



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
Oakland Military Institute College Preparatory Academy	Dr. Mary E. Streshly Superintendent	mstreshly@omiacademy.org (510) 594-3900

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
1	Provide high-quality classroom instruction

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Annual CAASPP Scores	CAASPP (2019): English Language Arts (ELA): 26.7% met or exceeded the standard Math (MA): 9.95% met or exceeded the standard	CAASPP (2022): meets/exceeds Overall: 33% ELA; 17% Math 11th grade: ELA 50%; 14% Math 8th grade: ELA 29%; 14% Math 7th grade: ELA 31%; 26% Math 6th grade: ELA 16%; 14% Math	CAASPP (2023): 9% increase in ELA; 1% decrease in Math Overall: 42% ELA; 16% Math 11th grade: 71% ELA; 14% Math 8th grade: 31% ELA; 22% Math 7th grade: 42% ELA; 13% Math 6th grade: 18% ELA; 14% Math	See 2024 LCAP for unofficial results Dashboard rate posted Fall 2024 ICA benchmark (2024): meets/exceeds Overall: 26% ELA; 11.5% Math 11th grade: ELA 57%; 14% Math 10th grade: ELA 26%; 15% Math 9th grade: ELA 34%; 20% Math 8th grade: ELA 27%; 6% Math 7th grade: ELA 11%; 14% Math 6th grade: ELA 3%; 2% Math	CAASPP meets/exceeds standard ELA 11th - 65%; Math 11th - 35% ELA 8th - 50%; Math 8th - 45% ELA 7th - 40%; Math 7th - 35% ELA 6th - 50% Math 6th - 50%
Renaissance Star Reading and Math Assessment Results	RenSTAR (2020): English Language Arts (ELA): 34.8% met	RenSTAR (January 2022):	RenSTAR (spring 2023) 2 highest bands	Renstar (2024-1): meets/exceeds	RenSTAR (spring 2024)

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	<p>or exceeded the standard Math (MA): 26.4% met or exceeded the standard</p> <p>RenSTAR (May 2021): English Language Arts (ELA): 30.1% met or exceeded the standard Math (MA): 26.2% met or exceeded the standard</p>	<p>English Language Arts (ELA): 28.8% met or exceeded the standard Math (MA): 16.9% met or exceeded the standard</p>	<p>ELA 6th - 49%; Math 6th - ELA 7th - 53%; Math 7th - ELA 8th - 48%; Math 8th - ELA 9th - 61%; Math 9th - ELA 10th - 56%; Math 10th - ELA 11th - 68%; Math 11th -</p>	<p>12th grade: ELA 40%; 56% Math 11th grade: ELA 34%; 50% Math 10th grade: ELA 19%; 40% Math 9th grade: ELA 28%; 43% Math 8th grade: ELA 19%; 27% Math 7th grade: ELA 16%; 26% Math 6th grade: ELA 16%; 12% Math</p>	<p>ELA 6th - 60%; Math 6th - 25% ELA 7th - 65%; Math 7th - 35% ELA 8th - 60%; Math 8th - 40% ELA 9th - 70%; Math 9th - 55% ELA 10th - 70%; Math 10th - 55% ELA 11th - 78%; Math 11th - 60%</p>
Core Growth Measure (Middle School)	<p>Core Growth Measure (2018-2019) ELA Growth: 35th percentile Math Growth: 19th percentile</p>	No Growth Data Until Fall 2023.	No Core Growth assessment administered in 22-23	TBD Fall 2024	N/A
8th Grade Promotion Rate	<p>92% 8th Grade Promotion</p> <p>65% 8th Grade Promoted w/o Summer School (2021) 100% Promoted after Summer School</p>	<p>62% 8th Graders Promoted w/o Summer School (2022) - 38% need to take Summer School</p>	<p>Spring 2023 79% promoted w/o summer REQ 21% not promoted/conditional summer REQ</p>	<p>88% on time; 93% w summer; 4 not promoted</p>	<p>100% 8th Grade Promotion</p>

