

## Supplement to the Annual Update to the 2021–22 Local Control and Accountability Plan

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Kings County Office of Education	Joy Santos Assistant Superintendent of Education Services	joy.santos@kingscoe.org (559)589-7068

California’s 2021–22 Budget Act, the federal American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, and other state and federal relief acts have provided local educational agencies (LEAs) with a significant increase in funding to support students, teachers, staff, and their communities in recovering from the COVID–19 pandemic and to address the impacts of distance learning on students. The following is a one-time mid-year report to the local governing board or body and educational partners related to engagement on, and implementation of, these Acts.

A description of how and when the LEA engaged, or plans to engage, its educational partners on the use of funds provided through the Budget Act of 2021 that were not included in the 2020–21 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP).

Following is a description of how and when the Kings County Office of Education engaged or plans to engage its educational partners on the use of funds provided through the Budget Act of 2021 that were not included in the 2021–22 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP).

Kings County Office of Education has made continuous efforts to solicit educational partner feedback and is committed to the idea that meaningful feedback is an integral part of developing effective plans. As such, the Kings County Office of Education uses a variety of meetings and activities to involve educational partner voice in all plans including, but not limited to:

- 1) Expanded Learning Opportunities Grant (current plan in place),
- 2) Educator Effectiveness Block Grant (current plan in place),
- 3) A-G Completion Improvement Grant Program: A-G Access Grant (anticipated plan),
- 4) A-G Completion Improvement Grant Program: A-G Learning Loss Mitigation Grants (anticipated plan),
- 5) Ethnic Studies Curricula Block Grant (anticipated plan),
- 6) California Pre-kindergarten Planning and Implementation Grant Program (anticipated plan),

Discussions and reviews of data, possible areas of focus, and proposed actions/services are all a part of our collaborative process. The following educational partners are actively involved in the development process: students, teachers, staff, parents, community, bargaining units (to include certificated and classified personnel), district administration, site principals, School Site Councils (including parents,

teachers/staff, and administration), site English learner representatives, and the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA). Our School Site Council (SSC) functions as our Parent Advisory Council. All board meetings and School Site Council meetings are open to the public. Translations of documents and translators are available at each convening.

J.C. Montgomery provides surveys in the Fall and Spring of each school year to parents, students, and staff. Surveys are provided electronically to staff and students. Surveys in English and Spanish for parents are also mailed home. Reminders are sent via Blackboard and social media in their system-identified languages. Follow-up calls are routinely made to parents to solicit further input verbally. Community input is also solicited during public hearings, School Site Council Meetings, and via website postings. Bargaining units meet in person to provide input. Kings County Office of Education district administration, the site principal, and the SELPA director collaborate virtually and in person. As such, this feedback was also used to develop this plan. The School Site Council holds quarterly hybrid meetings (in-person and via Zoom) where attendees are provided the needs assessment data and asked to provide input. English Learner Representative feedback is obtained before or during School Site Council meetings. Kings County Office of Education is not required to establish an English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) or District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) as the enrollment of English Learner students does not meet the minimum requirement. Educational partner feedback is consistently considered as we collaboratively review the most recent state and local data and identify possible root causes behind equitable access. Options are provided for remote participation in public meetings and public hearings surrounding the planning process include the opportunity for educational partners to join meetings via Zoom and telephone. Meeting conditions are based on current safe health practices as suggested by the local health department.

Additionally, a survey was sent out to families, students, and staff to obtain feedback regarding the Expanded Learning Opportunities Grant. The Educator Effectiveness Block Grant was also submitted at a public meeting for feedback before board approval in a subsequent meeting.

A description of how the LEA used, or plans to use, the additional concentration grant add-on funding it received to increase the number of staff who provide direct services to students on school campuses with an enrollment of students who are low-income, English learners, and/or foster youth that is greater than 55 percent.

Kings County Office of Education did not receive the Concentration Grant Add-on funds.

A description of how and when the LEA engaged its educational partners on the use of one-time federal funds received that are intended to support recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and the impacts of distance learning on pupils.

Following is a description of how and when Kings County Office of Education engaged its educational partners on the use of one-time federal funds received that are intended to support recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and the impacts of distance learning on pupils.

Kings County Office of Education has made continuous efforts to solicit educational partner feedback and is committed to the idea that meaningful feedback is an integral part of developing effective plans. As such, the Kings County Office of Education uses a variety of meetings and activities to involve educational partner voice in all plans including, but not limited to:

- 1) Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER II) (no formal plan required),
- 2) Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER III) (current plan in place),

Discussions and reviews of data, possible areas of focus, and proposed actions/services are all a part of our collaborative process. The following educational partners are actively involved in the development process: students, teachers, staff, parents, community, bargaining units (to include certificated and classified personnel), district administration, site principals, School Site Councils (including parents, teachers/staff, and administration), site English learner representatives, and the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA). Our School Site Council (SSC) functions as our Parent Advisory Council. All board meetings and School Site Council meetings are open to the public. Translations of documents and translators are available at each convening.

J.C. Montgomery provides surveys in the Fall and Spring of each school year to parents, students, and staff. Surveys are provided electronically to staff and students. Surveys in English and Spanish for parents are also mailed home. Reminders are sent via Blackboard and social media in their system-identified languages. Follow-up calls are routinely made to parents to solicit further input verbally. Community input is also solicited during public hearings, School Site Council Meetings, and via website postings. Bargaining units meet in person to provide input. Kings County Office of Education district administration, the site principal, and the SELPA director collaborate virtually and in person. As such, this feedback was also used to develop this plan. The School Site Council holds quarterly hybrid meetings (in-person and via Zoom) where attendees are provided the needs assessment data and asked to provide input. English Learner Representative feedback is obtained prior to or during School Site Council meetings. Kings County Office of Education is not required to establish an English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) or District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) as the enrollment of English Learner students does not meet the minimum requirement. Educational partner feedback is consistently considered as we collaboratively review the most recent state and local data and identify possible root causes behind equitable access. Options are provided for remote participation in public meetings and public hearings surrounding the planning process include the opportunity for educational partners to join meetings via Zoom and telephone. Meeting conditions are based on current safe health practices as suggested by the local health department.

A description of how the LEA is implementing the federal American Rescue Plan Act and federal Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief expenditure plan, and the successes and challenges experienced during implementation.

Following is a description of how Kings County Office of Education is implementing the federal American Rescue Plan Act and federal Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief expenditure plan, as well as the successes and challenges experienced during implementation.



In the first interim, the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER II) revised budget showed non-personnel expenses totaling approximately \$14,000 and actuals through 11/30/2021 totaling approximately \$13,000. These expenses include: Edgenuity software differentiation (rigorous instructional offerings & supplemental student materials) and Cengage.

Next, included in the first interim, the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER III) revised budget showed personnel expenses totaling approximately \$10,000 and actuals through 11/30/2021 totaling \$0 as the extra days have not yet been completed. These expected expenses include increased days/time for the transitional specialist from 190 to 215 for 3 years.

Successes regarding the implementation of the federal American Rescue Plan Act and federal Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief expenditure plan have included increased safety precautions to keep students and staff healthy and safe. Through this, we have also been able to support efforts to keep students and staff in school. An increase in technology and supplies have also supported health precautions. Funding to increase staff support to deliver rigorous instructional offerings and address learning loss was also key to supporting academic success.

Challenges experienced regarding the implementation of the federal American Rescue Plan Act and federal Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief expenditure plan have been ongoing waves of COVID-related absences. Also, although we welcomed the idea of staff support, it has been extremely difficult to fill positions.

A description of how the LEA is using its fiscal resources received for the 2021–22 school year in a manner that is consistent with the applicable plans and is aligned with the LEA’s 2021–22 LCAP and Annual Update.

Following is a description of how Kings County Office of Education is using its fiscal resources received for the 2021–22 school year in a manner that is consistent with the applicable plans and is aligned with the LEA’s 2021–22 LCAP and Annual Update.

Goal 1: Focus on student basic needs for engagement and maintain high expectations for student achievement.

1.2 Support staff and instructional supplies to provide additional assistance in scaffolding academic content. Also included is professional development to train staff in appropriate instructional and social-emotional support strategies. Co-op contract to support plan administration and federal program review.

- ESSER III: increased transitional specialist support
- A-G Completion Improvement Grant Program (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)
- Educator Effectiveness Block Grant (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)

1.3 Support staff and instructional supplies to provide additional assistance in scaffolding academic content. Also included is professional development to train staff in appropriate instructional/language acquisition strategies and social-emotional support for English Learners. Co-op contract to support plan administration and federal program review.

- ESSER II: Technology
- A-G Completion Improvement Grant Program (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)
- Educator Effectiveness Block Grant (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)
- Expanded Learning Opportunities Grant (instructional aide expenses to support scaffolding of academic content)

1.4 Curriculum support to include, but not limited to: online licenses, KCOE MOU (memorandum of understanding) lesson design, curriculum adoption /replacement, Edgenuity, WASC renewal fees.

- ESSER II: Edgenuity, Zoom
- A-G Completion Improvement Grant Program (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)

1.5 Professional growth opportunities and data dissemination support to assist staff in meeting the academic and social-emotional needs of students.

- Educator Effectiveness Block Grant (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)

1.6 Resource Specialist Program support contract (MOU) for training to assist students who have an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) in place.

- Educator Effectiveness Block Grant (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)

Goal 2: Provide a positive, safe, secure, and engaging learning environment that supports the social-emotional and mental health issues of our students. While strengthening parent engagement in the learning, rehabilitation, and success of students.

2.1 Lesson creation assistance in the form of consulting to build an engaging curriculum to academically and emotionally support students.

- Educator Effectiveness Block Grant (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)
- A-G Completion Improvement Grant Program (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)
- Expanded Learning Opportunities Grant (Movement Be MOU for writing expression lesson design expenses to support social-emotional growth while connecting with core content)

2.2 Trauma-informed training is provided to support teachers in helping students build coping skills, self-efficacy and strengthen student-staff relationships.

- Educator Effectiveness Block Grant (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)

2.3 Culturally Responsive Teaching training and activities will be provided for both teachers and parents to help them to recognize the importance of including students' cultural references in all aspects of learning.

- Educator Effectiveness Block Grant (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)
- Ethnic Studies Curricula Block Grant (no expenses at the current time, however, professional development will be provided in the future and may utilize funds)

Goals/Actions, not affected:

1.1 Staff support to focus on student basic needs for engagement and maintain high expectations for student achievement.

2.4 Parent engagement opportunities to strengthen communication with parents and provide support in the form of parent education and/or supplies for meetings.

2.5 Homeless set aside to ensure that services are provided to students who are experiencing homelessness.

Please note:

1) Goal 3 is a county-wide goal to coordinate high-quality educational programs and services for Kings County Foster & Expelled youth and is not addressed here.

2) California Pre-kindergarten Planning and Implementation Grant Program will not affect our LCAP as this will only be used to support the County Special Education school that is not represented in our LCAP.

