

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Murrieta Valley Unified School District

CDS Code: 33 75200 0000000

School Year: 2025-26

LEA contact information:

Faythe Mutchnick-Jayx


Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services

fmutchnick-jayx@murrieta.k12.ca.us

(951) 696-1600

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

Budget Overview for the 2025-26 School Year



This chart shows the total general purpose revenue Murrieta Valley Unified School District expects to receive in the coming year from all sources.

The text description for the above chart is as follows: The total revenue projected for Murrieta Valley Unified School District is \$341,764,436, of which \$266,133,977 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), \$33,317,145 is other state funds, \$32,260,864 is local funds, and \$10,052,450 is federal funds. Of the \$266,133,977 in LCFF Funds, \$25,944,135 is generated based on the enrollment of high needs students (foster youth, English learner, and low-income students).

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

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

Budgeted Expenditures in the LCAP

\$ 400,000,000
\$ 350,000,000
\$ 300,000,000
\$ 250,000,000
\$ 200,000,000
\$ 150,000,000
\$ 100,000,000
\$ 50,000,000
\$ 0

Total Budgeted
General Fund
Expenditures,
\$350,069,691

Total Budgeted
Expenditures in
the LCAP
\$28,909,530

This chart provides a quick summary of how much Murrieta Valley Unified School District plans to spend for 2025-26. It shows how much of the total is tied to planned actions and services in the LCAP.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: Murrieta Valley Unified School District plans to spend \$350,069,691 for the 2025-26 school year. Of that amount, \$28,909,530 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and \$321,160,161 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:

General funds support the educational needs of all students. Expenditures include salary and benefits for employees not specifically outlined in the LCAP, including teachers, custodians, librarians, transportation staff, facilities/ground maintenance staff, district and site support staff, as well as classified and certificated management. Expenditures in the general fund also include operating expenditures such as utilities, debt service obligations, capital project expenditures, and materials/supplies to operate the school district.


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

In 2025-26, Murrieta Valley Unified School District is projecting it will receive \$25,944,135 based on the enrollment of foster youth, English learner, and low-income students. Murrieta Valley Unified School District must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Murrieta Valley Unified School District plans to spend \$26,338,664 towards meeting this requirement, as described in the LCAP.

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

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

Prior Year Expenditures: Increased or Improved Services for High Needs Students



This chart compares what Murrieta Valley Unified School District budgeted last year in the LCAP for actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students with what Murrieta Valley Unified School District estimates it has spent on actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students in the current year.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: In 2024-25, Murrieta Valley Unified School District's LCAP budgeted \$26,286,195 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Murrieta Valley Unified School District actually spent \$25,249,503 for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2024-25.

The difference between the budgeted and actual expenditures of \$1,036,692 had the following impact on Murrieta Valley Unified School District's ability to increase or improve services for high needs students:

The district met the required percentage to increase or improve services for our unduplicated students and all actions were fully implemented, therefore, students were not impacted by the district spending less than budgeted. The expenditures exceeded the total Supplemental and Concentration Grant funding of \$25,082,000 by \$167,503, with expenditures totaling \$25,249,503.

Local Control and Accountability Plan

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

| Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name | Contact Name and Title | Email and Phone |
|---|---|--|
| Murrieta Valley Unified School District | Faythe Mutchnick-Jayx Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services | (fmutchnick-jayx@murrieta.k12.ca.us) (951) 696-1600 |

Plan Summary [2025-26]

General Information

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

The Murrieta Valley Unified School District (MVUSD) provides comprehensive academic programs to a student body of 21,700 individuals spanning from Preschool through our Adult Transition Program. Renowned for excellence, our institution offers highly acclaimed visual and performing arts opportunities, championship interscholastic athletic programs, nationally recognized student activities, and an expanding career technical education program. Central to our mission is a student-centered educational approach that prioritizes the academic achievement of every individual. With a distinguished record of performance, MVUSD stands as one of the premier districts in Riverside County. We were awarded three Distinguished School awards during the 2023-24 school year and one during the 2024-25 school year. Our dedicated team of highly qualified educators and staff deliver a rigorous educational experience that seamlessly integrates academics, co-curricular activities, and career preparedness, equipping students with the skills and knowledge necessary to thrive in their future educational and professional endeavors.

Schools

11 Elementary Schools (TK-5)

4 Middle Schools (6-8)

3 Comprehensive High Schools

1 Alternative Education Program that includes in-person, daily instruction, as well as independent study options

Our district also offers adult education, an adult-transition program, early childhood education, before and after school childcare, TK and Kindergarten wrap-around services, extended learning opportunities, and a parent center.

Students

Our student population is diverse, representing a wide range of ethnic backgrounds and sixty-one languages. We have eight Title I schools in our district. 5.0% of our students are English Learners, and 53.9% qualify for free or reduced lunches. Upon graduation, approximately 64% of our 2024 graduates enrolled in higher educational institutions including colleges and universities across the state and nation.

Ethnic/Racial Distribution:

American Indian or Alaska Native .2%

Asian 4.1%

Pacific Islander 0.5%

Filipino 3.7%

Hispanic or Latino 43.3%

African American 5.2%

White (not Hispanic) 32.8%

Multiple or No Response 10.3%

In February of 2025, the Board of Education set the vision and direction for the district's upcoming school year. The following key focus areas, organized to align with our LCAP goals, have been developed to improve the performance of schools which will ultimately translate to improved outcomes for our students.

Goal 1: Student Learning

1a. Professional Learning Communities and Teams (PLCs/PLTs)

1b. Early Learning (Pre-K, TK, Kindergarten)

1c. Career Readiness

1d. Mathematics

1e. Instructional Model

Goal 2: Student Intervention

2a. Inclusion

2b. Alternative Learning Opportunities

2c. English Learners

Goal 3: Professional Growth

3a. Classified Employees Professional Growth

3b. Certificated Employees Professional Growth

3c. Administration and Management Professional Growth

Goal 4: Climate and Culture

4a. Multi-Tiered System of Supports

4b. Student Engagement

4c. Student Attendance

4d. Family Engagement

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

SUCCESSES

Murrieta Valley USD has demonstrated success in the majority of metrics on the 2024 Dashboard, including English Language Arts performance, Mathematics performance, the College/Career Indicator, graduation rates, suspension rates, and English Learner progress as described below. Please note, the Dashboard colors indicate performance level as follows: Blue=Very High, Green=High, Yellow=Medium, Orange=Low, and Red=Very Low.

All Students

All Students State



Green

21.7 points above standard

Increased 5.6 Points 

Number of Students: 10,938

English Language Arts performance is a success for the district. On the 2024 CA School Dashboard it is categorized by the CDE as Green, with the district scoring 21.7 points above the standard, a data point which increased by 5.6 points from the previous year. The Filipino and Asian student groups are categorized as Blue, and the Hispanic, Two or More Races, Pacific Islander, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and White student groups are categorized as Green. The African American, English Learners, and Students with Disabilities student groups are categorized as Yellow. Local elementary data from the iReady diagnostic supports the dashboard data with many grade levels maintaining progress or continuing to trend in a positive direction. At the secondary level, the recently adopted STAR assessment provides baseline data only this school year, so progress is not able to be observed.

Despite this success, three student groups have low or very low performance in English Language Arts on the 2024 Dashboard. Foster Youth and Homeless student groups are characterized as Orange, and Long-Term English Learners are characterized as Red. Additionally, we continue to reflect on the 2023 Dashboard, since it informed the initial year of our three-year LCAP. In that Dashboard, two student groups within our schools were in the Red category for English Language Arts performance. This included English Learners at Avaxat and Students with Disabilities at Alta Murrieta, Avaxat, Buchanan, Lisa J. Mails, Monte Vista, Murrieta Canyon Academy, Murrieta Elementary, Rail Ranch, and Shively.

The district will continue to build on our success in English Language Arts Performance, while addressing the identified needs of these student groups, through our focus on professional learning teams that are looking at common assessment data and developing ways to respond when students are not learning. Additionally, the district's continued focus on early literacy instruction, inclusion, and English learner support will address these needs, as will a continued focus on quality Tier 2 interventions within the school day.

All Students

All Students State



Green

16.8 points below standard

Increased 5.4 Points ⓘ

Number of Students: 10,921

Mathematics performance is also a success for the district. On the 2024 CA School Dashboard it is categorized by the CDE as Green, with the district scoring 16.8 points below the standard, an increase of 5.4 points from the prior year. The Asian student group is categorized as Blue. The Filipino, Two or More Races, and White student groups are categorized as Green. The African American, English Learner, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities student groups are categorized as Yellow. Local elementary data from the iReady diagnostic supports the dashboard data with many grade levels maintaining progress or continuing to trend in a positive direction. At the secondary level, the recently adopted STAR assessment provides baseline data only this school year, so progress is not able to be observed.

Despite this success, three student groups have low or very low performance in Mathematics on the 2024 Dashboard. Foster Youth and Homeless student groups are characterized as Orange, and Long-Term English Learners are characterized as Red. Additionally, we continue to reflect on the 2023 Dashboard, since it informed the initial year of our three-year LCAP. In that Dashboard, one school and multiple student groups within our schools were in the Red category for Mathematics performance. This included Murrieta Canyon Academy overall, as well as Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, Hispanic, and White student groups at Murrieta Canyon Academy. It also included Students with Disabilities at Avaxat, Rail Ranch, Shivela, and Warm Springs, as well as English Learners at Thompson.

The district will continue to build on our success in Mathematics performance, while addressing the identified need of these students groups, through our focus on professional learning teams that are looking at common assessment data and developing ways to respond when students are not learning. Additionally, the district is adopting new Mathematics curriculum at the elementary level, which will offer teachers a new approach to teaching and opportunities for training in and reengagement with instruction in this subject area. The district has also identified mathematics as a goal in our Board of Education's Annual Goals and Directions. As such, professional development, coaching, new curriculum, and interventions will be in place to address this identified need, specifically for these student groups.

All Students

All Students State



Green

Prepared 58.8%

Increased 5.1%

Number of Students: 2,080

The College/Career Indicator has become a success for our district for the current year, despite being an identified need last year. On the 2024 CA School Dashboard it is categorized as Green with 58.8% of seniors considered to be prepared for college and career which is a 5.1% increase from the prior year. The Asian and Filipino student groups are categorized as Blue. The African American, Hispanic, Two or More Races, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and White student groups are categorized as Green. English Learners, Long-Term English Learners, and Students with Disabilities are categorized as Yellow. Local A-G and CTE Rate data supports this growth.

Despite this success, our Homeless student group is categorized as Orange on the 2024 Dashboard. Additionally, we continue to reflect on the 2023 Dashboard, since it informed the initial year of our three-year LCAP. In that Dashboard, there were not any student groups categorized as Very Low, but English Learners and Students with Disabilities were characterized as Low, and African American, Hispanic, Homeless, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students were categorized as Medium. Additionally, three student groups at two of our high schools were characterized as Very Low: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students at Murrieta Canyon Academy, Hispanic students at Murrieta Canyon Academy, and Students with Disabilities at Vista Murrieta HS.

The district will address the overall identified needs and the needs of these student groups through the PLT initiative, the Profile of a Graduate, and the work of our counselors. The district's focus on professional learning teams, who are looking at common assessment data and developing ways to respond when students are not learning, will ensure that more students meet proficiency in English Language Arts and Mathematics. Additionally, the implementation of Tier 2 interventions through elementary intervention teachers, additional sections at the secondary schools, and office hours/WIN (What I Need) time will complement the PLT work. Our district's recently adopted Profile of a Graduate will also impact this metric as it provides a new focus on career readiness for our staff and helps our students understand the outcome of their learning experience in our schools. Our counselors will also be key in helping more of our students meet the CCI. Their work to ensure students make progress in their A-G coursework, to promote and monitor CTE pathway completion and advanced coursework, and to ensure more students complete World Languages coursework to achieve the Seal of Biliteracy will help address our needs in this area.

All Students

All Students State



Blue

97.7% graduated

Increased 1.1%

Number of Students: 2,085

Graduation Rates continue to be a major success for the district. On the 2024 CA School Dashboard it is categorized as Blue, with a district graduation rate of 97.7% which increased 1.1% from the prior year. Every student group is categorized as Blue. The district does not have any student groups categorized as green, yellow, orange, or red for Graduation Rates, nor are there any schools or student groups characterized as Red on the 2023 Dashboard which informed the initial year of our three-year LCAP.

The district will build on the great success with our graduation rates by continuing our current counselor monitoring practices which have been a big part of this success. We will also continue to offer credit recovery opportunities, as well as enhance our communication around CTE pathways which can engage more students in their high school experience and in post high school planning. The district will also build on this success by rolling out our recently revised Grade Level Projects, aligned to our Profile of a Graduate. These projects will build school-wide engagement in career readiness and ensure students participate in the process of college and career planning over the course of their high school experience.

All Students

All Students State



Green

2.6% suspended at least one day

Declined 0.3%

Number of Students: 23,368

Suspension Rates have become a success for our district for the current year, despite being an identified need last year. On the 2024 CA School Dashboard, MVUSD is categorized as Green with an overall suspension rate of 2.6% which declined by 0.3% from the prior year. The following have been categorized as Green: Filipino, Two or More Races, Pacific Islander, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and White student groups. Asian, English Learners, Hispanic, and Students with Disabilities student groups have all been categorized as Yellow. While local suspension data (mid-year) demonstrates a decline in overall suspension rates, there continues to be a discrepancy between the rates

of all students and that of specific student groups, particularly Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities, Long-Term English Learners, and African American students.

Despite the Dashboard success this year, there are a number of student groups categorized as Orange or Red on the 2024 Dashboard. African American and Homeless student groups are categorized as Orange. American Indian, Foster Youth, and Long-Term English Learner student groups are categorized as Red. Additionally, we continue to reflect on the 2023 Dashboard, since it informed the initial year of our three-year LCAP. In that Dashboard, the Suspension Rate for Foster Youth was characterized as Red. Additionally, a number of student groups at specific schools were characterized as Red for Suspension Rates. That included Students with Disabilities at Antelope Hills, Monte Vista, and Rail Ranch; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students at Murrieta Canyon Academy; African American students at Murrieta Canyon Academy and Rail Ranch; and Multiple Race students at Murrieta Valley High School.

The district will address the overall identified needs and the needs of these student groups through a continued focus on MTSS and positive behavioral supports. We have built a foundation for this work and will continue to engage site teams in building a robust, tiered system of support for students. Additionally, our LCAP has specific actions to directly support Foster Youth and Long-Term English Learners. Our district is also providing resources to administrators which support alternatives to suspension and other means of correction, which is intended to positively impact our suspension rates, including those of specific student groups. Finally, the district is better aligning discipline practices and supporting administrators who oversee discipline with more opportunities for training and collaboration.

All Students

All Students State



Green

55% making progress

Increased 4.1% 

Number of Students: 939


English Learner Progress has become a success for our district for the current year, despite being an identified need last year. On the 2024 CA School Dashboard it is categorized as Green, with 55.0% of our English Learners making progress towards English language proficiency which represents an increase of 4.1% from the prior year. Our Long-Term English Learner student group is categorized as Yellow. Our local data also shows growth, with an increasing redesignation rate, although we are not seeing significant growth in midyear i-Ready performance. At the secondary level, the recently adopted STAR assessment provides baseline data only this school year, so progress is not able to be observed.

We also continue to reflect on the 2023 Dashboard, since it informed the initial year of our three-year LCAP. In that Dashboard, English Learner Progress is characterized as Red for Avaxat Elementary and Murrieta Valley High School.

Our LCAP has specific actions to directly support English Learner Progress, and English Learners are included as a key goal in our Board of Education's Annual Goals and Directions. The district has focused on professional development for teachers and plans to provide further training to teachers and administrators in the coming year. There are plans in place to address the needs of Long-term English Learners at the middle school level this year, to reengage elementary schools in the practice of designated instructional time, and to continue to improve practices for supporting dually identified (Special Education and English Learner) students. English Learner progress continues to be a key priority for our district.

CHALLENGES

Murrieta Valley USD has identified Chronic Absenteeism as an area needing further attention and focus.



While the district has had some success with Chronic Absenteeism, it continues to be a challenge and an identified need. On the 2024 CA School Dashboard it is categorized as Yellow with 18.2% of students chronically absent, a percentage that has declined by 5.3% from the prior year. The majority of our student groups are also in Yellow, but African American, Foster Youth, and Pacific Islander student groups are categorized as Orange, and American Indian and Long-Term English Learner student groups are categorized as Red. Local data is showing that chronic absenteeism continues to exceed pre-pandemic levels in our district, but it is definitely trending in the right direction, including all student groups. Foster Youth and Students with Disabilities have chronic absenteeism rates that are much higher than those of all students.

We continue to reflect on the 2023 Dashboard, since it informed the initial year of our three-year LCAP. In that Dashboard, while the district did not have any student groups that were categorized as Red, one of our schools (Murrieta Canyon Academy) was categorized as Red overall with the following students groups also categorized as Red: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, Hispanic, and White students. Additionally, a number of student groups from specific schools were categorized as Red, including English Learners at Antelope Hills, Dorothy McElhinney, and Tovashal; Asian students at Monte Vista; African American Students at Murrieta El; and White students at Rail Ranch.

The district will address the overall identified needs and the needs of these student groups through a continued focus on attendance. Attendance is an LCAP goal, as well as a key goal in the Board of Education's Annual Goals and Directions. Our Attendance Coordinator is currently working closely with our MTSS staff and has integrated attendance monitoring and response into the district's MTSS focus area.

Tier 2 MTSS teams have been formed at each site and are taking part in a process of identifying students and/or families who need additional support in the area of attendance and developing appropriate responses or interventions. This work will continue into next year with the help of district coaching. Additionally, continued attendance communication will be rolled out to the community with an emphasis on the importance of being present for the powerful moments of learning each day.

LEARNING RECOVERY EMERGENCY BLOCK GRANT (LREBG)

The district has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2025-26 school year. The following actions will be funded in part by LREBG funds. Each description below explains how the action is aligned to the allowable use of funds, as well as how the action addresses an area of need identified in the district's needs assessment.

Goal 1

1.1: Additional Teachers for Smaller Class Sizes: This action is aligned to the allowable use of funds as it addresses instructional learning time by adopting an evidence-based action which decreases or stabilizes staff-to-pupil ratios. It addresses English Language Arts and Mathematics performance, particularly for students in LTEL, Foster, and SWD student groups, who demonstrate the greatest need in these areas based on the district's needs assessment. The action provides smaller teacher-to-student ratios at the secondary level, including RSP and SDC classes, and allows for more individual and targeted instruction.

Goal 2

2.1: Elementary Intervention Teachers
2.2: Secondary Intervention
2.4: Intervention Programs and Support

Actions 2.1, 2.2, and 2.4 are aligned to the allowable use of funds as they provide evidence-based learning supports to accelerate progress to close learning gaps and access to instruction for credit-deficient pupils to complete graduation requirements. All three actions address English Language Arts and Mathematics performance, particularly for students in LTEL, Foster, and SWD student groups, who demonstrate the greatest need in these areas based on the district's needs assessment. These actions provide after-school intervention, tutors in high school math classes, summer credit recovery opportunities, and access to a foundational literacy intervention program.

Goal 4

4.3: Mental Health Supports and MTSS: This action is aligned to the allowable use of funds as it addresses other barriers to learning, and staff supports and training, such as the provision of health, counseling, or mental health services. It addresses Chronic Absenteeism, particularly for our American Indian student group, which demonstrated the greatest need in this area based on the district's needs assessment. This action provides additional mental health support in the form of "reset rooms" at the middle school level.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

MVUSD is eligible for Differentiated Assistance based on performance indicators for the Long-Term English Learner student group (English Language Arts, Math, Suspension, and Chronic Absenteeism) and the American Indian student group (Suspension and Chronic

Absenteeism). In response, the district has engaged in targeted technical assistance efforts to strengthen supports and improve outcomes for these student groups. The following summarizes the work currently underway.

For LTELs, the district has added designated sections at the secondary level to specifically support language acquisition using a research-based curriculum. The completion of the English Learner Master Plan has further clarified the instructional expectations and support structures for LTELs. Training and collaboration with EL teachers has been a key component, ensuring consistent implementation and capacity-building at school sites. In addition, site administrators have engaged in data reviews to identify trends, monitor progress, and inform next steps in serving this student group more effectively.

For American Indian students, technical assistance has included targeted data analysis with administrative teams to raise awareness and inform site-level action planning. This student group has been elevated within the district's broader Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) work, particularly within efforts to address behavior and chronic absenteeism. Focus has been placed on increasing access to Tier 2 interventions, with an emphasis on building stronger connections to school and reducing suspension and absenteeism rates.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

Schools Identified

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

Not Applicable

Support for Identified Schools

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

Not Applicable

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

Not Applicable

Engaging Educational Partners

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

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

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

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

| Educational Partner(s) | Process for Engagement |
|--|---|
| Parent Advisory Councils: District English Learner Advisory Council, Special Education Parent Advisory Council (and SELPA), African American Parent Advisory Council, Latino Parent Advisory Council | <p>District staff attend all district Parent Advisory Council meetings. At a spring meeting of each council, they facilitated a discussion about the LCAP, sharing current goals and actions. Staff asked for feedback regarding these goals and actions, as well as the overall current strengths and needs of the district based on their experiences. District staff sat with individuals to listen to their feedback, and all discussions resulted in documentation that was synthesized and used to inform our new LCAP.</p> <p>Meeting dates for this formal conversation were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">DELAC (March 19, 2025)LPAC (May 13, 2025)AAPAC (April 16, 2025)SEPAC (April 10, 2025) <p>Note: SEPAC leaders consulted with SELPA and provided feedback on the LCAP to the district throughout the school year and at the April 10th meeting.</p> |
| LCAP Surveys: Secondary Students (6-12), Parents/Family Members, District Staff, Site Classified Staff, Site Teaching/Certificated Staff | Our district's annual LCAP survey was available for feedback from January 20th - February 14th. The district and school sites provided multiple notices to all educational partners about the survey and encouraged everyone's participation. Members of the Partnership for Thriving Students and Families (PTSF) reviewed the results of the |

| Educational Partner(s) | Process for Engagement |
|--|---|
| | <p>Parents/Family Members survey, looking for trends and areas of need which could be used to inform our LCAP.</p> <p>The district had the following participation in this year's survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary Students (6-12) 3,638 Parents/Family Members 2,039 District Staff 80 Site Classified Staff 209 Site Teaching/Certificated Staff 454 |
| <p>School Site Councils: Parents, Site Administrators, Site Classified Staff, Site Certificated/Teaching Staff</p> | <p>Our district continued the practice of garnering LCAP feedback by attending Site Council meetings. District staff facilitated a discussion about the LCAP, sharing current goals and actions. They asked for feedback regarding these goals and actions, as well as the overall current strengths and needs of their sites based on the members' experiences. District staff listened to their feedback and all discussions resulted in documentation that was synthesized and used to inform this year's LCAP. These engagement sessions gave district staff a better understanding of each site, how the LCAP actions and services affect them, and their site's specific needs at this time.</p> <p>The district was not able to schedule visits for all schools, but we did visit a large portion of school sites. We plan to make this a regular process so that all schools are visited at least every other year. This year, the following Site Councils took part in this process on the dates indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vista Murrieta High School (October 2, 2024) Dorothy McElhinney Middle School (November 20, 2024) Murrieta Valley High School (December 3, 2024) Monte Vista Elementary School (January 16, 2025) Murrieta Elementary School (February 20, 2025) Tovashal Elementary School (March 6, 2025) Buchanan Elementary School (March 18, 2025) E. Hale Curran Elementary School (April 10, 2025) |

| Educational Partner(s) | Process for Engagement |
|---|---|
| Partnership for Thriving Students and Families (PTSF): Parents, Site Administrators, District Staff, Site Classified Staff, Site Certificated/Teaching Staff, Students, Community Members, Murrieta Educators Association (MEA), California School Employees Association (CSEA) | <p>Our district continued to merge our LCAP Advisory with the Partnership for Thriving Students and Families (PTSF) this year to engage one representative group around the topic of family engagement and the development of the LCAP, as well as other district initiatives. This was a diverse group which brought together a variety of perspectives and led to thoughtful reflections about how to support our families, students, and classrooms. Each meeting included a deep dive into two or three actions or services funded by the LCAP, allowing the team to learn more about how these initiatives are being implemented and providing time for input, discussion, and collaboration.</p> <p>This team met five times throughout this year on October 3rd, December 5th, January 30th, March 20th, and May 15th.</p> |
| LCAP Student Advisories | <p>Our district's coordinator who oversees student and family engagement, along with site administrators, meets quarterly with secondary students who are from unduplicated or other focus student groups to gather feedback regarding their school and individual needs. Some of the topics this year included site Panorama data, school culture and climate, teacher/student relationships, and academic supports. There was also a focus on reviewing the site's behavior expectations and the messaging of these expectations to students. The feedback received from students during these meetings allows our coordinator and site administrators to identify next steps at the site and district levels. Input is integrated into the overall data and informs the development of the LCAP.</p> |

Murrieta Valley USD is committed to an authentic LCAP engagement process, as demonstrated by our multiple methods for garnering input, as well as our efforts to continue improving these methods. In particular, the district recently made an intentional decision to merge two advisories to more effectively gain feedback from a variety of voices. Additionally, we expanded our opportunities for feedback by visiting school site councils and gaining input within the context of specific sites. Both of these initiatives were robust opportunities for us to strengthen our feedback systems and further our understanding of our district's needs.

Knowing that many of our current actions are tied to ongoing programs and personnel, our engagement process seeks to understand the impact of these actions on our students and school communities from the perspective of our educational partners. We want to continually validate these actions to ensure they remain relevant and effective, while also gathering specific feedback that can help us understand the effectiveness of their implementation. We have found that this input on implementation has had a meaningful influence on how we adapt our strategies to better meet student needs and improve outcomes.

