



2024-25 Local Performance Indicator Self-Reflection

| Local Educational Agency (LEA) | Contact Name and Title | Email and Phone |
|--|--|--|
| Oakland Military Institute College Preparatory Academy | Dr. Mary E. Streshly Superintendent | mstreshly@omiacademy.org (510) 594-3900 |

Introduction

The California State Board of Education (SBE) approved standards for the local indicators that support a local educational agency (LEA) in measuring and reporting progress within the appropriate priority area.

This template is intended as a drafting tool and based on the Local Performance Indicator Quick Guide published by CDE in January 2024.

Performance Standards

The approved performance standards require an LEA to:

- Annually measure its progress in meeting the requirements of the specific Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) priority.
- Report the results as part of a non-consent item at the same public meeting of the local governing board/body at which the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) is adopted.
- Report results to the public through the Dashboard utilizing the SBE-adopted self-reflection tools for each local indicator.

This Quick Guide identifies the approved standards and self-reflection tools that an LEA will use to report its progress on the local indicators.

Local Indicators

The local indicators address the following state priority areas:

Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities (LCFF Priority 1)

LEAs will provide the information below:

- Number/percentage of students without access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home
- Number of identified instances where facilities do not meet the “good repair” standard (including deficiencies and extreme deficiencies)

Note: The requested information are all data elements that are currently required as part of the School Accountability Report Card (SARC).

Note: LEAs are required to report the following to their local governing board/body in conjunction with the adoption of the LCAP:

- The LEA’s Teacher Assignment Monitoring and Outcome data available at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/tamo.asp>.
- The number/percentage of students without access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home, and
- The number of identified instances where facilities do not meet the “good repair” standard (including deficiencies and extreme deficiencies)

Implementation of State Academic Standards (LCFF Priority 2)

The LEA annually measures its progress implementing state academic standards; the LEA then reports the results to its local governing board/body at the same public meeting at which the LCAP is adopted and reports to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

Parent and Family Engagement (LCFF Priority 3)

This measure addresses Parent and Family Engagement, including how an LEA builds relationships between school staff and families, builds partnerships for student outcomes and seeks input for decision-making.

LEAs report progress of how they have sought input from parents in decision-making and promoted parent participation in programs to its local governing board or body using the SBE-adopted self-reflection tool for Priority 3 at the same public meeting at which the LEA adopts its LCAP, and reports to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

School Climate (LCFF Priority 6)

The LEA administers an annual local climate survey that captures a valid measure of student perceptions of school safety and connectedness, in at least one grade within each grade span(s) the LEA serves (e.g., TK-5, 6-8, 9-12), and reports the results to its local governing board/body at the same public meeting at which the LCAP is adopted and to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

Access to a Broad Course of Study (LCFF Priority 7)

The LEA annually measures its progress in the extent to which students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study that includes the adopted courses of study specified in the California Education Code (EC) for Grades 1-6 and Grades 7-12, as applicable, including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated students and individuals with exceptional needs; the LEA then reports the results to its local governing board/body at the same public meeting at which the LCAP is adopted and reports to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

Coordination of Services for Expelled Students – County Office of Education (COE) Only (LCFF Priority 9)

The COE annually measures its progress in coordinating services for foster youth; the COE then reports the results to its local governing board/body at the same public meeting at which the LCAP is adopted and reports to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

Coordination of Services for Foster Youth – COE Only (LCFF Priority 10)

The COE annually measures its progress in coordinating services for foster youth; the COE then reports the results to its local governing board/body at the same public meeting at which the LCAP is adopted and reports to educational partners and the public through the Dashboard.

Self-Reflection Tools

An LEA uses the self-reflection tools included within the Dashboard to report its progress on the local performance indicator to educational partners and the public.

The self-reflection tools are embedded in the web-based Dashboard system and are also available in Word document format. In addition to using the self-reflection tools to report its progress on the local performance indicators to educational partners and the public, an LEA may use the self-reflection tools as a resource when reporting results to its local governing board. The approved self-reflection tools are provided below.

