2023–24 Local Control and Accountability Plan Annual Update

The instructions for completing the 2023–24 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Annual Update follow the template.

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Jefferson Elementary School District	James W. Bridges Superintendent	SUPERINTENDENT@JSDTRACY.COM 209-836-3388

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
1	Pupil Outcomes: Ensure all students achieve at high levels and develop citizenship, leadership, and innovative thinking skills.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
2. Self reflection rating on Question 2 of the Implementation of SBE Adopted Academic & Performance Standards including how programs and services will enable ELs to access the CC academic content standards and ELD Standards (Local Indicator, Priority 2 Reflection Tool) Rating Scale (lowest to highest): 1 – Exploration and Research Phase; 2 – Beginning Development; 3 – Initial Implementation;	Rating for Instructional Materials Aligned to academic standards and curriculum frameworks ELA: 5 ELD: 4 Mathematics: 5 Next Generation Science Standards: 3 History/Social Science: 4 2020-21	Rating for Instructional Materials Aligned to academic standards and curriculum frameworks ELA: 5 ELD: 4 Mathematics: 4 Next Generation Science Standards: 5 History/Social Science: 5 2021-22	Rating for Instructional Materials Aligned to academic standards and curriculum frameworks ELA: 5 ELD: 4 Mathematics: 3 Next Generation Science Standards: 5 History/Social Science: 5 2022-23	Rating for Instructional Materials Aligned to academic standards and curriculum frameworks ELA: 5 ELD: 4 Mathematics: 4 Next Generation Science Standards: 5 History/Social Science: 5 2023-24	Rating for Instructional Materials Aligned to academic standards and curriculum frameworks ELA: 5 ELD: 5 Mathematics: 5 Next Generation Science Standards: 5 History/Social Science: 5

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
4 – Full Implementation; 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability					
4A. The average of all 3rd - 8th grade student CAASPP scores in English Language Arts/Math meeting or exceeding standards	ELA: 58.40% Math: 45.61% 2019 CAASPP results	ELA: 51.96% Math: 36.14% 2021 CAASPP results	ELA: 54.81% Math: 44.98% 2022 CAASPP results	ELA: 60.21% Math: 51.72% 2023 CAASPP results	ELA: 60.40% Math: 57.61%
4E. Percentage of EL pupils who make progress toward English proficiency as measured by the ELPAC (CA School Dashboard)	59.9% 2019-20 CA School Dashboard	Progress data unavailable on CA School Dashboard. ELPAC Testing suspended in 2019-2020 school year due to COVID-19. In 2020-2021, 33.53% of ELs were Proficient, earning a Level 4 on overall performance on the ELPAC. In 2018-2019, 28.08% were Proficient. 2020-2021 CAASPP-ELPAC CDE Reporting Site	57.0% Fall 2022 Dashboard	57.1% Fall 2023 Dashboard	70%

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
4F. Percentage of English Learners who meet the Jefferson District standards to be redesignated as Fluent English Proficient.	11.5% 2020-2021 Dataquest	15% 2021-2022 SIS 2021-2022 Dataquest report is not available for EL students redesignated as Fluent English Proficient.	17% 2022-23 SIS	7.3% 2023-24 SIS	15%
Priority 7: Percentage of students participating in STEAM Electives	85% 2020-2021 SIS	85% 2021-2022 SIS	70% 2022-23 SIS	71% 2023-24 SIS	95%
Priority 7: Percentage of students participating in before/after school programs	0% 2020-2021 SIS	20% 2021-2022 SIS	68.5% Student LCAP Survey	55% Student LCAP Survey	30%
Priority 8: Percentage of students demonstrating 5 of 6 Fitness Standards Met	Grade 5: 78% Grade 7: 79% 2018-2019 PFT Data	No data available. PFT was not administered 2020-2021.	No data available. PFT was not administered 2022-2023.	No data available. PFT was not administered 2023-2024.	Grade 5: 85% Grade 7: 86%

Goal Analysis

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.
A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

The actions contained in this goal in almost all areas was carried out as planned. Teacher PLC teams continued to meet weekly; review essential standards, analyze assessments, and plan for interventions to ensure students meet the essential standards (AS 1.5) Another

success was (AS 1.10), providing students with a broad course of student through before and after school programs. The addition of the Boys and Girls Club district-wide increased student's access to before and after school programs. The three areas with substantive differences would be increasing the number of students participating in STEAM electives (AS1.8). The District realized that not all electives could be converted to meet the definition of a STEAM elective. Students receiving intervention services or serving as teacher's assistants remained in elective categories outside of STEAM. Finally, the action/service of providing GLAD professional development (AS 1.3) was not implemented. The District continues to face challenges in having enough substitute coverage to provide professional development on the scale required for GLAD.