## **Instructions for the Supplement to the Annual Update for the 2021–22 Local Control and Accountability Plan Year**

*For additional questions or technical assistance related to the completion of the Supplement to the Annual Update to the 2021–22 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), please contact the local county office of education (COE), or the California Department of Education's (CDE's) Local Agency Systems Support Office, by phone at 916-319-0809 or by email at [lcff@cde.ca.gov](mailto:lcff@cde.ca.gov).*

## Introduction

California's 2021–22 Budget Act, the federal American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, and other state and federal relief acts have provided local educational agencies (LEAs) with a significant increase in funding to support students, teachers, staff, and their communities in recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic and to address the impacts of distance learning on students. Section 124(e) of Assembly Bill 130 requires LEAs to present an update on the Annual Update to the 2021–22 LCAP and Budget Overview for Parents on or before February 28, 2022, at a regularly scheduled meeting of the governing board or body of the LEA. At this meeting, the LEA must include all of the following:

- The Supplement to the Annual Update for the 2021–22 LCAP (2021–22 Supplement);
- All available mid-year outcome data related to metrics identified in the 2021–22 LCAP; and
- Mid-year expenditure and implementation data on all actions identified in the 2021–22 LCAP.

When reporting available mid-year outcome, expenditure, and implementation data, LEAs have flexibility to provide this information as best suits the local context, provided that it is succinct and contains a level of detail that is meaningful and accessible for the LEA's educational partners.

The 2021–22 Supplement is considered part of the 2022–23 LCAP for the purposes of adoption, review, and approval, and must be included with the LCAP as follows:

- The 2022–23 Budget Overview for Parents
- The 2021–22 Supplement
- The 2022–23 LCAP
- The Action Tables for the 2022–23 LCAP
- The Instructions for the LCAP Template

As such, the 2021–22 Supplement will be submitted for review and approval as part of the LEA's 2022–23 LCAP.

## Instructions

Respond to the following prompts, as required. In responding to these prompts, LEAs must, to the greatest extent practicable, provide succinct responses that contain a level of detail that will be meaningful and accessible for the LEA's educational partners and the broader public and must, to the greatest extent practicable, use language that is understandable and accessible to parents.

In responding to these prompts, the LEA has flexibility to reference information provided in other planning documents. An LEA that chooses to reference information provided in other planning documents must identify the plan(s) being referenced, where the plan(s) are located (such as a link to a web page), and where in the plan the information being referenced may be found.

**Prompt 1:** “A description of how and when the LEA engaged, or plans to engage, its educational partners on the use of funds provided through the Budget Act of 2021 that were not included in the 2020–21 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP).”



In general, LEAs have flexibility in deciding what funds are included in the LCAP and to what extent those funds are included. If the LEA received funding through the Budget Act of 2021 that it would have typically included within its LCAP, identify the funds provided in the Budget Act of 2021 that were not included in the LCAP and provide a description of how the LEA has engaged its educational partners on the use of funds. If an LEA included the applicable funds in its adopted 2021–22 LCAP, provide this explanation.

**Prompt 2:** “A description of how LEA used, or plans to use, the concentration grant add-on funding it received to increase the number of staff who provide direct services to students on school campuses with an enrollment of students who are low-income, English learners, and/or foster youth that is greater than 55 percent.”

If LEA does not receive a concentration grant or the concentration grant add-on, provide this explanation.

Describe how the LEA is using, or plans to use, the concentration grant add-on funds received consistent with California Education Code Section 42238.02, as amended, to increase the number of certificated staff, classified staff, or both, including custodial staff, who provide direct services to students on school campuses with greater than 55 percent unduplicated pupil enrollment, as compared to schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is equal to or less than 55 percent.

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

**Prompt 3:** “A description of how and when the LEA engaged its educational partners on the use of one-time federal funds received that are intended to support recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and the impacts of distance learning on pupils.”

If the LEA did not receive one-time federal funding to support recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and the impacts of distance learning on students, provide this explanation.

Describe how and when the LEA engaged its educational partners on the use of one-time federal funds it received that are intended to support recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and the impacts of distance learning on students. See the COVID-19 Relief Funding Summary Sheet web page (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/cr/relieffunds.asp>) for a listing of COVID-19 relief funding and the Federal Stimulus Funding web page (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/cr/>) for additional information on these funds. The LEA is not required to describe engagement that has taken place related to state funds.

**Prompt 4:** “A description of how the LEA is implementing the federal American Rescue Plan Act and federal Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief expenditure plan, and the successes and challenges experienced during implementation.”

If an LEA does not receive ESSER III funding, provide this explanation.

Describe the LEA’s implementation of its efforts to maintain the health and safety of students, educators, and other staff and ensure the



continuity of services, as required by the federal American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, and its implementation of the federal Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) expenditure plan to date, including successes and challenges.

**Prompt 5:** “A description of how the LEA is using its fiscal resources received for the 2021–22 school year in a manner that is consistent with the applicable plans and is aligned with the LEA’s 2021–22 LCAP and Annual Update.”

Summarize how the LEA is using its fiscal resources received for the 2021–22 school year to implement the requirements of applicable plans in a manner that is aligned with the LEA’s 2021–22 LCAP. For purposes of responding to this prompt, “applicable plans” include the Safe Return to In-Person Instruction and Continuity of Services Plan and the ESSER III Expenditure Plan.

California Department of Education  
November 2021



## Local Control 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
Kings County Office of Education	Joy Santos Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services	joy.santos@kingscoe.org (559)589-7068

## 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.

Kings County is a rural agricultural community, located in the San Joaquin Valley. The county's Census Day population was reported to be 153,443 as of July 1, 2021, which was a 0.6% increase over 2020. Census data also reported the median household income to be \$61,556 in 2020. It is home to three (3) state prison institutions, California State Prison - Corcoran, Avenal State Prison, and Pleasant Valley State Prison. The county-wide percentage of Unduplicated Pupil Count of Free/Reduced-Price Meals, including English Learners and Foster Youth, in 20-21 was 72.41%. Of these unduplicated students, students who received Free/Reduced-Price Meals made up 70.8% (21,014 students), English Learners made up 17.7% (5,261 students) and 232 (in 20-21) students were Foster Youth. Kings County educational institutions include one (1) County Office of Education, nine (9) Elementary School Districts, two (2) High School Districts, two (2) Unified School districts, and thirteen (13) charter schools. With a few exceptions, the typical district grade configurations in Kings County are elementary (K-8), high (9-12), and unified (K-12). The cumulative student enrollment of these schools for the 2020-21 school year was 31,301. Of these students, 3,410 was the cumulative enrollment of students with disabilities in our county.

Kings County Office of Education (KCOE) is located in Kings County in Hanford, California. Our county-run programs include two special population schools: Kings County Special Education/Shelly Baird School and J.C. Montgomery (JCM) School. Our special education site, Shelly Baird, is not only funded differently but their academic scores will no longer be reflected in our dashboard instead, these scores will return to their home school. As such, you will not see Shelly Baird's school expenditures in this plan. J.C. Montgomery is a court school that serves incarcerated youth at the juvenile detention center and is the only school funded directly by the Local Control Funding Formula. With

the health guidelines brought upon by the pandemic, our enrollment has seen a decline. The school-wide percentage of Unduplicated Pupil Count of Free/Reduced-Price Meals (including English Learners at 3 students (15.8 %), Foster Youth data was redacted due to the small number served) and overall was 100% in 20-21. It is important to understand the nature of our county's alternative education program as covered by this Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), including the traumatic needs, academic challenges, and transiency of the student population served. This LCAP was developed with an understanding and appreciation of the unique issues our students face, as well as the temporal nature of their time enrolled in our educational program. We will also be using the WASC Action Plan, educational partner feedback, and Local Indicators to guide our student improvement. Students at the court school come to us having been incarcerated pending their court proceedings or to serve their sentence for failure to successfully abide by judicial laws. Our students often come to us challenged with credit deficiencies, disengagement from school, local community and at times even their own families, from low-income or unemployed circumstances, struggling with drug use or abuse (either themselves or a family member), mental health issues, lack of both social coping skills, a mindset of educational despondence, and lack of self-discipline and/or esteem. Many of the students require intense intervention due to the lack of fundamental reading and/or math skills. Our program is key to providing students with a successfully engaging education and providing them the tools they need to become productive citizens in our community.

## Reflections: Successes

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

Following is a description of successes and/or progress based on a review of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) and local data:  
Local Indicator Priority #1:

- Educational partners have provided feedback requesting that students continue to have access to 100% of standards-aligned materials, 100% fully credentialed teachers, and 100% appropriately assigned teachers. Educational partner feedback is a priority in all areas of the LCAP.
- Facilities reviews continue to have exemplary results.

Local Indicator Priority #2:

- ELA iReady results show a 9.55% increase over last year
- Continued status of Met on 2022 LCAP Local Performance Indicator Self-Reflection, Priority 1 State and Local Indicator self-assessment, based on educational partner feedback as well as state and local data:
- Full Implementation and Sustainability in providing professional learning for teaching ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA.
- Full Implementation and Sustainability in making instructional materials that are aligned to the academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks for the following subject areas: ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA, ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards), Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Next Generation Science Standards.
- Full Implementation and Sustainability in implementing policies or programs to support staff in identifying areas where they can improve in delivering instruction aligned to the academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks for the following subject areas: ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA, ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards), Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Next Generation Science Standards.

• Full Implementation and Sustainability in the LEA's success at engaging in the following activities with teachers and school administrators during the prior school year (including the summer preceding the prior school year)

Local Indicator Priority #3:

• There was a 23.6% increase in parent participation in our Spring LCAP survey (all students are considered to be unduplicated at J.C. Montgomery)

Local Indicator Priority #4:

• ELA iReady results show a 9.55% increase over last year. This data point is used instead of CAASPP scores as we have consistently not had enough students to show reportable data (less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy)

• There was an increase of 4% in the number of students who completed A-G courses in Edgenuity (course completion and recovery)

Local Indicator Priority #5:

• High School dropout rates decreased by 40.85%

• High School graduation rates increased by 12.29%

Local Indicator Priority #6:

• Suspension rates decreased by 2.4%

• The sense of safety increased in the following areas: Pupils increased by 31.5%, Parents by 6.2%, and teachers maintained 100%

• The sense of connection increased in the following areas: Pupils increased by 46.6% and Parents maintained at 93%.

Local Indicator Priority #8:

• Students participated in 19 more elective courses

Local Indicator Priority #10:

• There was an increase of 10.5% of Foster Youth who graduated county-wide

• There was a decrease of 9.3% of Foster Youth that was suspended county-wide

• 100% of district/site liaisons and child welfare services were trained on the Foster Focus Data System

Following is our plan to maintain or build on the successes based on Local Indicator self-assessment data, educational feedback input, and state and local data:

- 1) We would like to continue to improve the LEA's progress in creating welcoming environments for all families in the community. Student stay duration is typically short and fluid which makes relationship building a challenge, but we will continue to reach out. With such a small population, communication makes pivots in current practices easier to manage. Parent survey completion was increased. We have moved to contacting parents individually to request feedback. This has proved to be a beneficial practice that could only be had with this smaller population.
- 2) For ELA, we have already planned to add a 3rd teacher for the 2022-23 school year. This will allow more individualized support and in-person teaching.
- 3) We would like to continue improving the graduation rate increase and drop-out decrease. To do this we will be engaging in CTE growth work over the 2022-23 school year.
- 4) Although 100% of district/site liaisons and child welfare services were trained on the Foster Focus Data System, personnel are fluid, so we are constantly working to achieve our goal of 100%.



