student Behavior/PBIS/ Leadership	Yes	\$110,000.00	\$0.00	0.00%	0.00%
3	3	Parent/Community Partnerships	Yes	\$0.00	\$139,010.00	0.00%	0.00%

2021-22 LCFF Carryover Table

Totals	9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	LCFF Carryover - Percentage (Input Percentage from Prior Year)	10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 plus 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)
Totals	\$8,212,753.00	\$504,427.00	0.00%	6.14%	\$603,190.00	0.00%	7.34%	No carryover	No carryover

Instructions

- Plan Summary
- Engaging Educational Partners
- Goals and Actions
- Increased or Improved Services

For additional questions or technical assistance related to the completion of the LCAP template, please contact the local 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 (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 aspects of the LCAP template 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, 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]).
- Annually reviewing and updating the LCAP to reflect progress toward the goals (EC Section 52064[b][7]).

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 should: (a) reflect comprehensive strategic planning (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 2021–22, 2022–23, and 2023–24 school years reflects statutory changes made through Assembly Bill 1840 (Committee on Budget), Chapter 243, Statutes of 2018. These statutory changes enhance transparency regarding expenditures on actions included in the LCAP, including actions that contribute to meeting the requirement to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, and low-income students, and to streamline the information presented within the LCAP to make adopted LCAPs more accessible for educational partners and the public.

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 California School Dashboard (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 that the LEA believes, based on input gathered from educational partners, research, and experience, 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 itself. Additionally, information is included at the beginning of each section emphasizing the purpose that each 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 provide a meaningful context for the rest of the LCAP, the content of this section should be clearly and meaningfully related to the content included in the subsequent sections of the LCAP.

Requirements and Instructions

General Information

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, or employment, the number and size of specific schools, recent community challenges, and other such information as an LEA wishes to include can enable a reader to more fully understand an LEA's LCAP.

Reflections: Successes

Based on a review of performance on the state indicators and local performance indicators included in the Dashboard, progress toward LCAP goals, local self-assessment tools, input from educational partners, and any other information, what progress is the LEA most proud of and how does the LEA plan to maintain or build upon that success? This may include identifying specific examples of how past increases or improvements in services for foster youth, English learners, and low-income students have led to improved performance for these students.

Reflections: Identified Need

Referring to the Dashboard, identify: (a) any state indicator for which overall performance was in the “Red” or “Orange” performance category or any local indicator where the LEA received a “Not Met” or “Not Met for Two or More Years” rating AND (b) any state indicator for which performance for any student group was two or more performance levels below the “all student” performance. What steps is the LEA planning to take to address these areas of low performance and performance gaps? An LEA that is required to include a goal to address one or more consistently low-performing student groups or low-performing schools must identify that it is required to include this goal and must also identify the applicable student group(s) and/or school(s). Other needs may be identified using locally collected data including data collected to inform the self-reflection tools and reporting local indicators on the Dashboard.

LCAP Highlights

Identify and briefly summarize the key features of this year’s LCAP.

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:

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

Support for Identified Schools:

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:

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, 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 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.

Statute and regulations specify the educational partners that school districts and COEs must consult when developing the LCAP: teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units of the LEA, parents, and students. Before adopting the LCAP, school districts and COEs must share it with the Parent Advisory Committee and, if applicable, to its English Learner Parent Advisory Committee. 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.

Statute requires charter schools to consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, parents, and students in developing the LCAP. 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 districtlevel goals and actions.

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 following web page of the CDE's website: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lc/>.

Requirements and Instructions

Below is an excerpt from the 2018–19 *Guide for Annual Audits of K–12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting*, which is provided to highlight the legal requirements for engagement of educational partners in the LCAP development process:

Local Control and Accountability Plan:

For county offices of education and school districts only, verify the LEA:

- a. Presented the local control and accountability plan to the parent advisory committee in accordance with Education Code section 52062(a)(1) or 52068(a)(1), as appropriate.
- b. If applicable, presented the local control and accountability plan to the English learner parent advisory committee, in accordance with Education Code section 52062(a)(2) or 52068(a)(2), as appropriate.
- c. Notified members of the public of the opportunity to submit comments regarding specific actions and expenditures proposed to be included in the local control and accountability plan in accordance with Education Code section 52062(a)(3) or 52068(a)(3), as appropriate.
- d. Held at least one public hearing in accordance with Education Code section 52062(b)(1) or 52068(b)(1), as appropriate.
- e. Adopted the local control and accountability plan in a public meeting in accordance with Education Code section 52062(b)(2) or 52068(b)(2), as appropriate.

Prompt 1: “A summary of the process used to engage educational partners and how this engagement was considered before finalizing the LCAP.”