The following actions, identified by goal, were validated and/or influenced by the feedback provided by educational partners:

Goal 1:

- 1.1 Additional Teachers for Smaller Class Sizes (K-3): This action was validated by feedback and continues to be a high priority for our community, particularly at the elementary level. Educational partners emphasized the benefits of smaller class sizes in fostering stronger student-teacher relationships, supporting individual learning needs, and creating a safe and nurturing environment for early learners.
- 1.2 Additional Counselors (TK-12): This action was strongly validated by feedback. Educational partners identified it as a high-impact support and expressed concern about maintaining supports with any fewer counselor positions. Middle school social-emotional support was noted as an area of particular need. Feedback will influence implementation in several ways: we will continue efforts to support counselors in deepening their understanding of college and career readiness; we will work toward more consistent practices across sites; and we will strengthen communication with staff and families to clarify the role of school counselors and how they can be effectively utilized.
- 1.3 Coordinators and PLT Leads: This action was validated by feedback. Educational partners spoke to the importance of maintaining a strong focus on Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) and highlighted the value of the training and support provided to PLT leads this year.
- 1.4 AVID: This action was highly validated by feedback. Educational partners highlighted the positive impact of AVID tutors, especially in math, describing them as a “game changer” for student support. Staff appreciated the opportunity to share AVID strategies during meetings and saw value in field trip experiences that expand college and career awareness. Feedback suggested a desire to bring AVID-aligned skills—such as organization and study habits—to all students more intentionally. To support this, the district will explore ways to help teachers more effectively teach these strategies and help students learn them, including the development of videos, one-pagers, or other tools. This will align with the roll-out of the district's new Instructional Model.
- 1.5 Career Technical Education (CTE): This action was validated by feedback. Industry and educational partners expressed strong support for expanding access to CTE and emphasized the importance of exposing students to pathway options earlier in their educational journey. Feedback also included questions about how the district is supporting the Adult Transition Program, which integrates job experiences into students' daily schedules. In response to input, the district will pilot a career exploration program at one of our middle schools this coming year, while continuing to explore additional opportunities to introduce CTE exposure at earlier grade levels and strengthen career readiness supports for students in specialized programs.

1.6 College and Career Readiness: This action was validated by feedback. Educational partners responded positively to the recently updated grade-level projects and appreciated the more balanced messaging that emphasizes both college and career pathways. The shift was seen as more inclusive and reflective of the diverse futures students may pursue.

Goal 2:

2.1 Elementary Intervention Teachers: This action was highly validated by feedback. Educational partners expressed appreciation for the structured focus of after-school interventions rolled out across the district this year and noted progress in integrating intervention supports into WIN (What I Need) time. Overall intervention efforts were seen as instrumental in providing targeted support and accelerating learning for students who need it most.

2.2 Additional Secondary Sections for Intervention: This action was validated by feedback. Educational partners affirmed the need for continued intervention opportunities at the secondary level to support students in meeting grade-level expectations and recovering credits when needed.

2.3 English Learner Program Support: This action was highly validated by feedback. Educational partners recognized the value of enhanced English Learner (EL) supports, particularly in recent curriculum adoptions, and spoke of their efforts to fully implement designated ELD instruction. The newly developed Master Plan for English Learners was praised as a clear and supportive guide for staff. Partners also expressed appreciation for resources like the EL Homework Club and Imagine Learning. Feedback highlighted areas for continued growth, including increasing parent engagement among EL families and providing stronger support for dually identified students (EL and Special Education). Feedback will influence implementation in the following ways: the district will explore various options for providing professional development for both ELD and general education teachers, increase efforts to promote the Master Plan to families, and continue to support parent engagement and dually identified students.

2.4 Intervention Programs and Support: This action was validated by feedback. Educational partners acknowledged the positive efforts to expand intervention supports, including for students in special education, and emphasized the importance of continuing this work. Feedback also pointed to the need for additional training in programs such as Freckle and STAR. This input will influence implementation by guiding the district to provide more targeted professional development to ensure these tools are used effectively across classrooms.

2.5 Long-Term English Learner (LTEL) Supports: This action was discussed with educational partners who pointed out the challenges of integrating designated LTEL support classes within existing school schedules. Some questioned whether these supports could be effectively combined with AVID strategies or classes. This feedback will influence implementation by informing how the district collaborates with school sites on master scheduling to ensure that LTEL students receive the targeted support they need.

Goal 3:

3.1 Instructional Coaches: This action was validated by feedback. Educational partners emphasized the critical role instructional coaches play in strengthening Tier 1 instruction across all grade levels. The intensive LETRS training in foundational literacy was highlighted as particularly impactful, along with the highly valued Ignite training for elementary teachers this past year. Coaches were recognized not only for delivering high-quality professional learning, but also for their ongoing, job-embedded support that helps teachers implement effective instructional practices in their classrooms.

3.2 Induction Program: This action was highly validated by feedback. Educational partners praised the personalized nature of the program and expressed strong appreciation for the support provided by mentors. The program was also recognized as an effective way to introduce new teachers to the district's culture and expectations, helping to build confidence and connection early in their careers.

3.4 Data and Assessment Programs: This action was validated by feedback. Educational partners emphasized the importance of data systems in supporting targeted programs such as AVID, as well as broader district efforts like improving student attendance. There was

notable interest in the rollout of EduClimber as a key tool for data-informed decision-making. Feedback will influence implementation in the coming year as the district expands access and training to additional staff groups to ensure effective use of these tools across school sites.

Goal 4:

4.1 Equitable and Inclusive Practices: This action was highly validated by feedback. Educational partners shared examples of how inclusion is being promoted across the district, including unified activities and increased access to programs. Attending the Equity Conference was seen as a valuable opportunity to deepen understanding and commitment to equity. Feedback also highlighted the continued presence of racial issues affecting students and emphasized the importance of holding all staff accountable for inclusive practices. This input will inform the implementation of this action by guiding continued professional development, site collaboration, and student education.

4.2 Educational Partner Engagement: This action was validated by feedback. Educational partners emphasized the importance of having opportunities to hear and share messages in safe spaces with others from similar backgrounds. There was strong interest in expanding these engagement opportunities at school sites. Feedback will inform implementation by guiding training for parent liaisons in key areas such as special education and highlighting the need to provide parents with more education on how to support their child academically.

4.3 Mental Health Supports and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS): This action was highly validated by feedback. Educational partners shared that they have seen an impact from this work, particularly highlighting the positive effect of the Playworks program and the behavioral coaches on school culture. Feedback will inform implementation in several ways: by involving counselors more directly in MTSS efforts, strengthening student screening processes through the new Satchel Pulse program, and exploring opportunities to expand successful elementary practices to middle schools.

4.4 Foster Youth Support Services: This action was validated by feedback. Educational partners recognized the importance of continued support for foster youth and emphasized the need to create a stronger sense of community and belonging for these students. This input will inform implementation by guiding efforts to build connections, provide consistent support, and ensure that foster youth feel seen, supported, and included across school sites.

4.5 Attendance Supports: This action was validated by feedback. Educational partners noted successes in targeted transportation efforts to support attendance and emphasized the importance of continuing to address attendance barriers. Feedback also highlighted the need for sensitive and positive messaging around attendance, especially for families facing challenges. Suggestions that will inform implementation include creating welcoming visuals, such as posters, and continuing to build strong partnerships with families to address the barriers to attendance. Ideas such as a TK/K attendance campaign were also shared as possible ways to engage families early and promote the importance of regular attendance.

In addition to our current actions, the following feedback was provided by educational partners as significant areas that should be included or captured in the LCAP:

* Math support: Educational partners identified this as a continued need. There is a concern about student achievement in math and the ability for students to get support when they fall behind. Math is a goal in our Board of Education's Annual Goals and Directions. While no actions will be added specifically for math in the LCAP, several of the current actions will support this need, including but not limited to: Goal 1 Action 3 (Coordinators and PLT Leads), Goal 2 Action 1 (Intervention Teachers), Goal 2 Action 2 (Intervention Sections), and Goal 3 Action 1 (Instructional Coaches). This year, our elementary teams will be implementing a new Math curriculum adoption. Additionally, the district will continue offering professional development in Math through the Math Institute and expand this offering to elementary teachers. PLT's and intervention will focus on supporting all students in achieving math proficiency.

* Safety: Educational partners expressed an appreciation for the recent efforts in safety, including the roll-out of the Raptor Emergency Management System and the development of an elementary parent advisory. While no actions will be added specifically for safety in the

LCAP, several of the current actions will support this focus area, including but not limited to: Goal 1 Action 2 (Counselors) and Goal 4 Action 4 (Mental Health Supports and MTSS).

* Professional development for classified staff: While the district is making strides in this area, educational partners identified this as a continued need, particularly for those working directly, in instructional or playground settings, with students. This feedback will influence Goal 4, Action 3 (Mental Health Supports and MTSS) so that intentional plans are in place to train classified staff in addressing and supporting student behavior. Training for classified staff is also part of the Board of Education's Annual Goals and Directions and will be a continued priority in the coming year.

Goals and Actions

Goal

| Goal # | Description | Type of Goal |
|--------|--|--------------|
| 1 | Student Learning and Achievement: Ensure all students have access to high quality actions and services that increase student learning, academic achievement, and college and career readiness. | Broad Goal |

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Student learning and achievement is at the core of what we do as a district. Murrieta Valley USD is committed to ensuring high levels of learning for all students. Based on an analysis of our academic achievement data, there is a continued need to keep our focus on this goal.

Performance in English Language Arts and Mathematics is a success based on the 2023 California Dashboard with both classified as Green, but there is a need for continued improvement. English Language Arts scores are 16.1 points above the standard, but scores maintained this year rather than increasing. Additionally, two student groups at specific schools in our district are identified as Red: English Learners and Students with Disabilities. Mathematics scores increased 4.1 points from the previous year, but overall we are scoring 22.2 points below the standard. Additionally, one school and multiple student groups at specific schools in our district are identified as Red.

Through the implementation of Goal 1 actions (additional teachers for smaller class sizes, additional counselors TK-12, coordinators and PLT Leads, Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) program, Career Technical Education, and college/career readiness), we expect to see growth in student learning and achievement as evidenced by Goal 1 metrics.

Measuring and Reporting Results

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|---|---|----------------|---|--|
| 1.1 | <p>iReady K - 3 (% at grade level)</p> <p>Increase % at grade level by 2% annually for all grade levels and student groups</p> <p>Source: Power BI</p> | <p>December 2023</p> <p>ELA Kinder 60.0% 1st Grade 39.8% 2nd Grade 58.4% 3rd Grade 68.1%</p> <p>All (K-3) 56.9% EL 32.8% SED 49.0% SWD 33.2% AA 54.5% HI 51.7% FY 43.9%</p> <p>Math Kinder 38.5% 1st Grade 24.8% 2nd Grade 32.6% 3rd Grade 37.8%</p> <p>All (K-3) 33.5% EL 16.4% SED 25.9% SWD 22.4% AA 26.4% HI 27.7% FY 17.1%</p> | <p>December 2024</p> <p>ELA Kinder 60.3% 1st Grade 39.0% 2nd Grade 55.6% 3rd Grade 70.7%</p> <p>All (K-3) 56.9% EL 29.3% SED 49.7% SWD 36.4% AA 51.6% HI 52.0% FY 30.6%</p> <p>Math Kinder 38.6% 1st Grade 26.3% 2nd Grade 32.2% 3rd Grade 39.5%</p> <p>All (K-3) 34.2% EL 16.7% SED 34.2% SWD 21.2% AA 19.7% HI 27.7% FY 13.9%</p> | | <p>December 2026</p> <p>ELA Kinder 66.0% 1st Grade 45.8% 2nd Grade 64.4% 3rd Grade 74.1%</p> <p>All (K-3) 62.9% EL 38.8% SED 55.0% SWD 39.2% AA 60.5% HI 57.7% FY 49.9%</p> <p>Math Kinder 44.5% 1st Grade 30.8% 2nd Grade 38.6% 3rd Grade 43.8%</p> <p>All (K-3) 39.5% EL 22.4% SED 31.9% (38.2% new) SWD 28.4% AA 32.4% HI 33.7% FY 23.1%</p> | <p>December 2024</p> <p>ELA Kinder +0.3% 1st Grade -0.8% 2nd Grade -2.8% 3rd Grade +2.6%</p> <p>All (K-3) +0.0% EL -3.5% SED +0.7% SWD +3.2% AA -2.9% HI +0.3% FY -13.3%</p> <p>Math Kinder +0.1% 1st Grade +1.5% 2nd Grade -0.4% 3rd Grade +1.7%</p> <p>All (K-3) +0.7% EL +0.3% SED +8.3% SWD -1.2% AA -6.7% HI -0.0% FY -3.2%</p> |
| 1.2 | CAASPP Grade 3 (% meets/ exceeds standard) | <p>Spring 2023</p> <p>ELA</p> | <p>Spring 2024</p> <p>ELA</p> | | <p>Spring 2026</p> <p>ELA</p> | <p>Spring 2024</p> <p>ELA</p> |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|---|---|----------------|--|---|
| | Increase % meets/exceeds standard by 2% annually overall and for all student groups Source: DataQuest | ALL 49.2% EL 20.6% SED 41.7% SWD 26.7% AA 36.0% HI 42.5% FY NA | ALL 52.8% EL 23.4% SED 45.2% SWD 33.0% AA 38.9% HI 47.2% FY NA | | ALL 55.2% EL 26.6% SED 47.7% SWD 32.7% (37.0% new) AA 42.0% HI 48.5% FY NA | ALL +3.6% EL +2.8% SED +3.5% SWD +6.3% AA +2.9% HI +4.7% FY NA |
| | | Math ALL 52.0% EL 28.7% SED 43.8% SWD 31.3% AA 23.0% HI 44.8% FY NA | Math ALL 55.4% EL 31.8% SED 45.0% SWD 34.1% AA 43.1% HI 47.8% FY NA | | Math ALL 58.0% EL 34.7% SED 49.8% SWD 37.3% AA 29.0% (47.1% new) HI 50.8% FY NA | Math ALL +3.4% EL +3.1% SED +1.2% SWD +2.8% AA +20.1% HI +3.0% FY NA |
| 1.3 | A-G Requirements Increase % meeting A-G requirements by 2% annually overall and for all student groups Source: Dashboard | 2023 Cohort ALL 57.0% EL 31.0% SED 48.3% SWD 13.0% AA 55.0% HI 50.9% FY NA | 2024 Cohort ALL 60.0% EL 35.1% SED 52.8% SWD 19.9% AA 56.3% HI 54.1% FY NA | | 2026 Cohort ALL 63.0% EL 37.0% SED 54.3% SWD 19.0% (23.9% new) AA 61.0% HI 56.9% FY NA | 2024 Cohort ALL +3.0% EL +4.1% SED +4.5% SWD +6.9% AA +1.3% HI +3.2% FY NA |
| 1.4 | A-G Requirements + CTE Pathway Completion Increase % meeting A-G requirements and completing CTE pathway | 2023 Cohort ALL 7.4% EL 3.4% SED 5.3% SWD 1.6% AA 5.4% | 2024 Cohort ALL 9.2% EL 6.3% SED 7.3% SWD 1.2% AA 4.8% | | 2026 Cohort ALL 13.4% EL 9.4% SED 11.3% SWD 7.6% AA 11.4% | 2024 Cohort ALL +1.8% EL +2.9% SED +2.0% SWD -0.4% AA -0.6% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|---|---|----------------|---|---|
| | by 2% annually overall and for all student groups Source: Dashboard | HI 6.2% FY NA | HI 7.3% FY NA | | HI 12.2% FY NA | HI +1.1% FY NA |
| 1.5 | CTE Pathway Completion Increase % completing a CTE pathway by 1% annually overall and for all student groups Source: Dashboard | 2023 Cohort ALL 9.1% EL 6.9% SED 7.0% SWD 3.8% AA 7.8% HI 7.8% FY NA | 2024 Cohort ALL 13.4% EL 9.0% SED 11.3% SWD 9.0% AA 6.3% HI 11.0% FY NA | | 2026 Cohort ALL 12.1% (15.4% new) EL 9.9% SED 10.0% (13.3% new) SWD 6.8% (11.0% new) AA 10.8% HI 10.8% (13.0% new) FY NA | 2024 Cohort ALL +4.3% EL +2.1% SED +4.3% SWD +5.2% AA -1.5% HI +3.2% FY NA |
| 1.6 | CCI Rate Increase % meeting college and career indicator by 2% annually overall and for all student groups Source: Dashboard | 2023 Cohort ALL 53.7% EL 26.4% SED 44.7% SWD 11.5% AA 42.6% HI 46.0% FY NA | 2024 Cohort ALL 58.8% EL 28.4% SED 51.7% SWD 18.8% AA 50.8% HI 52.5% FY NA | | 2026 Cohort ALL 59.7% EL 32.4% SED 50.7% (55.7% new) SWD 17.5% (22.8% new) AA 48.6% (54.8% new) HI 52.0% (56.5% new) FY NA | 2024 Cohort ALL +5.1% EL +2.0% SED +7.0% SWD +7.3% AA +8.2% HI +6.5% FY NA |
| 1.7 | CAASPP (% meets/exceeds standard) | Spring 2023 5th Grade ELA | Spring 2024 5th Grade ELA | | Spring 2026 5th Grade ELA | Spring 2024 5th Grade ELA |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|--|--|----------------|--|--|
| | Increase % meets/exceeds standard by 2% annually for all grade levels and student groups Source: DataQuest | ALL 53.7% EL 13.5% SED 46.7% SWD 20.5% AA 32.9% HI 42.0% FY NA | ALL 54.6% EL 16.8% SED 45.7% SWD 21.0% AA 39.8% HI 46.4% FY NA | | ALL 59.7% EL 19.5% SED 52.7% SWD 26.5% AA 38.9% (43.8% new) HI 48.0% FY NA | ALL +0.9% EL +3.3% SED -1.0% SWD +0.5% AA +6.9% HI +4.4% FY NA |
| | 5th Grade Math | ALL 42.4% EL 11.5% SED 35.4% SWD 13.8% AA 20.0% HI 28.4% FY NA | ALL 44.7% EL 10.4% SED 34.9% SWD 17.9% AA 29.5% HI 36.6% FY NA | | 5th Grade Math ALL 48.4% EL 17.5% SED 41.4% SWD 19.8% AA 26.0% (33.5% new) HI 34.4% (40.6% new) FY NA | 5th Grade Math ALL +2.3% EL -1.1% SED -0.5% SWD +4.1% AA +9.5% HI +8.2% FY NA |
| | 8th Grade ELA | ALL 58.1% EL 11.1% SED 50.4% SWD 15.8% AA 44.0% HI 51.8% FY NA | ALL 61.0% EL 7.7% SED 52.7% SWD 27.8% AA 50.6% HI 54.8% FY NA | | 8th Grade ELA ALL 64.1% EL 17.1% SED 56.4% SWD 21.8% (31.8% new) AA 50.0% (54.6% new) HI 57.8% FY NA | 8th Grade ELA ALL +2.9% EL -3.4% SED +2.3% SWD +12.0% AA +6.6% HI +3.0% FY NA |
| | 8th Grade Math | ALL 41.9% EL 7.9% SED 35.1% SWD 12.1% AA 29.3% | ALL 45.3% EL 6.4% SED 35.9% SWD 12.9% AA 18.9% | | 8th Grade Math ALL 47.9% EL 13.9% SED 41.1% SWD 18.1% AA 35.3% | 8th Grade Math ALL +3.4% EL -1.5% SED +0.8% SWD +0.8% AA -10.4% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|---|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | HI 34.2% FY NA | HI 39.1% FY NA | | HI 40.2% FY NA | HI +4.9% FY NA |
| | | 11th Grade ELA ALL 72.5% EL 12.9% SED 64.4% SWD 34.1% AA 67.5% HI 66.8% FY NA | 11th Grade ELA ALL 74.6% EL 17.1% SED 68.8% SWD 33.1% AA 65.4% HI 70.6% FY NA | | 11th Grade ELA ALL 78.5% EL 18.9% SED 70.4% SWD 40.1% AA 73.5% HI 72.8% FY NA | 11th Grade ELA ALL +2.1% EL +4.2% SED +4.4% SWD -1.0% AA -2.1% HI +3.8% FY NA |
| | | 11th Grade Math All 38.1% EL 1.4% SED 28.8% SWD 8.3% AA 20.0% HI 29.2% FY NA | 11th Grade Math All 38.2% EL 2.4% SED 29.6% SWD 5.3% AA 21.4% HI 30.5% FY NA | | 11th Grade Math All 44.1% EL 7.4% SED 34.8% SWD 14.3% AA 26.0% HI 35.2% FY NA | 11th Grade Math All +0.1% EL +1.0% SED +0.8% SWD -3.0% AA +1.4% HI +1.3% FY NA |
| 1.8 | CAST (% meets/exceeds standard) Increase % meets/exceeds standard by 2% annually for all grade levels and student groups Source: DataQuest | Spring 2023 5th Grade ALL 38.8% EL 4.9% SED 31.7% SWD 13.7% AA 25.8% HI 30.5% FY NA 8th Grade ALL 39.2% EL 1.5% SED 31.7% | Spring 2024 5th Grade ALL 42.1% EL 7.2% SED 33.1% SWD 16.6% AA 31.7% HI 30.9% FY NA 8th Grade ALL 44.2% EL 2.6% SED 36.0% | | Spring 2026 5th Grade ALL 44.8% EL 10.9% SED 37.7% SWD 19.7% AA 31.8% HI 36.5% FY NA 8th Grade ALL 45.2% EL 7.5% SED 37.7% | Spring 2024 5th Grade ALL +3.3% EL +2.3% SED +1.4% SWD +2.9% AA +5.9% HI +0.4% FY NA 8th Grade ALL +5.0% EL +1.1% SED +4.3% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|--|---|----------------|---|---|
| | | SWD 10.3% AA 27.1% HI 31.3% FY NA | SWD 15.2% AA 24.7% HI 36.6% FY NA | | SWD 16.3% AA 33.1% HI 37.3% FY NA | SWD +4.9% AA -2.4% HI +5.3% FY NA |
| | | 11th Grade ALL 46.5% EL1.5% SED 37.7% SWD 17.3% AA 28.4% HI 37.9% FY NA | 11th Grade ALL 46.3% EL 0.0% SED 39.3% SWD 11.2% AA 27.7% HI 40.9% FY NA | | 11th Grade ALL 52.5% EL7.5% SED 43.7% SWD 23.3% AA 34.4% HI 43.9% FY NA | 11th Grade ALL -0.2% EL -1.5% SED +1.6% SWD -6.1% AA -0.7% HI +3.0% FY NA |
| 1.9 | Avaxat CAASPP, CAST, Chronic Absenteeism Increase % meets/exceeds standard by 2% annually (CAASPP and CAST) overall and for all student groups Source: DataQuest Decrease % chronic absenteeism rate by 2% annually (Chronic Absenteeism) overall and for all student groups Source: Dashboard | Spring 2023 CAASPP ELA ALL 37.8% EL 4.7% SED 34.4% SWD 14.3% AA 30.8% HI 33.7% FY NA | Spring 2024 CAASPP ELA ALL 35.4% EL 11.4% SED 30.1% SWD 11.5% AA 26.3% HI 34.1% FY NA | | Spring 2026 CAASPP ELA ALL 43.8% EL 10.7% (15.4% new) SED 40.4% SWD 20.3% AA 36.8% HI 39.7% FY NA | Spring 2024 CAASPP ELA ALL -2.4% EL +6.7% SED -4.3% SWD -2.8% AA -4.5% HI +0.4% FY NA |
| | | CAASPP Math ALL 31.6% EL 7.0% SED 25.8% SWD 13.1% AA 11.5% HI 27.7% FY NA | CAASPP Math ALL 33.3% EL 18.4% SED 27.1% SWD 11.7% AA 26.3% HI 27.8% FY NA | | CAASPP Math ALL 37.6% EL 13.0% (22.4% new) SED 31.8% SWD 19.1% AA 17.5% (30.3% new) HI 33.7% FY NA | CAASPP Math ALL +1.7% EL +11.4% SED +1.3% SWD -1.4% AA +14.8% HI +0.1% FY NA |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|--|--|----------------|--|--|
| | | CAST ALL 28.7% EL 11.1% SED 27.5% SWD 12.0% AA 15.4% HI 22.0% Foster NA | CAST ALL 25.4% EL 0.0% SED 20.4% SWD 3.6% AA NA HI 16.2% Foster NA | | CAST ALL 34.7% EL 17.1% SED 33.5% SWD 18.0% AA 21.4% HI 28.0% Foster NA | CAST ALL -3.3% EL -11.1% SED -7.1% SWD -8.4% AA NA HI -5.8% Foster NA |
| | | Chronic Absenteeism ALL 34.0% EL 28.9% SED 37.1% SWD 47.0% AA 38.3% HI 34.2% FY NA | Chronic Absenteeism ALL 24.8% EL 19.8% SED 27.3% SWD 32.3% AA 35.7% HI 25.8% FY NA | | Chronic Absenteeism ALL 28.0% (20.8% new) EL 22.9% (15.8% new) SED 31.1% (23.3% new) SWD 41.0% (28.3% new) AA 32.3% HI 28.2% (21.8% new) FY NA | Chronic Absenteeism ALL -9.2% EL -9.1% SED -9.8% SWD -14.7% AA -2.6% HI -8.4% FY NA |
| 1.10 | AVID Participation Increase AVID school-wide participation rates by 1% annually overall and maintain current representation levels within AVID for all student groups Source: Power BI | January 2024 Middle School ALL 12.8% EL 2.8% SED 72.1% SWD 4.1% AA 9.0% HI 57.8% FY 0.6% | January 2025 Middle School ALL 10.9% EL 2.7% SED 70.1% SWD 2.9% AA 9.4% HI 55.9% FY 0% | | January 2027 Middle School ALL 15.8% EL 8.8% SED 79.1% SWD 10.1% AA 15.0% HI 63.8% FY 6.6% | January 2025 Middle School ALL -1.9% EL -0.1% SED -2.0% SWD -1.2% AA +0.4% HI -1.9% FY -0.6% |
| | | High School ALL 11.9% | High School ALL 11.8% | | High School ALL 14.9% | High School ALL -0.1% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|---|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | EL 4.3% SED 70.0% SWD 4.3% AA 7.8% HI 62.9% FY 0.4% | EL 1.9% SED 69.2% SWD 3.6% AA 8.2% HI 61.3% FY 0.3% | | EL 10.3% SED 76.0% SWD 10.3% AA 13.8% HI 68.9% FY 6.4% | EL -2.4% SED -0.8% SWD -0.7% AA +0.4% HI -1.6% FY -0.1% |
| 1.11 | AVID Retention High School Increase AVID retention rate by 2% annually overall and at each high school Source: Power BI | 2023 Cohort ALL 50.0% MMHS 45.7% MVHS 49.3% VMHS 55.9% | 2024 Cohort ALL 51.4% MMHS 43.2% MVHS 53.2% VMHS 58.5% | | 2026 Cohort ALL 56.0% MMHS 51.7% MVHS 55.3% VMHS 61.9% | 2024 Cohort ALL +1.4% MMHS -2.5% MVHS +3.9% VMHS +2.6% |
| 1.12 | AVID GPA Middle and High School Increase % of AVID at or above 2.5 GPA by 2% annually at each middle and high school Source: Power BI | December 2023 DMMS 92.1% SMS 64.7% TMS 74.7% WSMS 90.6% MMHS 74.5% MVHS 76.0% VMHS 84.3% | December 2024 DMMS 83.1% SMS 66.3% TMS 75.8% WSMS 81.9% MMHS 80.2% MVHS 85.5% VMHS 85.5% | | December 2026 DMMS 98.1% SMS 70.7% TMS 80.7% WSMS 96.6% MMHS 80.5% MVHS 82.0% (89.5% new) VMHS 90.3% | December 2024 DMMS -9.0% SMS +1.6% TMS +1.1% WSMS -8.7% MMHS +5.7% MVHS +9.5% VMHS +1.2% |
| 1.13 | Early Academic Preparedness (EAP) Rate Increase EAP "Fully Prepared" rates in ELA and Math by 2% annually overall and for all student groups | Spring 2023 ELA ALL 38.5% EL 0.0% SED 29.8% SWD 10.7% AA 27.2% HI 29.4% | Spring 2024 ELA ALL 40.0% EL 0.0% SED 34.3% SWD 7.6% AA 24.0% HI 34.1% | | Spring 2026 ELA ALL 44.5% EL 6.0% SED 35.8% SWD 16.7% AA 33.2% HI 35.4% | Spring 2024 ELA ALL +1.5% EL 0.0% SED +4.5% SWD -3.1% AA -3.2% HI +4.7% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|--|--|----------------|--|--|
| | Source: DataQuest | FY NA Math All 14.6% EL 0.0% SED 8.0% SWD 1.1% AA 2.6% HI 8.9% FY NA | FY NA Math All 16.4% EL 0.0% SED 12.5% SWD 2.0% AA 5.8% HI 11.8% FY NA | | FY NA Math All 20.6% EL 6.0% SED 14.0% SWD 7.1% AA 8.6% HI 14.9% FY NA | FY NA Math ALL +1.8% EL 0.0% SED +4.5% SWD +0.9% AA +3.2% HI +2.9% FY NA |
| 1.14 | AP Pass Rate Increase % of students completing AP exams with a score of 3 or higher by 2% annually overall and for all student groups Source: College Board and Power BI | Spring 2023 ALL 65.8% EL NA SED 52.8% SWD NA AA 54.7% HI 63.3% FY NA | Spring 2024 ALL 69.2% EL NA SED 64.8% SWD NA AA 68.9% HI 66.0% FY NA | | Spring 2026 ALL 71.8% EL NA SED 58.8% (68.8% new) SWD NA AA 60.7% (72.9% new) HI 69.3% FY NA | Spring 2024 ALL +3.4% EL NA SED +12.0% SWD NA AA +14.2% HI +2.7% FY NA |
| 1.15 | AP Participation Rate Increase % participation of students in SED and Hispanic student group 2% annually to align with proportionality data Source: Power BI | 2022-23 School Year EL 1.0% SED 40.9% SWD 2.1% AA 7.1% HI 36.5% FY 0.0% | 2023-24 School Year EL 0.6% SED 41.3% SWD 1.7% AA 5.7% HI 37.7% FY 0.1% | | 2025-26 School Year EL 1.0% SED 46.9% SWD 2.1% AA 7.1% HI 42.5% FY 0.0% | 2023-24 School Year EL -0.4% SED +0.4% SWD -0.4% AA -1.4% HI +1.2% FY +0.1% |
| 1.16 | Standards-aligned Instructional Materials | 2023-24 School Year | 2024-25 School Year | | 2026-27 School Year | 2024-25 School Year |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|--|--|----------------|--|---|
| | <p>Maintain 100% of students in the school district have access to the standards-aligned instructional materials</p> <p>Source: Destiny</p> | 100% of students in the school district have access to the standards-aligned instructional materials. | 100% of students in the school district have access to the standards-aligned instructional materials. | | 100% of students in the school district have access to the standards-aligned instructional materials. | +/-0% of students in the school district have access to the standards-aligned instructional materials. |
| 1.17 | <p>CA Dashboard Local Indicators</p> <p>Priority 2 Reflection Tool, Question 2 Attain and/or Maintain a score of 4 or higher for all subject areas</p> <p>Source: Local Indicator Self-Reflection Tool</p> | <p>Spring 2024</p> <p>LEA instructional materials aligned with standards and/or curriculum frameworks (1-5)</p> <p>ELA (4) ELD (3) Mathematics (1) NGSS (4) Social Science (4)</p> | <p>Spring 2025</p> <p>LEA instructional materials aligned with standards and/or curriculum frameworks (1-5)</p> <p>ELA (5) ELD (4) Mathematics (3) NGSS (4) Social Science (4)</p> | | <p>Spring 2027</p> <p>LEA instructional materials aligned with standards and/or curriculum frameworks (1-5)</p> <p>ELA (5) ELD (4) (5 new) Mathematics (4) NGSS (5) Social Science (5)</p> | <p>Spring 2025</p> <p>LEA instructional materials aligned with standards and/or curriculum frameworks (1-5)</p> <p>ELA +1 ELD +1 Mathematics +2 NGSS 0 Social Science 0</p> |