## 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.

Following is 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:

### Local Indicator Priority #2:

- Math iReady results show a 13.2% decrease over last year. We are working to add a 3rd teacher in 22-23 to provide in-person daily math instruction.

### Local Indicator Priority #4:

- Math iReady results show a 13.2% decrease over last year. This data point is used instead of CAASPP scores as we have consistently not had enough students to show reportable data (less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy). We are working to add a 3rd teacher in 22-23 to provide in-person daily math instruction.
- We have been unable to adequately support the "percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for career technical education sequences" and the "percentage of pupils who have successfully completed both types of courses" described in subparagraphs (B) and (C). As such we are leveraging Goal 1 to provide Career Technical Education (CTE) pathways.
- English Learners:
  - \* There was a decrease of 0.73% in Designated ELD GPA.
  - \* We continue to have 0% redesignated ELs.
  - \* To support English language development and redesignation of students we will be working with our ELD coach to create units and work on strategies that will support English Learners.

### Local Indicator Priority #5:

- School attendance rates have decreased by 8.7%.
- Chronic Absenteeism rates were 58.3% for all students. The data source was changed this year as this was the most recent public-facing data obtainable.
- School attendance is not an option at juvenile court schools. As COVID health restrictions are relaxed, we expect these metrics to decrease.

### Local Indicator Priority #6:

- The sense of connection decreased for teachers by 25%, however, we have changed the focus from teacher collaboration connections to student connections.

### Local Indicator Priority #9:

- We are still in the Exploration and Research Phase. This was a part of the new 3-year plan for Expelled youth. We are looking to develop a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for partial credit with the districts to improve this metric.

### Local Indicator Priority #10:

- There was an increase of 18.1% of Foster Youth who were chronically absent county-wide

Following is our plan to address areas of need based on Local Indicator self-assessment data, educational feedback input, and state and local data:

- We will be adding a 3rd teacher during the 2022-23 school year. This will allow for daily, in-person math delivery and additional tutoring for students in need of additional assistance.
- Regarding English Learner progress, although ELD grade point average continues to indicate this is within the "B" range, this continues to indicate a need. In the area of redesignations, again, although student enrollment is fluid, this continues to indicate need as well. To address this area, we have committed to working with our ELD coach to create units and work on strategies that will support English language development.
- We would like to continue to focus on the LEA's progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community. Our goal is to explore other ways to reach out to parents to attend engagement meetings. Tapping into community groups as a way to better reach out to families would be a way to explore and solicit feedback.
- The Kings County Office of Education is eligible for DA for Low-Income students in the areas of Chronic absenteeism, Graduation Rate, and College/Career. As a district, we have analyzed local and state data completed a systems analysis and systems map, engaged in a root cause analysis, worked on a driver diagram, and have begun to develop plans for our PDSA cycle. Through state CISC leadership, we have learned of the forthcoming State Performance Plan Indicator (SPLI) Resource Guide being developed by the State System of Support SELPA leads and of the work to update the existing CCSESA Improving Performance of Students with Disabilities Handbook to better align with continuous improvement efforts in place. We intend to draw upon these resources for the development and implementation of steps to address the areas with the greatest need for improvement.

## LCAP Highlights

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

Following is a brief overview of the LCAP, including any key features that should be emphasized:

The overall focus of this new LCAP will be on social-emotional and mental well-being to support academic achievement and pupil engagement. Although our overall focus remains consistent, we will be adding our focus on Career Technical Education (CTE) development this year. Our CTE pathways have been non-existent for J.C. Montgomery, so this has been a major task we are working on to provide students with the accessibility they have lacked due to the fluid nature of the population. We have experienced fluctuating enrollment for the past several years, however, we have continued to decline in enrollment, especially due to the health and safety concerns brought about by the pandemic. Due to the declining enrollment at J.C. Montgomery school, many of our state data points have not shown student information as "data not displayed for privacy." These missing data points include the CAASPP, ELPAC, and ELPI. To provide a comprehensive needs assessment, we have added local data sources, as much as possible, without exposing student information. Upon entry into our instructional programs, student transcripts are evaluated. Students are placed into courses based on their progress towards meeting graduation requirements. We continue to provide a variety of courses via our credit recovery program. This allows virtual access to a wide range of courses within a singular classroom. The in-person courses are taught by a limited number of teaching staff, which is based on student enrollment. The increase in course offerings through Edgenuity has allowed students to obtain more credits based on student achievement rather than a time-based model. We are also limited in our ability to offer a variety of physical education activities and science laboratories

based on our facilities and access to physical space. We continue to work with our agency partners to provide opportunities for students that increase access to a broad course of study.

Shelly Baird is the Kings County Special Education school. In the past, Shelly Baird's data was reported on the County Dashboard, however, now student achievement data will be returned to the student's school of origin, and as such, they are not reflected in our LCAP.

## **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.

Kings County Office of Education does not have any schools that were identified as being eligible for comprehensive support and improvement.

### ***Support for Identified Schools***

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

Kings County Office of Education does not have any schools that were identified as being eligible for comprehensive support and improvement.

### ***Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness***

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

Kings County Office of Education does not have any schools that were identified as being eligible for comprehensive support and improvement.



# Engaging Educational Partners

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

Kings County Office of Education has made continuous efforts to solicit educational partner feedback and is committed to the idea that meaningful educational partner engagement is an integral part of developing effective plans. As such, the Kings County Office of Education used a variety of meetings and activities to involve educational partners in the 2022 Local Control and Accountability Plan process including the discussion and review of district data, possible areas of focus, and proposed actions and services. The following educational partners were actively involved in the development process: students, parents, teachers/staff, community, bargaining units (to include certificated and classified personnel), district administration/site principals, School Site Councils (SSC) (including parents, teachers/staff and administration), English learner representative input as part of SSC, and the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA). Our School Site Council (SSC) functions as our Parent Advisory Council.

J.C. Montgomery provided surveys in the Spring for parents, students, correctional staff, and educational staff. The survey was provided electronically to staff and students. Surveys in English and Spanish for parents were mailed home. Reminders were sent via Blackboard and social media in their system-identified languages. Follow-up calls were made to parents to solicit further input verbally. Community input was solicited during a public hearing. Bargaining units met in-person to provide input. Kings County Office of Education district administration, the site principal, and the SELPA director collaborated virtually and in person. As such, this feedback was also used to develop this plan. The collaboration continued monthly throughout the school year. The School Site Council held a hybrid meeting where attendees were able to provide input in person or via Zoom. English learner representative feedback was obtained through the School Site Council meetings. Educational partner input was considered as we collaboratively reviewed the most recent state and local data to identify the root causes behind equitable access. The options provided for remote participation in public meetings and public hearings surrounding the development process included the opportunity for educational partners to join meetings via Zoom and by telephone. In-person meeting conditions were all based on safe meeting practices as suggested by our county health department. The School Site Council meetings were scheduled quarterly (September, November, January, and May). J.C. Montgomery is not required to establish an English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) because the enrollment of English Learner students continues to fall well below the requirement of 21 and likewise the county office programs do not have a District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) as we serve well below the threshold of 31 English Learner students. As such, English learner representatives are continuously invited to attend SSC meetings to provide input. Translation services are provided to meet the needs of attendees. SSC meetings were hybrid (if health restrictions allow) so that attendees could participate virtually or in person.

The Local Indicator self-assessment was also completed and reviewed to identify possible areas of growth that could be supported through the goals and actions of the Local Control and Accountability Plan.

A summary of the feedback provided by specific educational partners.

A summary of the feedback provided via discussions, surveys, and SSC meetings, by specific educational partner groups is listed below:



1) Students:

Student survey data reveals that 94% of students feel connected to the school. 88% of students feel that the school provides social and emotional support. Students listed ideas to increase school engagement and academic success: more access to individualized assistance, more opportunities for hands-on activities, and access to music. 94% of students felt that being Western Association of Schools and College accredited is helpful to the school. Through discussions and surveys, students indicated they felt more motivated to complete classwork if they had access to music and incentives. They requested more time and opportunities to work on credit recovery. Students were provided with innovative academic opportunities such as Stories with Style, the Skateboard art project, hands-on social-emotional learning lessons, hands-on Science lessons, high-interest English and rock and roll units, CodeCombat access, and Break-free challenges. Student interest was high and they requested to continue these experiences.

2) Educational Staff (includes Teachers) and Correctional Staff:

Educational staff survey data revealed that 100% of staff surveyed feel that being Western Association of Schools and Colleges accredited is helpful to the school. 100% of staff feel that the site has high expectations of students and classes are academically challenging. 100% of staff members feel that communication between the school and parents or guardians is very or somewhat effective. 100% of staff believe it is important for their students to graduate from high school. Through discussions and surveys, staff indicated they would like a higher staff-to-student ratio and continued support in the area of behavior tied to counseling services and Social-emotional lessons. Correctional Staff survey data revealed that 88% believe it important to support our student's social and emotional needs. 100% believe it is important for our students to graduate from high school. The overall consensus was to continue the high-engagement lessons and activities.

3) Parents:

Parent survey data revealed that 100% of parents report that the school has high expectations for students. 100% of parents feel that becoming Western Association of Schools and Colleges accredited is helpful to the school. 100% of parents feel the school is very supportive of students' social and emotional needs. 100% of parents feel that the communication from school to parents or guardians is very effective. The overall feedback from parents was very positive. They often commented how they felt more connected, welcomed, and informed by J.C. Montgomery staff and how this exceeded experiences with their district of residence.

4) Community:

The 2022 Local Control and Accountability Plan was presented at a public hearing meeting. \_\_\_\_\_ public comments. The 2021 Local Control and Accountability Plan was also taken for input at J.C. Montgomery School Site Council. Educational partners were able to view a draft of the newly prepared LCAP. Principal reviewed survey data with the SSC. Because goals for 23-24 were met in the areas of student safety, parent perception of school safety, and student connection to the school, these goals may be adjusted. Principal noted that while site benchmarks show that students are meeting the goal set for ELA, they are not meeting the goal for math. Because of this, the site plans to implement in person, direct instruction of math for the 22-23 school year. Feedback received from parents included: 1) student incentives make students want to work and 2) they appreciate the way staff interact with the students, and how they are always willing to give help, and 3) the school should keep doing what they are doing and although there are not a lot of kids at JC Montgomery the changes being made keep the students happy. A teacher also commented 1) that they appreciate staff from the outside (consultant support) coming in, 2) art projects should continue, and 3) impressed that the students are being taught to make businesses out of their talents.

5) Bargaining Unit: Representatives from both the Certificated and Classified County office units felt continued health and safety procedures regarding the COVID-19 pandemic were needed. They also indicated they would like a higher staff-to-student ratio and continued support in the area of behavior tied to counseling services and Social-emotional lessons.