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
High School Graduation Rate	High school graduation (2020): 85.6% High school graduation (2021) 80.8%	High school graduation (2022) 98% of class of 2022 90% of 4-year cohort	High School graduation (2023) 99% of class of 2023 4-year cohort rate 94%	unofficial rate: 91% on time; 98.5% w summer Dashboard rate posted Fall 2024	High school graduation: 100% of current class 95% of 4-year cohort
College/Career Indicator (CCI)	CCI (2019): 57.1% Students Prepared	Fall 2022 Dashboard shows unreported CCI A-G Rate: 54% CTE Rate: 0% % taking college courses: 71% Milsci course: 88% [coding problem]	Fall 2023 Dashboard CCI: 65% "prepared for college" college/career indicator	Dashboard rate posted Fall 2024	CCI: 80% Students Prepared
College Acceptance Rate	65.71% Attending 2 or 4 year Colleges	93.44% Attending 2 or 4 year Colleges (2022)	Class of 2023 87% attending 2-4 year [53% 4 year] 1% military	4-year university - 52 out of 64 [81%] 2-year community college - 100% 100% accepted to 2 or 4 year colleges Trade School/Technical Programs - 7 ROTC Scholarship awardees - 3 Military Enlistment Contracts - 2 97% of grads entering postsecondary education	95% acceptance to 2 or 4 year Colleges

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.

All of the 6 major actions targeting this goal were taken to a substantive level. These include adding a Dir of Teaching and Learning, increasing presence in the classrooms, contracting with Core Instructional Coaches in Literacy and Math, pursuing deep implementation of the JSWP writing program grades 6-12, mapping and implementing common units from our newly adopted CC standards aligned curriculum in ELA, Math and Science, launching 1-1 chromebook program and increasing our coaching capacity for teacher induction. Substantive differences were all additive and not subtractive. They include:

1. adding common CAASPP interim assessments [IABs] and calibrated scoring sessions for the ELA and Math subject areas.
2. Adding an onsite Mathematics coach for the spring semester
3. Increasing Core coaching contract days by 10 for Literacy in the spring semester in order to address staffing turnover.
4. Director of Student Services and Special Programs position was added to provide extra resource support to Special Education and English Learners

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.

Action 1.1:

- a) the expenditure for the Director of Teaching and Learning position [from \$162,862 to \$198,574] was due to not taking into account the COLA and benefits package.
- b) The Student Services Coordinator position was closed and the Director of Student Services and Special Programs position was opened. This was a recognition of the increased responsibilities and oversight for critical programs. This added approx \$20,000 to the budget expenditures for this goal.

Action 1.2:

- a) Literacy coaching days increased from 20 to 30 days due to training needs for new staff mid year
- b) Math coaching from Core decreased to 10 days due to loss of coach from the vendor agency and the decision to transition to an onsite math coach at the semester. Contract was reduced from \$145,000 to \$98,000 due to terminating math portion of Core contract. Remaining \$47,000 allocation was applied to onsite math coach for the spring semester.

Action 1.3

- a) Writing program costs increased slightly due to adding more staff from content areas, such as Military Science, to the PD sessions.

Action 1.4:

- a) Additional licenses for TCI [middle school social studies curriculum] and Read 180 licenses increased our anticipated costs from \$70,000 to \$84,000

Action 1.5:

- a) Tech equipment charged to technology budget, which lowered amount attributed to LCAP funds. This balance includes Pivot digital laboratory platform, Achieve 3000 reading platform, math dept tablets and additional training for Read 180 for new staff.

Action 1.6:

a) Increase in number of staff needing Induction Program to clear credentialing requirements.

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

Action 1.1: the addition of Director of Teaching and Learning was effective in providing a) more instructional support for new teachers most specifically targeting the middle school staff. b) cadet supervision that reduced challenging behaviors that disrupt the learning environment

Action 1.2: teacher feedback and classroom observations provided evidence that the Core coaches were effective in improving teacher practice in the following areas - classroom management, pacing and lesson design and curricular mapping

Action 1.3: teacher feedback, classroom observations, assessment and benchmark results provided evidence that this has been a very effective instructional initiative that has helped OMI improve writing skills exponentially. With the addition of new staff, trainings will need to be repeated annually and content area staff including milstaff need additional training to successfully integrate critical thinking and writing skills into their coursework.