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

The Murrieta Valley Unified School District implemented all Goal 1 actions. These actions were important in addressing student achievement which is at the core of what we do as a district. The district was intentionally focused on implementing Goal 1 actions and services to meet the learning needs of our unduplicated and identified student groups.

The district experienced several notable successes in the implementation of Goal 1 actions this year. The Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) were a key area of progress, with site leads receiving targeted training on how to effectively guide their teams. This investment strengthened site-level collaboration, particularly around the use of data and common assessments, and reinforced alignment with district focus areas. Efforts to promote college and career readiness remained a priority, and high school grade-level projects were updated to better reflect this goal. In support of early exploration, the district developed a middle school career exploration model, which will move into formal pilot implementation next year. Additional highlights include the continued expansion of the Education Pathway at two high schools and the successful coordination of career fairs at all elementary school sites. Despite these advancements, the district faced challenges in sustaining smaller class sizes in the primary grades across the district overall. Additionally, competing site-level initiatives have prompted a re-evaluation of the district's AVID Elementary program moving forward.

There were no substantive differences between planned and implemented Goal 1 actions.

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

The district used a 10% threshold (above or below budget) to define a substantive difference.

Action 1.6 was fully implemented, however the expenditures reflect a decrease of 25% because several expenditures came in lower than projected due to need/participation. This was the case for Advanced Coursework Readiness Program tutoring, AP waivers, substitutes, and conference attendance; fewer participants accessed these services than anticipated. We also spent less on the profile of a graduate due to the contract coming down in price and re-prints of the posters not being needed.

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

1.1 The allocation of additional teachers to maintain smaller class sizes in grades K–3 contributed meaningfully to the district's efforts to support early academic success and improve foundational literacy and numeracy skills. By reducing the student-to-teacher ratio in primary classrooms, teachers were better able to provide individualized attention, differentiate instruction, and respond more effectively to student needs. All available achievement data, including CAASPP and iReady results, show a positive trend, reflecting the impact of this strategy on student learning. Educational partners continue to emphasize the importance of maintaining smaller class sizes at these grade levels, particularly in light of the behavioral challenges that have become more common in early grades. This action has been especially important for English learners, students from low-income families, students in foster care or experiencing homelessness, and students with disabilities—groups who benefit significantly from increased adult support, stronger relationships, and more responsive instruction during these critical early years.

1.2 The addition of counselors across grades TK–12 has strengthened the district's college and career readiness efforts through a comprehensive set of aligned services. A key focus of training for counselors this year was on ensuring access to Career Technical Education (CTE) pathways and advanced coursework, helping students make informed choices about their academic and career trajectories. Counselors expanded early exposure to college and career pathways, implemented career fairs at every elementary school, and provided academic and mental health support at all grade level. The development of a common course catalog across high schools helped ensure access to consistent course planning information, and counselors held family information nights to help students and parents understand A–G requirements, college applications, and financial aid. These coordinated actions have contributed to measurable gains: the district experienced an increase in students meeting A–G requirements, higher rates of CTE pathway completion, and a significant jump in its College and Career Indicator (CCI). The district's strong graduation rates can be attributed, in part, to the efforts of our counselors to monitor students' progress. This action has been particularly impactful for English learners, low-income students, foster and homeless youth, and students with disabilities, offering these students greater access to personalized guidance, postsecondary planning, and timely academic or wellness support.

1.3 District coordinators and PLT leads played a critical role in supporting the implementation of Goal 1 through oversight, leadership, and direct support to schools. Coordinators provided districtwide leadership in key areas including technology, assessment, secondary instruction, and the arts. Their efforts helped guide the district's proactive integration of artificial intelligence, including the development of usage guidelines for students and staff. They also led to the successful rollout of EduClimber, a tool that staff are beginning to use for data analysis, MTSS implementation, and tracking of academic progress. In addition, they supported the creation of a common course catalog, the redesign of grade-level projects to better align with district priorities, and communication and site planning around Proposition 28 funding for arts education. PLT leads were instrumental in sustaining and expanding the professional learning team initiative. They participated in focused training on how to lead PLTs and guide instructional collaboration, which resulted in increased alignment around common assessments and deeper engagement with student data. Evidence of this impact can be seen in districtwide academic growth, including upward trends in CAASPP scores for ELA and math, as well as improvements on the CAST science assessment. These coordinated efforts have strengthened instruction and data use in ways that directly support English learners, low-income students, foster and homeless youth, and students with disabilities—ensuring these groups have access to high-quality instruction, well-aligned supports, and a more responsive educational environment.

1.4 The district continued its strong implementation of the Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) program across all secondary school sites and one elementary school, reinforcing its commitment to preparing all students for college and career success. AVID is designed to close opportunity gaps by providing students—especially those traditionally underrepresented in higher education—with academic support, organizational strategies, and a college-going mindset. The program emphasizes writing, inquiry, collaboration, and reading, while also helping students develop skills in time management, note-taking, and self-advocacy. This year, one of our middle schools was recognized as an AVID National Demonstration School, joining one existing demonstration site and two other sites designated as Schools of Distinction. A key area of expansion was the extension of AVID tutors into high school math classrooms to provide targeted academic support to a broader range of students and to build the capacity of teachers in implementing new models of instruction. Beginning next year, Avaxat Elementary will no longer operate as an AVID site. This decision was made thoughtfully, recognizing the challenges of fully implementing AVID strategies alongside other key elementary initiatives. At the secondary level, however, AVID continues to be a vital and impactful component of our district's college and career readiness efforts. Metrics reflecting the program's success include growth in AVID students' GPAs, particularly at the high school level, as well as increases in the district's College and Career Indicator (CCI) rate and A–G completion rate. AVID continues to play a critical role in supporting English learners, low-income students, foster and homeless youth, and students with disabilities—providing them with access to rigorous coursework, mentoring, and a pathway to postsecondary readiness.

1.5 The district continued to prioritize the expansion and enhancement of Career Technical Education (CTE) as a key strategy to support college and career readiness. A significant structural shift this year was the decision to move toward two-course pathways, designed to increase flexibility and provide students with broader opportunities to explore various career options before graduation. Additionally, the Education Pathway expanded with the implementation of a second course at one high school and the launch of a new pathway at another, offering students deeper, sequenced learning in a high-demand field. At the middle school level, the district collaborated with site leaders to design a model for career exploration that will better prepare students for future pathway decisions. This course will be piloted in the coming school year. To further support student planning, the district developed clear programs of study for each CTE pathway. Regular advisory meetings and sector-specific gatherings were held throughout the year, with the notable inclusion of special education representatives in each sector's advisory session last semester. This was an intentional step toward increasing awareness and support for students with disabilities as a designated special population in CTE, with the goal of providing more appropriate and effective access to pathway opportunities. These actions have had a measurable impact, contributing to strong growth in both the College and Career Indicator (CCI) and CTE pathway completion rates. The district's approach continues to strengthen access for English learners, low-income students, foster and homeless youth, and particularly students with disabilities—ensuring these students are informed, supported, and connected to meaningful postsecondary options.

1.6 The district's College and Career Readiness efforts reflect a wide-ranging and coordinated approach to preparing students for life beyond high school. This year, we integrated multiple initiatives to create a more cohesive system from elementary through high school. High school kick-off events at middle schools helped students and families understand academic and extracurricular options early on, while career fairs at elementary schools introduced students to a wide range of careers in an engaging and developmentally appropriate way. At the high school level, the district expanded access to college-aligned opportunities through Advanced Coursework Readiness Program or ACRP-funded tutoring for AP, IB, and Dual Enrollment courses, as well as by offering exam fee waivers for AP, IB, and PSAT exams to reduce financial barriers. The district also maintained a "summer melt" outreach program to support graduating seniors as they transition into postsecondary life, helping them follow through on college, training, or career plans. An additional layer for helping students acquire a job included job readiness workshops for resumes, interviewing, financial literacy, and apprenticeships and culminated in a job fair targeting those senior students. A major accomplishment this year was the collaborative alignment of the district's Profile of a Graduate with updated grade-level

projects, thanks to the work of teacher, counselor, and administrative representatives from all four high schools. In addition, the district created clear programs of study for various postsecondary paths—including apprenticeships, college and university, military service, and the trades—to support informed student decision-making. These activities were carefully aligned across elementary, middle, and high school to ensure continuity and awareness at each level. These collective efforts directly contributed to a measurable increase in the district's College and Career Indicator (CCI) rate, reflecting stronger student preparation and participation in college- and career-aligned activities. As with other Goal 1 strategies, this work has been especially important in supporting English learners, low-income students, foster and homeless youth, and students with disabilities by broadening access to critical information, academic supports, and future-ready opportunities.

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

Metrics

1.1 i-Ready K-3 (% at grade level) - SED met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 38.2%.

1.2 CAASPP Grade 3 (% meets/ exceeds standard) - SWD met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 37.0%; AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 47.1%.

1.3 A-G Requirements - SWD met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 23.9%.

1.5 CTE Pathway Completion - All students met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 15.4%; SED met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 13.3%; SWD met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 11.0%; HI met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 13.0%.

1.6 CCI Rate - SED met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 55.7%; SWD met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 22.8%; AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 54.8%; HI met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 56.5%.

1.7 CAASPP (% meets/ exceeds standard) - 5th grade ELA AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 43.8%; 5th grade Math AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 33.5%; 5th grade Math HI met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 40.6%; 8th grade ELA SWD met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 31.8%; 8th grade ELA AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 54.6%.

1.9 Avaxat CAASPP, CAST, Chronic Absenteeism - ELA EL met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 15.4%; Math EL met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 22.4%; Math AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 30.3%; Chronic Absenteeism - All, EL, SED, SWD, and HI met target for year 3 outcome so decreased those targets to 20.8% (All), 15.8% (EL), 23.3% (SED), 28.3% (SWD), and 21.8% (HI). These metrics and target outcomes will be discontinued in the upcoming years, as Avaxat will no longer be functioning as an AVID elementary school site.

1.12 AVID GPA Middle and High School - MVHS met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 89.5%.

1.14 AP Pass Rate - SED met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 68.8%; AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 72.9%.

1.17 CA Dashboard Local Indicators: Priority 2 Reflection Tool, Question 2 - ELD met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to (5).

Actions

1.1 Adjusted title of action to Additional Teachers for Smaller Class Sizes and reflected change in the description. We will not include "K - 3" in title and description since other grade levels are receiving funding through LREBG this year. Added that we will add metric 1.7 for monitoring this action. Adjusted location to All Schools.

1.3 The description was adjusted to include a description of the PLT Lead role.

1.4 Adjusted location of AVID to reflect All Secondary (6-12) Schools since Avaxat will not longer be functioning as an AVID elementary school site.

1.5 Adjusted action description to reflect two-course pathways, rather than three. We are transitioning to two-course pathways in the coming school year.

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

Actions

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|----------|---|---|----------------|--------------|
| 1.1 | Additional Teachers for Smaller Class Sizes | Additional teachers at the K-3 level will provide teachers with a greater opportunity to differentiate instruction to meet the specific learning needs of students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth) to ensure they meet grade level standards. LREBG funds (\$503,568) will also create smaller class sizes at the secondary level, including RSP and SDC classes, for a similar purpose. Research supports this use of funds, demonstrating that smaller class sizes provide substantial academic improvement in cognitive subjects such as reading and math with positive effects continuing for many years. This action will be directed towards the English Learner and | \$2,533,984.00 | Yes |

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|----------|---|---|----------------|--------------|
| | | Students with Disabilities groups, at specific elementary schools, that are characterized as Red for English Language Arts performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as well as Students with Disabilities, at specific elementary schools, who are characterized as Red for Mathematics performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. | | |
| 1.2 | Additional Counselors TK - 12 | Additional counselors at the elementary, middle, and high school levels will ensure students' social emotional well-being and college/career readiness, with a focus on providing services and support to students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). This action will also be directed towards the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students at Murrieta Canyon Academy, Hispanic students at Murrieta Canyon Academy, and Students with Disabilities at Vista Murrieta HS that are characterized as Very Low on the College/Career Indicator on the 2023 Dashboard. | \$3,858,945.00 | Yes |
| 1.3 | Coordinators and PLT Leads | Coordinators will support student learning by providing services in areas such as data disaggregation and analysis, curriculum and standards implementation, instructional technology and computer science, college/career readiness, and visual/performing arts, with a focus on providing services and support to students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). PLT Leads will facilitate team collaboration, guide data-driven discussions, and support the implementation of effective instructional practices. This action will also be directed towards the English Learner and Students with Disabilities groups, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for English Language Arts performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as well as Murrieta Canyon Academy, specific student groups at Murrieta Canyon Academy, and Students with Disabilities and English Learners, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for Mathematics performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. | \$1,334,915.00 | Yes |
| 1.4 | Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program | The AVID program at all Secondary Schools will provide students with academic support including organizational tools, academic planning/monitoring, tutoring, and college/career awareness with a focus on providing services and support to first generation college students and students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). | \$2,482,230.00 | Yes |

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------|--------------|
| | | | | |
| 1.5 | Career Technical Education (CTE) | Career Technical Education will provide students with opportunities to gain industry experience in a career pathway to prepare them for high wage, high skill, and high demand careers, with a focus on promoting these programs to students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). This action will also be directed towards the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students at Murrieta Canyon Academy, Hispanic students at Murrieta Canyon Academy, and Students with Disabilities at Vista Murrieta HS that are characterized as Very Low on the College/Career Indicator on the 2023 Dashboard. | \$3,473,405.00 | Yes |
| 1.6 | College/Career Readiness | The College/Career Readiness action will provide supplemental supports to promote post high school awareness, exploration, and preparation, with a focus on supporting students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth) in this area. This action will also be directed towards the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students at Murrieta Canyon Academy, Hispanic students at Murrieta Canyon Academy, and Students with Disabilities at Vista Murrieta HS that are characterized as Very Low on the College/Career Indicator on the 2023 Dashboard. | \$153,818.00 | Yes |

Goals and Actions

Goal

| Goal # | Description | Type of Goal |
|--------|---|--------------|
| 2 | Intervention: Provide high quality early intervention actions and services to close achievement gaps and ensure high levels of learning for all students. | Broad Goal |

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Intervention actions and services ensure all students receive targeted supports to enable them to achieve the standards. Based on an analysis of our academic achievement data, there is a continued need to have an intentional focus on intervention efforts to close achievement gaps for students in unduplicated student groups. The CA Dashboard data illustrates this need, as performance in English Language Arts is characterized as Green, but a number of student groups are not, including English Learners and Foster Youth who are characterized as Orange. In Mathematics the district is also characterized as Green, but most student groups are not, including Socioeconomically Disadvantaged which is Yellow and English Learners and Foster Youth students which are Orange. Additionally, the district is characterized as Orange when it comes to the English Learner Progress Indicator, with 50.8% of students making progress towards English language proficiency, a rate that declined 2.4% from the prior year.

Through the implementation of the Goal 2 actions (elementary intervention teachers, additional secondary sections for intervention, English Learner program support, intervention programs and support, and Long-term English Learner supports), we expect to see improved student learning and achievement as evidenced by Goal 2 metrics.

Measuring and Reporting Results

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|---|---|----------------|---|--|
| 2.1 | <p>iReady K - 5 (% at grade level)</p> <p>Increase % at grade level by 2% annually for all grade levels and student groups</p> <p>Source: Power BI</p> | <p>December 2023</p> <p>ELA</p> <p>Kinder 60.0%</p> <p>1st Grade 39.8%</p> <p>2nd Grade 58.4%</p> <p>3rd Grade 68.1%</p> <p>4th Grade 51.4%</p> <p>5th Grade 49.6%</p> <p>ALL 54.6%</p> <p>EL 26.4%</p> <p>SED 46.5%</p> <p>SWD 29.9%</p> <p>AA 49.6%</p> <p>HI 48.3%</p> <p>FY 31.6%</p> <p>Math</p> <p>Kinder 38.5%</p> <p>1st Grade 24.8%</p> <p>2nd Grade 32.7%</p> <p>3rd Grade 37.9%</p> <p>4th Grade 44.9%</p> <p>5th Grade 47.8%</p> <p>ALL 38.2%</p> <p>EL 17.4%</p> <p>SED 30.6%</p> <p>SWD 23.2%</p> <p>AA 29.5%</p> <p>HI 31.6%</p> <p>FY 15.8%</p> | <p>December 2024</p> <p>ELA</p> <p>Kinder 60.3%</p> <p>1st Grade 39.0%</p> <p>2nd Grade 55.6%</p> <p>3rd Grade 70.7%</p> <p>4th Grade 50.3%</p> <p>5th Grade 50.9%</p> <p>ALL 54.6%</p> <p>EL 24.0%</p> <p>SED 47.0%</p> <p>SWD 33.2%</p> <p>AA 46.6%</p> <p>HI 49.5%</p> <p>FY 33.3%</p> <p>Math</p> <p>Kinder 38.6%</p> <p>1st Grade 26.3%</p> <p>2nd Grade 32.2%</p> <p>3rd Grade 39.5%</p> <p>4th Grade 44.0%</p> <p>5th Grade 47.9%</p> <p>ALL 38.6%</p> <p>EL 17.3%</p> <p>SED 31.2%</p> <p>SWD 23.8%</p> <p>AA 24.0%</p> <p>HI 32.1%</p> <p>FY 17.5%</p> | | <p>December 2026</p> <p>ELA</p> <p>Kinder 66.0%</p> <p>1st Grade 45.8%</p> <p>2nd Grade 64.4%</p> <p>3rd Grade 74.1%</p> <p>4th Grade 57.4%</p> <p>5th Grade 55.6%</p> <p>ALL 60.6%</p> <p>EL 32.4%</p> <p>SED 52.5%</p> <p>SWD 35.9%</p> <p>AA 55.6%</p> <p>HI 54.3%</p> <p>FY 37.6%</p> <p>Math</p> <p>Kinder 44.5%</p> <p>1st Grade 30.8%</p> <p>2nd Grade 38.7%</p> <p>3rd Grade 43.9%</p> <p>4th Grade 50.9%</p> <p>5th Grade 53.8%</p> <p>ALL 44.2%</p> <p>EL 23.4%</p> <p>SED 36.6%</p> <p>SWD 29.2%</p> <p>AA 35.5%</p> <p>HI 37.6%</p> <p>FY 21.8%</p> | <p>December 2024</p> <p>ELA</p> <p>Kinder +0.3%</p> <p>1st Grade -0.8%</p> <p>2nd Grade -2.8%</p> <p>3rd Grade +2.6%</p> <p>4th Grade -1.1%</p> <p>5th Grade +1.3%</p> <p>ALL 0.0%</p> <p>EL -2.4%</p> <p>SED +0.5%</p> <p>SWD +3.3%</p> <p>AA -3.0%</p> <p>HI +1.2%</p> <p>FY +1.7%</p> <p>Math</p> <p>Kinder +0.1%</p> <p>1st Grade +1.5%</p> <p>2nd Grade -0.5%</p> <p>3rd Grade +1.6%</p> <p>4th Grade -0.9%</p> <p>5th Grade +0.1%</p> <p>ALL +0.4%</p> <p>EL -0.1%</p> <p>SED +0.6%</p> <p>SWD +0.6%</p> <p>AA -5.5%</p> <p>HI +0.5%</p> <p>FY +1.7%</p> |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|--|--|----------------|--|--|
| 2.2 | CAASPP (% meets/exceeds standard) Increase % meets/exceeds standard by 2% annually for all grade levels and student groups Source: DataQuest | Spring 2023 5th Grade ELA ALL 53.7% EL 13.5% SED 46.7% SWD 20.5% AA 32.9% HI 42.0% FY NA | Spring 2024 5th Grade ELA ALL 54.6% EL 16.8% SED 45.7% SWD 21.0% AA 39.8% HI 46.4% FY NA | | Spring 2026 5th Grade ELA ALL 59.7% EL 19.5% SED 52.7% SWD 26.5% AA 38.9% (43.8% new) HI 48.0% FY NA | Spring 2024 5th Grade ELA ALL +0.9% EL +3.3% SED -1.0% SWD +0.5% AA +6.9% HI +4.4% FY NA |
| | | 5th Grade Math ALL 42.4% EL 11.5% SED 35.4% SWD 13.8% AA 20.0% HI 28.4% FY NA | 5th Grade Math ALL 44.7% EL 10.4% SED 34.9% SWD 17.9% AA 29.5% HI 36.6% FY NA | | 5th Grade Math ALL 48.4% EL 17.5% SED 41.4% SWD 19.8% AA 26.0% (33.5% new) HI 34.4% (40.6% new) FY NA | 5th Grade Math ALL +2.3% EL -1.1% SED -0.5% SWD +4.1% AA +9.5% HI +8.2% FY NA |
| | | 8th Grade ELA ALL 58.1% EL 11.1% SED 50.4% SWD 15.8% AA 44.0% HI 51.8% FY NA | 8th Grade ELA ALL 61.0% EL 7.7% SED 52.7% SWD 27.8% AA 50.6% HI 54.8% FY NA | | 8th Grade ELA ALL 64.1% EL 17.1% SED 56.4% SWD 21.8% (31.8% new) AA 50.0% (54.6% new) HI 57.8% FY NA | 8th Grade ELA ALL +2.9% EL -3.4% SED +2.3% SWD +12.0% AA +6.6% HI +3.0% FY NA |
| | | 8th Grade Math ALL 41.9% EL 7.9% | 8th Grade Math ALL 45.3% EL 6.4% | | 8th Grade Math ALL 47.9% EL 13.9% | 8th Grade Math ALL +3.4% EL -1.5% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|--|--|----------------|---|--|
| | | SED 35.1% SWD 12.1% AA 29.3% HI 34.2% FY NA | SED 35.9% SWD 12.9% AA 18.9% HI 39.1% FY NA | | SED 41.1% SWD 18.1% AA 35.3% HI 40.2% FY NA | SED +0.8% SWD +0.8% AA -10.4% HI +4.9% FY NA |
| | | 11th Grade ELA ALL 72.5% EL 12.9% SED 64.4% SWD 34.1% AA 67.5% HI 66.8% FY NA | 11th Grade ELA ALL 74.6% EL 17.1% SED 68.8% SWD 33.1% AA 65.4% HI 70.6% FY NA | | 11th Grade ELA ALL 78.5% EL 18.9% SED 70.4% SWD 40.1% AA 73.5% HI 72.8% FY NA | 11th Grade ELA ALL +2.1% EL +4.2% SED +4.4% SWD -1.0% AA -2.1% HI +3.8% FY NA |
| | | 11th Grade Math All 38.1% EL 1.4% SED 28.8% SWD 8.3% AA 20.0% HI 29.2% FY NA | 11th Grade Math All 38.2% EL 2.4% SED 29.6% SWD 5.3% AA 21.4% HI 30.5% FY NA | | 11th Grade Math All 44.1% EL 7.4% SED 34.8% SWD 14.3% AA 26.0% HI 35.2% FY NA | 11th Grade Math All +0.1% EL +1.0% SED +0.8% SWD -3.0% AA +1.4% HI +1.3% FY NA |
| 2.3 | 2+ F Rate Decrease the % of students receiving 2+ F's by .5 annually for all grade levels and student groups Source: Power BI | January 2024 (1st Semester) Middle School By Grade Level 6th 2.6% 7th 5.0% 8th 4.4% Middle School by Student Group ALL 4.0% EL 7.1% | January 2025 (1st Semester) Middle School By Grade Level 6th 2.0% 7th 4.0% 8th 4.4% Middle School by Student Group ALL 3.5% EL 4.4% | | January 2027 (1st Semester) Middle School By Grade Level 6th 1.1% 7th 3.5% 8th 2.9% Middle School by Student Group ALL 2.5% | January 2025 (1st Semester) Middle School By Grade Level 6th -0.6% 7th -1.0% 8th 0.0% Middle School by Student Group ALL -0.5% EL -2.7% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|--|---|----------------|--|--|
| | | SED 5.2% SWD 6.0% AA 6.1% HI 4.7% FY 13.8% | SED 4.8% SWD 3.2% AA 4.7% HI 4.8% FY 7.1% | | EL 5.6% (3.4% new) SED 3.7% SWD 4.5% (2.2% new) AA 4.6% HI 3.2% FY 12.3% (6.1% new) | SED -0.4% SWD -2.8% AA -1.4% HI +0.1% FY -6.7% |
| 2.4 | English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) Increase the ELPI by 2% annually | 2023-24 School Year 50.8% | 2024-25 School Year 55.0% | | 2026-27 School Year 56.8% | 2024-25 School Year +4.2% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| | Source: Dashboard | | | | | |
| 2.5 | English Learner Reclassification Rate Increase the EL Reclassification Rate by 2% annually Source: Aeries | 2023-24 School Year 14.6% | 2024-25 School Year 15.9% | | 2026-27 School Year 20.6% | 2024-25 School Year +1.3% |
| 2.6 | Long-term English Learners (LTELs) Decrease the percent of LTELs by 2% annually Source: DataQuest | 2023-24 School Year 19.0% | 2024-25 School Year 22.8% | | 2026-27 School Year 13.0% | 2024-25 School Year +3.8% |
| 2.7 | Star (% at grade level) Increase % at grade level by 2% annually for all grade levels and student groups Source: Power BI | NA | December 2024 ELA 6th 58.2% 7th 57.2% 8th 55.5% 9th 60.3% 10th 66.4% ALL 59.6% EL 10.2% SED 52.7% SWD 24.5% AA 54.6% HI 52.5% FY 52.0% | | December 2026 ELA 6th 62.2% 7th 61.2% 8th 59.5% 9th 64.3% 10th 70.4% ALL 63.6% EL 14.2% SED 56.7% SWD 28.5% AA 58.6% HI 56.5% FY 56.0% | December 2024 ELA 6th NA 7th NA 8th NA 9th NA 10th NA ALL NA EL NA SED NA SWD NA AA NA HI NA FY NA |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | Math 6th 43.2% 7th 35.8% 8th 36.0% 9th 31.0% 10th 33.8% | Math 6th 47.2% 7th 39.8% 8th 40.0% 9th 35.0% 10th 37.8% | Math 6th NA 7th NA 8th NA 9th NA 10th NA | Math 6th NA 7th NA 8th NA 9th NA 10th NA |
| | | | ALL 35.8% EL 9.3% SED 28.9% SWD 8.7% AA 26.0% HI 28.9% FY12.5% | ALL 39.8% EL 13.3% SED 32.9% SWD 12.7% AA 30.0% HI 32.9% FY16.5% | ALL NA EL NA SED NA SWD NA AA NA HI NA FY NA | ALL NA EL NA SED NA SWD NA AA NA HI NA FY NA |