Appropriately Assigned Teachers, Access to Curriculum-Aligned Instructional Materials, and Safe, Clean and Functional School Facilities (LCFF Priority 1)

LEAs will provide the information below:

- Number/percentage of students without access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home
- Number of identified instances where facilities do not meet the “good repair” standard (including deficiencies and extreme deficiencies)

Note: The requested information are all data elements that are currently required as part of the School Accountability Report Card (SARC).

Note: LEAs are required to report the following to their local governing board/body in conjunction with the adoption of the LCAP:

- The LEA’s Teacher Assignment Monitoring and Outcome data available at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/tamo.asp>.
- The number/percentage of students without access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home, and
- The number of identified instances where facilities do not meet the “good repair” standard (including deficiencies and extreme deficiencies)

| Academic Year | Total Teaching FTE | Clear | Out-of-Field | Intern | Ineffective | Incomplete | Unknown | N/A |
|---------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|--------|-------------|------------|---------|-----|
| 2023-24 | 28 | 18 | 20 | | | | | |

| Access to Instructional Materials | Number | Percent |
|--|--------|---------|
| Students Without Access to Own Copies of Standards-Aligned Instructional Materials for Use at School and at Home | 0 | 0 |

| Facility Conditions | Number |
|--|--------|
| Identified Instances Where Facilities Do Not Meet The “Good Repair” Standard (Including Deficiencies and Extreme Deficiencies) | 0 |

Implementation of State Academic Standards (LCFF Priority 2)

LEAs may provide a narrative summary of their progress in the implementation of state academic standards based on locally selected measures or tools (Option 1). Alternatively, LEAs may complete the optional reflection tool (Option 2).

OPTION 1: Narrative Summary (Limited to 3,000 characters)

In the narrative box provided on the Dashboard, identify the locally selected measures or tools that the LEA is using to track its progress in implementing the state academic standards adopted by the state board and briefly describe why the LEA chose the selected measures or tools.

Additionally, summarize the LEA's progress in implementing the academic standards adopted by the SBE, based on the locally selected measures or tools. The adopted academic standards are:

- English Language Arts (ELA) – Common Core State Standards for ELA
- English Language Development (ELD) (Aligned to Common Core State Standards for ELA)
- Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics
- Next Generation Science Standards
- History-Social Science
- Career Technical Education
- Health Education Content Standards
- Physical Education Model Content Standards
- Visual and Performing Arts
- World Language

See Option 2

Implementation of State Academic Standards (LCFF Priority 2)

OPTION 2: Reflection Tool

Recently Adopted Academic Standards and/or Curriculum Frameworks

1. Rate the LEA's progress in providing professional learning for teaching to the recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest):

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

| Academic Standards | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA | | | | 4 | |
| ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards) | | | | 4 | |
| Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics | | | | 4 | |
| Next Generation Science Standards | | | | 4 | |
| History-Social Science | | | | 4 | |

2. Rate the LEA’s progress in making instructional materials that are aligned to the recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below available in all classrooms where the subject is taught.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest):

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

| Academic Standards | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA | | | | 4 | |
| ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards) | | | | 4 | |
| Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics | | | | 4 | |
| Next Generation Science Standards | | | | 4 | |
| History-Social Science | | | | 4 | |

3. Rate the LEA’s progress in implementing policies or programs to support staff in identifying areas where they can improve in delivering instruction aligned to the recently adopted academic standards and/or curriculum frameworks identified below (e.g., collaborative time, focused classroom walkthroughs, teacher pairing).

Rating Scale (lowest to highest):

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

| Academic Standards | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| ELA – Common Core State Standards for ELA | | | | 4 | |
| ELD (Aligned to ELA Standards) | | | | 4 | |
| Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics | | | | 4 | |
| Next Generation Science Standards | | | | 4 | |
| History-Social Science | | | | 4 | |

Other Adopted Academic Standards

4. Rate the LEA's progress implementing each of the following academic standards adopted by the state board for all students.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest):

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

| Academic Standards | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Career Technical Education | | | | | 5 |
| Health Education Content Standards | | | | | 5 |
| Physical Education Model Content Standards | | | | | 5 |
| Visual and Performing Arts | | | | 4 | |
| World Language | | | | 4 | |

Support for Teachers and Administrators

5. Rate the LEA's success at engaging in the following activities with teachers and school administrators during the prior school year (including the summer preceding the prior school year).