6) District Administration and Site Principal:

During collaborative meetings, the importance of addressing the social-emotional needs of students, parents, and staff was stressed. Input from students, staff, community members, bargaining units, the School Site Council, the English learner committee, and the SELPA were discussed and utilized to determine the action items for this plan. District Administration and Site Principal agree, based on English learner reclassification and other associated data, that support strategies for English Learners will be included. They also determined an additional staff member is needed to increase engagement and services to students. The administration has also prioritized the development of a CTE pathway. The funds listed in the LCAP are supplemental to the grants we have acquired to focus on this area.

7) SELPA:

Meetings were held between the district administration, the site principal, and the SELPA director to align the 2022 Local Control and Accountability Plan with special education requirements and expected outcomes. The SELPA director also held meetings and communicated through email with J.C. Montgomery's special education teaching staff to provide support for individual student needs.

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

A description of the aspects of the LCAP that were influenced by specific educational partner input was as follows:

- Goal 1, Action 1, contains staff support to focus on student basic needs for engagement and maintain high expectations for student achievement, as requested by parents, teachers/staff, students, District Administration, and Site Principal.
- Goal 1, Action 2 & 3, contain support staff and instructional supplies to provide additional assistance in scaffolding academic content, as requested by parents, teachers/staff, students, District Administration, and Site Principal.
- Goal 1, Action 4 contains the WASC, supplemental curriculum support, and CTE support requested by parents, staff, and students based on the importance of WASC and graduation. Although the funding through the LCAP is not especially notable, we have acquired grants to focus efforts.
- Goal 1, Action 6, contains the special education support as suggested by the SELPA.
- A focus on social-emotional support can be seen heavily throughout the plan and more specifically, Goal 1 (Action 4) and weaved within all of Goal 2, as requested by parents, teachers/staff, students, District Administration, and Site Principal.
- Although the enhanced health and safety procedures were not funded through the Local Control and Accountability Plan, we will continue with these processes and procedures as needed and requested by the Bargaining Unit.

# Goals and Actions

## Goal

Goal #	Description
1	<p>Focus on student basic needs for engagement and maintain high expectations for student achievement.</p> <p>State Priorities: Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning); Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning); Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes); Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement); Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning); Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)</p>

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Kings County Office of Education has chosen to prioritize this goal based on the opportunity for growth in the following areas:

- 1) Educational partner have provided feedback requesting that Students have had access to 100% of standards-aligned materials, 100% fully credentialed teachers, and 100% appropriately assigned teachers.
  - 2) We are seeking to increase local iReady benchmarks in both ELA and Math.
  - 3) We are seeking to decrease high school dropout rates.
  - 4) We are seeking to increase high school graduation rates.
  - 5) We are seeking to increase the access to electives.
  - 6) We are seeking to maintain - Full Implementation and Sustainability in implementing policies or programs to support staff in identifying areas where they can improve in delivering instruction aligned to the academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks for the following subject areas: ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA, ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards), Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics, Next Generation Science Standards. As well as increase History-Social Science from Full Implementation to Full Implementation and Sustainability.
- Educational partners have participated in surveys and meetings where they have been asked to provide input to both solidify initial findings and thoughts regarding areas of importance.
- The following State Priorities: Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning); Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning); Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes); Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement); Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning); Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes) and outlined actions have been selected to support the six outlined objectives above. Outlined objectives will be monitored and adjusted through the execution of these actions and data obtained from these metrics.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
<p>Priority 1: Basic Services (Conditions of Learning)</p> <p>A. Appropriately Assigned &amp; Credentialed Teachers</p> <p>B. Instructional Materials</p> <p>C. School Repairs</p>	<p>A1. 100% of teachers are appropriately assigned</p> <p>A2. 100% of teachers are fully credentialed</p> <p>B. 100% sufficient access to standards-aligned materials</p> <p>C. Exemplary rating on the FIT</p> <p>(SARC 2019-2020)</p>	<p>A1. 100% of teachers are appropriately assigned</p> <p>A2. 100% of teachers are fully credentialed</p> <p>B. 100% sufficient access to standards-aligned materials</p> <p>C. Exemplary rating on the FIT</p> <p>(SARC 2021-2022)</p>			<p>A1. 100% of teachers are appropriately assigned</p> <p>A2. 100% of teachers are fully credentialed</p> <p>B. 100% sufficient access to standards-aligned materials</p> <p>C. Exemplary rating on the FIT</p>
<p>Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)</p> <p>A. Implementation of academic content and performance standards</p> <p>B. How the programs and services will enable English learners to access the CCSS and the ELD standards for purposes of gaining academic content knowledge and English language proficiency</p>	<p>A. local benchmarks: (iReady 2020)</p> <p>1) ELA: 45% of students showing growth</p> <p>2) Math: 35.8% of students showing growth</p> <p>3) Status of Met on 2021 LCAP Local Performance Indicator</p> <p>Self-Reflection, Priority 1</p> <p>B. English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI):</p> <p>1) Kings County Office of Education: 11.1% making progress</p>	<p>A. local benchmarks: (iReady 2020)</p> <p>1) ELA: 54.55% of students showing growth</p> <p>2) Math: 22.60% of students showing growth</p> <p>*Please note: data represents students that took the benchmark more than once so they have an initial score and at least one additional score to determine growth/decline</p> <p>3) Status of Met on 2022 LCAP Local Performance Indicator</p>			<p>A. Local benchmarks: (iReady)</p> <p>1) ELA: Increase to 55% of students will show growth</p> <p>2) Math: Increase to 45% of students will show growth</p> <p>3) Status of Met on 2021 LCAP Local Performance Indicator</p> <p>Self-Reflection, Priority 1</p> <p>B. English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI):</p> <p>1) Kings County Office of Education: *All Shelly Baird student</p>



Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	towards English language proficiency: 2) J.C. Montgomery: Less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy. As such, we will be using Designated ELD class enrollment: 100% of EL students enrolled (CA Dashboard 2019)	Self-Reflection, Priority 1  B. English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI): 1) Kings County Office of Education: *All Shelly Baird student data will return to the school of origin 2) J.C. Montgomery: Less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy. As such, we will be using Designated ELD class enrollment: 100% of EL students enrolled			data will return to the school of origin 2) J.C. Montgomery: Designated ELD class enrollment: 100% of EL students enrolled
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes) A. Statewide assessments  B. The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California	A. CAASPP: (CA Dashboard 2019) 1) ELA: Less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy 1) Math: Less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy As such, we will be using iReady data: 1) ELA: 45% of students showing growth	A. CAASPP: (CA Dashboard 2020) 1) ELA: Less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy 1) Math: Less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy As such, we will be using iReady data: 1) ELA: 54.55% of students showing growth			A. CAASPP: 1) ELA: Less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy 2) Math: Less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy As such, we will be using iReady data: 1) ELA: Increase to 55% of students showing growth 2) Math: Increase to 45% of students showing growth

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
and the California State University	2) Math: 35.8% of students showing growth	2) Math: 22.60% of students showing growth			B. 40% of students who will complete A-G Courses
C. The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for career technical education sequences or programs of study that align with SBE-approved career technical education standards and frameworks	B. Less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy (CA Dashboard 2019 - CCI Indicator) As such, we will be using Edgenuity data: 20% of students completed A-G Courses	B. Less than 11 students - data not displayed for privacy (CA Dashboard 2019 - CCI Indicator) As such, we will be using Edgenuity data: 24% of students completed A-G Courses			C. 5% of pupils will successfully complete courses that satisfy the requirements for career technical education sequences
D. The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed both types of courses described in subparagraphs (B) and (C)	C. 0% of pupils have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for career technical education sequences. This is not in place yet	C. 0% of pupils have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for career technical education sequences. This is not in place yet			D. 5% percentage of pupils will successfully complete both (B) and (C)
E. Percentage of English learners who make progress toward English proficiency as measured by the ELPAC	D. 0% percentage of pupils who have successfully completed both (B) and (C)	D. 0% percentage of pupils who have successfully completed both (B) and (C)			E. Designated ELD GPA: 3.66/A-
F. The English learner reclassification rate	E. ELPAC (DataQuest 2018-19) In order to protect student privacy, data is suppressed	E. ELPAC (DataQuest 2020-21) In order to protect student privacy, data is suppressed			F. Reclassification Rate: (DataQuest 2020-21) 1) Kings County Office of Education: *All Shelly Baird student data will return to the school of origin 2) J.C. Montgomery: 10%
					G. 0% of pupils who have passed an advanced placement

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023-24
G. The percentage of pupils who have passed an advanced placement exam with a score of "3" or higher	because 10 or fewer students tested As such, we will use Designated ELD GPA: 3.33/ B+	because 10 or fewer students tested As such, we used Designated ELD GPA: 2.6/ B-			exam with a score of "3" or higher
H. The percentage of pupils who participate in, and demonstrate college preparedness pursuant to the Early Assessment Program	F. Reclassification Rate: (DataQuest 2020-21) 1) Kings County Office of Education: 27 (56.2 %) 2) J.C. Montgomery: 0 (0.0 %) (Total # of Enrolled ELs=3)  G. 0% of pupils who have passed an advanced placement exam with a score of "3" or higher (DataQuest 2018-19)  H. 0% demonstrate college preparedness pursuant to the Early Assessment Program (EAP) (DataQuest 2018-19)	F. Reclassification Rate: (DataQuest 2021-22) 1) Kings County Office of Education: *All Shelly Baird student data will return to the school of origin 2) J.C. Montgomery: 0 (0.0 %) (Total # of Enrolled ELs=6)  G. 0% of pupils who have passed an advanced placement exam with a score of "3" or higher (DataQuest 2020-21)  H. 0% demonstrate college preparedness pursuant to the Early Assessment Program (EAP) (DataQuest 2020-21)			H. 0% demonstrate college preparedness pursuant to the Early Assessment Program students do not have access to EAP
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)	A. School attendance rates: (Aeries) JCM: 95.07% from	A. School attendance rates: (Aeries) JCM: 86.37%			A. School attendance rates: JCM: 97%

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023-24
A. School attendance rates	7/11/2019-2/7/2020				
B. Chronic Absenteeism rates	B. Chronic Absenteeism rates (CA Dashboard 2019-20)	B. Chronic Absenteeism rates (CA Dashboard) 1) Kings County Office of Education: *All Shelly Baird student data will return to the school of origin			B. Chronic Absenteeism rates 1) Kings County Office of Education: *All Shelly Baird student data will return to the school of origin
C. Middle school dropout rates	1) Kings County Office of Education:	2) J.C. Montgomery: (changed to DataQuest 20-21, otherwise there would be no reportable data)			2) J.C. Montgomery:
D. High school dropout rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students: Red, 51.2% Chronically absent, increased by 4.1%, Very High</li> <li>Low-income: Red, 50% Chronically absent, increased by 2.4%, Very High</li> <li>students with Disabilities: Red, 51.6% Chronically absent, increased by 3.4%, Very High</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students: 58.3%</li> <li>Low-income: 58.3%</li> <li>Students with Disabilities: 57.1%</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students: Less than 11 students - data not displayed due to privacy</li> <li>Low-income: Less than 11 students - data not displayed due to privacy</li> <li>students with Disabilities: Less than 11 students - data not displayed due to privacy</li> </ul>
E. High school graduation rates	2) J.C. Montgomery:	J.C. Montgomery: 11/91 Total Served = 12.09%			*students who are incarcerated are required to attend school



Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	<p>displayed due to privacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low-income: Less than 11 students - data not displayed due to privacy</li> <li>students with Disabilities: Less than 11 students - data not displayed due to privacy</li> </ul> <p>C. Middle school dropout rate J.C. Montgomery: 0/1 Total Served = 0%</p> <p>D. High School dropout rates: (CALPADS) J.C. Montgomery: 9/17 Total Served = 52.94%</p> <p>E. High School graduation rates: (CBEDS) 1) Kings County Office</p>	<p>graduation rates: 1) Kings County Office of Education: Shelly Baird student data will return to the school of origin 2) J.C. Montgomery: #/# Seniors on CBEDS = 41.7% (4-year cohort via Dataquest) *All data through 5/1/2022</p>			<p>C. Middle school dropout rate: J.C. Montgomery: #/# Total Served = 0%</p> <p>D. High School dropout rates: J.C. Montgomery: #/# Total Served = 45%</p> <p>E. High School graduation rates: (CBEDS) J.C. Montgomery: #/# Seniors on CBEDS = 40%</p>

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	of Education: 6/35 Seniors on CBEDS = 17.14% 2) J.C. Montgomery: 5/17 Seniors on CBEDS = 29.41%				
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning): The extent to which pupils have access to and are enrolled in: A. A broad course of study B. Programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated pupils C. Programs and services developed and provided to students with disabilities	A. 100% of students have course access B. 100% of unduplicated pupils have course access and access to services C. 100% of students with disabilities have course access and access to services (Local Indicators 2020-21)	A. 100% of students have course access B. 100% of unduplicated pupils have course access and access to services C. 100% of students with disabilities have course access and access to services (Local Indicators 2021-22)			A. 100% of students will have course access B. 100% of unduplicated pupils will have course access and access to services C) 100% of individuals with disabilities will have course access and access to services
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes Course completion: Foreign Language, Applied Arts, Career Technical Education	students participated in 12 elective courses from 7/2020 through 5/2021	students participated in 31 elective courses from 7/2021 through 5/2022			students will participate in 15 elective courses from 7/2023 through 5/2024

## Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.1	Staff Support	Staff support to focus on student basic needs for engagement and maintain high expectations for student achievement. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$9,729. Priority 1: Basic Services (Conditions of Learning) Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning) Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)	\$129,991.00	Yes
1.2	Support Staff and Instructional Supplies (Title I N & D)	Support staff and instructional supplies to provide additional assistance in scaffolding academic content. Also included is professional development to train staff in appropriate instructional and social-emotional support strategies. Co-op contract to support plan administration and federal program review. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$10,567. (Title 1 N & D) Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning) Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes) Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)	\$141,190.00	No
1.3	Support Staff and Instructional Supplies (Title I Part A)	Support staff and instructional supplies to provide additional assistance in scaffolding academic content. Also included is professional development to train staff in appropriate instructional/language acquisition strategies and social-emotional support for English Learners. Co-op contract to support plan administration and federal program review. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$681. (Title 1 Part A) Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning) Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes) Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)	\$9,100.00	No
1.4	Curriculum Support	Curriculum Support to include, but not limited to:	\$18,594.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online Licenses</li> <li>• KCOE MOU Lesson Design</li> <li>• Curriculum adoption/replacement</li> <li>• Edgenuity</li> <li>• WASC Renewal Fees</li> <li>• Video materials</li> <li>• CTE support</li> </ul> <p>Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$1,392.            Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)            Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)            Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)            Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)            Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes</p>		
<b>1.5</b>	Professional Growth and Data Dissemination Support	<p>Professional growth opportunities and data dissemination support to assist staff in meeting the academic and social-emotional needs of students. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$40.            Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)            Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)            Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)</p>	\$540.00	Yes
<b>1.6</b>	RSP Support	<p>Resource Specialist Program support contract (MOU) for training to assist students who have an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) in place. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$243.            Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)            Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)</p>	\$3,243.00	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.

The overall intent of this goal was to focus on students' basic needs for engagement and maintain high expectations for student achievement. To meet this objective, our actions included providing staff and curriculum support as well as ongoing time and dedicated opportunities for not only data dissemination but for staff to attend professional development sessions. All actions were carried out and there were no substantive differences in planned actions and implementation of these actions.

Challenges:

It was difficult hiring for our Instructional aide position as qualified candidate choices were limited. As there was a reduction in Title funds to supplement actions in this goal, we need to prioritize needs that had been previously agreed upon. The fluidity of student enrollment make it difficult to put longterm plans into place. The low & fluid enrollment also makes it difficult to effectively track and share data with educational partners as we want to ensure student privacy.

Successes:

As the year progressed, we were able to quickly pivot regarding the types of professional development to provide for current student needs. The program student enrollment is fluid and requires constant reevaluation of the current student needs to make sure we are prepared to equitably serve our unduplicated population in an effective manner. One pivot in particular was the addition of professional development for Math. We were also able to purchase novels for students.

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.

Our planned budget was \$320,816.00, however, our total estimated actual expenditures were \$329,647.63. Budgeted costs were exceeded due to: 1) additional costs incurred by salary increases, 2) additional staff needed to serve students, and 3) a decrease in title funding. Although our overall daily numbers in our facility are relatively low, J.C. Montgomery has 3 units (grouped cohorts of students). These students are separated in a manner that they are not a danger to themselves or others. This proves to be a challenge as the amount of staff that is required for this task is not always easily attainable.

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

ELA we are within less than a 0.5% towards meeting our 23-24 goal. Math declined about 13% and is at 22.6%. We require a 22.4% growth to meet our 23-24 goal. CAASPP data is not displayed for privacy as such we used the previously mentioned iReady data. There was a 4% increase of students completing A-G Courses. For ELPAC, in order to protect student privacy, data is suppressed because 10 or fewer students tested. As such, we used Designated ELD GPA to track progress which was 2.6/ B-. High School dropout rates have decreased greatly from 52.94% to 12.09%. J.C. Montgomery attributes this to the communication and follow-up from our Transition Specialist who works to make sure students continue their school enrollment once they are released from our program. We have seen this same success as we look at the increase in our graduation rate from 29.41% to 41.7%. This also goes along with the increase of students who participated in elective courses which has increased from 12 to 31. Again, we recognize the support from our Transition Specialist, as well as the

opportunities our students have been afforded to access credit recovery. It is also worth mentioning the innovative student engagement units we are proud to have implemented to keep students motivated to participate and ultimately graduate. Overall, we were effective in making progress toward our goal.

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.

Due to the pandemic, we have seen an increase in attendance and absenteeism rates. As restrictions and conditions improve we expect these metrics will improve as well. We are working to add a 3rd teacher in 22-23 to provide in-person daily math instruction. Also in 22-23, we have committed to working with our ELD coach to create units and work on strategies that will support English language development. Our main focus for this goal will be to strengthen our CTE courses and continue to work on engaging and innovative ways to reach our at-risk students.

**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.**

# Goals and Actions

## Goal

Goal #	Description
2	Provide a positive, safe, secure, and engaging learning environment that supports the social-emotional and mental health issues of our students. Strengthen parent engagement in the learning, rehabilitation, and success of students.  State Priorities: Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement) & Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Kings County Office of Education has chosen to prioritize this goal based on the opportunity for growth in the following areas:

- 1) We are seeking to increase parent feedback and participation.
- 2) We are seeking to decrease student suspension for all students and low-income students.
- 3) We are seeking to increase and/or maintain (where 100% is indicated) survey feedback.

Educational partners have participated in surveys and meetings where they have been asked to provide input to both solidify initial findings and thoughts regarding areas of importance.

The following State Priorities: State Priorities: Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement) & Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement) and outlined actions have been selected to support the three outlined objectives above. Outlined objectives will be monitored and adjusted through the execution of these actions and data obtained from these metrics.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
State Priorities: Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement) A. The efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and	A. 44.4% participation by all Parent/Guardians on the 2020 Spring LCAP Survey B. 44.4% participation by Parent/Guardian of unduplicated pupils on	A. 68% participation by all Parent/Guardians on the 2022 Spring LCAP Survey B. 68% participation by Parent/Guardian of unduplicated pupils on			A. 65% participation by all Parent/Guardians on the LCAP Survey B. 65% participation by Parent/Guardian of unduplicated pupils on LCAP Survey

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
<p>each individual school site</p> <p>B. How the school district will promote parental participation in programs for unduplicated pupils</p> <p>C. How the school district will promote parental participation in programs for students with disabilities</p>	<p>2020 Spring LCAP Survey</p> <p>C. 100% Parent/Guardian participation in IEPs</p> <p>A. B. and C. Status of Met on 2021 LCAP Local Performance Indicator Self-Reflection, Priority 3</p>	<p>2022 Spring LCAP Survey</p> <p>C. 100% Parent/Guardian participation in IEPs</p> <p>A. B. and C. Status of Met on 2022 LCAP Local Performance Indicator Self-Reflection, Priority 3</p>			<p>C. 100% of Parent/Guardian will participate in IEPs</p> <p>A. B. and C. Status of Met on 2021 LCAP Local Performance Indicator Self-Reflection, Priority 3</p>
<p>Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)</p> <p>A. Pupil Suspension rate</p> <p>B. Pupil Expulsion rate</p> <p>C. Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness</p>	<p>A. % Suspended (CA Dashboard 2019)</p> <p>1) Kings County Office of Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Students: Red, 9.3% suspended at least once, maintained 0.2%, Very High</li> <li>Hispanic: Orange, 7.4% suspended at least once, maintained 0.2%, Very High</li> </ul>	<p>A. % Suspended (* No dashboard info available, will use DataQuest for current needs and return to Dashboard for the 22-23 school year)</p> <p>1) Kings County Office of Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Students: 0.6%</li> <li>Hispanic: N/A</li> <li>Low Income: N/A</li> <li>English Learner: 0%</li> <li>Students with Disabilities: N/A</li> </ul>			<p>A. % Suspended</p> <p>1) Kings County Office of Education:</p> <p>*All Shelly Baird data will return to the school of origin.</p> <p>2) J.C.Montgomery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Students: 6% suspended at least once</li> <li>Hispanic: 3.5% suspended at least once</li> <li>Low Income: 6% suspended at least once</li> </ul>



Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Income: Orange, 9.6% suspended at least once, declined 1.3%, Very High</li> <li>English Learner: Green, 3.4% suspended at least once, declined 1.2%, Low</li> <li>Students with Disabilities: Orange, 9% suspended at least once, declined 0.4%, Very High</li> </ul> <p>2) J.C.Montgomery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Students: Red, 10.1% suspended at least once, increased 0.3%, Very High</li> <li>Hispanic: Orange, 9.8% suspended at</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Foster: N/A</li> </ul> <p>*NOTE: To protect student privacy, the report filtering capability for “Students with Disabilities” and “Program Subgroups” filters is disabled</p> <p>2) J.C.Montgomery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Students: 7.7%</li> <li>Hispanic: N/A</li> <li>Low Income: 7.7%</li> <li>English Learner: 0%</li> <li>Students with Disabilities: 16.7%</li> <li>Foster: 0%</li> </ul> <p>*NOTE: Data source changed to DataQuest, otherwise there would be no reportable data</p> <p>B. % Expelled (DataQuest 2020-21)</p> <p>1) Kings County Office of Education: 0%</p> <p>2) J.C. Montgomery: 0%</p> <p>C. Sense of Safety</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English Learner: 3% suspended at least once</li> <li>Students with Disabilities: 6% suspended at least once</li> </ul> <p>B. % Expelled</p> <p>1) Kings County Office of Education: 0%</p> <p>2) J.C. Montgomery: 0%</p> <p>C. Sense of Safety and School Connectedness</p> <p>1) Pupils: 75% Feel Safe</p> <p>65% Feel Connected</p> <p>2) Parents: 95% Feel Safe</p> <p>95% Feel Connected</p> <p>3) Teachers: 100% Feel School Safe</p> <p>100% Feel Connected via collaboration (DISCONTINUED)</p> <p>100% Feel Connected to students (NEW)</p>

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	<p>least once, increased 0.8%, High</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Income: Red, 10.1% suspended at least once, increased 0.3%, Very High</li> <li>English Learner: Yellow, 9.4% suspended at least once, increased 2.4%, High</li> <li>Students with Disabilities: Yellow, 9.4% suspended at least once, declined 6.8%, High</li> </ul> <p>B. % Expelled (DataQuest 2019-20)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kings County Office of Education: 0%</li> <li>J.C. Montgomery: 0%</li> </ol> <p>C. Sense of Safety and School Connectedness</p>	<p>and School Connectedness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pupils: 100% Feel Safe 94% Feel Connected</li> <li>Parents: 100% Feel Safe 93% Feel Connected</li> <li>Teachers: 100% Feel School Safe 75% Feel Connected to Students (changed from collaboration to student focus - new baseline)</li> </ol>			

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	<p>1) Pupils: 68.5% Feel Safe 47.4% Feel Connected</p> <p>2) Parents: 93.8% Feel Safe 93.8% Feel Connected</p> <p>3) Teachers: 100% Feel School Safe 100% Feel Connected via collaboration</p>				

## Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.1	Social-Emotional Support	Lesson creation assistance in the form of consulting to build an engaging curriculum to academically and emotionally support students. This action includes student incentives and instructional supplies. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$4,746. Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)	\$63,414.00	Yes
2.2	Trauma-Informed Training (Title II Part A)	Trauma-informed training is provided to support teachers in helping students build coping skills, self-efficacy and strengthen student-staff relationships. Supplies are built into the memorandum of understanding (MOU). (Title II Part A) Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$52. Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)	\$690.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.3	Culturally Responsive Teaching (Title I N & D)	Culturally Responsive Teaching training and activities will be provided for both teachers and parents to help them to recognize the importance of including students' cultural references in all aspects of learning. (Title I N & D) - THIS HAS BEEN DISCONTINUED FOR THE 2022-23 SCHOOL YEAR Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement) & Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)	\$0.00	No
2.4	Parent Engagement	Parent engagement opportunities to strengthen communication with parents and provide support in the form of parent education and/or supplies for meetings. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$97. Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement) & Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)	\$1,297.00	Yes
2.5	Homeless Set Aside (Title I Part A)	Homeless set aside to ensure that services are provided to students who are experiencing homelessness. (Title I Part A) Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)	\$200.00	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.

The overall intent of this goal was to provide a positive, safe, secure, and engaging learning environment that supports the social-emotional and mental health issues of our students and to strengthen parent engagement in the learning, rehabilitation, and success of students. Many of our students are with us for a short amount of time which makes it challenging to build relationships with parents. To meet this objective, our actions included providing social-emotional support, trauma-informed training, and culturally responsive teaching strategies for students,



teachers, and families. Also included were supplies for implementation and a homeless set-aside. All actions were carried out, except for the purchase of parent engagement supplies, which was the only substantive difference in planned actions.

**Challenges:**

A parent engagement night was scheduled but no families signed up. We will continue to communicate with families to find ways to engage with them at J.C. Montgomery. The fluidity of student enrollment makes it difficult to put long-term plans into place. The low & fluid enrollment also makes it difficult to effectively track and share data with educational partners as we want to ensure student privacy.

**Success:**

The low enrollment numbers provide for quick pivots based on student needs. Student, staff, and parent surveys shared positive praise regarding the social-emotional supports we have put into place. We will continue to grow these supports for students, families, and staff.

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.

Our planned budget was \$49,356.00, however, our total estimated actual expenditures were \$56,762.51. Budgeted costs were exceeded due to additional costs charged to Supplemental and Concentration funds. Additional costs were a result of a decrease in Title funding. After receiving feedback from educational partners, it was determined the social-emotional supports were a necessary cost. As such, we opted to continue the course without the original Title I funding.

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

**State Priorities: Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)** has been met. As the student population is so fluid we will continue to reinforce and build engagement strategies to prioritize student learning and well-being. Suspension rates for all subgroups, except for Students with Disabilities have decreased. Expulsions have remained at zero. Pupil results for safety (100%) and connectedness (94%) have exceeded our expectations. Parent results for safety have reached 100%, which exceeded expectations. Connectedness results for parents maintained at 93%. Staff safety results were maintained at 100%. The connectedness results declined however, the measurement of this metric has changed from collaboration to connectedness to students. It is also worth noting that 4 staff members were surveyed. Overall, we deem these activities successful in making progress toward our goal.

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.

There are only minor changes to the activities planned: 1) Some data points reported this year were different from the original reporting source due to the inability to garner the most up-to-date data, 2) The culturally responsive training has moved to an in-situation coaching model. Educational Partners have provided input to support continuance of the goal. Overall, the goal has been deemed effective by the metrics and as such will remain the same.

**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.**

# Goals and Actions

## Goal

Goal #	Description
3	<p>Coordinate high-quality educational programs and services for Kings County Foster &amp; Expelled youth</p> <p>State Priorities: Priority 9: Expelled Pupils (Conditions of Learning) &amp; Priority 10: Foster Youth (Conditions of Learning)</p>

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Kings County Foster Youth Coordinating Services Program (FYSCP) assists district and county health and human services agencies in ensuring that foster youth receive the necessary support and information to graduate and obtain and complete post-secondary education. The high mobility of foster youth makes it imperative that the FYSCP establish county-wide policies and procedures that address school stability and the immediate enrollment of foster youth. There is a need to share information, coordinate the transfer of health and education records between districts and other county agencies, and respond to the needs of the juvenile court system. Kings County supports the district through the coordinator of services for expelled youth in the county. Data shows that the three greatest areas of need for foster youth in Kings County are to increase the operational capacity of LEA site liaisons, improve academic engagement and school conditions and climate, and increase graduation rates and college and career readiness for foster youth students. Kings County supports districts through the coordination of services for expelled youth in the county.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Priority 9: Expelled Pupils (Conditions of Learning) Addresses how the county superintendent of schools will coordinate instruction of expelled pupils	Status of Met on 2021 LCAP Local Performance Indicator Self-Reflection, Priority 9: Developing a memorandum of understanding regarding the coordination of partial credit policies	Status of Met on 2021 LCAP Local Performance Indicator Self-Reflection, Priority 9: Developing a memorandum of understanding regarding the coordination of partial credit policies			Status of Met on 2021 LCAP Local Performance Indicator Self-Reflection, Priority 9: Developing a memorandum of understanding regarding the coordination of partial credit policies

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Priority 10: Foster Youth (Conditions of Learning) A and C. FYSCP will work alongside the county child welfare agency and juvenile court to minimize the changes in school placement, delivery, and coordination of educational services. B and D. Provide educational-related information to county child welfare agency to assist in the delivery of services utilizing the Foster Focus Data System as the efficient and expeditious mechanism for the transfer of health and education records	between the district of residence and the county office of education. 1 – Exploration and Research Phase  A. and C. 1) 21.9% of Foster Youth were chronically absent in 2019-2020 2) 47.8% of Foster Youth graduated in 2019-2020 3) 12.3% of Foster Youth were suspended in 2019-2020  B and D. 85% of district/site liaisons and child welfare services are trained on the Foster Focus Data System.	between the district of residence and the county office of education. 2 – Beginning Development  A. and C. 1) 40% of Foster Youth were chronically absent in 2020-2021 2) 58.3% of Foster Youth graduated in 2020-2021 3) 3% of Foster Youth were suspended in 2020-2021  B and D. 100% of district/site liaisons and child welfare services are trained on the Foster Focus Data System.			between the district of residence and the county office of education. 3 – Initial Implementation  A. and C. 1) Decrease the chronic absenteeism rate of Foster Youth by 8% 2) Increase the graduation rate of Foster Youth by 10%. 3) Decrease the suspension rate of Foster Youth by 5%.  B and D. 100% of district/site liaisons and child welfare services will be trained on the Foster Focus Data System.

# Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.1	Transfer of Educational Records, Case Management, and School Stability	Foster Youth Liaison and Educational Learning Advisors will evaluate academic credit completion and review transcripts for transitional-aged Foster Youth students. The Advisors will work with the Independent Living Program (ILP) to review credits, present information, assist with financial aid applications, and records for student transfers. The Advisors will work directly with JC Montgomery in order to provide transitional services for district Foster Youth. This position also serves as the contact for questions regarding Foster Youth for Kings County school districts and; school sites, and; assisted with student records requests and; transmittals. The Liaison will connect Educational resources for Foster Youth of all ages through programs to all LEA's within the County. Ensure school stability, immediate enrollment, and transfer of credits received for newly enrolled students. Provide technical assistance to LEA's and Health and Human Services on reading and analyzing transcripts for AB490/AB167 credit reduction requirements. Assist students in completing the FAFSA by the March 2 deadline by conducting two student workshops, following up with individual students to ensure the process is complete and facilitating the development of a mechanism for tracking FAFSA completions. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$17,612.	\$235,312.00	No
3.2	Foster Focus	The FYSCP will continue to utilize the Foster Focus system for the data management of Foster Youth. Weekly updates taken from the CalPads 5.7 report provide the Kings County Foster Focus system a means to further the benefits of the Foster Focus system. The FYSCP will maintain an MOU with 6 districts currently linked and Health and Human Services. FYSCP will reach out to districts that are not linked and provide support to enable those LEA's to link to the Foster Focus System. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$1,527.	\$20,397.00	No
3.3	Ongoing collaboration with all	Ensure the coordination of educational services for foster youth by facilitating quarterly Kings County Executive Advisory Council which	\$2,481.00	No



Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
	educational partners (stakeholders - previously used term) and Facilitation of Education Advisory Council	includes LEA's, Department of Social Services, Probation, and other educational partners (stakeholders - previously used term) for the planning and development of capacity building and training opportunities. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$186.		
<b>3.4</b>	Build Capacity with LEA's, Health and Human Services, and FYSCP Staff.	Build capacity with LEA, probation, child welfare, and other organizations by providing professional learning opportunities for the purposes of implementing school-based support systems for foster youth intended to improve educational outcomes. Training could include Trauma-informed practices, alternatives to suspension, student re-engagement, and legislative updates. FYSCP staff will participate in professional learning provided by local, regional, state, and national organizations to build their capacity to better serve LEA's and Health and Human Services. Included in this activity are indirect costs totaling \$3,908.	\$55,652.00	No
<b>3.5</b>	Expelled Youth Plan Administrator	5% Administrative costs to implement and update countywide plans for providing educational services to all expelled pupils. No indirect costs are included in this activity.	\$11,114.00	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.