Action 1.4: ELA subject area trainings have had success, but it is less clear if the math coaching will make enough of an impact on student performance this year. More intensive math training is needed. Training for Social Studies [TCI] and Science curriculum is needed for next year.

Action 1.5: Teacher peer trainings were effective in ensuring all staff were exposed to a variety of digital platforms that increased cadet engagement as well as a comfort level to use the programs appropriately.

Action 1.6: Induction teacher survey is pending, but triad meetings with coach and mentees along with classroom observations and teacher evaluation reflections revealed growth from the induction coaching experiences.

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

We are not achieving our desired improvement levels in math at both the high school and middle school level and with Literacy at the middle school level. While math and literacy curriculum adoption and math coaching produced nominal improvement, the very low % of math and middle school ELA proficiency remains our biggest concern and reasons of the ineffectiveness include 1) staff turnover in math department [coaching investment goes with them] 2) inexperienced and under qualified staff [teachers without and single subject math credential] 3) curriculum implementation [unit/lesson mapping] achieved only partial implementation 4) Saturday and after school intervention only addressed approx 25% 5) significant increase in the number of cadets with disabilities requiring more intensive intervention and increased number of cadets entering OMI with 3 or more grade levels behind per our Renstar diagnostics. These issues combined call for more dramatic, targeted intervention for both the cadets and the instructional approaches

Action 1.1: add additional ELA and Math teacher release to encourage department based leadership and peer leadership and mentoring; add back Coordinator for Special Education and English Learners due to increases in special populations

Action 1.2: move away from Core coaches to internal peer coaching & mentoring on a more regular, frequent "day to day" basis in ELA and Math

Action 1.3: continue deeper implementation of school wide writing program for enculturation of college level synthesis, analysis and argumentation within the writing process and build a stronger foundation of writing teaching skills in all the content areas, including military science and electives

Action 1.4: decision was made mid year to add a targeted literacy program for 11th graders [Achieve 300], any changes would be pending our CAASPP and Renstar results.

Action 1.5: 1-1 chromebook launch of overall very successful; changes include adding insurance options to help maintain our assets and refresh budget; refresh of classroom digital displays changes from updating projectors to the implementation of large flat screen mobile monitors to enhance visual accessibility

Action 1.6: Recruitment enhancements, such as signing bonuses and extra duty pay for highly qualified, fully credentialed teachers in mathematics who have a strong conceptual knowledge. Over the last two years, new teaching candidates have struggled and retention has been poor compared to experienced hires.

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

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
2	Provide English Learners with the required skills to reach grade level standards/proficiency

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
ELPAC Growth	English Learners ELPAC annual growth data (2019): 47.1% English Learners ELPAC annual growth data (2021): 25.8%	English Learners ELPAC annual growth data (2022): 54% making progress toward English Language proficiency CA Dashboard: medium	English Learners ELPAC annual growth Data (2023): 70% making progress toward English Language proficiency	English Learners ELPAC annual growth Data (2023): 70% making progress toward English Language proficiency	English Learners ELPAC annual growth data: 65%
Reclassification Rate	EL Reclassification Rate (2019-2020): 9% EL Reclassification Rate (2020-2021): 5.5%	EL Reclassification Rate (2021-2022): 8% Fall 2022	EL Reclassification Rate (2022-2023) 8%	EL Reclassification Rate (2022-2023) 8%	EL Reclassification Rate: 15%
EL Proficiency Level RenSTAR	RenSTAR (2020): English Language Arts (ELA): 9% Math (MA): 7% of EL students meet or exceeds the standard	RenSTAR (January 2022): English Language Arts (ELA): 3.8% Math (MA): 2.6% of EL students meet or exceeds the standard	RenSTAR (January 2023) EL 9-12 Grade level equivalency literacy - 5.2 EL 9-12 Math Grade level equivalency - 6.7	RenSTAR (January 2023) EL 9-12 Grade level equivalency literacy - 5.2 EL 9-12 Math Grade level equivalency - 6.7	RenSTAR (2020): English Language Arts (ELA): 45% Math (MA): 40% of EL students meet or exceeds the standard