Rating Scale (lowest to highest):

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

| Academic Standards | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Identifying the professional learning needs of groups of teachers or staff as a whole | | | | 4 | |
| Identifying the professional learning needs of individual teachers | | | | 4 | |
| Providing support for teachers on the standards they have not yet mastered | | | | 4 | |

Optional Narrative (Limited to 1,500 characters)

6. Provide any additional information in the text box provided in the Dashboard that the LEA believes is relevant to understanding its progress implementing the academic standards adopted by the state board.

Parental Involvement and Family Engagement (LCFF Priority 3)

Introduction

Family engagement is an essential strategy for building pathways to college and career readiness for all students and is an essential component of a systems approach to improving outcomes for all students. More than 30 years of research has shown that family engagement can lead to improved student outcomes (e.g., attendance, engagement, academic outcomes, social emotional learning, etc.).

Consistent with the California Department of Education's (CDE's) Family Engagement Toolkit: ¹

- Effective and authentic family engagement has been described as an intentional partnership of educators, families and community members who share responsibility for a child from the time they are born to becoming an adult.
- To build an effective partnership, educators, families, and community members need to develop the knowledge and skills to work together, and schools must purposefully integrate family and community engagement with goals for students' learning and thriving.

The LCFF legislation recognized the importance of family engagement by requiring LEAs to address Priority 3 within their LCAP. The self-reflection tool described below enables LEAs to reflect upon their implementation of family engagement as part of their continuous improvement process and prior to updating their LCAP.

For LEAs to engage all families equitably, it is necessary to understand the cultures, languages, needs and interests of families in the local area. Furthermore, developing family engagement policies, programs, and practices needs to be done in partnership with local families, using the tools of continuous improvement.

Instructions

This self-reflection tool is organized into three sections. Each section includes research and evidence-based practices in family engagement:

1. Building Relationships between School Staff and Families
2. Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes
3. Seeking Input for Decision-Making

Based on an evaluation of data, including educational partner input, an LEA uses this self-reflection tool to report on its progress successes and area(s) of need related to family engagement policies, programs, and practices. This tool will enable an LEA to engage in continuous improvement and determine next steps to make improvements in the areas identified. The results of the process should be used to inform the LCAP and its development process, including assessing prior year goals, actions and services and in modifying future goals, actions, and services in the LCAP.

LEAs are to implement the following self-reflection process:

1. Identify the diverse educational partners that need to participate in the self-reflection process in order to ensure input from all groups of families, staff and students in the LEA, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.
2. Engage educational partners in determining what data and information will be considered to complete the self-reflection tool. LEAs should consider how the practices apply to families of all student groups, including families of unduplicated students and families of individuals with exceptional needs as well as families of underrepresented students.
3. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each of the 12 practices using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):
 - 1 – Exploration and Research
 - 2 – Beginning Development
 - 3 – Initial Implementation
 - 4 – Full Implementation
 - 5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability
4. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, respond to each of the prompts pertaining to each section of the tool.
5. Use the findings from the self-reflection process to inform the annual update to the LCAP and the LCAP development process, as well as the development of other school and district plans.

Sections of the Self-Reflection Tool

Section 1: Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families

Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each practice in this section using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

| Practices | Rating Scale Number |
|--|---------------------|
| 1. Rate the LEA's progress in developing the capacity of staff (i.e., administrators, teachers, and classified staff) to build trusting and respectful relationships with families. | 5 |
| 2. Rate the LEA's progress in creating welcoming environments for all families in the community. | 4 |
| 3. Rate the LEA's progress in supporting staff to learn about each family's strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children. | 4 |
| 4. Rate the LEA's progress in developing multiple opportunities for the LEA and school sites to engage in 2-way communication between families and educators using language that is understandable and accessible to families. | 5 |

Building Relationships Dashboard Narrative Boxes (Limited to 3,000 characters)

1. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's current strengths and progress in Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families.

- Outreach via Internet and Social Media Platforms
- Holding face-to-face events and activities with both faculty and military cadre
- Providing staff training in communicating with parents and community.

2. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's focus area(s) for improvement in Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families.