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

The Murrieta Valley Unified School District implemented all Goal 2 actions. These actions were important in addressing a variety of student achievement needs which are not able to be addressed at the Tier 1 level. The district was intentionally focused on implementing Goal 2 actions and services to intervene to meet the learning needs of our unduplicated and identified student groups.

Under Goal 2, the district made significant strides in strengthening academic supports and interventions. Notable successes include the initial implementation of Star and Freckle as diagnostic and intervention tools, providing a common framework for identifying student needs. The district also continued its focused efforts on English Learners, offering training to teachers at all grade levels and developing an English Learner Master Plan to bring greater clarity and consistency to support structures. At the high school level, new LTEL support sections were launched using specific curriculum to foster language acquisition. Sites also made progress in embedding intervention time during the school day through WIN Time and Office Hours, led by Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) that are increasingly using data to determine and plan for student intervention needs. While this shift marks a meaningful step forward, ongoing work is needed to ensure these blocks are used effectively for re-teaching and targeted instruction. High schools also began offering support classes in math and ELA, leveraging Freckle as a tool for personalized learning. As this initiative is still in its early stages, the district continues to explore the most effective implementation models to maximize student growth.

There were no substantive differences between planned and implemented Goal 2 actions.

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

The district used a 10% threshold (above or below budget) to define a substantive difference.

Action 2.1 was fully implemented, but the expenditures reflect a decrease of 15% due to reductions in staff based on declining enrollment, as well as salaries which were lower than projected due to staff placement on the salary schedule.

Action 2.5 was fully implemented, and the expenditures reflect an increase of 16% due to a need for more LTEL sections at the high schools than anticipated.

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

2.1 Elementary intervention teachers proved to be an effective strategy for accelerating student progress, as evidenced by positive trends in both i-Ready growth data and third grade CAASPP performance. This year there was a targeted focus on foundational reading and math skills for our intervention teachers. In reading, they implemented the 95% Core Lesson Library, which aligns directly with the classroom-based 95% Core program, creating instructional consistency and strengthening phonics skill development. In math, the use of Do the Math also supported a foundational approach and, like the 95% Core program, offered the use of common screeners that are consistent across all elementary grade levels and into middle school. Intervention teachers also played a central role in supporting after-school interventions funded through ELOP—either by coordinating, teaching, or assisting in delivery. During the school day, intervention efforts were strategically aligned with grade-level WIN time, allowing students with intensive needs to receive additional support without missing core instruction. The district also implemented a shift to more frequent progress monitoring every 6–8 weeks, allowing for greater flexibility and responsiveness in student placement and support.

2.2 Secondary intervention sections in ELA and math contributed to steady growth in CAASPP scores across multiple student groups, signaling the effectiveness of this action. This year, the district introduced the Star diagnostic to create a standardized system for identifying students in need of additional academic support. Intervention classes were structured to provide targeted instruction in prerequisite skills and to address learning gaps using the Freckle program. These support classes enabled more students to succeed in their general education coursework, as reflected in grade performance. This year, there was a more intentional approach to how these sections were implemented and supported, both at the district and site levels. The focus remained on ensuring that all students could access grade-level curriculum, with the support class designed to provide the scaffolding necessary for success. Continued emphasis will be placed on building site capacity to understand the importance of these sections and apply best practices for student selection, master scheduling, and class instruction to maximize their impact.

2.3 The district's support for English Learners was effective, as demonstrated by growth in the English Learner Progress Indicator and the achievement of a Green classification on the California School Dashboard. Significant progress was made this year in strengthening systems to support English Learners across all grade levels. A key component was the intensive professional development provided by county specialists to representative teams of teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school levels, which helped build a deeper understanding of effective instructional strategies for EL students. The district also provided targeted training for special education teachers on how to

effectively support dually identified students—those who are both English Learners and students with disabilities. In alignment with this focus, the district developed reclassification criteria for students with moderate to severe disabilities and is currently working on criteria for students with mild to moderate disabilities. In addition to professional development, the district continued to offer support programs such as homework clubs and Imagine Learning to reinforce language development outside of core instructional time. A major milestone was the development of an English Learner Master Plan, designed to clearly articulate districtwide expectations and align practices for serving English Learners. There was also an emphasis on ensuring that designated EL sections at the secondary level are intentionally designed to support true language acquisition, reinforcing the district's commitment to improving academic and linguistic outcomes for English Learners.

2.4 This action, Intervention Programs and Support, was effective in fostering academic growth, as reflected in continued improvement in CAASPP scores. The district sustained its use of Read 180 as an intensive reading intervention for students with the most significant needs. Additionally, the adoption of the Renaissance Star diagnostic and Freckle instructional platform marked a key step in strengthening intervention systems at the secondary level. Star provided a new diagnostic tool to assess student performance and identify specific areas for support, while Freckle delivered individualized, targeted instruction aligned with each student's needs. These tools were closely tied to the newly implemented support class model, allowing for a more structured and responsive approach to intervention. Together, these resources contributed to a more cohesive and data-driven system for identifying and addressing student learning gaps.

2.5 Support for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) demonstrated effectiveness through gains on the English Learner Progress Indicator and a Green classification on the California Dashboard, with LTELs specifically showing medium growth at the Yellow level. The district provided additional designated secondary sections aimed at supporting LTELs, with a more intentional focus on helping students read complex texts and engage in evidence-based writing. English 3D was implemented as the core instructional program for LTELs, offering targeted strategies to meet the unique needs of students at this stage of English acquisition. To ensure these supports were effectively embedded into the school day, the district worked closely with school sites to align master scheduling with the needs of LTEL students, allowing for intentional placement into appropriate language development courses. This action also tied directly into the development of the district's English Learner Master Plan, which outlines a clearly defined model for serving English Learners, including LTELs, with a consistent and intentional approach. Training and collaboration opportunities for teachers further strengthened the implementation of this model, building site capacity to deliver focused instruction and support for this student group.

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

Metrics:

2.2 CAASPP (% meets/ exceeds standard) - 5th grade ELA AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 43.8%; 5th grade Math AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 33.5%; 5th grade Math HI met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 40.6%; 8th grade ELA SWD met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 31.8%; 8th grade ELA AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 54.6%.

2.3 2+ F Rate - MS EL met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 3.4%; MS SWD met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 2.2%; MS FY met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 6.1%; HS EL met target for year 3 outcome

so decreased that target to 12.0%; HS SWD met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 6.2%; HS AA met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 5.8%; HS FY met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 12.5%.

2.7 Metric for Star data added to reflect first year results. Target for Year 3 Outcome was also included.

Actions:

2.1 Adjusted action description to reflect use of LREBG funds.

2.2 Removed the word acceleration, as these sections are intended for intervention purposes. Adjusted title and description to reflect use of LREBG funds. Title now reads: Secondary Intervention.

2.4 Adjusted action description to reflect use of LREBG funds.

2.2 and 2.4: Added Metric 2.7 (Star Data) to section regarding data for monitoring these actions.

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

Actions

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|----------|----------------------------------|--|----------------|--------------|
| 2.1 | Elementary Intervention Teachers | Elementary Intervention Teachers will provide direct intervention services for elementary students who have academic gaps in English Language Arts and Mathematics, with a focus on supporting students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). LREBG funds (\$1,304,986) will allow us to provide before and after school intervention as well. Research supports this use of funds, indicating that quality intervention which provides targeted, explicit instruction, with feedback for students, can accelerate student learning. This action will also be directed towards the English Learner and Students with Disabilities groups, at specific elementary schools, that are characterized as Red for English Language Arts performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as well as Students with Disabilities, at specific elementary schools, who are characterized as Red for Mathematics performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. | \$6,070,097.00 | Yes |
| 2.2 | Secondary Intervention | Additional sections at the secondary level (6-12) for intervention, tutors in Math courses, and summer school credit recovery will enable schools to | \$1,531,143.00 | Yes |

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---|----------------|--------------|
| | | provide direct intervention services for middle and high school students who have academic gaps in English Language Arts and Mathematics, with a focus on supporting students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). This action will include services funded by LREBG (\$418,273). Research supports this use of funds, emphasizing the benefit of intervention offered during the school day, as well as the importance of credit recovery options for low-income, African American, and Hispanic students in increasing graduation rates. This action will also be directed towards Students with Disabilities, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for English Language Arts performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as well as Murrieta Canyon Academy, specific student groups at Murrieta Canyon Academy, and Students with Disabilities and English Learners, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for Mathematics performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. | | |
| 2.3 | English Learner Program Support | The English Learner Program support will provide our English Learners with additional resources and interventions to assist them in meeting English language proficiency which will support their achievement of the academic standards. This action will also be directed towards English Learners at Avaxat Elementary and Murrieta Valley High School which are characterized as Red on the 2023 Dashboard. | \$1,091,169.00 | Yes |
| 2.4 | Intervention Programs and Support | The Intervention Programs and Support action will provide our schools with intervention programs, such as Read 180 and STAR/Freckle, and other resources to serve students who have academic gaps in English Language Arts and Mathematics, with a focus on supporting students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). LREBG funds (\$138,603) will support this action. Research supports this use of funds, clarifying that Tier 2 interventions can prevent disengagement which would otherwise result in behavior issues and academic failure. This action will also be directed towards the English Learner and Students with Disabilities groups, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for English Language Arts performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as well as Murrieta Canyon Academy, specific student groups at Murrieta Canyon Academy, and Students with Disabilities and English Learners, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for | \$662,429.00 | Yes |

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|------------|------------------------------------|---|--------------|--------------|
| | | Mathematics performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. | | |
| 2.5 | Long-term English Learner Supports | The Long-term English Learner (LTEL) Supports action will provide our sites with resources to support English Learners who have not reclassified over six school years, including additional sections for classes specifically targeting the language needs of LTEL and curriculum to support this instruction. This action will also be directed towards English Learners at Murrieta Valley High School which are characterized as Red on the 2023 Dashboard. It also will address the district's Differentiated Assistance for Long-Term English Learners in the areas of English Language Arts, Math, college/career, and suspension by providing students with services that will assist them with language acquisition and reclassification, school connectedness, and academic progress. | \$210,060.00 | Yes |

Goals and Actions

Goal

| Goal # | Description | Type of Goal |
|--------|--|--------------|
| 3 | Professional Development: Ensure classroom teachers, instructional support staff, and school administrators are trained in key areas that will support them in meeting the needs of all students, including research-based instructional practices, standards-aligned curriculum and assessments, the implementation of professional learning teams, positive behavioral support systems, and strategies for addressing the needs of all learners. | Broad Goal |

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The Murrieta Valley USD values continuous learning for all, particularly for staff who work directly with students. Based on an analysis of our district's data, there is a continued need for professional development for our staff to meet all students' needs, and particularly those in our unduplicated student groups.

The CA Dashboard illustrates the need for continued instructional training. Performance in English Language Arts is characterized as Green, but a number of student groups are not, including English Learners (EL) and Foster Youth (FY) who are characterized as Orange. In Mathematics the district is also characterized as Green, but most student groups are not, including Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students which are Yellow and English Learners and Foster Youth students which are Orange. Local data aligns with these needs and highlights Mathematics instruction as an area that needs further attention. Additionally, other metrics demonstrate the need for professional development in engaging and supporting student behavior. For example, Chronic Absenteeism is characterized as Yellow with 23.4% of students chronically absent, and ELs and SED students are also yellow, with FY characterized as Orange. The Suspension Rate is characterized as Orange with 2.9% of students suspended at least one day. SED students are characterized as Yellow for Suspension Rate, and FY are Red.

Through the implementation of the Goal 3 actions (instructional coaching, the induction program, curriculum work teams, and data and assessment programs), we expect to see improved student learning and engagement as evidenced by Goal 3 metrics.

Measuring and Reporting Results

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|---|---|----------------|---|--|
| 3.1 | <p>Clear FTE Rate (Teacher Assignment Monitoring Outcomes)</p> <p>Increase % of clear FTE by 2% annually</p> <p>Source: DataQuest</p> | <p>2021-22 School Year</p> <p>88.3% Clear FTE</p> | <p>2022-23 School Year</p> <p>87.6% Clear FTE</p> | | <p>2024-25 School Year</p> <p>94.3% Clear FTE</p> | <p>2022-23 School Year</p> <p>-0.7</p> |
| 3.2 | <p>iReady K - 5 (% at grade level)</p> <p>Increase % at grade level by 2% annually for all grade levels and student groups</p> <p>Source: Power BI</p> | <p>December 2023</p> <p>ELA</p> <p>Kinder 60.0%</p> <p>1st Grade 39.8%</p> <p>2nd Grade 58.4%</p> <p>3rd Grade 68.1%</p> <p>4th Grade 51.4%</p> <p>5th Grade 49.6%</p> <p>ALL 54.6%</p> <p>EL 26.4%</p> <p>SED 46.5%</p> <p>SWD 29.9%</p> <p>AA 49.6%</p> <p>HI 48.3%</p> <p>FY 31.6%</p> | <p>December 2024</p> <p>ELA</p> <p>Kinder 60.3%</p> <p>1st Grade 39.0%</p> <p>2nd Grade 55.6%</p> <p>3rd Grade 70.7%</p> <p>4th Grade 50.3%</p> <p>5th Grade 50.9%</p> <p>ALL 54.6%</p> <p>EL 24.0%</p> <p>SED 47.0%</p> <p>SWD 33.2%</p> <p>AA 46.6%</p> <p>HI 49.5%</p> <p>FY 33.3%</p> | | <p>December 2026</p> <p>ELA</p> <p>Kinder 66.0%</p> <p>1st Grade 45.8%</p> <p>2nd Grade 64.4%</p> <p>3rd Grade 74.1%</p> <p>4th Grade 57.4%</p> <p>5th Grade 55.6%</p> <p>ALL 60.6%</p> <p>EL 32.4%</p> <p>SED 52.5%</p> <p>SWD 35.9%</p> <p>AA 55.6%</p> <p>HI 54.3%</p> <p>FY 37.6%</p> | <p>December 2024</p> <p>ELA</p> <p>Kinder +0.3%</p> <p>1st Grade -0.8%</p> <p>2nd Grade -2.8%</p> <p>3rd Grade +2.6%</p> <p>4th Grade -1.1%</p> <p>5th Grade +1.3%</p> <p>ALL 0.0%</p> <p>EL -2.4%</p> <p>SED +0.5%</p> <p>SWD +3.3%</p> <p>AA -3.0%</p> <p>HI +1.2%</p> <p>FY +1.7%</p> |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|---|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | ALL 38.2% EL 17.4% SED 30.6% SWD 23.2% AA 29.5% HI 31.6% FY 15.8% | ALL 38.6% EL 17.3% SED 31.2% SWD 23.8% AA 24.0% HI 32.1% FY 17.5% | | ALL 44.2% EL 23.4% SED 36.6% SWD 29.2% AA 35.5% HI 37.6% FY 21.8% | ALL +0.4% EL -0.1% SED +0.6% SWD +0.6% AA -5.5% HI +0.5% FY +1.7% |
| 3.3 | Chronic Absenteeism K-8 Decrease % of chronically absent students at each grade level by 2% annually overall and for all student groups Source: Dashboard | 2022-23 School Year All 23.4% EL 26.8% SED 29.3% SWD 30.8% AA 23.4% HI 26.4% FY 40.2% | 2023-24 School Year All 18.2% EL 21.7% SED 22.7% SWD 24.5% AA 20.8% HI 20.4% FY 33.0% | | 2025-26 School Year All 17.4% EL 20.8% SED 23.3% (18.7% new) SWD 24.8% (20.5% new) AA 17.4% HI 20.4% (16.4% new) FY 34.2% (29.0% new) | 2023-24 School Year All -5.2% EL -5.1% SED -6.6% SWD -6.3% AA -2.6% HI -6.0% FY -7.2% |
| 3.4 | CAASPP (% meets/exceeds standard) Increase % meets/exceeds standard by 2% annually for all grade levels and student groups Source: DataQuest | Spring 2023 5th Grade ELA ALL 53.7% EL 13.5% SED 46.7% SWD 20.5% AA 32.9% HI 42.0% FY NA 5th Grade Math ALL 42.4% | Spring 2024 5th Grade ELA ALL 54.6% EL 16.8% SED 45.7% SWD 21.0% AA 39.8% HI 46.4% FY NA 5th Grade Math ALL 44.7% | | Spring 2026 5th Grade ELA ALL 59.7% EL 19.5% SED 52.7% SWD 26.5% AA 38.9% (43.8% new) HI 48.0% FY NA 5th Grade Math ALL 48.4% | Spring 2024 5th Grade ELA ALL +0.9% EL +3.3% SED -1.0% SWD +0.5% AA +6.9% HI +4.4% FY NA 5th Grade Math ALL +2.3% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|----------------|--|--|----------------|--|---|
| | | EL 11.5% SED 35.4% SWD 13.8% AA 20.0% HI 28.4% FY NA | EL 10.4% SED 34.9% SWD 17.9% AA 29.5% HI 36.6% FY NA | | EL 17.5% SED 41.4% SWD 19.8% AA 26.0% (33.5% new) HI 34.4% (40.6% new) FY NA | EL -1.1% SED -0.5% SWD +4.1% AA +9.5% HI +8.2% FY NA |
| | 8th Grade ELA | ALL 58.1% EL 11.1% SED 50.4% SWD 15.8% AA 44.0% HI 51.8% FY NA | ALL 61.0% EL 7.7% SED 52.7% SWD 27.8% AA 50.6% HI 54.8% FY NA | | 8th Grade ELA ALL 64.1% EL 17.1% SED 56.4% SWD 21.8% (31.8% new) AA 50.0% (54.6% new) HI 57.8% FY NA | 8th Grade ELA ALL +2.9% EL -3.4% SED +2.3% SWD +12.0% AA +6.6% HI +3.0% FY NA |
| | 8th Grade Math | ALL 41.9% EL 7.9% SED 35.1% SWD 12.1% AA 29.3% HI 34.2% FY NA | ALL 45.3% EL 6.4% SED 35.9% SWD 12.9% AA 18.9% HI 39.1% FY NA | | 8th Grade Math ALL 47.9% EL 13.9% SED 41.1% SWD 18.1% AA 35.3% HI 40.2% FY NA | 8th Grade Math ALL +3.4% EL -1.5% SED +0.8% SWD +0.8% AA -10.4% HI +4.9% FY NA |
| | 11th Grade ELA | ALL 72.5% EL 12.9% SED 64.4% SWD 34.1% AA 67.5% HI 66.8% FY NA | ALL 74.6% EL 17.1% SED 68.8% SWD 33.1% AA 65.4% HI 70.6% FY NA | | 11th Grade ELA ALL 78.5% EL 18.9% SED 70.4% SWD 40.1% AA 73.5% HI 72.8% FY NA | 11th Grade ELA ALL +2.1% EL +4.2% SED +4.4% SWD -1.0% AA -2.1% HI +3.8% FY NA |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|---|--|----------------|--|---|
| | | 11th Grade Math All 38.1% EL 1.4% SED 28.8% SWD 8.3% AA 20.0% HI 29.2% FY NA | 11th Grade Math All 38.2% EL 2.4% SED 29.6% SWD 5.3% AA 21.4% HI 30.5% FY NA | | 11th Grade Math All 44.1% EL 7.4% SED 34.8% SWD 14.3% AA 26.0% HI 35.2% FY NA | 11th Grade Math ALL +0.1% EL +1.0% SED +0.8% SWD -3.0% AA +1.4% HI +1.3% FY NA |
| 3.5 | Induction Program * Maintain 100% participation of qualifying teachers in the Induction Program * Maintain 98% or greater recommendation rate for a clear credential for teachers who participated in the Induction Program * Maintain 98% or higher retention rate for teachers who completed the Induction Program Source: Induction Leads | 2023-24 School Year * 100% of qualifying teachers participated in the Induction Program * 100% of teachers who participated in the Induction Program were recommended for a clear credential * District retained 98.6% of teachers who completed the Induction Program | 2024-25 School Year * 100% of qualifying teachers participated in the Induction Program * 100% of teachers who participated in the Induction Program were recommended for a clear credential * District retained 100% of teachers who completed the Induction Program | | 2026-27 School Year * 100% of qualifying teachers participated in the Induction Program * At least 98% of teachers who participated in the Induction Program were recommended for a clear credential * District retained at least 98% of teachers who completed the Induction Program | 2024-25 School Year * 0 (difference) of qualifying teachers participated in the Induction Program * 0 (difference) of teachers who participated in the Induction Program were recommended for a clear credential * District retained +1.4% of teachers who completed the Induction Program |
| 3.6 | 2+ F Rate Decrease the % of students receiving 2+ F's by .5 annually for all grade levels and student group | January 2024 (1st Semester) Middle School By Grade Level 6th 2.6% 7th 5.0% | January 2025 (1st Semester) Middle School by Grade Level 6th 2.0% 7th 4.0% | | January 2027 (1st Semester) Middle School By Grade Level 6th 1.1% 7th 3.5% | January 2025 (1st Semester) Middle School By Grade Level 6th -0.6% 7th -1.0% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|-------------------------|---|--|----------------|--|---|
| | Source: Power BI | 8th 4.4% Middle School by Student Group ALL 4.0% EL 7.1% SED 5.2% SWD 6.0% AA 6.1% HI 4.7% FY 13.8% | 8th 4.4% Middle School by Student Group ALL 3.5% EL 4.4% SED 4.8% SWD 3.2% AA 4.7% HI 4.8% FY 7.1% | | 8th 2.9% Middle School by Student Group ALL 2.5% EL 5.6% (3.4% new) SED 3.7% SWD 4.5% (2.2% new) AA 4.6% HI 3.2% FY 12.3% (6.1% new) | 8th 0.0% Middle School by Student Group ALL -0.5% EL -2.7% SED -0.4% SWD -2.8% AA -1.4% HI +0.1% FY -6.7% |
| | | High School by Grade Level 9th 9.2% 10th 10.0% 11th 5.3% 12th 1.6% | High School by Grade Level 9th 7.8% 10th 8.9% 11th 5.5% 12th 1.7% | | High School by Grade Level 9th 7.7% 10th 8.5% 11th 3.8% 12th 0.1% | High School By Grade Level 9th -1.4% 10th -1.1% 11th +0.2% 12th +0.1% |
| 3.7 | Star (% at grade level) | NA | December 2024 | | December 2026 | December 2024 |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|----------|---|----------------|---|--|
| | Increase % at grade level by 2% annually for all grade levels and student groups Source: Power BI | | ELA 6th 58.2% 7th 57.2% 8th 55.5% 9th 60.3% 10th 66.4% | | ELA 6th 62.2% 7th 61.2% 8th 59.5% 9th 64.3% 10th 70.4% | ELA 6th NA 7th NA 8th NA 9th NA 10th NA |
| | | | ALL 59.6% EL 10.2% SED 52.7% SWD 24.5% AA 54.6% HI 52.5% FY 52.0% | | ALL 63.6% EL 14.2% SED 56.7% SWD 28.5% AA 58.6% HI 56.5% FY 56.0% | ALL NA EL NA SED NA SWD NA AA NA HI NA FY NA |
| | | | Math 6th 43.2% 7th 35.8% 8th 36.0% 9th 31.0% 10th 33.8% | | Math 6th 47.2% 7th 39.8% 8th 40.0% 9th 35.0% 10th 37.8% | Math 6th NA 7th NA 8th NA 9th NA 10th NA |
| | | | ALL 35.8% EL 9.3% SED 28.9% SWD 8.7% AA 26.0% HI 28.9% FY12.5% | | ALL 39.8% EL 13.3% SED 32.9% SWD 12.7% AA 30.0% HI 32.9% FY16.5% | ALL NA EL NA SED NA SWD NA AA NA HI NA FY NA |

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

The Murrieta Valley Unified School District implemented all Goal 3 actions. These actions were important in addressing the professional development of our staff so that they could address the various learning, engagement, and behavioral needs of our students. The district was intentionally focused on implementing Goal 3 actions and services to help our staff meet the needs of our unduplicated and identified student groups.