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.

In goal one JESD had a number of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures. They included the following:
AS 1.1 Instructional aid support: More funding was necessary to cover the number of additional classes added and all positions were full for the school year.
AS 1.3 GLAD Strategies: was not implemented due to the lack of substitutes and the District's ability to provide the professional development
AS 1.4 Professional Development: ?????
AS 1.5 PLCs: More funding was necessary to cover the increased number of credentialed staff
AS 1.6 Targeted Intervention: Not all of the budgeted funds were utilized due to not being able to find staff members willing to take on extra hours, combined with the introduction of Boys and Girls Club after school through the ELOP grant.
AS 1.10 Broad Course of Study: Sites didn't not purchase new curriculum resources for their STEAM classes

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

There were a series of actions under goal one that were effective in bringing about academic gains in ELA and math:
AS 1.1 provided primary teachers with instructional aide time which allowed for additional small group instruction in reading and math (Metric 4A)
AS 1.2 was highly effective as NGSS standards were completely implemented in all grade levels (Metric 2).
AS 1.4 provided all instructional staff with professional development in accelerated learning for students that had academic gaps in ELA and math (Metric 4A).
AS 1.5 Professional Learning Communities (Metric 4A)
AS 1.6 Targeted Interventions (Metric 4A)
AS 1.7 MTSS (Metric 4A)
AS 1.11 PD on Differentiation all provide an environment for teachers to develop common essential standards, assessments, and options for providing interventions to help students master the standards (Metric 4A)

There were a few actions that were ineffective in bringing about the desired results:

AS 1.3 Utilizing GLAD strategies was ineffective due to the lack of substitutes and the District's ability to provide the professional development (Metric 4E and 4F).
AS 1.8 and AS 1.10) Providing access to STEAM activities and Broad Course of Study. This number decreased due to the increased number of students participating as teacher assistance. When given a choice many students chose to serve as teacher's aides vs. taking STEAM electives (Metric Priority 7).
AS 1.9 Monitoring classroom teachers use of EI curriculum on a daily basis. The District maintained its high standard for EI reclassification which made it impossible to reach 15% in the 23-24 school year. In addition, the District continues to not only review ELPAC scores, but grades and teacher recommendations. The long-term success of English learners was more important than meeting a reclassification goal. (Metric 4E and 4F).
AS 1.12 sought to provide training for special education staff on providing individualized academic support. Due to lack of additional PD time, paraprofessionals were provided training, but not credentialed teachers (Metric 4A).

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

Based on educational partner feedback and the results of our needs assessment, we have substantially changed our LCAP. We have moved from 3 broad goals to 14 focused goals. Metrics aligned to the state priorities and local metrics are included throughout the plan to measure progress and effectiveness. By doing so, the District will be able to provide more specific/actionable data on each goal.

AS 1.3 Utilizing GLAD strategies and AS 1.9 Monitoring EL curriculum were addressed in the 2024 LCAP in Goal 4 (AS 4.1/4.2 and Metrics 4.1/4.2)
AS 1.8 and AS 1.10) Providing access to STEAM activities and Broad Course of Study were addressed in the 2024 LCAP in Goal 13 (AS 13.2 and Metric 13.3)
AS 1.12 Special Education staff training was addressed in the 2024 LCAP in Goal 6 (AS 6.1/6.2 and metrics 6.1-6.3)