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	RenSTAR (May 2021): English Language Arts (ELA): 5.1% Math (MA): 6.5% of EL students meet or exceeds the standard				
EL Meeting or exceeding standard on CAASPP	CAASPP (2019): English Language Arts (ELA): 8% Math (MA): 3%	CAASPP EL's (2022) met/exceed EL's in Math: 5.8% EL's in ELA: 5.8%	CAASPP EL's (2023) met/exceed EL's in Math: 10% EL's in ELA: 11%	CAASPP EL's (2023) met/exceed EL's in Math: 10% EL's in ELA: 11%	CAASPP (2024): English Language Arts (ELA): 35% Math (MA): 35%
RFEP students meeting annual goals on standards mastery and grade requirements	57% of RFEP students met annual goals on standards mastery and grade requirements	72% of RFEP students met annual goals on standards mastery and grade requirements	RFEP Annual Goals (2023): 90%	RFEP Annual Goals (2023): 90%	100% of RFEP students meet annual goals on standards mastery and grade requirements
CLAD/BCLAD certification from Commission on Teacher Credentialing	(2020-2021) 66% of teachers have CLAD/BCLAD Certification	(2021-2022) 81.3% of teachers have CLAD/BCLAD/ELA Certification	(2022-2023) 83% of teachers have CLAD/BCLAD/ELA certification	(2022-2023) 83% of teachers have CLAD/BCLAD/ELA certification	(2024) 100% of teachers have CLAD/BCLAD Certification

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.

- Action 2.1: All designated English Learners were placed in ELD support classes at the middle and high school level
- Action 2.2: English Learner supports were embedded in our structured writing program and explicit vocabulary instruction by Core coach were both provided to all staff. Instructional coaches targeted speaking and listening and interactive/cooperative instructional strategies to support English Learners.
- Action 2.3: Credentialed Teachers who needed CLAD were supported in getting this certification
- Action 2.4: Bilingual aides and long term subs were hired to support the classrooms with English Learners

Action 2.5: Extensive coaching/training was provided for teachers and aides using Read 180 Literacy program and System 44 for English Learners; licenses were purchased as needed

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.

Action 2.1: Difference of close to \$100,00 less in actual expense was due to ELD teacher leaving mid year due to illness and was replaced by a substitute and several EL students were reclassified mid year causing 3 sections to be collapsed at the semester.

Action 2.2: English Learner supports were embedded in our structured writing program and explicit vocabulary instruction by Core coach were both provided to all staff. A \$55,000 difference in expense was due to the fact that the expense was covered in the training contracts listed in goal 1.

Action 2.3: no material difference

Action 2.4: We were only able to hire 2 of the 4 projected hires due to staffing shortages

Action 2.5: The \$130,000 differential was due to lower student projected counts and not needing 100 extra licenses

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

Action 2.1: Ensuring all English Learners were placed in ELD supports with a strong literacy program and extensive training has produced significant improvements in reading and reclassification rates

Action 2.2: English Learner supports were embedded in our structured writing program and explicit vocabulary instruction by Core coach were both provided to all staff - data from our writing benchmarks and the CAASPP IABs showed improvements in writing and fluency for ELs

Action 2.3: Credentialed Teachers who needed CLAD were supported in getting this certification

Action 2.4: Bilingual aides and after school tutors are attributed to success rates by providing mentoring, communications and classroom supports.

Action 2.5: Changing the ELD curriculum from National Geographic to Read 180, System 44 and JSWP gave us more progress targets and kept teachers and students moving towards individualized goals

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.

More school wide English Learner teacher PD has been asked for by teachers and the focused PD will be added to the 24-25 LCAP

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	Create a safe, welcoming and inclusive campus environment for all cadets, their families and OMI personnel. Cadet promotion creates cadet leaders and the ability to handle enhanced leadership roles throughout the campus.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Annual Parent Survey Results	(Baseline Winter 2021) 74.3% Parents are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the school overall	(Baseline winter 2022) 74.3% Parents are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the school overall	(Spring 2023) Parent Survey Satisfied w/ instruction: 81% Satisfied w/ safety: 86% Satisfied w/ communication: 91% Satisfied w/ conditions: 87%	No data	85% Parents are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the school overall
Annual Student Survey Results	66.5% Students are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the school overall (Baseline Winter 2021)	66.5% Students are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the school overall (Baseline)	(winter 2022) CA Healthy Kids Survey safety sadness	(2022-23) CA Healthy Kids Survey School connectedness 12th: 45% 11th: 47% 10th: NA% 9th: 48% 8th: 51% 7th: 48% 6th: 71% School perceived as very safe or safe	90% Students are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the school overall