- Providing capacity and time for stakeholder engagement
- Expanding cadet outreach to community
- Including parents in cadet decision making

3. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe how the LEA will improve engagement of underrepresented families identified during the self-reflection process in relation to Building Relationships Between School Staff and Families.

- -Analyze student performance and benchmark data to appropriately strategize initiatives and programs
- -Evaluate above data frequently and with fidelity to moving student with special needs
- -Seek input from unduplicated families to guide programs to suits their needs

Section 2: Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes

Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each practice in this section using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

| Practices | Rating Scale Number |
|---|---------------------|
| 5. Rate the LEA's progress in providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school's capacity to partner with families. | 4 |
| 6. Rate the LEA's progress in providing families with information and resources to support student learning and development in the home. | 4 |
| 7. Rate the LEA's progress in implementing policies or programs for teachers to meet with families and students to discuss student progress and ways to work together to support improved student outcomes. | 4 |
| 8. Rate the LEA's progress in supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own students and all students. | 4 |

Building Partnerships Dashboard Narrative Boxes (Limited to 3,000 characters)

- Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's current strengths and progress in Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes.

- Developing Dual Enrollment programs with local community colleges
- Creating early College Program
- Meeting with Instructional Leadership Teams and Department Chairs
- Utilizing Building Assets, Reducing Risks (BARR) program and Academic Support Group
- Providing numerous surveys for various stakeholder groups

- Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's focus area(s) for improvement in Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes.

In the development of the Governors Baccalaureate Degree Program, OMI seeks to establish long term relationships to fully integrate dual enrollment programs into regular OMI course of study. Our ability to support all cadets to be successful with DE will be at the center of our efforts in the next few years.

- Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe how the LEA will improve engagement of underrepresented families identified during the self-reflection process in relation to Building Partnerships for Student Outcomes.

Examine data in the following categories

- -Analyze student performance and benchmark data to appropriately strategize initiatives and programs
- -Evaluate above data frequently and with fidelity to moving student with special needs

- -Seek input from unduplicated families to guide programs to suits their needs

Section 3: Seeking Input for Decision-Making

Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, identify the number which best indicates the LEA's current stage of implementation for each practice in this section using the following rating scale (lowest to highest):

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

| Practices | Rating Scale Number |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. Rate the LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making. | 4 |
| 2. Rate the LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making. | 4 |
| 3. Rate the LEA's progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented groups in the school community. | 4 |
| 4. Rate the LEA's progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels. | 4 |

Seeking Input for Decision-Making Dashboard Narrative Boxes (Limited to 3,000 characters)

1. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's current strengths and progress in Seeking Input for Decision-Making.

- -We developed and deployed parent surveys to respond to LCAP
- -We developing more incentives and motivations for parents to participate including looking into teleconferencing opportunities
- -Strategically combining school processes and community/parent meetings to encourage stakeholders to attend and participate in

2. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe the LEA's focus area(s) for improvement in Seeking Input for Decision-Making.

- -Increasing number of attending families
- -Looking at media and communication channels that families utilize
- Integrating cadet responsibilities in media campaigns

3. Based on the analysis of educational partner input and local data, briefly describe how the LEA will improve engagement of underrepresented families identified during the self-reflection process in relation to Seeking Input for Decision-Making.

- -Analyze student performance and benchmark data to appropriately strategize initiatives and programs
- -Evaluate above data frequently and with fidelity to moving student with special needs
- -Seek input from unduplicated families to guide programs to suits their needs

School Climate (LCFF Priority 6)

Introduction

The initial design of the Local Control Funding Formula recognized the critical role that positive school conditions and climate play in advancing student performance and equity. This recognition is grounded in a research base demonstrating that a positive school climate directly impacts indicators of success such as increased teacher retention, lower dropout rates, decreased incidences of violence, and higher student achievement.

In order to support comprehensive planning, LEAs need access to current data. The measurement of school climate provides LEAs with critical data that can be used to track progress in school climate for purposes of continuous improvement, and the ability to identify needs and implement changes to address local needs.