Implementation of Goal 3 saw several notable successes this year. Instructional coaches played a key role in supporting a rigorous pilot process for the adoption of new math curriculum, helping to ensure thoughtful evaluation and teacher feedback. The Induction program continued to evolve, refining its Essentials training for all new staff. Curriculum work teams advanced their collaboration to support the work of Professional Learning Teams (PLTs), further updating pacing guides and assessments. Cross-site high school teams also came together to revise grade-level projects, aligning them with the district's Profile of a Graduate and deepening the focus on career readiness. Additionally, the initial rollout of the EduClimber program provided a valuable foundation for integrating data into both PLT and MTSS processes. Despite these gains, the district faces challenges related to declining enrollment, which may impact our ability to retain early career teachers who have benefited from Induction support. Another area for continued growth is building teacher capacity to effectively use assessment tools within PLTs to inform instructional decisions.

There were no substantive differences between planned and implemented Goal 3 actions.

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

The district used a 10% threshold (above or below budget) to define a substantive difference.

Action 3.3 was fully implemented, but the expenditures reflect a decrease of 19% due to the projected budget exceeding the actual needs of the Curriculum Work Teams this year. As a result, the budget for 2025-26 has been reduced in this area.

Action 3.4 was implemented, but the expenditures reflect a decrease of 10% due a decrease in Softchoice's data storage usage. As a result, the 2025-26 budget was reduced to reflect the lower costs.

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

3.1 Instructional Coaches: This action was effective, as evidenced by student growth reflected in i-Ready data across multiple grade levels and student groups. Instructional coaches played a central role in several high-impact initiatives, including leading the rigorous math pilot process to guide the adoption of a new curriculum. They provided ongoing support to PLTs by attending meetings, modeling lessons, planning with teams or individual teachers, and facilitating the use of assessment data to inform instruction. Coaches also began

collaboration with RSP and Essentials teachers, helping these educators focus more intentionally on essential standards and student learning needs. In addition, they collaborated with site administrators to support curriculum, instruction, and assessment efforts across campuses. Their contributions were instrumental in building instructional capacity and fostering a culture of continuous improvement at the elementary level.

3.2 Induction Program: This action was effective, with metrics for Induction consistently met, alongside steady growth in broader student outcome indicators, including CAASPP performance and reductions in chronic absenteeism. The program continued to implement Essentials training tailored to both elementary and secondary contexts, with participation expanding to include not only new teachers but also some veteran educators seeking additional support. A strong emphasis remained on supporting special education teachers, ensuring they received the guidance and tools needed to meet student needs. The use of GoReact provided an effective platform for feedback and reflection for new teachers, strengthening instructional practice. The program also began preparing for the rollout of updated California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs), aligning Induction work with state expectations. Looking ahead, we are rolling out two tailored Essential trainings for Foundations teachers who serve students with more extensive support needs. Additionally, Essentials training will be integrated with the district's new instructional model to strengthen coherence and enhance professional learning for new teachers.

3.3 Curriculum Work Teams: This action was effective, as evidenced by strong growth in CAASPP scores across many grade levels and student groups, as well as a significant decline in the percentage of students earning two or more F grades. Secondary core content-area advisories met to update common assessments and pacing guides, providing essential resources to support PLT collaboration. This work gained momentum as teachers increasingly recognized the value of aligned planning and assessment in improving student outcomes. In addition, special education teams engaged in parallel efforts to identify and prioritize essential standards for programs such as Essentials, ensuring greater instructional coherence for learners with varied learning needs. Representative teams from across the district also came together to revise high school grade-level projects, intentionally connecting them to the Profile of a Graduate and reinforcing the district's commitment to career readiness. These collaborative efforts across schools have been instrumental in building systems that promote consistency and instructional quality districtwide.

3.4 Data and Assessment Programs: This action was effective, as reflected in strong growth in CAASPP scores and notable gains in i-Ready performance. The district's investment in data and assessment platforms has provided a consistent structure for developing and analyzing common assessments, which are being used with increasing frequency through PLT work. Teachers are creating their own assessments, using results to reflect on instruction, and identifying students in need of targeted support. The platforms have also enabled the collection of meaningful survey data related to student wellness, school climate, and LCAP feedback, further informing district decision-making. In addition, data systems are being used to monitor and analyze student engagement, allowing schools to respond proactively with interventions. These systems are foundational to advancing the district's two key focus areas—Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)—by ensuring timely access to actionable information.

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

Metrics:

3.3 Chronic Absenteeism K-8 - SED met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 18.7%; SWD met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 20.5%; HI met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 16.4%; FY met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 29.0%.

3.4 CAASPP (% meets/ exceeds standard) - 5th grade ELA AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 43.8%; 5th grade Math AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 33.5%; 5th grade Math HI met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 40.6%; 8th grade ELA SWD met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 31.8%; 8th grade ELA AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 54.6%.

3.6 2+ F Rate - MS EL met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 3.4%; MS SWD met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 2.2%; MS FY met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 6.1%; HS EL met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 12.0%; HS SWD met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 6.2%; HS AA met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 5.8%; HS FY met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 12.5%.

3.7 Metric for Star data added to reflect first year results. Target for Year 3 Outcome was also included.

Actions:

3.3 and 3.4 Star Data (Metric 3.7) was added as a metric to monitor effectiveness.

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

Actions

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|----------|-----------------------|--|--------------|--------------|
| 3.1 | Instructional Coaches | Instructional coaches will provide training and support to elementary teachers in key areas such as research-based instructional practices, standards-aligned curriculum and assessments, the implementation of professional learning teams, positive behavioral support systems, and strategies for addressing the needs of all learners, particularly students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). This action will also be directed | \$494,657.00 | Yes |

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|----------|------------------------------|--|--------------|--------------|
| | | towards the English Learner and Students with Disabilities groups, at specific elementary schools, that are characterized as Red for English Language Arts performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as well as Students with Disabilities, at specific elementary schools, who are characterized as Red for Mathematics performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. | | |
| 3.2 | Induction Program | The Induction Program will provide new teachers with the support, training, and mentoring necessary to allow them to effectively enter the teaching profession equipped to meet the needs of all students, with a focus on supporting students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). | \$265,485.00 | Yes |
| 3.3 | Curriculum Work Teams | Curriculum Work Teams will provide teachers with time for training and collaboration in key areas such as research-based instructional practices, standards-aligned curriculum and assessments, the implementation of professional learning teams, positive behavioral support systems, and strategies for addressing the needs of all learners, particularly students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). This action will also be directed towards Students with Disabilities, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for English Language Arts performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as well as Murrieta Canyon Academy, specific student groups at Murrieta Canyon Academy, and Students with Disabilities and English Learners, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for Mathematics performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. | \$147,270.00 | Yes |
| 3.4 | Data and Assessment Programs | Data and Assessment Programs will enable teachers and staff to collaborate around student learning and engagement as part of the professional learning community model, with a focus on meeting the academic needs of all students, particularly those in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). This action will also be directed towards the English Learner and Students with Disabilities groups, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for English Language Arts performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as well as Murrieta Canyon Academy, specific student groups at Murrieta Canyon Academy, and Students with Disabilities and English | \$318,556.00 | Yes |

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|----------|-------|--|-------------|--------------|
| | | Learners, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for Mathematics performance on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. | | |

Goals and Actions

Goal

| Goal # | Description | Type of Goal |
|--------|--|--------------|
| 4 | Engagement and School Culture: Ensure all school sites develop positive environments where students, staff, and families feel connected and valued and where the needs of the whole child are prioritized as a fundamental part of student growth and achievement. | Broad Goal |

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The district is committed to ensuring that a positive school culture exists at each of our schools. We want students and families to view our schools as places in which they feel safe and supported, where they are connected and embraced for who they are and valued as an important part of the school community.

The CA Dashboard illustrates the need for increased efforts in the area of student engagement and school climate. The district's Chronic Absenteeism is characterized as Yellow with 23.4% of students chronically absent. ELs and SED students are also characterized as Yellow, and Foster Youth are Orange. Similarly, the district's Suspension Rate is characterized as Orange with 2.9% of students suspended at least one day, a metric that has increased 0.3% from the prior year. Our SED students are characterized as Yellow and Foster Youth are in Red.

Educational partner input emphasizes the need to address student behavior on our campuses, as well as to promote student engagement and connectedness. Additionally, the district continues to receive feedback regarding the importance of the Parent Advisory Councils and the need to remain focused on authentic family engagement efforts.

Through the implementation of the Goal 4 actions (practices to support all students, educational partner engagement, mental health supports and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), Foster Youth support services, and attendance supports), we expect to see improved school cultures and higher levels of student engagement and connectedness as evidenced by Goal 4 metrics. The district believes that improvement in this goal will lead to improved academic outcomes as well.

Measuring and Reporting Results

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|--|--|----------------|---|--|
| 4.1 | <p>Chronic Absenteeism K-8</p> <p>Decrease % chronically absent students by 2% annually overall and for all student groups</p> <p>Source: Dashboard</p> | <p>2022-23 School Year</p> <p>All 23.4% EL 26.8% SED 29.3% SWD 30.8% AA 23.4% HI 26.4% FY 40.2%</p> | <p>2024-25 School Year</p> <p>All 18.2% EL 21.7% SED 22.7% SWD 24.5% AA 20.8% HI 20.4% FY 33.0%</p> | | <p>2025-26 School Year</p> <p>All 17.4% EL 20.8% SED 23.3% (18.7% new) SWD 24.8% (20.5% new) AA 17.4% HI 20.4% (16.4% new) FY 34.2% (29.0% new)</p> | <p>2023-24 School Year</p> <p>All -5.2% EL -5.1% SED -6.6% SWD -6.3% AA -2.6% HI -6.0% FY -7.2%</p> |
| 4.2 | <p>ADA K-8</p> <p>Attain and/or Maintain 94% ADA or greater for overall and for all student groups</p> <p>Source: Power BI</p> | <p>2023-24 School Year (P2)</p> <p>All 93.5% EL 92.7% SED 92.8% SWD 91.3% AA 93.7% HI 93.2% FY 89.0%</p> | <p>2024-25 School Year (P2)</p> <p>All 93.9% EL 93.8% SED 93.3% SWD 92.7% AA 93.9% HI 93.4% FY 90.1%</p> | | <p>2026-27 School Year (P2)</p> <p>All 94.0% EL 94.0% SED 94.0% SWD 94.0% AA 94.0% HI 94.0% FY 94.0%</p> | <p>2024-25 School Year (P2)</p> <p>All +0.4% EL +1.1% SED +0.5% SWD +1.4% AA +0.2% HI +0.2% FY +1.1%</p> |
| 4.3 | <p>High School Cohort Graduation Rate</p> <p>Attain and/or Maintain 95% or greater graduation rate for all students and student groups</p> | <p>2022-23 School Year</p> <p>All 96.7% EL 93.1% SED 95.6% SWD 86.7% AA 97.7%</p> | <p>2023-24 School Year</p> <p>All 97.7% EL 97.3% SED 97.4% SWD 91.9% AA 98.4%</p> | | <p>2025-26 School Year</p> <p>All 96.7% (97.7% new) EL 95.0% (97.3% new)</p> | <p>2023-24 School Year</p> <p>All +1.0% EL +4.2% SED +1.8% SWD +5.2% AA +0.7%</p> |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|---|---|----------------|---|---|
| | Source: Dashboard | HI 96.0% FY NA | HI 97.8% FY NA | | SED 95.6% (97.4% new) SWD 95.0% AA 97.7% (98.4% new) HI 96.0% (97.8% new) FY NA | HI +1.8% FY NA |
| 4.4 | High School Dropout Rate Attain and/or Maintain 2% or less dropout rate for all students and student groups Source: DataQuest | 2022-23 School Year All 1.2% EL 2.3% SED 1.7% SWD 2.9% AA 0.8% HI 1.8% FY NA | 2023-24 School Year All 0.3% EL 0.0% SED 0.4% SWD 0.6% AA 0.0% HI 0.2% FY NA | | 2025-26 School Year All 1.2% (0.3% new) EL 2.0% (0.0% new) SED 1.7% (0.4% new) SWD 2.0% (0.6% new) AA 0.8% (0.0% new) HI 1.8% (0.2% new) FY NA | 2023-24 School Year All -0.9% EL -2.3% SED -1.3% SWD -2.3% AA -0.8% HI -1.6% FY NA |
| 4.5 | Middle School Dropouts Attain and maintain 0 middle school dropouts Source: CALPADS | 2022-23 School Year 4 students | 2023-24 School Year 1 student | | 2025-26 School Year 0 students | 2023-24 School Year -3 students |
| 4.6 | Suspension Rates Attain and maintain a suspension rate of 2.5% | 2022-23 School Year All 2.9% EL 2.9% | 2023-24 School Year All 2.6% | | 2025-26 School Year All 2.5% | 2023-24 School Year All -0.3% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|--|---|----------------|--|---|
| | or lower for all students and student groups Source: Dashboard | SED 3.8% SWD 5.2% AA 4.8% HI 2.9% FY 13.2% | EL 3.1% SED 3.3% SWD 4.8% AA 5.1% HI 2.7% FY 16.4% | | EL 2.5% SED 2.5% SWD 2.5% AA 2.5% HI 2.5% FY 2.5% | EL +0.2% SED -0.5% SWD -0.4% AA +0.3% HI -0.2% FY +3.2% |
| 4.7 | Expulsions Maintain 5 expulsions or less per year for all students and student groups Source: DataQuest | 2022-23 School Year All 5 EL 0 SED 3 SWD 3 AA 1 HI 3 FY 0 | 2023-24 School Year All 11 EL 0 SED 9 SWD 3 AA 1 HI 7 FY 1 | | 2025-26 School Year All 5 EL 0 SED 3 SWD 3 AA 1 HI 3 FY 0 | 2023-24 School Year All +6 EL 0 SED +6 SWD 0 AA 0 HI +4 FY +1 |
| 4.8 | Tiered Fidelity Inventory Attain 100% of schools scoring 70% or higher on Tier 1 (eligible for silver CA PBIS state recognition) Source: MTSS Leads | 2023-24 School Year 5 out of 22 (23%) schools have scored 70% or higher on Tier 1 | 2024-25 School Year 18 out of 20 (90%) schools have scored 70% or higher on Tier 1 | | 2026-27 School Year 100% of schools will score 70% or higher on Tier 1 | 2024-25 School Year +13 out of 20 (+67%) schools have scored 70% or higher on Tier 1 |
| 4.9 | Number of Facilities Meeting "Good Repair" status in Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) reports Maintain 100% of schools rated as "Good Repair" status or higher | 2023-24 School Year 100% of schools are rated as "Good Repair" status or higher | 2024-25 School Year 95% of schools are rated as "Good Repair" status or higher | | 2026-27 100% of schools are rated as "Good Repair" status or higher | 2024-25 School Year -5% of schools are rated as "Good Repair" status or higher |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|--|--|----------------|--|---|
| | Source: FIT (Facility Inspection Tool) Evaluation | | | | | |
| 4.10 | <p>CA Dashboard Local Indicators</p> <p>Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement) Increase each rating by at least one level</p> <p>Source: Local Indicator Self-Reflection Tool</p> | <p>2023-24 School Year</p> <p>1-5 Rating * LEA's progress in developing the capacity of staff to build trusting and respectful relationships with families All (3) Unduplicated (2) SWD (4) * LEA's progress in supporting staff to learn about each family's strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children All (2) Unduplicated (2) SWD (2) * LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making All (3) Unduplicated (3)</p> | <p>2024-25 School Year</p> <p>1-5 Rating * LEA's progress in developing the capacity of staff to build trusting and respectful relationships with families All (3) Unduplicated (3) SWD (4) * LEA's progress in supporting staff to learn about each family's strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children All (2) Unduplicated (2) SWD (2) * LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in</p> | | <p>2026-27 School Year</p> <p>1-5 Rating * LEA's progress in developing the capacity of staff to build trusting and respectful relationships with families All (4) Unduplicated (3) (4 new) SWD (5) * LEA's progress in supporting staff to learn about each family's strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children All (3) Unduplicated (3) SWD (3) * LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in</p> | <p>2024-25 School Year</p> <p>1-5 Rating * LEA's progress in developing the capacity of staff to build trusting and respectful relationships with families All (0) Unduplicated (+1) SWD (0) * LEA's progress in supporting staff to learn about each family's strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children All (0) Unduplicated (0) SWD (0) * LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in</p> |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|--|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | SWD (3) * LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making All (3) Unduplicated (3) SWD (3) | advisory groups and with decision-making All (3) Unduplicated (3) SWD (3) * LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making All (3) Unduplicated (3) SWD (3) | | engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making All (4) Unduplicated (4) SWD (4) * LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making All (4) Unduplicated (4) SWD (4) | advisory groups and with decision-making All (0) Unduplicated (0) SWD (0) * LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making All (0) Unduplicated (0) SWD (0) |
| 4.11 | Local School Climate Survey - Panorama LCAP Survey Increase percentage of positive response by 1% annually for each question Source: Panorama | Spring 2024 Parent Survey * Overall, how satisfied are you with your student's school - 76% * How comfortable do you feel communicating with your student's school - 75% * How much do you feel the school values your opinion - 51% * To the best of your knowledge, how fairly do staff in your school community treat people | Spring 2025 Parent Survey * Overall, how satisfied are you with your student's school - 77% * How comfortable do you feel communicating with your student's school - 77% * How much do you feel the school values your opinion - 54% | | Spring 2027 Parent Survey * Overall, how satisfied are you with your student's school - 79% * How comfortable do you feel communicating with your student's school - 78% * How much do you feel the school values your opinion - 54% (56% new) | Spring 2025 Parent Survey * Overall, how satisfied are you with your student's school +1% * How comfortable do you feel communicating with your student's school +2% * How much do you feel the school values your opinion +3% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--------|--|---|----------------|---|---|
| | | <p>of different backgrounds than themselves - 79%</p> <p>Student Survey (6-12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How satisfied are you with your learning experience at school - 57% * How connected do you feel to the adults at your school this year - 38% * How connected do you feel to other students at your school this year - 54% * How fairly do you believe staff at your school treat people of different backgrounds than themselves - 62% | <p>* To the best of your knowledge, how fairly do staff in your school community treat people of different backgrounds than themselves - 80%</p> <p>Student Survey (6-12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How satisfied are you with your learning experience at school - 64% * How connected do you feel to the adults at your school this year - 42% * How connected do you feel to other students at your school this year - 61% * How fairly do you believe staff at your school treat people of different backgrounds than themselves - 69% | | <p>* To the best of your knowledge, how fairly do staff in your school community treat people of different backgrounds than themselves - 82%</p> <p>Student Survey (6-12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How satisfied are you with your learning experience at school - 60% (66% new) * How connected do you feel to the adults at your school this year - 41% (44% new) * How connected do you feel to other students at your school this year - 57% (63% new) * How fairly do you believe staff at your school treat people of different backgrounds than themselves - 65% (71% new) | <p>* To the best of your knowledge, how fairly do staff in your school community treat people of different backgrounds than themselves +1%</p> <p>Student Survey (6-12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How satisfied are you with your learning experience at school +7% * How connected do you feel to the adults at your school this year +4% * How connected do you feel to other students at your school this year +7% * How fairly do you believe staff at your school treat people of different backgrounds than themselves +7% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|---|--|---|----------------|---|--|
| | | Staff Survey (Classified/Certificated) * How satisfied are you with your school's campus as an environment for learning - 71%/73% * How fairly do you believe staff at your school treat people of different backgrounds than themselves - 80%/76% * Overall, how much do you feel like you belong at your school - 78%/74% * How easy is it to form relationships with students this year - 76%/79% | Staff Survey (Classified/Certificated) * How satisfied are you with your school's campus as an environment for learning - 78%/80% * How fairly do you believe staff at your school treat people of different backgrounds than themselves - 77%/79% * Overall, how much do you feel like you belong at your school - 77%/78% * How easy is it to form relationships with students this year - 73%/ 81% | | Staff Survey (Classified/Certificated) * How satisfied are you with your school's campus as an environment for learning - 74%/76% (80%/82% new) * How fairly do you believe staff at your school treat people of different backgrounds than themselves - 83%/79% (83%/81% new) * Overall, how much do you feel like you belong at your school - 81%/77% (81%/80% new) * How easy is it to form relationships with students this year - 79%/82% | Staff Survey (Classified/Certificated) * How satisfied are you with your school's campus as an environment for learning +7%/+7% * How fairly do you believe staff at your school treat people of different backgrounds than themselves -3%/ +3% * Overall, how much do you feel like you belong at your school -1%/ +4% * How easy is it to form relationships with students this year -3%/ +2% |
| 4.12 | CAASPP (% meets/exceeds standard) Increase % meets/exceeds standard by 2% annually for all grade levels and student groups | Spring 2023 5th Grade ELA ALL 53.7% EL 13.5% SED 46.7% SWD 20.5% AA 32.9% | Spring 2024 5th Grade ELA ALL 54.6% EL 16.8% SED 45.7% SWD 21.0% AA 39.8% | | Spring 2026 5th Grade ELA ALL 59.7% EL 19.5% SED 52.7% SWD 26.5% | Spring 2024 5th Grade ELA ALL +0.9% EL +3.3% SED -1.0% SWD +0.5% AA +6.9% |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--|--|-------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| | Source: DataQuest | HI 42.0% FY NA | HI 46.4% FY NA | | AA 38.9% (43.8% new) HI 48.0% FY NA | HI +4.4% FY NA |
| | 5th Grade Math ALL 42.4% EL 11.5% SED 35.4% SWD 13.8% AA 20.0% HI 28.4% FY NA | 5th Grade Math ALL 44.7% EL 10.4% SED 34.9% SWD 17.9% AA 29.5% HI 36.6% FY NA | | 5th Grade Math ALL 48.4% EL 17.5% SED 41.4% SWD 19.8% AA 26.0% (33.5% new) HI 34.4% (40.6% new) FY NA | 5th Grade Math ALL +2.3% EL -1.1% SED -0.5% SWD +4.1% AA +9.5% HI +8.2% FY NA | |
| | 8th Grade ELA ALL 58.1% EL 11.1% SED 50.4% SWD 15.8% AA 44.0% HI 51.8% FY NA | 8th Grade ELA ALL 61.0% EL 7.7% SED 52.7% SWD 27.8% AA 50.6% HI 54.8% FY NA | | 8th Grade ELA ALL 64.1% EL 17.1% SED 56.4% SWD 21.8% (31.8% new) AA 50.0% (54.6% new) HI 57.8% FY NA | 8th Grade ELA ALL +2.9% EL -3.4% SED +2.3% SWD +12.0% AA +6.6% HI +3.0% FY NA | |
| | 8th Grade Math ALL 41.9% EL 7.9% SED 35.1% SWD 12.1% AA 29.3% HI 34.2% FY NA | 8th Grade Math ALL 45.3% EL 6.4% SED 35.9% SWD 12.9% AA 18.9% HI 39.1% FY NA | | 8th Grade Math ALL 47.9% EL 13.9% SED 41.1% SWD 18.1% AA 35.3% HI 40.2% FY NA | 8th Grade Math ALL +3.4% EL -1.5% SED +0.8% SWD +0.8% AA -10.4% HI +4.9% FY NA | |
| | 11th Grade ELA | 11th Grade ELA | | 11th Grade ELA | 11th Grade ELA | 11th Grade ELA |

| Metric # | Metric | Baseline | Year 1 Outcome | Year 2 Outcome | Target for Year 3 Outcome | Current Difference from Baseline |
|----------|--------|---|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | ALL 72.5% EL 12.9% SED 64.4% SWD 34.1% AA 67.5% HI 66.8% FY NA | ALL 74.6% EL 17.1% SED 68.8% SWD 33.1% AA 65.4% HI 70.6% FY NA | | ALL 78.5% EL 18.9% SED 70.4% SWD 40.1% AA 73.5% HI 72.8% FY NA | ALL +2.1% EL +4.2% SED +4.4% SWD -1.0% AA -2.1% HI +3.8% FY NA |
| | | 11th Grade Math All 38.1% EL 1.4% SED 28.8% SWD 8.3% AA 20.0% HI 29.2% FY NA | 11th Grade Math All 38.2% EL 2.4% SED 29.6% SWD 5.3% AA 21.4% HI 30.5% FY NA | | 11th Grade Math All 44.1% EL 7.4% SED 34.8% SWD 14.3% AA 26.0% HI 35.2% FY NA | 11th Grade Math All +0.1% EL +1.0% SED +0.8% SWD -3.0% AA +1.4% HI +1.3% FY NA |

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

The Murrieta Valley Unified School District implemented all Goal 4 actions. These actions were important in addressing student needs related to engagement and school connectedness, as well as promoting school practices that would lead to optimal outcomes for student behavior and school attendance. Additionally, Goal 4 actions supported ongoing efforts to engage families and students, as well as to build the capacity of our staff to ensure all students have access to high-quality learning opportunities, including our foster youth. The district was intentionally focused on implementing Goal 4 actions and services to help our staff meet the needs of our unduplicated and identified student groups.