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

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
2	Engagement: Foster positive relationships between staff, students, parents, and the community as part of a successful learning environment.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
3. Self reflection rating on Parent and Family Engagement (percent who agree): Building Relationships Seeking Input for Decision Making (JSD LCAP Parent Survey Question 3) Rating Scale: Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree *Neither agree or disagree *Somewhat agree *Strongly agree *Unsure / NA (*Included in Agree %)	Please indicate how much you disagree or agree with the following statements: School staff effectively communicate with parents. 87% Agree The district encourages parental involvement. 89% Agree My child's school encourages parental involvement. 89% Agree The district offers parents a say in the	Please indicate how much you disagree or agree with the following statements: School staff effectively communicate with parents. 78% Agree The district encourages parental involvement. 83% Agree My child's school encourages parental involvement. 76% Agree The district offers parents a say in the	Please indicate how much you disagree or agree with the following statements: School staff effectively communicate with parents. 75.3% Agree The district encourages parental involvement. 67.1% Agree My child's school encourages parental involvement. 73% Agree The district offers parents a say in the	Please indicate how much you disagree or agree with the following statements: School staff effectively communicate with parents. 77.18% Agree The district encourages parental involvement. 62.79% Agree My child's school encourages parental involvement. 72.73% Agree The district offers parents a say in the	Please indicate how much you disagree or agree with the following statements: School staff effectively communicate with parents. 100% Agree The district encourages parental involvement. 100% Agree My child's school encourages parental involvement. 100% Agree The district offers parents a say in the

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	decision-making process at the district level. 78% Agree I have been given different options or ways that I can be involved with the school, either at the school itself, at home, or in the community. 82% Agree 2020-21	decision-making process at the district level. 69% Agree I have been given different options or ways that I can be involved with the school, either at the school itself, at home, or in the community. 72% Agree 2021-22	decision-making process at the district level. 34.4% Agree I have been given different options or ways that I can be involved with the school, either at the school itself, at home, or in the community. 60.4% Agree 2022-23 JESD Family Engagement Survey	decision-making process at the district level. 34.4% Agree I have been given different options or ways that I can be involved with the school, either at the school itself, at home, or in the community. 65.08% Agree 2023-24 JESD Family Engagement Survey	decision-making process at the district level. 100% Agree I have been given different options or ways that I can be involved with the school, either at the school itself, at home, or in the community. 100% Agree
5A. School attendance rate- the percentage of pupils attending school daily on average	96.42% SIS, EOY, 2019 - 20	90.67% SIS, EOY, 2021-22	95.06% SIS, P2, 2022-23	96.25% SIS, P2, 2023-24	97.5%
5B. Percentage of students who are absent from school 10% or more for the total number of days that they are enrolled in school.	All Students Chronic Absenteeism Rate: 6.6% Black or African American: 7.0% American Indian or Alaska Native: 9.1% Asian: 3.0% Filipino: 1.8%	All Students Chronic Absenteeism Rate: 2.8% Black or African American: 6.8% American Indian or Alaska Native: 0% Asian: 1.9% Filipino: 0.9%	All Students Chronic Absenteeism Rate: 15.4% Black or African American: 19.8% American Indian or Alaska Native: 33.3% Asian: 11.3% Filipino: 9.2%	All Students Chronic Absenteeism Rate: 14.6% Black or African American: 21.5% American Indian or Alaska Native: 11.1% Asian: 10.6% Filipino: 11.9% Hispanic: 18.8%	JSD's chronic absentee rate for all students and each student group will be 6.0% or less.