Introduction

LEAs are required, at a minimum, to annually administer a local climate survey. The survey must:

- Capture a valid measure of student perceptions of school safety and connectedness in at least one grade within each grade span the LEA serves (e.g. TK-5, 6-8, 9-12); and
- At a minimum, report disaggregated data by student groups identified in California Education Code 52052, when such data is available as part of the local school climate survey.

Based on the analysis of local data, including the local climate survey data, LEAs are to respond to the following three prompts. Each prompt response is limited to 3,000 characters. An LEA may provide hyperlink(s) to other documents as necessary within each prompt:

Prompt 1 (DATA): Describe the local climate survey data, including available data disaggregated by student groups. LEAs using surveys that provide an overall score, such as the California Healthy Kids Survey, are encouraged to report the overall score for all students as well as available student group scores. Responses may also include an analysis of a subset of specific items on a local survey and additional data collection tools that are particularly relevant to school conditions and climate.

At the Middle School level, 6th grade students generally scored in the positive range when compared to the 7th and 8th grade. In the category of School Connectedness, 6th grade scored 20 points higher than the other grades, 48 and 51 respectively as compared to 71. While in Social Emotional Distress, 7th and 8th scored at 36 and 20 with 6th graders were at 14.

At the High School level, 12th grade students generally scored higher in the positive range leading in categories such as “School is really boring” and “Cyberbullying.” As an entire school, OMI scored high in the two-thirds range in categories such as “Current alcohol or drug use,” “Academic motivation” and “School perceived as very safe or safe.”

Prompt 2 (MEANING): Describe key learnings, including identified needs and areas of strength determined through the analysis of data described in Prompt 1, including the available data disaggregated by student group.

Even with disaggregated data, the very clear low or negative data of the upper grades as compared to the 6th grade informs us that there must deliberate interventions applied to upper grades.

Prompt 3 (USE): Describe any changes to existing plans, policies, or procedures that the LEA determines necessary in order to address areas of need identified through the analysis of local data and the identification of key learnings. Include any revisions, decisions, or actions the LEA has, or will, implement for continuous improvement purposes.

Three areas of improvement have been brought to bear on improving indicators for the Middle School.

- The further implementation of the OMI literacy program
- The re-focus on Cadet Code of Conduct

Three areas of improvement have been brought to bear on improving indicators for the High School.

- Advance ASG processes to connect parents and teachers
- Development of MTSS systems to monitor academics and behavior
- Provide more options in college and career pathways

Access to a Broad Course of Study (LCFF Priority 7)

LEAs provide a narrative summary of the extent to which all students have access to and are enrolled in a broad course of study by addressing, at a minimum, the following four prompts:

1. Briefly identify the locally selected measures or tools that the LEA is using to track the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study, based on grade spans, unduplicated student groups, and individuals with exceptional needs served. (response limited to 1,500 characters)

- Annual CAASPP Scores
- Renaissance Star Reading and Math Assessment Results
- 8th Grade Promotion Rate
- High School Graduation Rate
- College/Career Indicator (CCI)

2. Using the locally selected measures or tools, summarize the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study. The summary should identify any differences across school sites and student groups in access to, and enrollment in, a broad course of study, and may describe progress over time in the extent to which all students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study. (response limited to 1,500 characters)

Based on teacher feedback, principal observation and local assessment indicators, the actions associated with Core/induction coaching and curriculum sequencing/lesson planning was significant in progressing toward the goal of improving quality instruction. Furthermore, a focus on goal-setting and reflection in the evaluation process and frequent classroom observations with feedback cycle saw notable improvement in teacher confidence, lesson planning and student responsiveness based on coaches' feedback.

3. Given the results of the tool or locally selected measures, identify the barriers preventing the LEA from providing access to a broad course of study for all students. (response limited to 1,500 characters)

1. Due to teacher feedback and scheduling issues, teacher coaching by CORE coaches throughout the year with the hiring a of in-house math coach.
2. ELA and Math pilot and adoption process to ensure common CCSS curriculum across all grade levels in math and English
3. BARR initiative was shelved for a more faculty-led ASG program
4. Intervention programs for Math in the MS and ELA and Math in the HS program.