The district made significant strides in expanding its Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), with particularly strong implementation at the elementary level. One major success was the rollout of Tier 2 attendance teams at every school site, which helped establish a more consistent and streamlined process for addressing chronic absenteeism across all grade levels. At the elementary level, the addition of site-based behavior leads was met with strong positive feedback. These roles have effectively supported behavior systems and aligned well with the implementation of the Playworks program, reinforcing positive school climate and student engagement. Another key success under this goal was the pilot implementation of parent liaisons at selected sites. This effort allowed the district to explore new models of family engagement and better understand how targeted staff support can strengthen school-home partnerships. A primary challenge this year was

the delay in launching the district's Parent Center, which in turn paused planned hiring and limited early implementation of services intended to support families through that space.

There were no substantive differences between planned and implemented Goal 4 actions.

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

The district used a 10% threshold (above or below budget) to define a substantive difference.

Action 4.1 was fully implemented, but the expenditures reflect a decrease of 11% due to a decreased need for the mentoring sections at one of our high schools.

Action 4.2 was fully implemented, but the expenditures reflect a decrease of 51% due to a delay in the facility construction of the Parent Center which led to a delay in hiring personnel.

Action 4.4 was fully implemented, but the expenditures reflect a decrease of 11% due to lower participation in tutoring than planned.

Action 4.5 was fully implemented, but the expenditures reflect a decrease of 12% due to changes in enrollment which impacted transportation costs.

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

4.1 Equitable and Inclusive Practices: This action demonstrated effectiveness through continued growth in key student outcome measures, including already high graduation rates, steady improvement in CAASPP scores, and positive trends in both parent and student survey data. The district provided meaningful support to schools through professional learning on complex and challenging topics aimed at supporting all students. In addition to leading these professional development efforts, the coordinator played a critical role in supporting administrators as they worked directly with families to navigate sensitive issues. Access to the RCOE Equity Conference was another highlight, with participants sharing strong positive feedback on its impact on their professional practices and their understanding of how to better meet the needs of all students. While the male mentoring sections were viewed as effective by participating sites, the program was not accessed consistently across the district and will transition to a site-based initiative moving forward, rather than being funded by LCAP.

4.2 Educational Partner Engagement: This action demonstrated effectiveness through positive gains on both parent and student surveys, particularly in areas related to communication, feeling valued, and student connectedness. Engagement of families remains a district priority, with multiple strategies contributing to strengthened relationships. Parent advisory committees (PACs) continue to serve as important spaces for connection, learning, and two-way dialogue, offering families opportunities to provide input and receive tools to support their students. The district also expanded community-based events to increase family involvement and introduced pilot parent liaisons at select sites. These liaisons offered a personal, approachable point of contact for families—especially those less likely to engage with school staff—and the model continues to be explored for broader implementation. In addition, student engagement was elevated through the continued

implementation of site-based advisories and the intramural program, which has proven to be a highly popular and meaningful avenue for students to connect with school through shared interests.

4.3 Mental Health Supports and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS): The district's MTSS efforts continue to show effectiveness, as evidenced by reductions in suspension rates for most student groups—with the exception of English Learners, African American students, and Foster Youth, who remain areas for further focus. Progress was also demonstrated on the Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI), with 90% of sites achieving a score of 70% or higher, indicating strong implementation of MTSS practices. Survey feedback, particularly from students, reflected notable growth in perceptions related to school climate and support. Throughout the year, the district sustained its focus on strengthening MTSS across all sites. Tier 1 implementation continued to be supported by site-based Tier 1 teams, with district guidance and coaching provided to build capacity and consistency. In addition, Tier 2 structures were expanded with a targeted emphasis on attendance and related interventions. Elementary sites also benefited from support in implementing Playworks during recess and the addition of MTSS behavioral aides, who delivered intensive, student-specific interventions. Site teams were further supported through direct coaching and consultation to guide implementation and refine practices aligned to the MTSS framework.

4.4 Foster Youth Services: Support services for Foster Youth demonstrated effectiveness, particularly in reducing chronic absenteeism rates for this student group. While CAASPP academic performance data was not available due to the small sample size, and suspension rates showed an increase, these fluctuations are common with smaller student populations and will continue to be closely monitored. However, local assessment data (i-Ready) showed some encouraging growth in academic performance among Foster Youth, suggesting positive impacts from the supports provided. This year, the district continued to strengthen its targeted supports for Foster Youth. A designated district registrar provided personalized assistance with enrollment and scheduling to ensure continuity of education. Students received resources to meet basic needs and to ensure they could access school, including school supplies and technology. Academic support was offered through access to tutoring, while district social workers maintained regular check-ins, providing counseling and connecting students to additional services as needed. These layered supports help develop a sense of stability and connection for our Foster Youth across school sites.

4.5 Attendance supports were highly effective this year, as evidenced by a significant decrease in chronic absenteeism across all student groups and a steady increase in Average Daily Attendance (ADA). These positive trends reflect strong, systemwide improvements in how attendance is supported and monitored. The district made substantial progress in streamlining attendance processes and providing clearer guidance to school sites. Attendance was further integrated into the MTSS framework through the addition of Tier 2 teams focused specifically on attendance, which received direct coaching and support from the district. These teams were equipped to review data, identify students in need of support, and implement consistent intervention strategies in collaboration with families. In addition, an early-year campaign promoted positive messaging around the importance of attendance, reinforcing the idea that students need to be present each day to experience the powerful moments that shape their learning and growth.

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

Metrics:

4.1 Chronic Absenteeism K-8 - SED met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 18.7%; SWD met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 20.5%; HI met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 16.4%; FY met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 29.0%.

4.3 High School Cohort Graduation Rate - All met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 97.7%; EL met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 97.3%; SED met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 97.4%; AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 98.4%; HI met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 97.8%.

4.4 High School Dropout Rate - All met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 0.3%; EL met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 0.0%; SED met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 0.4%; SWD met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 0.6%; AA met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 0.0%; HI met target for year 3 outcome so decreased that target to 0.2%.

4.8 Tiered Fidelity Inventory - Adjusted total schools from 22 to 20 to account for discontinuation of the Learn@Home school and to account for two schools that function as one in terms of MTSS practices (MCA and Options).

4.10 CA Dashboard Local Indicators: Priority 3 (Parental Involvement and Family Engagement) - Unduplicated met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to (4).

4.11 Local School Climate Survey - Panorama LCAP Survey - Parent Survey (values your opinion question) met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 56%; Student Survey met target for year 3 outcomes for all questions so increased those targets to 66%, 44%, 63%, and 71%; Staff survey met target for year 3 outcomes for at least one staff group for the first three questions so increased those targets to 80%/82%, 83%/81%, and 81%/80%.

4.12 CAASPP (% meets/ exceeds standard) - 5th grade ELA AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 43.8%; 5th grade Math AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 33.5%; 5th grade Math HI met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 40.6%; 8th grade ELA SWD met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 31.8%; 8th grade ELA AA met target for year 3 outcome so increased that target to 54.6%.

Actions:

4.1 Title has been changed to Practices to Support All Students to better describe its focus. The adjusted language has been updated throughout the action description, including relevant research.

4.3 Adjusted action description to reflect use of LREBG funds.

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

Actions

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|----------|---|--|----------------|--------------|
| 4.1 | Practices to Support All Students | The actions in Practices to Support All Students will provide educational partners with training in and resources to support all students in order to ensure our staff is prepared to meet the individual needs of the students they serve, with a focus on providing services and support to students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). This action will also be directed towards Foster Youth which has been characterized as Red for Suspension Rates on the 2023 Dashboard and Students with Disabilities, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, African American students, and Multiple Race students, at specific schools, which are also characterized as Red for Suspension Rates on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. | \$260,396.00 | Yes |
| 4.2 | Educational Partner Engagement | Educational Partner Engagement will provide opportunities for parents and students to engage with our district and schools in meaningful ways which promote connectedness, family education and input, and emotional well-being, with a focus on supporting students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). | \$184,786.00 | Yes |
| 4.3 | Mental Health Supports and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) | Mental Health Supports and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) will provide actions and services to address the social emotional well-being of students, as well as to develop systems at each school that support positive behavior, strong school cultures, and student safety, with a focus on supporting students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). LREBG (\$205,436) will fund services in this action. Research supports this use of funds, finding that MTSS and RTI provide an effective framework to better meet student learning needs and improve outcomes for all students. This action will also be directed towards Foster Youth which has been characterized as Red for Suspension Rates on the 2023 Dashboard and Students with Disabilities, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, African American students, and Multiple Race students, at specific schools, which are also characterized as Red for Suspension Rates on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. It will also address the district's Differentiated Assistance for American Indian students in the areas of suspension and chronic absenteeism. | \$1,780,982.00 | Yes |

| Action # | Title | Description | Total Funds | Contributing |
|----------|-------------------------------|--|----------------|--------------|
| 4.4 | Foster Youth Support Services | Foster Youth Support Services will provide the necessary services to ensure improved attendance, engagement, social-emotional health, and academic achievement for our Foster Youth students. On the CA Dashboard, the FY group consistently demonstrates the most need of all of our students groups, as it is characterized as Red for Suspension Rate. | \$172,384.00 | Yes |
| 4.5 | Attendance Supports | Attendance supports will provide resources for schools for attendance monitoring, prevention, and response and supports for students and families, such as transportation at reduced cost, to improve attendance and decrease chronic absenteeism, with a focus on supporting students in unduplicated student groups (English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Foster Youth). This action will also be directed towards Murrieta Canyon Academy, specific student groups at Murrieta Canyon Academy, and English Learners, Asian students, African American students, and White students, at specific schools, that are characterized as Red for Chronic Absenteeism on the 2023 Dashboard, as listed in the Plan Summary. It will also address the district's Differentiated Assistance for American Indian students in the area of chronic absenteeism. | \$1,882,819.00 | Yes |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants | Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant |
| \$\$25,944,135.00 | \$0 |

Required Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the LCAP Year

| Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year | LCFF Carryover — Percentage | LCFF Carryover — Dollar | Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 10.806% | 0.000% | \$0.00 | 10.806% |