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	Hispanic or Latino: 8.2% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 15.2% White: 6.2% Two or more races: 8.4% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 9.6% English Learners 4.4% Students with Disabilities: 11% Foster Youth: 8.3% Homeless: * (does not meet min. required # students for reporting) 2019 Chronic Absenteeism CA Dashboard Indicator	Hispanic or Latino: 3.0% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 24.2% White: 1.8% Two or more races: 1.7% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 5.7% English Learners 2.6% Students with Disabilities: 6.7% Foster Youth: 0.0% Homeless: * (does not meet min. required # students for reporting) 2021-22 Chronic Absenteeism, Data Quest	Hispanic or Latino: 19.1% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 37.5% White: 12.1% Two or more races: 21.8% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 19.2% English Learners 17.7% Students with Disabilities: 28.9% Foster Youth: * (does not meet min. required # students for reporting) Homeless: 22.2% 2022-23 Chronic Absenteeism, Data Quest	Pacific Islander: 28.6% White: 11.9% Two or More Races: 19.9% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 19.4% English Learners: 14.7% Students with Disabilities: 24.5% Foster Youth: 30.8% Homeless: 28.6% 2023-24 Chronic Absenteeism, Data Quest	
5C. Percentage of students in grades 7 or 8 who stop coming to school and who do not enroll in another school. Percentage of students who	Middle School Dropout Rate: 0.13% Verified from Dataquest 2020-2021 Middle School Graduation Rate: 97%	Middle School Dropout Rate: 0.00% Verified from CALPADS Fall 1 Middle School Graduation Rate:96.5%	Middle School Dropout Rate: 0.00% Verified from CALPADS Fall 1 Middle School Graduation Rate:97.2%	Middle School Dropout Rate: 0.00% Verified from CALPADS Fall 1 Middle School Graduation Rate: 95.3%	Middle School Dropout Rate: 0% Middle School Graduation Rate: 100%

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
graduate middle school.	SIS, 2020-2021	SIS, 2021-2022	SIS, 2022-23	SIS, 2023-24.	
6A. Student suspension rate- the percentage of pupils who are suspended at least once during the academic year	Student Suspension Rate: All Students: 2.4% Black or African American: 4.3% American Indian or Alaska Native: 9.1% Asian: 1.2% Filipino: 1.8% Hispanic or Latino: 2.3% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 2.9% White: 2.5% Two or more races: 3.8% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 3.7% English Learners: 1.3% Students with Disabilities: 5.4% Foster: 8.3% Male: NA Female: NA 2019 CA Dashboard Suspension Rate (Elementary District) Indicator - 2019 (2018-2019 rates)	Student Suspension Rate: All Students: 0.5% Not able to pull other items from Data Quest 2020-2021 Suspension Rate, Data Quest	Student Suspension Rate: All Students: 2.3% Black or African American: 4.5% American Indian or Alaska Native: NPL Asian: 1.1% Filipino: 0.0% Hispanic or Latino: 3.3% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: NPL White: 3.0% Two or more races: 1.7% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 3.4% English Learners: 2.1% Students with Disabilities: 2.7% Foster: 0.0% Homeless: 5.6% Male: NA Female: NA No Performance Level (NPL) 2022 CA Dashboard	Student Suspension Rate: All Students: 2.8% Black or African American: 7.3% American Indian or Alaska Native: 3.7% Asian: 1.5% Filipino: 2.4% Hispanic or Latino: 3.2% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 0% White: 4.0% Two or more races: 3.1% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 5.1% English Learners: 4.0% Students with Disabilities: 4.3% Foster: 7.1% Homeless: 3.3% Male: NA Female: NA 2023 CA Dashboard	JSD's suspension rate for all students and each student group will be below 1.5%.

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
6B. Student expulsion rate- the percentage of students who are expelled from the district during the academic year	0% 2019 Expulsion Rate, SIS	0% 2020-21 Expulsion Rate, Data Quest	0% 2021-22 Expulsion Rate, Data Quest	0% 2022-23 Expulsion Rate, Data Quest	0%
6C. Percentage of students, parents and teachers who feel the school is safe - based on survey results Percentage of students, parents and teachers who feel connected to school - based on survey results	Feel School is Safe Students: 78% Parents: 90% Teachers: 88% Feel Connected to School Students: 72% Parents: NA Teachers. NA 2019 -2020 CHKS	Feel School is Safe Students: 76.8% Parents: 47% Teachers: 57% Feel Connected to School Students: 72.6% Parents: NA Teachers. NA 2021 -2022 CHKS	Feel School is Safe Students: 58.9% Parents: NA% - No question Teachers: 86.5% Feel Connected to School Students: 46.4% Parents: 73.6% Teachers. 82.4% 2022-23 District Family, Student, Staff Engagement Surveys	Feel School is Safe Students: 64.6% Parents: 90.91% Teachers: 91.02% Feel Connected to School Students: 52.04% Parents: NA Teachers. 88.17% 2023-24 District Family, Student, Staff Engagement Surveys	Feel School is Safe Students: 90% Parents: 95% Teachers: 93% Feel Connected to School Students: 85% Parents: 90% Teachers. 90%