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
				12th: 66% 11th: 63% 10th: NA% 9th: 57% 8th: 53% 7th: 54% 6th: 89%	
Parent Engagement (committees, school events, parent meetings) Annually	20% Parents engaged in committees, school events, volunteers or parent meetings	10% Parents engaged in committees, school events, volunteers or parent meetings	Back to School Night 150+ 33% 4 events w/ 40+ parents. 10% Ave Grizzly Night attendance 25 5% *need better monitoring system for accountability	Back to School Night 150+ 33% Fall Fest 110+ 22%	50% Parents engaged in committees, school events, volunteers or parent meetings
Annual Student Attrition	8% Student Attrition	(2021-2022) 17% Student Attrition	(2022-2023) Student Attrition Rate: 6.15%	(2023-2024 Mid-Term) Student Attrition Rate: TBD	3% Student Attrition
Suspension/Expulsion Rate	Suspension Rate (2019) 13.2%	Suspension Rate (2022) 8.3% suspended at least 1 day	(2022-2023) Suspension Rate: 3.5%	(2023-2024 Mid-Term) Suspension Rate: 3.5%	2% Suspension Rate
Average Daily Attendance Rate	95.04% ADA	90.3% ADA (2021-2022) 25% chronically truant	(2022-2023) 92% ADA	(2023-2024 Mid-Term) 92%	98% ADA
Annual School Application/Enrollment Target	91% of Available Seats Filled	82% Available Seats Filled	77% Available Seats Filled	TBD lottery March; 100% applications submitted	100% Available Seats Filled

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Cadet Leadership/ CACC Promotions	CACC AGI Standard: C/SGT or higher: 50%	(2021-2022) C/SGT Sophomores: 22% C/SGT Juniors/Seniors 37%	(2022-2023) % of Cadets that are C/SGT or higher 10th: 27.3% 11th/12th: 54.5%	10th grade: 20 Cadets or 23%; 11th grade: 54 Cadets or 78%; 12th grade 56 Cadets or 89%	(2023-2024) C/SGT or Higher Sophomores : 50% C/SGT or Higher Juniors/Seniors 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.

Action 3.1: Systemized positive behavior interventions were not implemented schoolwide, but rather inconsistently within grade level teams [ASGs] and often more consistently with individual teachers. The BARR supports were implemented schoolwide and training and facilitation supports provided, but there were inconsistencies between the cohesion and effective team facilitation based on group chemistry and experience level in the make up the teams. 6th grade team, 11th/12th grade teams were identified as most productive.

Action 3.2: Parent outreach improved, but we still fall short of our desired participation rates. The student lead newsletter steadily became more and more inconsistent throughout the year. On the improvement side, our Grizzly Night Parent meetings have steadily increased in participation, parent portal access data has greatly improved due to targeted support during orientation and Back to School Night. BTSN was also a participation success, but complaints about crowding has us rethinking the design and separating MS and HS dates or locations.

Action 3.3: Our front office clerical staff is a 100% bilingual and our leadership staff is 60-70% bilingual. We did not fill a separate bilingual liaison position, but rather paid stipends for bilingual staff to support parent outreach and community events.

Action 3.4: No substantive difference between implementation and goal. CA Healthy Kids Survey was Administered.

Action 3.5: Cadet recruitment process was expanded greatly due to donor funds allowing us to hire marketing agency. Additional cadre staff and cadet leadership were also assigned to extra recruitment activities, such as fairs, parades, tours and shadowing

Action 3.6: No substantive differences between implementation and goal. Much investment was made by leadership to design separate middle and high school discipline and safety teams, which worked to improve consistency and proactivity in student supervision and progressive discipline processes. More adjustments are planned for 24-25 as we continued to gather data and refine systems of communication and progressive restorative practices in addition to chain of command in decision-making.