4. In response to the results of the tool or locally selected measures, what revisions, decisions, or new actions will the LEA implement, or has the LEA implemented, to ensure access to a broad course of study for all students? (response limited to 1,500 characters)

Changes made for the upcoming year revolve around doubling down on "deep implementation" of the initiatives that were strongly perceived by the OMI community as having the most positive impact on student achievement in 23-24. Changes include a focus on the following for 23-24:

1. Implementation of the newly adopted ELA and Math Curriculum SAVVAS - curriculum mapping & lesson design with Literacy and Math coaches
2. Deep Implementation and expansion of HMH Read 180/System 44 Reading intervention to remediate learning loss and propel our English Learner literacy and SuccessMaker Math personalized math remediation.
3. School wide focus on writing and vocabulary expansion using Jane Schaffer Writing Program for multiple writing modalities across disciplines
4. Intervention courses in Math and ELA with data focused and leveled instruction
5. Acquisition of Newsela and Achieve 3000
6. Coaching for new and recently credentialed induction teachers.

Coordination of Services for Expelled Students – COE Only (LCFF Priority 9)

Assess the degree of implementation of the progress in coordinating instruction for expelled students in your county.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest):

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

| Coordinating Instruction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Assessing status of triennial plan for providing educational services to all expelled students in the county, including: | [No response required] | [No response required] | [No response required] | [No response required] | [No response required] |
| a. Review of required outcome data. | | | | | |
| b. Identifying existing educational alternatives for expelled pupils, gaps in educational services to expelled pupils, and strategies for filling those service gaps. | | | | | |
| c. Identifying alternative placements for pupils who are expelled and placed in district community day school | | | | | |

| Coordinating Instruction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| programs, but who fail to meet the terms and conditions of their rehabilitation plan or who pose a danger to other district pupils. | | | | | |
| 2. Coordinating on development and implementation of triennial plan with all LEAs within the county. | | | | | |
| 3. Establishing ongoing collaboration and policy development for transparent referral process for LEAs within the county to the county office of education or other program options, including dissemination to all LEAs within the county a menu of available continuum of services for expelled students. | | | | | |
| 4. Developing memorandum of understanding regarding the coordination of partial credit policies between district of residence and county office of education. | | | | | |

Coordination of Services for Foster Youth – COE Only (LCFF Priority 10)

Assess the degree of implementation of coordinated service program components for foster youth in your county.

Rating Scale (lowest to highest):

- 1 - Exploration and Research Phase
- 2 - Beginning Development
- 3 - Initial Implementation
- 4 - Full Implementation
- 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability

| Coordinating Services | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. Establishing ongoing collaboration and supporting policy development, including establishing formalized information sharing agreements with child welfare, probation, Local Education Agency (LEAs), the courts, and other organizations to support determining the proper educational placement of foster youth (e.g., school of origin versus current residence, comprehensive versus alternative school, and regular versus special education). | | | | | |

| Coordinating Services | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Building capacity with LEA, probation, child welfare, and other organizations for purposes of implementing school-based support infrastructure for foster youth intended to improve educational outcomes (e.g., provide regular professional development with the Foster Youth Liaisons to facilitate adequate transportation services for foster youth). | | | | | |
| 3. Providing information and assistance to LEAs regarding the educational needs of foster youth in order to improve educational outcomes. | | | | | |
| 4. Providing direct educational services for foster youth in LEA or county-operated programs provided the school district has certified that specified services cannot be provided or funded using other sources, including, but not limited to, Local Control Funding Formula, federal, state or local funding. | | | | | |
| 5. Establishing ongoing collaboration and supporting development of policies and procedures that facilitate expeditious transfer of records, transcripts, and other relevant educational information. | | | | | |
| 6. Facilitating the coordination of post-secondary opportunities for youth by engaging with systems partners, including, but not limited to, child welfare transition planning and independent living services, community colleges or universities, career technical education, and workforce development providers. | | | | | |
| 7. Developing strategies to prioritize the needs of foster youth in the community, using community-wide assessments that consider age group, geographical area, and identification of highest needs students based on academic needs and placement type. | | | | | |

| Coordinating Services | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. Engaging in the process of reviewing plan deliverables and of collecting and analyzing LEA and COE level outcome data for purposes of evaluating effectiveness of support services for foster youth and whether the investment in services contributes to improved educational outcomes for foster youth. | | | | | |