Goal Analysis

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

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

In goal 2, AS 2.2 the District had great success in communicating with families using email, text, and social media. The ParentSquare program allowed administrators to communicate directly with parents through text messages providing just in time communication. In AS 2.7, the District increased counseling hours at each site in the district to provide greater access to mental health services. AS 2.12 led to each site having an up to date safety plan that covered all of the essential elements in education code. There were a few actions/services AS 2.3, AS

2.9, AS 2.10, 2.13 with a substantive difference between planned actions and actual implementation of these actions. AS 2.3, planned to provide more virtual opportunities for parents to participate in district meetings. The district attempted to hold various leadership meetings remotely, but they were rarely attended and when families attended they usually had their cameras off and didn't participate. provide AS 2.9 sought to bring more structured playground activities to each campus. At one of the sites the maintenance staff was not able to paint the playground surface to account for the games and at another site new administration was focused on other pressing needs and they system was not implemented. AS 2.10, planned to provide research based PD on classroom climate. Due to limited substitutes and lack of extra PD days, the district made the decision to focus PD on math instruction instead of school climate. Finally, AS 2.13, sought to develop additional instructional resources on cultural celebrations. This was not implemented due to the amount of time the Federal Program Monitoring audit took for the Curriculum Department staff.

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

In Goal 2, there were three actions services (AS 2.5, AS 2.9 and 2.13) where there were material differences between budgeted expenditures and estimated actual expenditures.

AS 2.5: AS 2.5 sought to hire BCBA providers to train staff and support students. Based upon the need 3 staff members were hired instead of the original one position budgeted for.
AS 2.9: This increase was due to the district purchasing a one time curriculum for campus supervisors.
AS 2.13: This was due to the action not being implemented.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

In goal 2, seven of the actions were deemed effective based upon the metrics.
AS 2.1 Stakeholder Engagement and AS 2.3 Parent Involvement (Metric 3) were deemed effective due to the 5% increase in families reporting that there were multiple ways for them to participate in their student's education.
AS 2.2 School to Home Communication (Metric 3) was determined to be effective due to the 2% increase in parent satisfaction with staff communication.
AS 2.4 Social Emotional Learning and AS 2.7 Counseling Services (Metrics 5A & 6C) showed a positive effect upon the metrics associated with each action.
AS 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, and 2.10 were deemed effective as suspension data remained constant with a .5% increase district-wide.
AS 2.11 Attendance (Metric 5A) was determined effective due to the 1.19% increase in overall students attendance rate.
AS 2.12 Safety Drills (Metric 6A) the plans all met the criteria in the education code.

There was only one action deemed ineffective because it wasn't implemented:

AS 2.13 Cultural Celebrations had no metric associated, but the instructional resources weren't created.

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

Based on educational partner feedback and the results of our needs assessment, we have substantially changed our LCAP. We have moved from 3 broad goals to 14 focused goals. Metrics aligned to the state priorities and local metrics are included throughout the plan to measure progress and effectiveness. By doing so, the District will be able to provide more specific/actionable data on each goal.

AS 2.13 Cultural celebrations were addressed in the 2024 LCAP in Goal 10 (AS 10.1 and Metric 10.1)

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

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
3	Conditions of Learning: Provide highly qualified staff, standards aligned curriculum, up to date technology, and modern school facilities that are maintained in good repair.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
1A. Percentage of teachers appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area(s) and for the students they are teaching	100% Teachers appropriately assigned 94% Teachers fully credentialed 2020-21, Williams Report to Board and SARC	100% Teachers appropriately assigned 98% Teachers fully credentialed 2021-22, Williams Report to Board and SARC	100% Teachers appropriately assigned 91.2% Teachers fully credentialed 2022-23, Williams Report to Board and SARC	91.9% Teachers appropriately assigned 83% Teachers fully credentialed 2023-24, District Credentialing Information	100% Teachers appropriately assigned 100% Teachers fully credentialed
1B. Percentage of students who have sufficient access to standards aligned instructional materials	100% 2020-21, Williams Report to Board and SARC	100% 2021-22, Williams Report to Board and SARC	100% 2022-23, Williams Report to Board and SARC	100% 2023-24, Williams Report to Board	100%
1C. Percentage of school facilities maintained in good repair or exemplary	100% 2020, FIT Report	100% 2021, FIT Report	98.25% 2022, FIT Report	94.9% 2023-2024 FIT Report	100%
Technology Inventory-Number of Student Devices	2,900	3,153	3,560	3,527	3,500