Describe the engagement process used by the LEA to involve educational partners in the development of the LCAP, including, at a minimum, describing how the LEA 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.

Prompt 2: “A summary of the feedback provided by specific educational partners.”

Describe and summarize the feedback provided by specific educational partners. A sufficient response to this prompt will indicate ideas, trends, or inputs that emerged from an analysis of the feedback received from educational partners.

Prompt 3: “A description of the aspects of the LCAP that were influenced by specific input from educational partners.”

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. The response must describe aspects of the LCAP that were influenced by or developed in response to the educational partner feedback described in response to Prompt 2. 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. For the purposes of this prompt, “aspects” of an LCAP that may have been influenced by educational partner input can include, but are 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 desired 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 services
- Determination of effectiveness of the specific actions to achieve the goal
- Determination of material differences in expenditures
- Determination of changes made to a goal for the ensuing LCAP year based on the annual update process
- Determination 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 should 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 should 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.

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.
- **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.

At a minimum, the LCAP must address all LCFF priorities and associated metrics.

Focus Goal(s)

Goal 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.

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.

Broad Goal

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.

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

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.

Explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal: Explain how the actions will sustain the progress exemplified by the related metrics.

Required Goals

In general, LEAs have flexibility in determining what goals to include in the LCAP and what those goals will address; however, beginning with the development of the 2022–23 LCAP, LEAs that meet certain criteria are required to include a specific goal in their LCAP.

Consistently low-performing student group(s) criteria: An LEA is eligible for Differentiated Assistance for three or more consecutive years based on the performance of the same student group or groups in the Dashboard. A list of the LEAs required to include a goal in the LCAP based on student group performance, and the student group(s) that lead to identification, may be found on the CDE’s Local Control Funding Formula web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.

- ***Consistently low-performing student group(s) goal requirement:*** An LEA meeting the consistently low-performing student group(s) criteria must include a goal in its LCAP focused on improving the performance of the student group or groups that led to the LEA’s eligibility for Differentiated Assistance. This goal must include metrics, outcomes, actions, and expenditures specific to addressing the needs of, and improving outcomes for, this student group or groups. An LEA required to address multiple student groups is not required to have a goal to address each student group; however, each student group must be specifically addressed in the goal. This requirement may not be met by combining this required goal with another goal.
- ***Goal Description:*** Describe the outcomes the LEA plans to achieve to address the needs of, and improve outcomes for, the student group or groups that led to the LEA’s eligibility for Differentiated Assistance.
- ***Explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal:*** Explain why the LEA is required to develop this goal, including identifying the student group(s) that lead to the LEA being required to develop this goal, how the actions and associated metrics included

in this goal differ from previous efforts to improve outcomes for the student group(s), and why the LEA believes the actions, metrics, and expenditures included in this goal will help achieve the outcomes identified in the goal description.

Low-performing school(s) criteria: The following criteria only applies to a school district or COE with two or more schools; it does not apply to a single-school district. A school district or COE has one or more schools that, for two consecutive years, received the two lowest performance levels on all but one of the state indicators for which the school(s) receive performance levels in the Dashboard and the performance of the “All Students” student group for the LEA is at least one performance level higher in all of those indicators. A list of the LEAs required to include a goal in the LCAP based on school performance, and the school(s) that lead to identification, may be found on the CDE’s Local Control Funding Formula web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.

- ***Low-performing school(s) goal requirement:*** A school district or COE meeting the low-performing school(s) criteria must include a goal in its LCAP focusing on addressing the disparities in performance between the school(s) and the LEA as a whole. This goal must include metrics, outcomes, actions, and expenditures specific to addressing the needs of, and improving outcomes for, the students enrolled at the low-performing school or schools. An LEA required to address multiple schools is not required to have a goal to address each school; however, each school must be specifically addressed in the goal. This requirement may not be met by combining this goal with another goal.
- ***Goal Description:*** Describe what outcomes the LEA plans to achieve to address the disparities in performance between the students enrolled at the low-performing school(s) and the students enrolled at the LEA as a whole.
- ***Explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal:*** Explain why the LEA is required to develop this goal, including identifying the schools(s) that lead to the LEA being required to develop this goal; how the actions and associated metrics included in this goal differ from previous efforts to improve outcomes for the school(s); and why the LEA believes the actions, metrics, and expenditures included in this goal will help achieve the outcomes for students enrolled at the low-performing school or schools identified in the goal description.

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 are encouraged to identify metrics for specific student groups, as appropriate, including expected outcomes that would reflect narrowing of any existing performance gaps.

Include in the baseline column the most recent data associated with this 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 2019 Dashboard for the baseline of a metric only if that data represents the most recent available (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. Because final 2020–21 outcomes on some metrics may not be computable at the time the 2021–24 LCAP is adopted (e.g., graduation rate, suspension rate), the most recent data available may include a point in time calculation taken each year on the same date for comparability purposes.