Action 3.7: This was not fully achieved. We made progress as we hosted advanced leadership courses during the second semester, but with natural attrition and graduating Cadets with high ranks, we made progress in backfilling them.

Action 3.8: No substantive differences between implementation and goal. Middle School focused counselor was created and a middle school wellness center was opened.

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.

- Action 3.1: Due to inconsistent practices across ASG grade level teams, only 1/2 of the budget was spent on PBIS and the last year of the BARR contract was cancelled due to perceived lack of impact or effectiveness of the vendor. [-\$30,000)
- Action 3.2: No significant expenditure differences
- Action 3.3: Bilingual aides were increased by 1.0 fte [+\$76,000] due to additional classroom support needs
- Action 3.4: No substantive difference between implementation and expenditure.
- Action 3.5: Substantive difference [-\$38,000] was due to more expenses shifting to donor direct to vendor funding.
- Action 3.6: Our goal to integrate and expand cadre roles across multiple school functions, including discipline, safety, PBIS, cadet activities and operations increased cadre cost projection by +\$217,000
- Action 3.7: No substantive differences in implementation and expenditures
- Action 3.8: No substantive differences between implementation and expenditures attributed to LCFF.

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

- Action 3.1: Systemized positive behavior interventions were not implemented schoolwide, but rather inconsistently within grade level teams [ASGs] and often more consistently with individual teachers. The BARR supports were implemented schoolwide and training and facilitation supports provided, but there were inconsistencies between the cohesion and effective team facilitation based on group chemistry and experience level in the make up the teams. 6th grade team, 11th/12th grade teams were identified as most productive.
- Action 3.2: Parent outreach improved, but we still fall short of our desired participation rates. The student lead newsletter steadily became more and more inconsistent throughout the year. On the improvement side, our Grizzly Night Parent meetings have steadily increased in participation, parent portal access data has greatly improved due to targeted support during orientation and Back to School Night. BTSN was also a participation success, but complaints about crowding has us rethinking the design and separating MS and HS dates or locations.
- Action 3.3: Our front office clerical staff is a 100% bilingual and our leadership staff is 60-70% bilingual. We did not fill a separate bilingual liaison position, but rather paid stipends for bilingual staff to support parent outreach and community events. More training for front office staff is necessary to improve customer service and professionalism.
- Action 3.4: CA Healthy Kids Survey was Administered, but higher participation rates are necessary as well as additional targeted questions, as the results do not provide us with actionable information.
- Action 3.5: Cadet recruitment process was expanded greatly due to donor funds allowing us to hire marketing agency. Additional cadre staff and cadet leadership were also assigned to extra recruitment activities, such as fairs, parades, tours and shadowing
- Action 3.6: Much investment was made by leadership to design separate middle and high school discipline and safety teams, which worked to improve consistency and proactivity in student supervision and progressive discipline processes. More adjustments are planned for 24-25 as we continued to gather data and refine systems of communication and progressive restorative practices in addition to chain of command in decision-making. Some communication gaps and inconsistent practices were reported.

Action 3.7: This was not fully achieved. We made progress as we hosted advanced leadership courses during the second semester, but with natural attrition and graduating Cadets with high ranks, we made progress in backfilling them.

Action 3.8: Middle school wellness took longer than anticipated to get services that reach all students up and running. Increased mental health crisis and special education counseling interferes with academic counseling and interventions.

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.

Action 3.1: BARR will be canceled due to lack of anticipated results. More structured and facilitated agendas for ASGs needed along with regrouping of some teacher teams for improved cohesion and student impacts.

Action 3.2: We continue to brainstorm ways to increase parent participation. We have joined the CA Community Engagement Initiative which will give us statewide thought partners and we have identified a parent liaison position for 24-25. Finally, we are aiming to combine parent meetings with cadet recognition awards ceremonies, parent education and banquets to improve attendance.

Action 3.3: More training for front office staff is necessary to improve customer service and professionalism. Cadre will be integrated into front office operations.