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

Required Descriptions

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | <p>Action: Additional Teachers for Smaller Class Sizes</p> <p>Need: The district's local assessment data (iReady) demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics at the K-3 level. Despite all students scoring 56.9% proficient in ELA,</p> | To address these academic needs, the district will continue to provide additional K-3 teachers to reduce class size beyond collectively bargained contract requirements. This will enable teachers to differentiate more effectively and to more easily provide integrated and designated supports to meet English Learners' needs. These supports will improve ELA and math achievement for our foster youth, English Learners, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students on the CAASPP assessment which will be reflected on the state's | The district will monitor this action using local iReady diagnostic data for grades K - 3 (metric 1.1), as well as CAASPP data for grade 3 (metric 1.2) and grades 8 and 11 (metric 1.7). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|---|---|
| | <p>32.8% of ELs, 49.0% of SED students, and 43.9% of FY are scoring proficient. Similarly, 33.5% of all students are proficient in Math, and only 16.4% of ELs, 25.9% of SED students, and 17.1% of FY are proficient in Math. The district has room to grow in overall achievement levels, as well as in closing achievement gaps for unduplicated students.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>dashboard. LREBG funds will enable us to provide similar support for smaller class sizes at the secondary level, including RSP and SDC classes. This action will benefit all students across the district, but it has been implemented specifically to impact the achievement of these targeted student groups. It is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students. Funds directed towards smaller class sizes provide opportunities for more robust Tier I support of all students. They are principally directed to our unduplicated students, including English Learners, to allow for differentiation, as well as the use of integrated supports within the classroom.</p> <p>From the Harvard Magazine and research study: "After four years, it was clear that smaller classes did bring substantial improvement in early learning in cognitive subjects such as reading and arithmetic. Following the groups further, the Lasting Benefits Study demonstrated that the positive effects persisted into grades 4, 5, 6, and 7, so that students who had originally been enrolled in smaller classes continued to perform better than their grade mates who had started in larger classes" (Harvard Magazine, August 28, 2019). This research is encouraging as it speaks specifically to the district's purpose in providing additional teachers at the primary grades at our elementary schools to allow teachers to more effectively meet the learning needs of our unduplicated student groups.</p> | <p>groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Because smaller class sizes allow teachers to more easily differentiate instruction to meet the needs of our unduplicated students, because teachers believe that smaller class sizes enable them to more effectively engage and meet the academic needs of all students, and because current research indicates that smaller class size positively impacts student learning, particularly for the students with the greatest needs, we conclude this is the most effective use of these resources.</p> | |
| 1.2 | <p>Action: Additional Counselors TK - 12</p> <p>Need: The district's A-G and CCI data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students' college/career readiness. The district's overall A-G rate was 57.0%, while our EL student group had a rate 31.0% and our SED student group had a rate of 48.3%. Similarly, the district's overall CCI rate was 53.7%, while our EL student group had a rate of 26.4% and our SED student group had a rate 44.7%. Our FY student group was not big enough to have a reported A-G or CCI rate. The district has room to grow in overall A-G and CCI rates, as well as in closing gaps in these rates for unduplicated students.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>To address these needs, the district will support our English Learners, foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students through additional counseling services at each of our school levels. These services will provide targeted academic guidance and resources, as well as mental health support and social emotional learning. Counselors will focus on preparing students for middle school, high school, and post-secondary college and career opportunities. Additionally, the coordinator of counseling will ensure that consistent and impactful practices are in place district-wide to serve our unduplicated student groups, as well as our entire student population.</p> <p>The district expects that A-G and CCI rates will increase for our foster youth, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and English Learners as a result of the additional targeted counseling services. This counseling services action will benefit all students district-wide, but it has been implemented specifically to impact the achievement of these student groups. It is</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using A-G completion rates (metric 1.3) and College and Career Indicator (CCI) data (metric 1.6). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students.</p> <p>An ASCA Empirical Research Study, Supporting the Value of School Counseling-Comprehensive School Counseling in Rhode Island, Dimmitt, C., & Wilkerson, B. 2012, explored relationships among school counseling practices, secondary school demographics, and student outcomes in the state of Rhode Island during a two-year period. The takeaway from this research study was that the presence of comprehensive school counseling programs is linked to an array of positive student outcomes ranging from better attendance to a stronger sense of connection to school. Another ASCA study focused on elementary counseling, comprehensive school counseling programs, and student achievement outcomes: A comparative analysis of Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) versus non-RAMP schools, Wilkerson, K., Perusse, R., & Hughes, A. (2013). Findings indicated that school-wide proficiency rates in English/Language Arts and Math are significantly higher in RAMP designated elementary schools compared to elementary controls. The takeaway from this research is that there is strong evidence that elementary schools with comprehensive, data-driven school counseling programs display higher academic outcomes compared to schools without such programs.</p> <p>Because our foster youth, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and English Learners will receive increased and targeted counseling services, which provide early intervention, academic and mental health support, and</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|---|---|
| | | college/career guidance, and because research indicates that comprehensive counseling programs are linked to an array of positive student outcomes, we conclude that this is the most effective use of these resources. | |
| 1.3 | <p>Action: Coordinators and PLT Leads</p> <p>Need: The district's dashboard data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. Despite the district being categorized as Green overall in English Language Arts, our EL and FY student groups are characterized as Orange. In Mathematics, the district is also categorized as Green, but our SED student group is characterized as Yellow, and our EL and FY student groups are characterized as Orange.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>To address these needs, the district will provide coordinators to support our school staff's work in professional learning teams (PLTs) with a focus on the use of data to improve student learning and achievement for our foster youth, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and English Learners. Additionally, the district will provide stipends for PLT leads for each grade level and course in the district in order to ensure that our teams focus on the key components of effective PLTs. The PLT work will improve instructional and assessment practices by aligning pacing, curriculum, and assessments. The PLTs will develop strategies and interventions that support all learners' needs, especially our foster youth, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and English Learners.</p> <p>With district coordinators and PLT leads supporting PLTs, the district expects that achievement, as measured by CAASPP data and dashboard indicators, will increase at a greater rate for our foster youth, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and English Learners than for our overall student population. The coordinators' and PLT leads' oversight of this work ensures that consistent and impactful practices are in place district-wide. Their support of PLTs will benefit all students district-wide, but this action is</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using CAASPP data in English Language Arts and Mathematics (metric 1.7), as well as CAST data (metric 1.8). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students.</p> <p>In a review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning, Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. 2007., there is clear evidence that the PLC model shifts teachers' habits of mind and creates cultures of teaching that engage educators in enhancing teacher and student learning. Additionally, in those studies where the work of PLCs is linked to student achievement, the research clearly demonstrates a strong positive connection. In each of these cases, the key was collaboration with a clear and persistent focus on data about student learning. This finding is consistent with the findings of other researchers who have reviewed literature about the importance of a focus on student learning and the analysis of student work (Guskey, 1997; Little, Gearhart, Curry, & Kafka, 2003). The studies in this review documented changes in student achievement over time, in some cases up to 5 years. What these studies show is that working collaboratively is the process, not the goal, of a PLC. The goal is enhanced student achievement.</p> <p>Because our unduplicated students, especially our foster youth, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and English Learners are receiving increased academic supports due to teacher collaboration in PLTs, because coordinators are in place to provide resources and guidance for this initiative, and because research indicates that the work of PLCs is linked to increased student</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| | | achievement, this is the most effective use of these resources. | |
| 1.4 | <p>Action: Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program</p> <p>Need: The district's A-G and CCI data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students' college/career readiness. The district's overall A-G rate was 57.0%, while our EL student group had a rate 31.0% and our SED student group had a rate of 48.3%. Similarly, the district's overall CCI rate was 53.7%, while our EL student group had a rate of 26.4% and our SED student group had a rate 44.7%. Our FY student group was not big enough to have a reported A-G or CCI rate. The district has room to grow in overall A-G and CCI rates, as well as in closing gaps in these rates for unduplicated students.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>To address this need, the AVID program will provide students with support in attaining college readiness. The AVID program is specifically designed to serve our low-income, first-generation, college-bound students to ensure college readiness upon graduation. The AVID program is offered at all secondary schools district-wide.</p> <p>The district expects to see increased A-G rates and CCI rates for students as a result of the continued implementation of the AVID program. This action will benefit all secondary students who meet AVID criteria and participate in the program, but it is in place to primarily impact socioeconomically disadvantaged students, as the program promotes increased college readiness for low-income, first-generation students. Therefore, this action is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students.</p> <p>The research shows AVID is a "Best Practice in Innovative Programming" (Hanover Research, December 2012). Specifically, the findings show, "Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), a college readiness program aimed at disadvantaged students of moderate academic ability, boasts significant graduation and college attendance rates for program participants. In a study of 'best practices' AVID schools, researchers identified several aspects central to program success. These included targeted recruitment efforts and the identification and retention of</p> | The district will monitor this action using A-G completion rates (metric 1.3) and College and Career Indicator (CCI) data (metric 1.6), as well as AVID participation, retention, and GPA data (metrics 1.10 - 1.12). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed. |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>qualified tutors. Nearly every 'best practice' school examined in the study employed AVID graduates as tutors, as these individuals were widely considered to be most knowledgeable on students' attitudes and needs" (Best Practices in Innovative Programming, December 2012). Our district continues to adhere to the AVID prescribed implementation guidance and, as a result, we continue to achieve strong outcomes for our AVID participants.</p> <p>Because our unduplicated students, especially socioeconomically disadvantaged students, demonstrate a need for improved A-G rates, and because the AVID program focuses on supporting this group of students in college readiness, and because research indicates that AVID programs can contribute to significant graduation and college attendance rates for program participants, this is the most effective use of these resources.</p> | |
| 1.5 | <p>Action: Career Technical Education (CTE)</p> <p>Need: The district's CCI data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students' college/career readiness. The district's overall CCI rate was 53.7%, while our EL student group had a rate of 26.4% and our SED student group had a rate 44.7%. Our FY student group was not big enough to have a reported CCI rate. The district has room to grow in our overall CCI rate, as well as in closing gaps for unduplicated students.</p> | <p>To address this need, the district will continue to provide targeted recruitment for our unduplicated students to enroll in Career Technical Education (CTE) courses and pathways. We will continue to promote our two-course pathways to students and families so they are aware of certifications and/or trajectories to community colleges, technical colleges, 4-year universities, the workplace, or the military.</p> <p>The district expects to see increased engagement in learning and school, as well as enhanced planning for post high school opportunities, due to having CTE opportunities for our unduplicated student groups. These efforts align with the</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using College Career Indicator (CCI) data (metric 1.6), as well as CTE Pathway Completion data (metric 1.5). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| | <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>additional counseling supports for academic planning which will result in increased A-G rates and increased college and career indicator rates. CTE programs will positively impact all students, but this action is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students.</p> <p>CTE programs have an impact on graduation rates. Research studies have shown that there is a ninety percent CTE student graduation rate in high school versus the seventy-five percent average nationwide graduation rate (U.S. Department of Education 2007-2008 data, National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium). Additionally, CTE programs support retention rates for at-risk students. High-risk students are eight to ten times less likely to drop out in the 11th and 12th grades if they enroll in a CTE program (Kulik, "Curriculum Tracks and High School Vocational Studies," University of Michigan, 1998). CTE has increased school connectedness, reduced behavioral problems related to suspensions and expulsions, and reduced dropouts in all student groups, but especially among students who are at highest risk of dropping out (Op. Cite, University of Memphis, 2004).</p> <p>Because our College and Career Indicator data indicates a need to focus on connecting all students to school and post-secondary options, and because research indicates that taking CTE courses results in a higher graduation rate, particularly for at-risk students, and because research indicates that CTE increases</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| | | connectedness and reduces dropouts in all student groups, this is the most effective use of these resources. | |
| 1.6 | <p>Action: College/Career Readiness</p> <p>Need: The district's A-G and CCI data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students' college/career readiness. The district's overall A-G rate was 57.0%, while our EL student group had a rate 31.0% and our SED student group had a rate of 48.3%. Similarly, the district's overall CCI rate was 53.7%, while our EL student group had a rate of 26.4% and our SED student group had a rate 44.7%. Our FY student group was not big enough to have a reported A-G or CCI rate. The district has room to grow in overall A-G and CCI rates, as well as in closing gaps in these rates for unduplicated students.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>To address this need, the district will take intentional steps to prepare unduplicated students for high school and post-secondary planning, as well as promote and support advanced coursework options with these student groups. These efforts will include High School Kick-off events, AP/IB exam fee waivers, summer follow-up and support for high school graduates, college field trips, and Profile of a Graduate planning and implementation.</p> <p>The district expects to see an increase in A-G and CCI rates for foster youth, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and English Learners, as well as increased AP enrollment for socioeconomically disadvantaged students. These efforts align with the additional counseling support for academic planning, resulting in increased college readiness. This action will support all students, but it is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students.</p> <p>According to National Council Access Network (NCAN), the following are barriers to students attending college: they are not academically prepared, they do not understand options for college, they don't understand the importance of college entrance exams, they are not involved in extra-curricular activities, and/or they come from families who are unfamiliar with higher education. The programs and supports that we are putting in</p> | The district will monitor this action using EAP rates (metric 1.13), A-G completion rates (metric 1.3), A-G + CTE Pathway Completion rates (metric 1.4), AP Participation and Pass Rates (metrics 1.14 and 1.15), and College and Career Indicator (CCI) data (metric 1.6). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed. |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>place to promote college/career readiness help to eliminate these barriers for unduplicated students. In a study by Tomas Rivera Policy Institute, "findings indicate that access to AP courses remains an unlikely opportunity for Black and Latino students and many low-income/rural students regardless of ethnicity and that AP courses continue to be an inequitable sorting mechanism that limits some groups' college preparation opportunities" (Gaining or Losing Ground? Equity in Offering Advanced Placement Courses in California High Schools 1997-2003, Zarate, Maria Estela; Pachon, Harry P., 2006). Additionally, research shows that students who take AP courses and exams are much more likely than their peers to complete a college degree on time—which means they avoid paying for a fifth year of tuition. Most colleges and universities nationwide offer college credit, advanced placement, or both for qualifying AP Exam scores. This can mean fulfilling graduation requirements early and skipping introductory courses or required general-education courses (AP Central at https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/about-ap/discover-benefits).</p> <p>Because our A-G and AP enrollment rates indicate a need to promote college/career readiness, and because research supports intentional efforts to provide college/career readiness activities for unduplicated students, especially socioeconomically disadvantaged students, English Learners, and identified student groups who are not likely to matriculate into post-secondary education, these efforts are the most</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| | | effective use of the funds. | |
| 2.1 | <p>Action: Elementary Intervention Teachers</p> <p>Need: The district's local assessment data (iReady) demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics at the elementary level. Despite all students scoring 56.9% proficient in ELA, 32.8% of ELs, 49.0% of SED students, and 43.9% of FY are scoring proficient. Similarly, 33.5% of all students are proficient in Math, and only 16.4% of ELs, 25.9% of SED students, and 17.1% of FY are proficient in Math. The district has room to grow in overall achievement levels, as well as in closing achievement gaps for unduplicated students.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>To address these academic needs, the district will offer full-time intervention teachers at each elementary site to address the reading and math needs of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners. This intentional intervention for our unduplicated students, as well as before and after school intervention using LREBG funds, will provide supplemental, targeted support leading to higher achievement as evidenced by CAASPP scores and the local iReady assessment data. This action will benefit all elementary students who qualify for intervention, but this action is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of our unduplicated students.</p> <p>Murrieta Valley USD will provide an elementary intervention teacher at each of our eleven elementary schools. Two teachers will be in place at schools that are over 1000 students. These teachers will support students who are not meeting standards on local and state assessments. Intervention teachers use research-based programs and practices to close the achievement gap both in push-in and pull-out service delivery models. They are an integral part of the development of universal access programs and support teachers in analyzing and responding to student achievement data in PLTs.</p> <p>A 2015 research study states there were positive effects of small group instruction on student learning even though all students did not reach grade-level proficiency in reading by the end of the</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using local iReady diagnostic data for grades K - 5 (metric 2.1). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>school year. By providing the intervention class, students identified as at-risk learners received a more individualized and differentiated type of daily instruction than what is provided in a traditional classroom setting (A Case Study of the Impact of Reading Intervention in Early Elementary School Grade Levels, Smith, Bonnie S., Gardner-Webb University, 2015). Burns et al. (2008) conducted research to identify the key components of quality interventions including: (a) highly targeted, (b) provides an appropriate level of challenge for the individual student, (c) explicitly teaches a specific skill, (d) allows many opportunities to respond, and (e) provides immediate corrective feedback for an individual student.</p> <p>Because our local iReady assessment scores indicate a need for providing academic support for our elementary foster youth, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and English Learners, and because research supports targeted, small group intervention efforts with specific components, and because our intervention teachers provide support which aligns to these identified components, the intervention teacher support is the most effective use of the funds.</p> | |
| 2.2 | <p>Action: Secondary Intervention</p> <p>Need: The district's CAASPP data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics at the</p> | <p>To address this need, the district will continue to provide our socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners with academic support and credit recovery opportunities by offering additional intervention sections at the secondary schools, tutors in Math classes, and summer school opportunities. This will support students' achievement in literacy and math, as well as improve their grades in core</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using CAASPP data (metric 2.2), as well as local data from a new assessment tool (Star data - metric 2.7). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|---|---|
| | <p>secondary level. Despite a proficiency rate of 58.1% in ELA for all students in 8th grade, our ELs scored at 11.1% and our SED students scored at 50.4%. In math at 8th grade, all students scored at 41.9% proficiency, while our ELs scored at 7.9% and our SED at 35.1%. There is a similar pattern of proficiency at 11th grade with overall ELA proficiency at 72.5% and ELs at 12.9% and SED students at 64.4%. In math, 38.1% are proficient at 11th grade, with 1.4% of ELs and 28.8% of SED. Our FY student group was not big enough to have a reported score. The district has room to grow in overall achievement levels, as well as in closing achievement gaps for unduplicated students, particularly for our English Learners.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>classes. The additional intervention services provide our socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners with focused support in math and ELA, as well as in other core classes.</p> <p>The district expects to see an increase in CAASPP scores in English Language Arts and Mathematics at the secondary schools, overall and for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners, due to these intervention services. Our new local assessment at the secondary level, STAR, will be used to monitor this action. This action will benefit all secondary students who are in need of credit recovery and intervention, but it is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students.</p> <p>From research and a panel paper on credit recovery, findings indicate students who take credit recovery courses are more likely to graduate from high school and less likely to drop out than students who repeat courses traditionally. Credit recovery is a particularly effective strategy to prevent Black, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged students from dropping out and for increasing the likelihood of graduating from high school for economically disadvantaged students (Panel Paper: An Evaluation of Credit Recovery As an Intervention for Students who Fail Courses, Samantha L. Viano, UCONN Department of Public Policy, November 10, 2018). In The Benefits of In-School Intervention (enrichingstudents.com), the authors state that, "The best option would be to create a time during the day for intervention, and</p> | <p>groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>other opportunities. This would help students not to miss out on class time, and avoid the embarrassment and stigma that may come with being pulled out of class. During-school intervention also gets students while they are at school. You don't have to worry about extending teacher hours or getting students a ride. It also provides the extra instruction in real-time. Students can take what they learn in intervention to their next class." This aligns with the district's intention with this action which is to provide opportunities, during the school day, for students to receive support in their academic skills in core areas, particularly English Language Arts and Math.</p> <p>Because our CAASPP ELA and Math scores indicate a need to support our socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners in all coursework, and because the research indicates that intervention and credit recovery positively impact student learning and graduation rates, we conclude this is the most effective use of funds.</p> | |
| 2.4 | <p>Action: Intervention Programs and Support</p> <p>Need: The district's dashboard data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. Despite the district being categorized as Green overall in English Language Arts, our EL and FY student groups are characterized as Orange. In</p> | <p>To address these academic needs, the district will continue to provide intervention programs to support the learning needs of our English Learners, foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students in both English Language Arts and Math. Programs used to provide this support will include Read 180 and Star/Freckle, which build skills that lead to reading and math proficiency. The EduClimber program will be used to ensure there is collaboration amongst staff and families around interventions to support students who need them. LREBG funds will provide</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using local assessment (metrics 2.1 and 2.7) and CAASPP data (metric 2.2). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | <p>Mathematics, the district is also categorized as Green, but our SED student group is characterized as Yellow, and our EL and FY student groups are characterized as Orange. There is a need to provide additional support to close academic achievement gaps.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>elementary sites with the 95 Phonics Lesson Library.</p> <p>The CAASPP scores and local assessment data are expected to increase for our English Learners, foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students as a result of the use of intervention programs. This action will benefit all students who need intervention, but it is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students.</p> <p>There is research demonstrating the effectiveness and potential impact on student achievement for the district's intervention programs. For example, the What Works Clearinghouse found that READ 180 was found to have positive effects on comprehension and general literacy achievement (2016) and in a study of Freckle for Math and Freckle for ELA by Renaissance (published 2024), "Practice with Freckle was associated with a greater percentage of students meeting Star proficiency benchmarks at the end of the year compared to the beginning of the year, and higher levels of growth in general math or reading ability." Research states, "If addressed early, Tier 2 interventions can prevent further disengagement - which often results in chronic or more serious behaviors and academic failure" (New Hampshire Center for Effective Behavioral Interventions and Supports, November 2010).</p> <p>Because the district's dashboard indicates a need to support English Learners, foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics, and</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| | | because the district is providing intervention using research-based practices, and because research indicates that among the students with the greatest needs, Tier 2 interventions positively impact student learning, we conclude this is the most effective use of funds. | |
| 3.1 | <p>Action: Instructional Coaches</p> <p>Need: The district's local assessment data (iReady) demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics at the elementary level. Despite all students scoring 56.9% proficient in ELA, 32.8% of ELs, 49.0% of SED students, and 43.9% of FY are scoring proficient. Similarly, 33.5% of all students are proficient in Math, and only 16.4% of ELs, 25.9% of SED students, and 17.1% of FY are proficient in Math. The district has room to grow in overall achievement levels, as well as in closing achievement gaps for unduplicated students.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>To address these academic needs, the district will provide instructional coaching to support teacher training at the elementary level. This action provides an array of supports to our staff and enables them to more effectively meet the needs of our unduplicated students. This includes instructional coaching of individuals and grade level teams, professional development for teachers, support of the implementation of teacher-developed pacing guides and assessments, and assistance in using data to support the work of PLTs.</p> <p>The district expects to see improved student achievement in English Language Arts and Math as measured by CAASPP scores and local iReady data. This action will benefit all students across the district, but it is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of English Learners, foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.</p> <p>This action contributes to supporting teacher growth in meeting the needs of every learner in their classroom, specifically the students with the greatest needs, our English Learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and foster youth. Research has found that instructional coaching improves both instructional practice and</p> | The district will monitor this action using local iReady diagnostic data for grades K - 5 (metric 3.2). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed. |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>student achievement—more so than other professional development and school-based interventions. In fact, the quality of teachers' instruction improves by as much as—or even more than—the difference in effectiveness between a new teacher and one with five to ten years of experience, the research shows (Instructional Coaching Works, Says a New Analysis. But There's a Catch, Will, M. Education Week, July 2018).</p> <p>Because CAASPP data indicates a need for growth in both English Language Arts and Math for our socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners, and because research supports the positive impact of instructional coaching on student achievement, we conclude that this is the most effective use of funds.</p> | |
| 3.2 | <p>Action: Induction Program</p> <p>Need: The district's dashboard data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. Despite the district being categorized as Green overall in English Language Arts, our EL and FY student groups are characterized as Orange. In Mathematics, the district is also categorized as Green, but our SED student group is characterized as Yellow, and our EL and FY student groups are characterized as Orange.</p> | <p>To address these academic needs, the district will provide an Induction Program to support new teachers as they enter the district and the teaching profession. This action provides an array of supports to our staff which enable them to more effectively meet the needs of our unduplicated students. This includes mentoring and professional development for new teachers to learn about the district, their professional duties, and best strategies for the instruction and engagement of students.</p> <p>The district expects to see improved student achievement in English Language Arts and Math as measured by CAASPP scores, as well as decreased chronic absenteeism due to greater</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using CAASPP performance for English Language Arts and Mathematics (metric 3.4), as well as Chronic Absenteeism data (metric 3.3) and Induction Program data (metric 3.5). The district will look at the first two data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| | <p>There is a need to provide additional support to close academic achievement gaps. This need is also demonstrated in the district's academic engagement data, such as Chronic Absenteeism. All students are characterized as Yellow, including SED and FY, and Foster Youth is Orange. This demonstrates a need to support staff in developing strategies for engaging and building connections with students.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>engagement. This action will benefit all students across the district, but it is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of English Learners, foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.</p> <p>This action contributes to supporting teacher growth in meeting the needs of every learner in their classroom, specifically the students with the greatest needs, our English Learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and foster youth. Research supports the implementation of strong induction programs. In Examining the Effects of New Teacher Induction, Marjorie Wechsler finds, "New teachers are typically less effective than veteran teachers at improving student achievement, but induction and mentoring programs can help new teachers become more effective teachers more quickly than without the support (Menlo Park: SRI International, 2010).</p> <p>Because the dashboard data indicates a need for growth in English Language Arts and Math performance, as well as a need to reduce our chronic absenteeism rates for our socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners, and because research supports the positive impact of induction programs, we conclude that this is the most effective use of funds.</p> | |
| 3.3 | <p>Action: Curriculum Work Teams</p> <p>Need:</p> | <p>To address these academic needs, the district will implement curriculum work teams at the secondary level to bring teachers together to collaborate around and develop the infrastructure</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using CAASPP data (metric 3.4), as well as local data from a new</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | <p>The district's CAASPP data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics at the secondary level. Despite a proficiency rate of 58.1% in ELA for all students in 8th grade, our ELs scored at 11.1% and our SED students scored at 50.4%. In math at 8th grade, all students scored at 41.9% proficiency, while our ELs scored at 7.9% and our SED at 35.1%. There is a similar pattern of proficiency at 11th grade with overall ELA proficiency at 72.5% and ELs at 12.9% and SED students at 64.4%. In math, 38.1% are proficient at 11th grade, with 1.4% of ELs and 28.8% of SED. Our FY student group was not big enough to have a reported score. The district has room to grow in overall achievement levels, as well as in closing achievement gaps for unduplicated students, particularly for our English Learners.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>needed for PLTs. This action provides an array of supports to our staff which enable them to more effectively meet the needs of our unduplicated students. This includes teacher-developed pacing guides and assessments, curriculum adoption, grade level projects aligned to the district's Profile of a Graduate, and new course development. The district expects to see improved student achievement in English Language Arts and Math as measured by CAASPP scores, as well as a decline in F rates. This action will benefit all students across the district, but it is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of English Learners, foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.</p> <p>This action contributes to supporting teacher collaboration and proficiency in meeting the needs of every learner in their classroom, specifically the students with the greatest needs, our English Learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and foster youth. The curriculum work teams contribute to the district's work in developing effective PLCs, which have been shown to significantly improve student achievement. "PLCs engaged in high-level learning, intensive collaboration, and exchange of knowledge are, in turn, highly likely to positively impact student achievement" (Basileo, Lindsey Devers, PhD, Did You Know? Your School's PLCs Have a Major Impact, Learning Science International, 2016).</p> <p>Because dashboard data indicates a need for growth in English Language Arts and Math performance, as well as a need to reduce our F</p> | <p>assessment tool (Star data - metric 3.7). 2+ F data (metric 3.6) will also be used to monitor this action. The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| | | rates for our socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners, and because research supports the positive impact of PLCs on student achievement, and because the curriculum work teams directly impact the effectiveness of our PLCs, we conclude that this is the most effective use of funds. | |
| 3.4 | <p>Action: Data and Assessment Programs</p> <p>Need: The district's dashboard data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. Despite the district being categorized as Green overall in English Language Arts, our EL and FY student groups are characterized as Orange. In Mathematics, the district is also categorized as Green, but our SED student group is characterized as Yellow, and our EL and FY student groups are characterized as Orange. There is a need for staff to analyze data to inform instruction and to develop interventions or supports for students who are not meeting standards.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>To address these academic needs, the district will provide outsourced data and assessment programs to aid our PLC focus. This action provides a support to our staff which enables them to more effectively meet the needs of our unduplicated students. This includes academic and school climate data to support the work of PLCs.</p> <p>The district expects to see improved student achievement in English Language Arts and Math as measured by CAASPP scores and local data, such as iReady. This action will benefit all students across the district, but it is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of English Learners, foster youth, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.</p> <p>This action contributes to supporting teacher collaboration and proficiency in meeting the needs of every learner in their classroom, specifically the students with the greatest needs, our English Learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and foster youth. Outsourced data and assessment programs contribute to the district's work in developing effective PLCs, which have been shown to significantly improve student achievement. "PLCs engaged in high-level</p> | The district will monitor this action using local assessments (metric 3.2 and 3.7) and CAASPP data (metric 3.4). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed. |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>learning, intensive collaboration, and exchange of knowledge are, in turn, highly likely to positively impact student achievement." (Basileo, Lindsey Devers, PhD, Did You Know? Your School's PLCs Have a Major Impact, Learning Science International, 2016)</p> <p>Because CAASPP data indicates a need for growth in both English Language Arts and math for our socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners, and because research supports the positive impact of PLCs on student achievement, and because the outsourced data and assessment systems directly impact the effectiveness of our PLCs, we conclude that this is the most effective use of funds.</p> | |
| 4.1 | <p>Action: Practices to Support All Students</p> <p>Need: The district's dashboard data demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. Despite the district being categorized as Green overall in English Language Arts, our EL and FY student groups are characterized as Orange. In Mathematics, the district is also categorized as Green, but our SED student group is characterized as Yellow, and our EL and FY student groups are characterized as Orange. There is a need to provide additional support to teachers to build their mindset and capacity for closing academic achievement gaps. In</p> | <p>To address these needs, the district will provide training on student-centered practices for staff, as well as connect key district initiatives to this work. As a result of this action, academic achievement will increase and suspension rates will decrease for our unduplicated students. This action will benefit all students across the district who will be positively impacted by a continued focus on building our staff's understanding of the role of student-centered practices in educational practice, but it is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students.</p> <p>Building practices to support all students is a process. "Before people can conceive of the how, they must first understand the why." (Community: The Structure of Belonging, P. Block, 2008). Our district is dedicated to helping all educational partners understand the importance of student-</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using CAASPP (metric 4.12) and Suspension Rate data (metric 4.6), graduation and dropout rates (metrics 4.3 - 4.5), and input from our educational partners on the LCAP survey (metric 4.11). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups, when data is available, to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|--|------------------------------------|
| | <p>addition to this academic achievement data, the climate data, such as Suspension Rates, also demonstrates a need for this focus. While our EL student group is Green, our SED students are Yellow, all students are Orange, and Foster Youth are Red. This illustrates a need to support staff in developing strategies for engaging and building connections with students.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>centered work through professional development, collaboration, and capacity building. We have a commitment to sending staff to learning opportunities that engage them in thinking about these practices and how they play a role in their daily work, such as RCOE's Excellence through Education conference. Additionally, we are now making explicit connections for our staff to help them understand the impact that our key educational initiatives have on developing supportive learning environments for all. The district understands how complex this work is, but we are dedicated to a continued emphasis on student-centered practices and building our educational partners' awareness of what this can look like in our schools.</p> <p>Chase Nordengren of NWEA outlines "10 Ways to Meet the Learning Needs of All Students," highlighting research-based strategies that support academic growth for every learner. His recommendations—such as differentiation, self-directed learning, structured student discourse, and a focus on academic vocabulary—are designed to optimize instructional time, deepen content access, and promote student ownership. These strategies reflect the mindset we are cultivating among staff: a commitment to responsive instruction that ensures all students are supported and challenged in their learning.</p> <p>Because the data indicates a need for growth in both ELA and math for our socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners, and because the data indicates a need to improve suspension rates for foster youth and</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | | socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and because research supports the importance of building staff's understanding of practices to support all students, and because these efforts align with the LCAP's goals of meeting the needs of all learners, we conclude these actions are the most effective use of funds. | |
| 4.2 | <p>Action: Educational Partner Engagement</p> <p>Need: Family input on the LCAP survey indicates that while families are satisfied with their students' schools (76%) and the communication from the schools (75%), there is a discrepancy in the percentage of families who feel the school strongly values their opinion (51%). This indicates a continued need to build partnerships and trust with our families. Educational partner input tells us that these partnerships are harder to develop and maintain for our families that represent unduplicated students groups, including English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED), demonstrating a need to strengthen our efforts with these focus groups.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>To address this need, the district will support student and family engagement through our many advisory groups. The feedback from families at the various meetings helps us understand and address the needs of our students and families. Our families appreciate the opportunity to share and are supportive of our LCAP's four goals, especially Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 which specifically support meeting the needs of all students and family engagement. Based on our advisory group's feedback, the district has provided training for staff, tutoring and extra supports at all schools, social emotional supports, family informational sessions, and cultural events. Efforts are being made to implement site-based advisory councils, implement new opportunities for engaging families (parent liaisons and a family center), and promote family engagement practices with our site leaders as a result of participating in the Community Engagement Initiative. The district expects to see a positive increase in our LCAP survey results due to continued educational partner engagement. We expect to see greater engagement of all families, but this action is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of our unduplicated students' families.</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using LCAP survey data (metric 4.11) and the Local Indicator Self-Reflection Tool - Priority 3 (metric 4.10). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups, when data is available, to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>The district continues to make intentional efforts to authentically engage our educational partners through quality and meaningful engagement activities which is critical to the successful implementation of the programs and services principally directed towards our unduplicated students. There are a number of educational partner groups, many of which represent the needs of specific student groups. These include, but are not limited to: Partnership for Thriving Students and Families (PTSF), District and Site-based English Learner Parent Advisory, Latino Parent Advisory, African American Parent Advisory, Special Education Parent Advisory, PTAs, School Site Councils, and secondary Student LCAP Advisories. These groups provide great insight into the effectiveness of the various actions and services provided through the LCAP, as well as share continued needs for the district to consider. Feedback from educational partners and advisory groups indicates appreciation for the engagement efforts and a desire to have a continued voice in the district's decision making.</p> <p>Research shows that family engagement in schools improves student achievement, reduces absenteeism, and restores parents' confidence in their children's education. Students with involved parents or other caregivers earn higher grades and test scores, have better social skills, and show improved behavior (National Educators' Association).</p> <p>"Stakeholder engagement is about ensuring that the ideas and concerns of all relevant educational partners are well represented throughout a more</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>collaborative and transparent decision-making process. When done right, stakeholder engagement yields specific benefits including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better insight into stakeholders' views and opinions • The ability to make big decisions more quickly and at reduced cost Greater buy-in from stakeholders, who played a larger role throughout the decision-making process • Stronger likelihood of positive outcome thanks to access to more ideas and broader awareness of the decision made • Greater trust for education leaders among stakeholders" <p>(Five Criteria for Effective Stakeholder Engagement in Education, Thought Exchange, 2018)</p> <p>Because family survey data indicates a continued need to involve families and demonstrate that the district values their opinions, and because the district has experienced success in past educational partner engagement and hopes to build on this foundation, and because research supports the involvement of families and the impact it will have on student achievement and wellness, and because research supports the positive impact of family engagement on district decision making, we conclude that educational partner engagement actions and services are the most effective use of the funds.</p> | |
| 4.3 | <p>Action: Mental Health Supports and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)</p> | <p>To address these needs, the district will continue to provide mental health and social emotional supports, as well as continue to develop Multi-</p> | <p>This district will monitor this metric using Chronic Absenteeism (metric 4.1),</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|---|---|
| | <p>Need: The district's Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rates demonstrate a need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in school connectedness and positive behavior. The overall Chronic Absenteeism Rate for the district is 23.4%, while that for ELs is 26.8%, SED students is 29.3%, and FY is 40.2%. Similarly, the overall district suspension rate is 2.9%. While that of our ELs is also 2.9%, that of our SED students is 3.8% and that of our FY is 13.2%. The discrepancies in these rates indicate a need for continued work in this area, specifically providing supports that promote mental wellness, school connectedness, and positive student behavior.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) with a focus on positive behavior intervention at our school sites. These intentional services for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners will decrease suspension and chronic absenteeism rates by increasing student well-being and readiness for learning. Our schools continue to see increased needs in the area of behavior and mental health, and this is validated by educational partner input. This action will benefit all students across the district, but it is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students.</p> <p>Mentally healthy children are more successful in school and life. Research demonstrates that students who receive social-emotional and mental health support achieve better academically. School climate, classroom behavior, on-task learning, and students' sense of connectedness and well-being all improve as well. According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, one in five children and adolescents experience a mental health problem during their school years. Examples include stress, anxiety, bullying, family problems, depression, and alcohol and substance abuse. Serious mental health problems, such as self-injurious behaviors and suicide, are on the rise, particularly among youth. Unfortunately, it is estimated that up to 60% of students do not receive the treatment they need due to stigma and lack of access to services. Of those who do get help, nearly two thirds do so only in school (School-Based Mental Health Services: Improving Student Learning and Well-Being,</p> | Suspension and Expulsion Rates (metrics 4.6 and 4.7), as well as results from the LCAP survey (metric 4.11). We will also monitor progress on the Tiered Fidelity Inventory (metric 4.8). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups, when data is available, to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed. |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>National Association of School Psychologists, 2016).</p> <p>Across the country, local school districts, particularly those challenged by often long-standing achievement gaps and higher mandated standards for student performance, are increasingly turning to tiered system of support frameworks such as Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and Response to Intervention (RTI). They are finding that MTSS and RTI provide an effective framework for turning around schools, reforming curricula to better meet student learning needs, and improving outcomes for all students—including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. With a focus on improving outcomes for all students especially those who have been historically underserved, ESSA suggests that schools and districts implement a tiered system of support and allow states flexibility in developing their MTSS model for both behavior and academic needs (ESSA: Multi-Tiered System of Supports (formerly RTI) American Institutes for Research, June 2018).</p> <p>The mental health services, MTSS implementation, and elementary behavioral support aides will assist school sites in developing systematic services for all students, as well as allow them to provide direct group and individual services for our at-risk students with a focus on our unduplicated students.</p> <p>Because the suspension data indicates a need to support English Learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and foster youth in</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|---|---|
| | | behavior and well-being, and because research supports the positive impact of mental health services on students in schools, and because the research indicates that the MTSS framework is key to improving outcomes for those who have been historically underserved, we conclude these efforts represent the most effective use of the funds. | |
| 4.5 | <p>Action: Attendance Supports</p> <p>Need: The district's Chronic Absenteeism data reflected on the CA Dashboard demonstrates the need to support English Learners (EL), Foster Youth (FY), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students in daily school engagement. The district is characterized as Yellow overall, with 23.4% of students chronically absent. While this number has declined from the previous year, it is still very high and much higher than pre-pandemic levels. Our ELs and SED students are also characterized as Yellow, and our FY are characterized as Orange. This illustrates a need to identify barriers for students and collaborate with families to ensure students are present at school daily to maximize learning.</p> <p>Scope: LEA-wide</p> | <p>To address the attendance needs of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners, the district will provide intentional attendance efforts led by the attendance coordinator. These efforts include an attendance program for communicating concerns with families, as well as regular meetings with school site teams to address efforts to build attendance awareness and provide interventions for students who have high absenteeism. These teams will meet with families to help increase student attendance, as well as to offer supports for social-emotional well-being and school involvement, resulting in increased student learning and academic achievement.</p> <p>As part of these attendance efforts, the district will address attendance gaps for our unduplicated students by providing transportation to and from school to students with minimal to no fees, based on low-income eligibility. This service will focus on TK - 6 grade students from low-income families, students experiencing homelessness, and foster youth. Transportation to and from school will assist families in maintaining strong attendance by providing an integral support service to access our educational program.</p> | The district will monitor this metric using Attendance (metric 4.2) and Chronic Absenteeism data (metric 4.1). The district will look at these data points specifically for unduplicated student groups to assess whether the identified needs are being addressed. |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>The attendance rates are expected to increase, and chronic absenteeism rates are expected to decrease, for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners as a result of the intentional supports for students and families who have high absenteeism rates, as well as the transportation services offered to TK-6 grade students. Post-pandemic, overall attendance rates are still impacted so these actions will benefit all students across the district, but they are principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of our unduplicated students.</p> <p>You might have heard the saying, "80% of success is showing up." While that might be a high estimate of the impact of student attendance, research does tell us that attendance in school is one critical factor for success. Researchers who have studied early warning factors, or factors that can help us to predict a student's likelihood to graduate from high school, have noted the importance of looking at GPA, courses failed, and attendance. A student attending school less than 80% of the time, beginning in 6th grade, can impact later outcomes, including graduation from high school.</p> <p>Some of the key research findings include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor attendance in kindergarten and first grade can predict whether or not students can read on grade level in 3rd grade. | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By middle school, chronic attendance problems can predict whether or not a student will graduate. • Students who miss more than 2 days in the first month of school are likely to go on to miss enough days to equal an entire month of school. • When students miss 10% of the instructional year (18 days in a 180-day school year), achievement and progress are impacted. • While most school systems only have consequences or interventions that begin when students miss unexcused days, the impact is the same even when the absences are excused. The impact is also the same when the students are suspended from school. <p>There are three relatively simple interventions that schools can implement immediately to address students with chronic attendance issues and disengagement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage all students to become involved in the school through extracurricular activities and clubs. 2. Create a non-academic student attendance incentive: Connect all students in the school to a caring adult or mentor. 3. Ensure that students see the relevance of what they are learning to the real-world and to their future aspirations and goals. <p>(Success Begins with Showing Up: The Impact of Attendance on Academic Performance, Sailors, A., Life Plan Labs, October 2017)</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>The National Center for Research on Education Access and Choice provides some important research on the impact of transportation on student outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School bus eligibility increases attendance rates for economically disadvantaged students by 0.63 percentage points (approximately a 1 day increase in a 180-day school year). • School bus eligibility decreases the probability of being chronically absent (missing more than 10% of school days) for economically disadvantaged students by 3.8 percentage points (an approximate 20%-25% reduction). <p>Overall, the findings indicate that bus eligibility can help put vulnerable student populations less at risk of missing a significant amount of time in the classroom.</p> <p>(How Does School Bus Transportation Affect Student Achievement and Attendance?, Edwards, Danielle Sanderson, July 19, 2022)</p> <p>Because the data indicates a need to improve the attendance of our socioeconomically disadvantaged students, foster youth, and English Learners, and because the research supports interventions for attendance to impact wellbeing and achievement, and because the research supports transportation to and from school as positively affecting student attendance for vulnerable student populations, we conclude these efforts represent the most effective use of the funds.</p> | |