1) Priority 10 - Foster Youth:  
Challenges:

- Across the county, 58.3% of our foster students graduated from High school, this is a significant decrease, due to the COVID 19 pandemic and school engagement.
- There were 148 or 0.47% of students expelled throughout the county. We continue to work to support districts with school climate measures.
- We planned on holding more in-person events for our adult supporters, but due to COVID restrictions, we were limited to what we could share due to low zoom engagement and attendance.

- Lack of quality data due to the COVID 19 pandemic proved challenging to make proactive interventions for students.

**Successes:**

- All actions used to support Foster Youth and to implement and update County-Wide Plan to Serve Expelled Youth were accomplished despite the effects of the COVID-19 health restrictions.
- We added 37 users to Foster Focus during the 2021-22 school year and provided 17 training sessions.
- 71% of Foster youth HS Seniors Attended & Completed FAFSA application, In conjunction with Kings County ILP and West Hills College Lemoore we held 3 workshops during the 2021-22 year. All other FAFSA applications were done by KCOE FYSCP staff with students in a one-on-one setting.
- 100% of District/Site Coordinators Trained on Educational Reports in Foster Focus and Dataquest
- 15 Transitional Conferences (ages 17-21) were held and attended by FYSCP staff.
- Signed AB 2083 MOU
- Development of a County-Wide Foster Youth Transportation Plan being executed between the Kings County FYSCP, Kings County Human Services, and all thirteen school districts in Kings County.

Overall the Kings County Foster Youth Coordinating Services Program (FYSCP) assisted districts and county health and human services agencies in ensuring that foster youth receive the necessary support by providing 358 hours of case management during the 2021-22 school year. Stability reports shared by the CDE this year were used to inform CWS and LEAs about the high mobility of foster youth. With the absence of a 2021 Dashboard, we have relied on DataQuest to provide data to all educational partners on the Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension of Foster Youth in Kings County. KCOE FYSCP continues to build capacity and relationships with Kings County Child Welfare Services by providing training on case management, Foster Youth Educational Rights as well as Foster Focus onboarding for all new social workers, Furthermore the FYSCP has partnered with Kings County ILP to provide opportunities for students to access community events and college tours utilizing the AB 130 funds provided by the legislature.

**2) Priority 9 - Expelled Youth:**

**Challenge:** This is a county-wide action, which requires some shared expectations from multiple educational partners. This alone proves challenging at times as each LEA has multiple factors at play they need to consider.

**Success:** Although difficult at times, all LEAs are committed to supporting expelled youth and are committed to developing a memorandum of understanding regarding the coordination of partial credit policies between the district of residence and the county office of education.

**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.**

**1 ) Priority 10 - Foster Youth:**

**Material differences between budgeted expenditures and estimated actuals are described below by action.**

- Action 3.1: Transfer of Educational Records, Case Management, and School Stability: There was no substantive difference in expenditures for action 3.1
  - Action 3.2: Foster Focus: There was a difference of \$13,411 not spent due to the Sacramento County Office of Education which runs Foster Focus not wanting to link any district with under 35 foster youth enrolled. Kings County has multiple districts that were previously allowed to link their student information system to Foster Focus which enabled the district, FYSCP staff, and Human services to have access to the most up-to-date attendance and grades for foster students. The remainder of funds will be carried over into the 2022-23 school year and will be used to provide post-secondary transition information and services to foster youth students as well as support the districts in utilizing Foster Focus.
  - Action 3.3: Ongoing Collaboration with all Educational Partners and Facilitation of Education Advisory Council: There was a difference of \$357 not spent due to a decrease in anticipated costs to hold Advisory Council meetings. Due to the Pandemic, we held all meetings via zoom. The money instead was spent on mileage for Education Learning Advisors providing one on one assistance on the FAFSA.
  - Action 3.4: Build Capacity with LEAs, Health and Human Services Staff, and FYSCP Staff: There was no substantive difference in expenditures for action 3.4
- 2) Priority 9 - Expelled Youth:
- Action 3.5: Expelled Youth Plan Administrator: There was \$1,154 additional expenditure for this action due to an increase in the salary schedule with the increase in the state COLA.

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

- 1) Priority 10 - Foster Youth:
- Action 3.1: Transfer of Educational Records, Case Management, and School Stability
    - \* 358 hours of case management were provided to districts to meet the educational needs of foster youth.
    - \* School Stability was addressed through conversation at the Education Advisory Council. Each school of origin recommendation made by the FYSCP takes school stability into consideration.
  - Action 3.2: Foster Focus
    - \* FYSCP staff held 17 Foster Focus Trainings for Human Services, School Districts, and Internal Staff. The use of the Foster Focus data system allows up-to-date attendance and academic achievement data for both the school districts and Child Welfare. It provides a system to ensure CWS reports and CALPADS records are matching. Which in turn provides easily accessible records for all educational adult supporters.
    - Action 3.3: Ongoing Collaboration with all Educational Partners and Facilitation of Education Advisory Council
      - \* Number of Meeting with HSA
      - \* FYSCP staff attended 27 Child Family Team Meetings that were requested by Child Welfare.
      - \* 60 Champions for Success meetings were held to provide foster youth a voice in their education while providing them with the tools to be successful.
      - \* FYSCP attended 3 Children's System of Care meetings to prepare for AB 2083 meetings.

- \* FYSCP participated in 14 meetings in the collaborative effort to develop the AB 2083 MOU.
  - \* FYSCP attended 21 Interagency Placement Committee meetings with one of them being on policy review.
  - \* FYSCP facilitated 7 meetings with Health and Human Services to develop a Kings County Transportation Plan.
  - \* FYSCP staff held 3 collaboration meetings with local Post Secondary Institutions.
  - \* FYSCP Liaison attended 2 Interagency Leadership Team meetings to collaborate on an interagency system of care.
  - \* Kings FYSCP held 4 Kings County Executive Advisory Council Meetings: October 7, 2021, December 7, 2021, February 22, 2022, May 19, 2022
    - Action 3.4: Build Capacity with LEAs, Health and Human Services Staff, and FYSCP Staff.
    - Training for Adult Supporters
  - \* Kings County FYSCP partnered with the Central Valley Truancy Summit to provide keynote speakers and breakout sessions for adult supporters of Foster Youth. Dr. Julia Garcia spoke about engaging foster youth in the educational process by providing them with a voice.
- 2) Priority 9 - Expelled Youth:
- Action 3.5: Expelled Youth Plan Administrator
- \* We are leveraging this position to help support the movement of the following metric: Developing a memorandum of understanding regarding the coordination of partial credit policies between the district of residence and the county office of education. We surveyed the districts and found out if and how they were assigning partial credit. The next step is to develop an MOU for partial credit with the districts.

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.

- 1) Priority 10 - Foster Youth:  
 The Foster Youth support staff, collaboration, and supplies, as well as the Administrator for the County-wide, Expelled Youth Plan, were all instrumental in providing support for Foster Youth and Neglected Youth and effective in meeting the individual needs of Students. Based on Educational Partner input Action 1.1 Transfer of Educational Records, Case Management, and School Stability will become more focused around the areas of case management as it relates to Chronic Absenteeism and School Suspension.  
 Furthermore AB 130 funds have allowed the FYSCP to offer direct service to Foster Youth students especially in the area of PostSecondary Transition. FYSCP will work closely with Kings County Health and Human Services Social Workers to ensure a smooth transition from the K12 system to the community college, university or vocational institutions.
- 2) Priority 9 - Expelled Youth:  
 No changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

**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 [2022-23]

Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional LCFF Concentration Grant (15 percent)
\$217,080.00	\$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	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year
52.50%	0%	52.50%
	LCFF Carryover — Dollar	
	\$0.00	

**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.

Following is a description of how actions included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement is principally directed to and effective in meeting its goals for unduplicated pupils:

Goal 1, Action 1: After assessing the needs, conditions, and circumstances of our low-income students (100% of students), we learned, 1) Year 1 Local iReady benchmarks show 54.55% of unduplicated students have shown growth in ELA and 22.60% of unduplicated students have shown growth in Math, 2) High School dropout rates for unduplicated students show 12.09%, and 3) High School graduation rates show 41.7% for unduplicated students. In order to address this condition of our low-income students, we will provide staff support to focus on student basic needs for engagement and maintain high expectations for student achievement. We will use this staff to target and monitor individual needs in ELA and Math, to increase Graduation rates, and decrease dropout rates. Measurement for effectiveness will be based on: 1) 3% growth on iReady Math and ELA benchmarks, 2) 3% decrease of our dropout rate, 3) 3% increase of our graduation rate.

Goal 1, Action 4: After assessing the needs, conditions, and circumstances of our low-income students (100% of students), we learned, 1) Educational partners have provided feedback requesting that Students have had access to 100% of standards-aligned materials, 100% fully credentialed teachers, 100% effective teachers, 2) Year 1 Local iReady benchmarks show 54.55% of unduplicated students have shown growth in ELA and 22.60% of unduplicated students have shown growth in Math, 3) High School dropout rates for unduplicated students show 12.09%, and 4) High School graduation rates show 41.7% for unduplicated students. In order to address this condition of our low-income students, we will provide engaging and rigorous curriculum support to include, but not limited to Online Licenses, KCOE memorandum of understanding (MOU) Lesson Design, Curriculum adoption/replacement, Edgenuity, and WASC Renewal Fees. Measurement for effectiveness will be based on: 1) Maintain 100% baseline for Priority 1 metrics, 2) 3% increase on iReady Math and ELA benchmarks, 3) 3% decrease of our dropout rate, 4) 3% increase of our graduation rate.

Goal 1, Action 5: After assessing the needs, conditions, and circumstances of our low-income students (100% of students), we learned, 1) Educational partners have provided feedback requesting that students have had access to 100% of standards-aligned materials and 100% fully credentialed teachers, and 2)2) Year 1 Local iReady benchmarks show 54.55% of unduplicated students have shown growth in ELA and 22.60% of unduplicated students have shown growth in Math. In order to address this condition of our low-income students, we will provide professional growth opportunities and data dissemination support to assist staff in meeting the academic and social-emotional needs of students. Measurement for effectiveness will be based on: 1) Maintain 100% baseline for Priority 1 metrics, 2) 3% increase on iReady Math and ELA benchmarks.