The baseline data shall remain unchanged throughout the three-year LCAP.

Complete the table as follows:

- **Metric:** Indicate how progress is being measured using a metric.
- **Baseline:** Enter the baseline when completing the LCAP for 2021–22. As described above, the baseline is the most recent data associated with a metric. Indicate the school year to which the data applies, consistent with the instructions above.

- **Year 1 Outcome:** When completing the LCAP for 2022–23, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies, consistent with the instructions above.
- **Year 2 Outcome:** When completing the LCAP for 2023–24, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies, consistent with the instructions above.
- **Year 3 Outcome:** When completing the LCAP for 2024–25, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies, consistent with the instructions above. The 2024–25 LCAP will be the first year in the next three-year cycle. Completing this column will be part of the Annual Update for that year.
- **Desired Outcome for 2023-24:** When completing the first year of the LCAP, enter the desired outcome for the relevant metric the LEA expects to achieve by the end of the 2023–24 LCAP year.

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for Year 3 (2023-24)
Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for 2021–22 .	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for 2021–22 .	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for 2022–23 . Leave blank until then.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for 2023–24 . Leave blank until then.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for 2024–25 . Leave blank until then.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for 2021–22 or when adding a new metric.

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

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 self-reflection tool for local indicators within the Dashboard.

Actions:

Enter the action number. Provide a short title for the action. This title will also appear in the action tables. Provide a description of the action. Enter the total amount of expenditures associated with

this action. Budgeted expenditures from specific fund sources will be provided in the summary tables. Indicate whether the action contributes to meeting the increase 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 action offered on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, the LEA will need to provide additional information in the Increased or Improved Summary Section to address the requirements in California Code of Regulations, Title 5 [5 CCR] Section 15496(b) in the Increased or Improved Services Section of the LCAP).

Actions for English Learners:

School districts, COEs, and charter schools that have a numerically significant English learner student subgroup must include specific actions in the LCAP related to, at a minimum, the language acquisition programs, as defined in EC Section 306, provided to students and professional development activities specific to English learners.

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.

Goal Analysis:

Enter the LCAP Year

Using actual annual measurable outcome data, including data from the Dashboard, analyze whether the planned actions were effective in achieving the goal. Respond to the prompts as instructed.

- Describe the overall implementation of the actions to achieve the articulated goal. Include a discussion of relevant challenges and successes experienced with the implementation process. This 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.
- 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.
- Describe the effectiveness of the specific actions to achieve the articulated goal as measured by the LEA. 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.
- 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.

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 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.

Requirements and Instructions

Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants: Specify the amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grant funds the LEA estimates it will receive in the coming year based on the number and concentration of low income, foster youth, and English learner students.

Projected Additional LCFF Concentration Grant (15 percent): 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 LEAs 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:

For each action being provided to an entire school, or across the entire school district or COE, an explanation of (1) how the needs of foster youth, English learners, and low-income students were considered first, and (2) how these actions are effective in meeting the goals for these students.

For each action included in the Goals and Actions section as contributing to the increased or improved services requirement for unduplicated pupils and provided on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis, the LEA must include an explanation consistent with 5 CCR Section 15496(b). For any such actions continued into the 2021–24 LCAP from the 2017–2020 LCAP, the LEA must determine whether or not the action was effective as expected, and this determination must reflect evidence of outcome data or actual implementation to date.

Principally Directed and Effective:

An LEA demonstrates how an action is principally directed towards and effective in meeting the LEA's goals for unduplicated students when the LEA explains how:

- It considers the needs, conditions, or circumstances of its unduplicated pupils;

- The action, or aspect(s) of the action (including, for example, its design, content, methods, or location), is based on these considerations; and
- The action is intended to help achieve an expected measurable outcome of the associated goal.

As such, the response provided in this section may rely on a needs assessment of unduplicated 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 increase or improve services standard because enrolling students is not the same as serving students.