Limited Actions

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

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| 2.3 | <p>Action: English Learner Program Support</p> <p>Need: The district's English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) rate and other California Dashboard data metrics demonstrate the need to support our English Learner students in attaining English proficiency. Our ELPI status is Orange with 50.8% of students making progress towards English language proficiency, a decline of 2.4% from the prior year. In both English Language Arts and Math achievement, our English Learners are characterized as Orange. There is a need to improve the rate of language acquisition for our English Learners in order to positively impact their academic achievement.</p> <p>Scope: Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)</p> | <p>To address these needs, the district will provide our English Learner students with access to supplemental supports, including language acquisition programs, curriculum and materials, integrated and designated resources, secondary classes for designated instruction and support in core classes, and family engagement opportunities at the school site and at a district level.</p> <p>Additionally, the district will finalize our EL Master Plan, enhance support for newcomers and LTELs, and provide professional development for teachers to help them meet the needs of English Learners.</p> <p>The district expects to see an increase in the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) and an increase in academic achievement as measured by CAASPP scores and local assessment data due to these actions and services. This action is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of English Learner students.</p> <p>Regardless of the overall program structure, the Institute of Education Sciences, the Education Department's research agency, has identified rigorous evidence that the following teaching practices are effective in teaching academic content to ELLs: 1. Teach a set of academic vocabulary words intensively across several days using a variety of instructional activities. 2. Integrate oral and written English language instruction into content-area teaching. 3. Provide regular, structured opportunities to develop written</p> | <p>The district will monitor this action using English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) rates (metric 2.4), as well the performance of English learners on our local assessment tools and CAASPP (metrics 2.1 and 2.2).</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>language skills. 4. Provide small-group instructional intervention to students struggling in areas of literacy and English language development (Helping Your English Learner Students Succeed: Evidence-Based Practices for Educators, Ostrow, L., Regional Educational Laboratory, 2019).</p> <p>Additionally, the organizations Unidos, The Education Trust, and Next100 collaborated around a series of recommendations for leveraging ESSER funding to accelerate learning for ELs. Here are their tips:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage linguistically diverse families and communities by eliminating communication barriers, partnering with community-based organizations, and conducting digital literacy training. • Accelerate learning for kids learning English with targeted supports, such as summer programming and supports extended throughout the year. • Provide social and emotional, physical, and mental health supports, including hiring multilingual counselors and mental health providers. • Ensure efforts are sustainable and support long-term improvements, such as investing in a well-trained, diverse workforce and developing systems to monitor the progress of ELs. <p>By taking steps like these, education leaders will be going a long way toward helping ELs close existing opportunity gaps and ensuring they thrive in school and beyond (Katie Carroll, NWEA, March 25, 2022).</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Because data indicates a need to address the language acquisition and academic achievement of our English Learners, and because research supports specific teaching strategies and other high-leverage practices that align with the district's planned actions, we conclude this is the most effective use of funds. | |
| 2.5 | <p>Action: Long-term English Learner Supports</p> <p>Need: The district has a significant number (215) of students classified as Long-term English Learners which represents 19.0% of the overall English Learner population. These students have specific needs, and the district recognizes that we need to provide services that address these needs above and beyond what we offer for all English Learners. The district's LTEL population impacts our progress with English Learners as a whole, as well. The CA Dashboard characterizes our district's English Learner Progress as Orange with 50.8% making progress towards English language proficiency, a percentage which has declined by 2.4% from the prior year. There is a need to address the specific needs of our LTEL students to help them achieve proficiency and reclassification.</p> <p>Scope: Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)</p> | <p>To address these needs, the district will provide our Long-term English Learner students with access to services beyond those offered to all EL students. This will include a course within the school day that will target their specific language needs and curriculum that will be implemented to provide this support. Additionally, the district will finalize our EL Master Plan, which will include our approach to enhancing support for LTELs, and we will provide professional development for teachers to help them meet the needs of Long-term English Learners.</p> <p>The district expects to see a decline in our percentage of Long-term English Learners, an increase in the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI), and an increase in academic achievement of English Learners as measured by CAASPP scores and local assessment data due to these actions and services. This action is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of Long-term English Learner students.</p> <p>In a Hanover study entitled, "Effective Interventions for Long-Term English Learners," (July 2017) a number of key findings were identified, one of which was, "Despite proficiency in social English, LTELs typically lack proficiency</p> | The district will monitor this action using LTEL data (metric 2.6) and the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) rates (metric 2.4). |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>in academic language and thus require dedicated support in developing vocabulary needed for academic settings." This is a specific focus of the district's plan for supporting LTELs.</p> <p>Specifically, the English 3D program includes eight evidence-based principles for language development including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Focus on English language development for long-term English language learners. * Utilize consistent instructional routines * Explicitly teach language elements. * Extend prior knowledge of language and content. * Model verbal and written academic English. * Orchestrate peer interactions with clear language targets. * Monitor language production conscientiously. * Provide timely, productive feedback on verbal items. <p>For English language learners to advance in their education they require access to rigorous curricula at their grade levels in a way that supports English language development. Without explicit English language development, most English language learners will not gain proficiency in academic English (Olsen, 2010; Scarcella, 2003).</p> <p>Effective language teaching is not synonymous with effective content teaching. English language learners need dedicated time for second-language learning and practice (Kinsella, 2011; Gersten & Baker, 2000).</p> <p>Because data indicates a need to address language acquisition for our Long-term English</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|---|---|---|
| | | Learners, and because research supports specific teaching strategies and other high-leverage practices that align with the district's planned actions, we conclude this is the most effective use of funds. | |
| 4.4 | <p>Action: Foster Youth Support Services</p> <p>Need: While the district is pleased that we are no longer in Differentiated Assistance based on our Foster Youth (FY) metrics, we continue to recognize the need for supporting these students. On the CA Dashboard, the FY group consistently demonstrates the most need of all of our students groups, as it is characterized as Orange for English Language Arts performance, Math performance, and Chronic Absenteeism and Red for Suspension Rate. Because it is a small group, there are some indicators for which it does not have a reported color. Those that do, though, indicate a need for both academic and school engagement/climate supports to improve the success of Foster Youth in our district.</p> <p>Scope: Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)</p> | <p>In conducting a root cause analysis as part of the district's previous differentiated assistance designation, we have identified specific needs for foster youth, including academic tutoring, resources to support academics and daily living, activities to promote connections, and intensive case management and mental health support. This intentional support for Foster Youth includes a designated coordinator to monitor and address the needs of our Foster and McKinney Vento Youth, as well as a student support liaison to enroll Foster Youth students and to ensure we have all necessary documentation to support individual foster students as they transition into our schools.</p> <p>All dashboard metrics, including academic performance, graduation rate, chronic absenteeism, and suspension rate, are expected to improve as a result of the intentional supports for foster youth. Our Foster Youth were impacted tremendously by the pandemic, resulting in higher chronic absenteeism, greater mental health needs, and lower levels of engagement which have all negatively impacted student learning and achievement. This action is principally directed to and most effective in meeting the needs of Foster Youth.</p> <p>Murrieta Valley USD is in a unique position to provide public education to a high number of foster</p> | <p>The district will monitor this metric using CAASPP (metric 4.12), Chronic Absenteeism (metric 4.1), and Suspension Rate (metric 4.6) data.</p> |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>youth who reside in Short Term Residential Treatment Programs (STRTP). The STRTP program is designed to be short term and focus on stabilization. MVUSD recognizes that the needs of our foster youth in short-term programs will differ from that of other foster home placements, and interventions and supports should align with the needs of the specific foster youth.</p> <p>California students in the foster care system face more significant barriers during their transition from high school to college than their peers and require tailored supports to overcome them, according to a recent study from the Educational Results Partnership and California College Pathways. Authors of the study analyzed outcomes of more than 4,000 California foster youth and over 621,000 of their peers from their 2016–17 academic year high school cohort. Foster youth included in the study experienced lower rates of school attendance, higher rates of suspension or exclusion, a greater number of high schools attended, and less access to advanced placement courses, among other challenges. It's important that districts and practitioners working with foster youth focus on reducing school mobility to mitigate the impact regular moves have on academic outcomes. Developing cost-sharing agreements and transportation plan templates, as well as documenting processes for sending and receiving students between schools, can help ensure smoother transitions if a student does need to transfer schools. California Education Code has a robust set of protections aimed at helping foster youth maintain a stable school environment. Foster youth have the right to stay in their "school</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | | <p>of origin," even after they have moved foster care placements, if that is in their best interest. If students cannot feasibly stay in their school of origin, foster students have a right to immediate school enrollment at a new school and the right to partial credits for high school students (Study Finds Foster Youth Face Significant Barriers in Transitions to College, Kirby, A., CSBA Blog, February 2020).</p> <p>Providing students in foster care with targeted social, emotional, and academic services as part of a tiered system of support can help address the range of challenges they face. Supports can include mental health services, support for transitions, timely assessment for academic needs, screening for special education, support for school engagement, and an evaluation of credits for high school students. Access to such a web of supports can help address academic and nonacademic barriers to student learning as well as make up for lost instructional time due to absences, exclusionary discipline, and school mobility, which the quantitative data show is an urgent concern for students in foster care. (California's Students in Foster Care: Challenges and Promising Practices, Dion Burns, Daniel Espinoza, Julie Adams, and Naomi Ondrasek, September 12, 2022)</p> <p>Because data indicates substantial needs for our foster students in multiple metrics (academic achievement, chronic absenteeism, and suspension rate), and because research studies reflect the unique needs and challenges of foster students, and because research demonstrates the</p> | |

| Goal and Action # | Identified Need(s) | How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) | Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness |
|-------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | | positive impact that tiered and targeted supports can have on foster students' academic and nonacademic progress, we conclude that these are the most effective use of the funds. | |

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

NA

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

NA

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

2025-26 Total Expenditures Table

| LCAP Year | | 1. Projected LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount) | 2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount) | 3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1) | LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Input Percentage from Prior Year) | Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %) | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|---|---|--|---|--|------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|
| Totals | | \$240,090,512.00 | \$25,944,135.00 | 10.806% | 0.000% | 10.806% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Totals | | LCFF Funds | Other State Funds | Local Funds | Federal Funds | Total Funds | Total Personnel | Total Non-personnel | | | | | | | | |
| Totals | | \$26,338,664.00 | \$2,570,866.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$28,909,530.00 | \$24,977,446.00 | \$3,932,084.00 | | | | | | | | |
| Goal # | Action # | Action Title | Student Group(s) | Contributing to Increased or Improved Services? | Scope | Unduplicated Student Group(s) | Location | Time Span | Total Personnel | Total Non-personnel | LCFF Funds | Other State Funds | Local Funds | Federal Funds | Total Funds | Planned Percentage of Improved Services |
| 1 | 1.1 | Additional Teachers for Smaller Class Sizes | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing | \$2,533,984.00 | \$0.00 | \$2,030,416.00 | \$503,568.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$2,533,984.00 | |
| 1 | 1.2 | Additional Counselors TK - 12 | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing | \$3,858,945.00 | \$0.00 | \$3,858,945.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$3,858,945.00 | |
| 1 | 1.3 | Coordinators and PLT Leads | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing | \$1,334,915.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,334,915.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,334,915.00 | |
| 1 | 1.4 | Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All secondary (6-12) schools | Ongoing | \$2,261,412.00 | \$220,818.00 | \$2,482,230.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$2,482,230.00 | |
| 1 | 1.5 | Career Technical Education (CTE) | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All secondary (6-12) schools | Ongoing | \$2,954,257.00 | \$519,148.00 | \$3,473,405.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$3,473,405.00 | |
| 1 | 1.6 | College/Career Readiness | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All secondary (6-12) schools | Ongoing | \$54,133.00 | \$99,685.00 | \$153,818.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$153,818.00 | |
| 2 | 2.1 | Elementary Intervention Teachers | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Elementary (TK - 5) | Ongoing | \$6,070,097.00 | \$0.00 | \$4,765,111.00 | \$1,304,986.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$6,070,097.00 | |
| 2 | 2.2 | Secondary Intervention | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Secondary Schools (6-12) | Ongoing | \$1,529,643.00 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,112,870.00 | \$418,273.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,531,143.00 | |

| Goal # | Action # | Action Title | Student Group(s) | Contributing to Increased or Improved Services? | Scope | Unduplicated Student Group(s) | Location | Time Span | Total Personnel | Total Non-personnel | LCFF Funds | Other State Funds | Local Funds | Federal Funds | Total Funds | Planned Percentage of Improved Services |
|--------|----------|---|--|---|--|--|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|
| 2 | 2.3 | English Learner Program Support | English Learners | Yes | Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s) | English Learners | All Schools | Ongoing | \$998,519.00 | \$92,650.00 | \$1,091,169.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,091,169.00 | |
| 2 | 2.4 | Intervention Programs and Support | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing | \$0.00 | \$662,429.00 | \$523,826.00 | \$138,603.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$662,429.00 | |
| 2 | 2.5 | Long-term English Learner Supports | English Learners | Yes | Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s) | English Learners | High Schools (9-12) | Ongoing | \$179,310.00 | \$30,750.00 | \$210,060.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$210,060.00 | |
| 3 | 3.1 | Instructional Coaches | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Elementary (TK - 5) | Ongoing | \$494,657.00 | \$0.00 | \$494,657.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$494,657.00 | |
| 3 | 3.2 | Induction Program | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing | \$264,165.00 | \$1,320.00 | \$265,485.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$265,485.00 | |
| 3 | 3.3 | Curriculum Work Teams | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Secondary level (6 - 12) | Ongoing | \$146,520.00 | \$750.00 | \$147,270.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$147,270.00 | |
| 3 | 3.4 | Data and Assessment Programs | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing | \$0.00 | \$318,556.00 | \$318,556.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$318,556.00 | |
| 4 | 4.1 | Practices to Support All Students | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing | \$204,896.00 | \$55,500.00 | \$260,396.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$260,396.00 | |
| 4 | 4.2 | Educational Partner Engagement | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing | \$160,536.00 | \$24,250.00 | \$184,786.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$184,786.00 | |
| 4 | 4.3 | Mental Health Supports and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing | \$1,625,206.00 | \$155,776.00 | \$1,575,546.00 | \$205,436.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,780,982.00 | |

| Goal # | Action # | Action Title | Student Group(s) | Contributing to Increased or Improved Services? | Scope | Unduplicated Student Group(s) | Location | Time Span | Total Personnel | Total Non-personnel | LCFF Funds | Other State Funds | Local Funds | Federal Funds | Total Funds | Planned Percentage of Improved Services |
|--------|----------|-------------------------------|--|---|--|--|-------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|
| 4 | 4.4 | Foster Youth Support Services | Foster Youth | Yes | Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s) | Foster Youth | All Schools | Ongoing | \$111,634.00 | \$60,750.00 | \$172,384.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$172,384.00 | |
| 4 | 4.5 | Attendance Supports | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | Ongoing | \$194,617.00 | \$1,688,202.00 | \$1,882,819.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,882,819.00 | |

2025-26 Contributing Actions Table

| 1. Projected LCFF Base Grant | 2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants | 3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1) | LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year) | Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %) | 4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds) | 5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%) | Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (4 divided by 1, plus 5) | Totals by Type | Total LCFF Funds |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|-------------------|------------------|
| \$240,090,512.00 | \$25,944,135.00 | 10.806% | 0.000% | 10.806% | \$26,338,664.00 | 0.000% | 10.970 % | Total: | \$26,338,664.00 |
| | | | | | | | | LEA-wide Total: | \$24,865,051.00 |
| | | | | | | | | Limited Total: | \$1,473,613.00 |
| | | | | | | | | Schoolwide Total: | \$0.00 |

| Goal | Action # | Action Title | Contributing to Increased or Improved Services? | Scope | Unduplicated Student Group(s) | Location | Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) | Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%) |
|------|----------|---|---|----------|--|------------------------------|--|---|
| 1 | 1.1 | Additional Teachers for Smaller Class Sizes | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | \$2,030,416.00 | |
| 1 | 1.2 | Additional Counselors TK - 12 | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | \$3,858,945.00 | |
| 1 | 1.3 | Coordinators and PLT Leads | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | \$1,334,915.00 | |
| 1 | 1.4 | Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All secondary (6-12) schools | \$2,482,230.00 | |
| 1 | 1.5 | Career Technical Education (CTE) | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All secondary (6-12) schools | \$3,473,405.00 | |
| 1 | 1.6 | College/Career Readiness | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All secondary (6-12) schools | \$153,818.00 | |

| 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 (%) |
|------|----------|---|---|--|--|--------------------------|--|---|
| 2 | 2.1 | Elementary Intervention Teachers | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Elementary (TK - 5) | \$4,765,111.00 | |
| 2 | 2.2 | Secondary Intervention | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Secondary Schools (6-12) | \$1,112,870.00 | |
| 2 | 2.3 | English Learner Program Support | Yes | Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s) | English Learners | All Schools | \$1,091,169.00 | |
| 2 | 2.4 | Intervention Programs and Support | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | \$523,826.00 | |
| 2 | 2.5 | Long-term English Learner Supports | Yes | Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s) | English Learners | High Schools (9-12) | \$210,060.00 | |
| 3 | 3.1 | Instructional Coaches | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Elementary (TK - 5) | \$494,657.00 | |
| 3 | 3.2 | Induction Program | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | \$265,485.00 | |
| 3 | 3.3 | Curriculum Work Teams | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | Secondary level (6 - 12) | \$147,270.00 | |
| 3 | 3.4 | Data and Assessment Programs | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | \$318,556.00 | |
| 4 | 4.1 | Practices to Support All Students | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | \$260,396.00 | |
| 4 | 4.2 | Educational Partner Engagement | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | \$184,786.00 | |
| 4 | 4.3 | Mental Health Supports and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | \$1,575,546.00 | |
| 4 | 4.4 | Foster Youth Support Services | Yes | Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s) | Foster Youth | All Schools | \$172,384.00 | |

| 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 (%) |
|------|----------|---------------------|---|----------|--|-------------|--|---|
| 4 | 4.5 | Attendance Supports | Yes | LEA-wide | English Learners Foster Youth Low Income | All Schools | \$1,882,819.00 | |

2024-25 Annual Update Table

| Totals | Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds) | Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds) |
|---------------|--|--|
| Totals | \$26,286,195.00 | \$25,249,503.00 |

| 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 | Additional Teachers for Smaller Class Sizes K - 3 | Yes | \$2,532,534.00 | 2,686,985.00 |
| 1 | 1.2 | Additional Counselors TK - 12 | Yes | \$2,913,950.00 | 2,893,799.00 |
| 1 | 1.3 | Coordinators and PLT Leads | Yes | \$1,343,457.00 | 1,339,896.00 |
| 1 | 1.4 | Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program | Yes | \$2,386,017.00 | 2,548,313.00 |
| 1 | 1.5 | Career Technical Education (CTE) | Yes | \$3,386,310.00 | 3,336,062.00 |
| 1 | 1.6 | College/Career Readiness | Yes | \$187,881.00 | 141,082.00 |
| 2 | 2.1 | Elementary Intervention Teachers | Yes | \$5,057,756.00 | 4,316,382.00 |
| 2 | 2.2 | Additional Secondary Sections for Intervention | Yes | \$960,447.00 | 985,035.00 |
| 2 | 2.3 | English Learner Program Support | Yes | \$1,138,286.00 | 1,090,656.00 |
| 2 | 2.4 | Intervention Programs and Support | Yes | \$479,908.00 | 493,924.00 |
| 2 | 2.5 | Long-term English Learner Supports | Yes | \$104,328.00 | 121,183.00 |

| Last Year's Goal # | Last Year's Action # | Prior Action/Service Title | Contributed to Increased or Improved Services? | Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds) | Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds) |
|--------------------|----------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | | |
| 3 | 3.1 | Instructional Coaches | Yes | \$490,167.00 | 490,530.00 |
| 3 | 3.2 | Induction Program | Yes | \$332,518.00 | 314,783.00 |
| 3 | 3.3 | Curriculum Work Teams | Yes | \$173,312.00 | 140,333.00 |
| 3 | 3.4 | Data and Assessment Programs | Yes | \$342,445.00 | 307,304.00 |
| 4 | 4.1 | Equitable and Inclusive Practices | Yes | \$450,515.00 | 401,663.00 |
| 4 | 4.2 | Educational Partner Engagement | Yes | \$174,143.00 | 85,017.00 |
| 4 | 4.3 | Mental Health Supports and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) | Yes | \$1,877,666.00 | 1,827,299.00 |
| 4 | 4.4 | Foster Youth Support Services | Yes | \$283,632.00 | 251,804.00 |
| 4 | 4.5 | Attendance Supports | Yes | \$1,670,923.00 | 1,477,453.00 |

2024-25 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

| 6. Estimated LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount) | 4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds) | 7. Total Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) | Difference Between Planned and Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4) | 5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%) | 8. Total Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (%) | Difference Between Planned and Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8) |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| \$25,082,535.00 | \$26,286,195.00 | \$25,249,503.00 | \$1,036,692.00 | 0.000% | 0.000% | 0.000% |

| Last Year's Goal # | Last Year's Action # | Prior Action/Service Title | Contributing to Increased or Improved Services? | Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) | Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds) | Planned Percentage of Improved Services | Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage) |
|--------------------|----------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1.1 | Additional Teachers for Smaller Class Sizes K - 3 | Yes | \$2,532,534.00 | \$2,686,985.00 | | |
| 1 | 1.2 | Additional Counselors TK - 12 | Yes | \$2,913,950.00 | \$2,893,799.00 | | |
| 1 | 1.3 | Coordinators and PLT Leads | Yes | \$1,343,457.00 | \$1,339,896.00 | | |
| 1 | 1.4 | Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program | Yes | \$2,386,017.00 | \$2,548,313.00 | | |
| 1 | 1.5 | Career Technical Education (CTE) | Yes | \$3,386,310.00 | \$3,336,062.00 | | |
| 1 | 1.6 | College/Career Readiness | Yes | \$187,881.00 | \$141,082.00 | | |
| 2 | 2.1 | Elementary Intervention Teachers | Yes | \$5,057,756.00 | \$4,316,382.00 | | |
| 2 | 2.2 | Additional Secondary Sections for Intervention | Yes | \$960,447.00 | \$985,035.00 | | |
| 2 | 2.3 | English Learner Program Support | Yes | \$1,138,286.00 | \$1,090,656.00 | | |
| 2 | 2.4 | Intervention Programs and Support | Yes | \$479,908.00 | \$493,924.00 | | |
| 2 | 2.5 | Long-term English Learner Supports | Yes | \$104,328.00 | \$121,183.00 | | |
| 3 | 3.1 | Instructional Coaches | Yes | \$490,167.00 | \$490,530.00 | | |
| 3 | 3.2 | Induction Program | Yes | \$332,518.00 | \$314,783.00 | | |

| Last Year's Goal # | Last Year's Action # | Prior Action/Service Title | Contributing to Increased or Improved Services? | Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) | Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds) | Planned Percentage of Improved Services | Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage) |
|--------------------|----------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3.3 | Curriculum Work Teams | Yes | \$173,312.00 | \$140,333.00 | | |
| 3 | 3.4 | Data and Assessment Programs | Yes | \$342,445.00 | \$307,304.00 | | |
| 4 | 4.1 | Equitable and Inclusive Practices | Yes | \$450,515.00 | \$401,663.00 | | |
| 4 | 4.2 | Educational Partner Engagement | Yes | \$174,143.00 | \$85,017.00 | | |
| 4 | 4.3 | Mental Health Supports and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) | Yes | \$1,877,666.00 | \$1,827,299.00 | | |
| 4 | 4.4 | Foster Youth Support Services | Yes | \$283,632.00 | \$251,804.00 | | |
| 4 | 4.5 | Attendance Supports | Yes | \$1,670,923.00 | \$1,477,453.00 | | |

2024-25 LCFF Carryover Table

| 9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount) | 6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants | LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year) | 10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 + Carryover %) | 7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) | 8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%) | 11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8) | 12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9) | 13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9) |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| 238,987,556.00 | \$25,082,535.00 | 0.00% | 10.495% | \$25,249,503.00 | 0.000% | 10.565% | \$0.00 | 0.000% |

Local Control and Accountability Plan Instructions

[Plan Summary](#)

[Engaging Educational Partners](#)

[Goals and Actions](#)

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

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

Introduction and Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Plan Summary

Purpose

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

Requirements and Instructions

General Information

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

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

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

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

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

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

Schools Identified

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

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

Support for Identified Schools

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

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

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

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

Engaging Educational Partners

Purpose

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

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

Requirements

Requirements

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

- Teachers,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Respond to the prompts as follows:

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Educational Partners

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

Process for Engagement

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

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

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

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

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

Goals and Actions

Purpose

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

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

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

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

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

Requirement to Address the LCFF State Priorities

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

Respond to the following prompts, as applicable:

Focus Goal(s)

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

Description

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

Focus goals for Equity Multiplier schoolsites must address the following:

(A) All student groups that have the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the Dashboard, and

(B) Any underlying issues in the credentialing, subject matter preparation, and retention of the school's educators, if applicable.

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

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

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

Broad Goal

Description

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

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Maintenance of Progress Goal

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Measuring and Reporting Results:

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Metric #

- Enter the metric number.

Metric

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

Baseline

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

Year 1 Outcome

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

Year 2 Outcome

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

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

Target for Year 3 Outcome

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

Current Difference from Baseline

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

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

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

Goal Analysis:

Enter the LCAP Year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actions:

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

Action

- Enter the action number.

Title

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

Description

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

Total Funds

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

Contributing

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

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

Required Actions

For English Learners and Long-Term English Learners

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

For Technical Assistance

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

For Lowest Performing Dashboard Indicators

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

For LEAs With Unexpended LREBG Funds

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

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

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

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

Purpose

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

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

Statutory Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

For School Districts Only

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

Complete the tables as follows:

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

Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover — Percentage

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

LCFF Carryover — Dollar

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

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

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

Required Descriptions:

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

Limited Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

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

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

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

Provide the following descriptions, as applicable to the LEA:

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

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

Action Tables

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

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

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

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

Total Planned Expenditures Table

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Annual Update Table

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

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

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

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

Calculations in the Action Tables

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

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

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

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

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

California Department of Education

November 2024