Goal 2, Action 1: After assessing the needs, conditions, and circumstances of our low-income students (100% of students), we learned, 1) student suspension was 0.6%. 2) survey feedback results were as follows: Sense of Safety and School Connectedness a) Pupils: 100% Feel Safe and 94% Feel Connected; b) Parents: 100% Feel Safe 93% Feel Connected. In order to address this condition and continue areas of success for our low-income students, we will provide Social-Emotional Support to include lesson creation assistance in the form of consulting to build an engaging curriculum to academically and emotionally support students. This action includes student incentives and instructional supplies. Measurement for effectiveness will be based on: 1) decrease of student suspension by 0.3%, 2) survey feedback results: Sense of Safety and School Connectedness a) Pupils: maintain 100% safety and 3% increase of connectedness; b) Parents: maintain 100% safety and 3% increase of connectedness.

Goal 2, Action 4: After assessing the needs, conditions, and circumstances of our low-income students (100% of students) (includes English Learners at 3 students (15.8 %), Foster Youth data was redacted due to the small number served), we learned, 1) parent feedback and participation as seen in the following baseline metric: 68% participation by all Parent/Guardians on the 2022 Spring LCAP Survey. 2) survey feedback results: Sense of Safety and School Connectedness a) Pupils: 100% Feel Safe and 94% Feel Connected; b) Parents: 100% Feel Safe 93% Feel Connected. In order to address this condition for our foster youth, English Learners, and low-income students, we will provide Parent engagement opportunities to strengthen communication with parents and provide support in the form of parent education and/or supplies for meetings. Measurement for effectiveness will be based on: 1) increase participation by all Parent/Guardians on the 2023 Spring

LCAP Survey by 5%, 2) survey feedback results: Sense of Safety and School Connectedness a) Pupils: maintain 100% safety and 3% increase of connectedness; b) Parents: maintain 100% safety and 3% increase of connectedness.

Please note: J. C. Montgomery school consistently has a limited number of Foster Youth and English Learner students on an ongoing basis. Ultimately, this does not allow for state-wide data collection due to groups of less than 10/11 students at one time. As such, we continue to provide designated services for English Learners through Title Funding. For Foster Youth, we provide designated services through Foster Youth designated state funding as the County-Wide Lead Administrators.

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

The Kings County Office of Education (KCOE) Alternative Education program has calculated supplemental and concentration funds to be \$162,970, based on the number of Low Income, Foster Youth, and English Learners per 5CCR 15496(a)(5). The percentage of students that are identifiable as unduplicated at J.C. Montgomery school is 100%. Using the above identified actions and services supported by the contributing expenditure table, this shows how we met the MPP.

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.

Kings County Office of Education did not receive the additional concentration grant add-on funding.

<b>Staff-to-student ratios by type of school and concentration of unduplicated students</b>	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	N/A	N/A
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	N/A	N/A

## 2022-23 Total Expenditures Table

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	\$217,079.00	\$324,956.00		\$151,180.00	\$693,215.00	\$490,267.00	\$202,948.00

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
1	1.1	Staff Support	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	\$129,991.00				\$129,991.00		
1	1.2	Support Staff and Instructional Supplies (Title I N & D)	Low-income				\$141,190.00	\$141,190.00		
1	1.3	Support Staff and Instructional Supplies (Title I Part A)	English Learner				\$9,100.00	\$9,100.00		
1	1.4	Curriculum Support	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	\$18,594.00				\$18,594.00		
1	1.5	Professional Growth and Data Dissemination Support	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	\$540.00				\$540.00		
1	1.6	RSP Support	Students with Disabilities	\$3,243.00				\$3,243.00		
2	2.1	Social-Emotional Support	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	\$63,414.00				\$63,414.00		
2	2.2	Trauma-Informed Training (Title II Part A)	Including English Learners, Low-Income, and Foster Youth All				\$690.00	\$690.00		
2	2.3	Culturally Responsive Teaching (Title I N & D)	All					\$0.00		
2	2.4	Parent Engagement	English Learners Foster Youth	\$1,297.00				\$1,297.00		

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
			Low Income					
2	2.5	Homeless Set Aside (Title I Part A)	Students Experiencing Homelessness				\$200.00	\$200.00
3	3.1	Transfer of Educational Records, Case Management, and School Stability	County-Wide Foster Youth		\$235,312.00			\$235,312.00
3	3.2	Foster Focus	County-Wide Foster Youth		\$20,397.00			\$20,397.00
3	3.3	Ongoing collaboration with all educational partners (stakeholders - previously used term) and Facilitation of Education Advisory Council	County-Wide Foster Youth		\$2,481.00			\$2,481.00
3	3.4	Build Capacity with LEA's, Health and Human Services, and FYSCP Staff.	County-Wide Foster Youth		\$55,652.00			\$55,652.00
3	3.5	Expelled Youth Plan Administrator	County-Wide Expelled Youth		\$11,114.00			\$11,114.00



## 2022-23 Contributing Actions Table

1. Projected LCFF Base Grant	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF — Percentage from Prior Year	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)	Totals by Type	Total LCFF Funds
\$413,490.00	\$217,080.00	52.50%	0%	52.50%	\$213,836.00	0.00%	51.71 %	<b>Total:</b>	\$213,836.00
								<b>LEA-wide Total:</b>	\$0.00
								<b>Limited Total:</b>	\$0.00
								<b>Schoolwide Total:</b>	\$213,836.00

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
1	1.1	Staff Support	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: J.C. Montgomery	\$129,991.00	
1	1.4	Curriculum Support	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: J.C. Montgomery	\$18,594.00	
1	1.5	Professional Growth and Data Dissemination Support	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: J.C. Montgomery	\$540.00	
2	2.1	Social-Emotional Support	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: J.C. Montgomery	\$63,414.00	
2	2.4	Parent Engagement	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: J.C. Montgomery	\$1,297.00	

## 2021-22 Annual Update Table

Totals		Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)		
<b>Totals</b>		\$692,152.00	\$659,778.00		
Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
1	1.1	Staff Support	Yes	\$134,644.00	\$138,354.00
1	1.2	Support Staff and Instructional Supplies (Title I N & D)	No	\$173,466.00	\$155,745.00
1	1.3	Support Staff and Instructional Supplies (Title I Part A)	No	\$13,504.00	\$14,210.00
1	1.4	Curriculum Support	Yes	\$15,966.00	\$14,883.00
1	1.5	Professional Growth and Data Dissemination Support	Yes	\$3,565.00	\$1,055.00
1	1.6	RSP Support	No	\$5,401.00	\$5,401.00
2	2.1	Social-Emotional Support	Yes	\$35,447.00	\$40,448.00
2	2.2	Trauma-Informed Training (Title II Part A)	No	\$1,233.00	\$992.00
2	2.3	Culturally Responsive Teaching (Title I N & D)	No	\$15,123.00	\$15,123.00

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
2	2.4	Parent Engagement	Yes	\$1,296.00	\$0.00
2	2.5	Homeless Set Aside (Title I Part A)	No	\$200.00	\$200.00
3	3.1	Transfer of Educational Records, Case Management, and School Stability	No	\$211,568.00	\$213,284.00
3	3.2	Foster Focus	No	\$21,604.00	\$6,589.00
3	3.3	Ongoing collaboration with all stakeholders and Facilitation of Education Advisory Council	No	\$2,484.00	\$1,943.00
3	3.4	Build Capacity with LEA's, Health and Human Services, and FYSCP Staff.	No	\$47,087.00	\$41,543.00
3	3.5	Expelled Youth Plan Administrator	No	\$9,564.00	\$10,008.00

**2021-22 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table**

6. Estimated LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	7. Total Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	8. Total Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)	
\$162,970.00	\$190,918.00	\$194,740.00	(\$3,822.00)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
1	1.1	Staff Support	Yes	\$134,644.00	\$138,354.00		
1	1.4	Curriculum Support	Yes	\$15,966.00	\$14,883.00		
1	1.5	Professional Growth and Data Dissemination Support	Yes	\$3,565.00	\$1,055.00		
2	2.1	Social-Emotional Support	Yes	\$35,447.00	\$40,448.00		
2	2.4	Parent Engagement	Yes	\$1,296.00	\$0.00		

**2021-22 LCFF Carryover Table**

9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	\$310,419.00	10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 + Carryover %)	52.50%	7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	\$194,740.00	8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)	0.00%	11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)	62.73%	12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)	\$0.00	13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)	0.00%
6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	\$162,970.00	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	0%										



# Instructions

## [Plan Summary](#)

## [Engaging Educational Partners](#)

## [Goals and Actions](#)

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

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

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

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 <b>2021–22</b> .	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for <b>2021–22</b> .	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for <b>2022–23</b> . Leave blank until then.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for <b>2023–24</b> . Leave blank until then.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for <b>2024–25</b> . Leave blank until then.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for <b>2021–22</b> or when adding a new metric.

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

- Table 1: Total Planned Expenditures Table (for the coming LCAP Year)



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

Note: The coming LCAP Year is the year that is being planned for, while the current LCAP year is the current year of implementation. For example, when developing the 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 transitional kindergarten through grade five), as appropriate.
- **Time Span:** Enter "ongoing" if the action will be implemented for an indeterminate period of time. Otherwise, indicate the span of time for which the action will be implemented. For example, an LEA might enter "1 Year," or "2 Years," or "6 Months."
- **Total Personnel:** Enter the total amount of personnel expenditures utilized to implement this action.
- **Total Non-Personnel:** This amount will be automatically calculated based on information provided in the Total Personnel column and the Total Funds column.

- **LCFF Funds:** Enter the total amount of LCFF funds utilized to implement this action, if any. LCFF funds include all funds that make up an LEA's total LCFF target (i.e., base grant, grade span adjustment, supplemental grant, concentration grant, Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant, and Home-To-School Transportation).
    - **Note:** For an action to contribute towards meeting the increased or improved services requirement it must include some measure of LCFF funding. The action may also include funding from other sources, however the extent to which an action contributes to meeting the increased or improved services requirement is based on the LCFF funding being used to implement the action.
  - **Other State Funds:** Enter the total amount of Other State Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
  - **Local Funds:** Enter the total amount of Local Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
  - **Federal Funds:** Enter the total amount of Federal Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
  - **Total Funds:** This amount is automatically calculated based on amounts entered in the previous four columns.
  - **Planned Percentage of Improved Services:** For any action identified as contributing, being provided on a limited basis to unduplicated students, and that does not have funding associated with the action, enter the planned quality improvement anticipated for the action as a percentage rounded to the nearest hundredth (0.00%). A limited action is an action that only serves foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income students.
    - As noted in the instructions for the Increased or Improved Services section, when identifying a Planned Percentage of Improved Services, the LEA must describe the methodology that it used to determine the contribution of the action towards the proportional percentage. The percentage of improved services for an action corresponds to the amount of LCFF funding that the LEA estimates it would expend to implement the action if it were funded.
- For example, an LEA determines that there is a need to analyze data to ensure that instructional aides and expanded learning providers know what targeted supports to provide to students who are foster youth. The LEA could implement this action by hiring additional staff to collect and analyze data and to coordinate supports for students, which 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