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	Technology Inventory (Student Devices)	Technology Inventory (Student Devices) 1.7.2022	Technology Inventory (Student Devices) 3/30/23	Technology Inventory (Student Devices) 2/8/24	

Goal Analysis

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

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

In goal 3, the district was proud of the fact that even during a teacher shortage, all but two positions were filled with credentialed teachers or teachers in credential programs. In addition, the district continues to provide all staff and students with technology to meet the needs of the instructional program. There were two actions that were not implemented as planned. AS 3.2 Instructional Coaches were not hired due to the staffing shortage. The teachers that had been serving as coaches in the district were needed in the classrooms to avoid having classrooms being served by substitute teachers all year. Second, AS 3.5 addressing class in 4th - 8th grade could not be implemented due to the teacher shortage and the increase of over 250 new students this year. In addition, the district utilized every available classroom and had no space to add additional classes.

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.

In Goal 3, there was only two actions services (AS 3.1 and 3.2) where there were material differences between budgeted expenditures and estimated actual expenditures.

AS 3.1: This was due to the increase number of overall staff due to increasing enrollment.
AS 3.2: This was due to the inability to hire instructional coaches.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

In goal 3, two of the actions were deemed effective based upon the metrics.

AS 3.3 Technology (Metric TI), the district maintained the same level of technology access for all students and staff.
AS 3.4 Maintenance Operation & Transportation (Metric 1C), the district continues to maintain 95% of our schools in good repair as determined by the FIT report, while there was a small decline of 3.25% this school year, the additional scrutiny provided by the new MOT Director has led to more maintenance projects being completed.
AS 3.6 Transportation (No Metric) was effective in training and certifying two bus drivers utilizing JESD trainers.

There were three actions deemed ineffective based upon the metrics.
AS 3.1 Core Basic Services (Metric 1A) saw a small decrease due to the need to hire teachers that were pre-interns during the teacher shortage, JESD was able to minimize this decline and the impact to students.
AS 3.2 Coaching (No Metric) was deemed ineffective because the district had to use all credential staff to cover the classrooms that didn't have teachers.
AS 3.5 Class Size Reduction (No Metric) was not implemented due to the teacher shortage and lack of additional classroom space.

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

Based on educational partner feedback and the results of our needs assessment, we have substantially changed our LCAP. We have moved from 3 broad goals to 14 focused goals. Metrics aligned to the state priorities and local metrics are included throughout the plan to measure progress and effectiveness. By doing so, the District will be able to provide more specific/actionable data on each goal.

AS 3.1 Core Basic Services and AS 3.5 Class Size Reduction were addressed in the 2024 LCAP in Goal 11 (AS 11.1/11.2 and Metrics 11.1/11.2)
AS 3.2 Coaching was addressed in the 2024 LCAP Goal 1 (AS 1.1 and 1.3 and Metrics 1.4 and 1.4)

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.

Instructions

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.

Complete the prompts as instructed for each goal included in the 2023–24 LCAP. Duplicate the tables as needed. The 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update must be included with the 2024–25 LCAP.

Goals and Actions

Goal(s)

Description:

Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Measuring and Reporting Results

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Metric:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Baseline:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Year 1 Outcome:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Year 2 Outcome:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Year 3 Outcome:

- When completing the 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies.

Desired Outcome for 2023–24:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

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

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for Year 3 (2023–24)
Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Enter information in this box when completing the 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Goal Analysis

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

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

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

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.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

- Describe the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle. “Effectiveness” means the degree to which the actions were successful in producing the desired result and “ineffectiveness” means that the actions did not produce any significant or desired 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, desired 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.

California Department of Education
November 2023