Action 3.4: Additional targeted questions pertaining to our LCAP goals will be added as well as a HKS student and HKS staff survey to compliment our HKS student survey.

Action 3.5: Significant investment will need to be continued into 24-25 in order to reach a very competitive charter market in the bay area. This number one asset is word of mouth from our families and our academic rankings, so other than marketing, our biggest focus will remain on instruction and cadet experience.

Action 3.6: Much investment was made by leadership to design separate middle and high school discipline and safety teams, which worked to improve consistency and proactivity in student supervision and progressive discipline processes. More adjustments are planned for 24-25 as we continued to gather data and refine systems of communication and progressive restorative practices in addition to chain of command in decision-making. Some communication gaps and inconsistent practices were reported.

Action 3.7: Next year we will need to offer additional weekend courses both semesters to allow cadets to achieve the right rank for the right position they are serving. One barrier we faced was the competitive space of MilSci. We pushed in Drug Demand Reduction, Sexual Education, Counseling, writing assignments, etc. Having this competitive space made it hard to cover the advanced leadership curriculum when we designed MS to have "Beginner, Intermediate, and Advanced" classes. Again, we will find time on the weekends or non-school days to address this. Reorganization of Cadet Headquarters and Cadet Mentoring in Operations to expand impact across the student body.

Action 3.8: Add mental health counseling interns and leadership supports to build a more cohesive and organized counseling department.

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
4	Bolster leadership capacity at the school for substantial and sustainable academic improvement over time

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Overall Staff satisfaction with leadership				Incomplete Data - TBD Staff Leadership Survey LCAP survey results: [n=22] safe/very safe = 94.5 kept informed = 89% feel supported = 94% responsive leadership = 94.5% satisfied w supt leadership = 89%	
Overall Parent/Student satisfaction with school and leadership				See Healthy Kids Survey results LCAP survey results: [n=20] satisfied: instruction = 85% safety = 85.6 kept informed = 78.6% school management = 78.6%	

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
				military program = 78.6%	
Governing Board Superintendent Evaluation				No Data	
Overall tenure of management team				full team ave 6 years; exec team ave 3 years	
Staff Retention average				As of 5/24/2024 all staff who have been offered a 24-25 agreement have committed to returning. 3 staff. 8% voluntary departure mid year. 6% involuntary	

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.

Action 4.1: Leadership organization chart was developed and reviewed at a leadership retreat. Integrating civilian leadership who are new to the school with cadre leadership that are ever shifting, training or deploying is an ongoing process that takes vision, determination and patience.

Action 4.2: Hired Director with experience, but leadership trainings were minimal due to time constraints and scheduling conflicts. Most trainings came from superintendent mentoring and YMC and El Dorado Selva webinars [legal trainings] and well as our required annual statutory trainings for mandated reporters, sexual harrassment, blood borne pathogens, pesticides/hazardous chemicals and food service trainings. Two business office staff were sent to CBO academy training.

Action 4.3: Staff leadership and LCAP survey was sent out and results are pending.

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.

Action 4.1: No material difference

Action 4.2: Leadership trainings were minimal due to time constraints and scheduling conflicts, ie CSDC conference was canceled. Most trainings came from superintendent mentoring and YMC and El Dorado Selva webinars [legal trainings] and well as our required annual statutory trainings for mandated reporters, sexual harrassment, blood borne pathogens, pesticides/hazardous chemicals and food service trainings. Two business office staff were sent to CBO academy training, Dual Enrollment Coordinator attended DE conference, grant coordinator attended grant seminars and superintendent attended LCAP and School Services and OUSD charter office meetings.

Action 4.3: Staff leadership and LCAP survey was sent out and results are pending.

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

Action 4.1: As explained above, the vision of integrating Cadre functions with school leadership functions is ongoing and trail and error is a necessary part of the process as we work to determine functional fits with personnel skills and integrated chain of command and oversight structures. We may great strides this year, but staff promotions, reassignments and vacancies will lead us to update the organization chart and division of duties and functions. Communication and consistency of administrative processes are areas for improvement.

Action 4.2:

Action 4.3: Staff leadership and LCAP survey was sent out and results are pending.

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

A 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
5	

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24

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.

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.

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

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

A 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