For example, if an LEA determines that low-income students have a significantly lower attendance rate than the attendance rate for all students, it might justify LEA-wide or schoolwide actions to address this area of need in the following way:

- After assessing the needs, conditions, and circumstances of our low-income students, we learned that the attendance rate of our low-income students is 7 percent lower than the attendance rate for all students. (Needs, Conditions, Circumstances [Principally Directed])
- In order to address this condition of our low-income students, we will develop and implement a new attendance program that is designed to address some of the major causes of absenteeism, including lack of reliable transportation and food, as well as a school climate that does not emphasize the importance of attendance. Goal N, Actions X, Y, and Z provide additional transportation and nutritional resources as well as a districtwide educational campaign on the benefits of high attendance rates. (Contributing Action[s])
- These actions are being provided on an LEA-wide basis and we expect/hope that all students with less than a 100 percent attendance rate will benefit. However, because of the significantly lower attendance rate of low-income students, and because the actions meet needs most associated with the chronic stresses and experiences of a socio-economically disadvantaged

status, we expect that the attendance rate for our low-income students will increase significantly more than the average attendance rate of all other students. (Measurable Outcomes [Effective In])

COEs and Charter Schools:

Describe how actions included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement on an LEA-wide basis are principally directed to and effective in meeting its goals for unduplicated pupils in the state and any local priorities as described above. In the case of COEs and charter schools, schoolwide and LEA-wide are considered to be synonymous.

For School Districts Only:

Actions Provided on an LEA-Wide Basis:

Unduplicated Percentage > 55%:

For school districts with an unduplicated pupil percentage of 55 percent or more, describe how these actions are principally directed to and effective in meeting its goals for unduplicated pupils in the state and any local priorities as described above.

Unduplicated Percentage < 55%:

For school districts with an unduplicated pupil percentage of less than 55 percent, describe how these actions are principally directed to and effective in meeting its goals for unduplicated pupils in the state and any local priorities. Also describe how the actions are the most effective use of the funds to meet these goals for its unduplicated pupils. Provide the basis for this determination, including any alternatives considered, supporting research, experience, or educational theory.

Actions Provided on a Schoolwide Basis:

School Districts must identify in the description those actions being funded and provided on a schoolwide basis, and include the required description supporting the use of the funds on a schoolwide basis.

For schools with 40% or more enrollment of unduplicated pupils:

Describe how these actions are principally directed to and effective in meeting its goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state and any local priorities.

For school districts expending funds on a schoolwide basis at a school with less than 40% enrollment of unduplicated pupils:

Describe how these actions are principally directed to and how the actions are the most effective use of the funds to meet its goals for foster youth, English learners, and low-income students in the state and any local priorities.

A description of how services for foster youth, English learners, and low-income students are being increased or improved by the percentage required.

Consistent with the requirements of 5 CCR Section 15496, describe how services provided for unduplicated pupils are increased or improved by at least the percentage calculated as compared to the services provided for all students in the LCAP year. 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 included in the Goals and Actions section as contributing to the increased or improved services requirement, whether they are provided on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis or provided on a limited basis to unduplicated students. A limited action is an action that only serves foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income students. This description must address how these action(s) are expected to result in the

required proportional increase or improvement in services for unduplicated pupils as compared to the services the LEA provides to all students for the relevant LCAP year.

For any 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. See the instructions for determining the Planned Percentage of Improved Services for information on calculating the Percentage of Improved Services.

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 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 Data Entry 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 Data Entry Table, the Annual Update Table, the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table, and the LCFF Carryover Table. With the exception of the Data Entry 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 action tables are required to be included in the LCAP as 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 2022–23 LCAP, 2022–23 will be the coming LCAP Year and 2021–22 will be the current LCAP Year.

Data Entry Table

The Data Entry Table may be included in the LCAP as adopted by the local governing board or governing body, but is not required to be included. In the Data Entry 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 of LCFF funding the LEA estimates it will receive for the coming school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Grant Program and the Home to School Transportation Program, pursuant to 5 CCR Section 15496(a)(8).

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

- *2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants:* Provide the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants the LEA estimates it will receive 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; OR, type “No” if the action is not included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services.

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 K-5), 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”.

Personnel Expense:

This column will be automatically calculated based on information provided in the following columns:

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.

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:

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

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 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 Service 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 the LEA estimates it will actually receive based on of 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 LCFF funding the LEA estimates it will receive for the current school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Grant Program and the Home to School Transportation Program, pursuant to 5 CCR Section 15496(a)(8).
- *10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year:* This percentage will not be entered. The percentage is calculated based on the amounts of the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9) and the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (6), pursuant to 5 CCR Section 15496(a)(8), plus the LCFF Carryover – Percentage from the prior year. This is the percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the current LCAP year.

Calculations in the Action Tables

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

Contributing Actions Table

4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)

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

5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services

- This percentage is the total of the Planned Percentage of Improved Services column

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

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and Concentration Grants

- This is the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants the LEA estimates it will actually receive based on of the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the current school year.

4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)

- This amount is the total of the Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)

7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions

- This amount is the total of the Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)

Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)

- This amount is the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (7) subtracted from the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4)

5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)

- This amount is the total of the Planned Percentage of Improved Services column

8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)

- This amount is the total of the Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services column

Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)

- This amount is the Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (5) subtracted from the Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (8)

LCFF Carryover Table

10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 + 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 January 2022