

# 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
Hayward Collegiate Charter	Caprice Young, Superintendent and Chief Executive Officer	<a href="mailto:caprice.young@navigatorsschools.org">caprice.young@navigatorsschools.org</a> , (408) 843-4107

## Goals and Actions

### Goal

Goal #	Description
1	Create a Culture of Excellence within the school community (students, staff, and parents) to foster a positive school climate, promote a sense of belonging and nurture social, emotional, and academic growth.

### Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
NWEA MAP: % meeting Fall to Spring growth target (Source: Local)	2020-21: 13% of students met Fall to Spring math growth target 27% of Students met Fall to Spring reading growth target (Baseline data corrected in 2022)	2021-22: 60% of students met Fall to Spring math growth target 67% of students met Fall to Spring reading growth target	NWEA was not utilized for testing this year. STAR testing took place 5 times this year	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
% of core and EL teachers are properly credentialed and appropriately assigned	100%	100%	100%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)

Teacher survey: 100% of curriculum materials are adequate, up-to-date, and aligned to school goals and state/national standards, including ELD standards	100%	100%	Data not collected	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
% of students with access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional	100%	2021-22: 100%	100%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
ELPAC Summative: % of students improving a level (Dashboard measure)	2019-20 ELPAC testing canceled due to the pandemic.	2020-21 Level 3 or 4: 79.3% Proficient: 34.5%  ELPI not provided for 2021	Not available yet	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
EL reclassification rate (target to exceed district by at least 5%) (Source: Dataquest)	2019-20: 0%	2020-21: 0%	0%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
CAASPP performance: ELA, Math, and Science % Met/Exceeded Standard for all students and all numerically significant subgroups. (Source: Dataquest)	No CAASPP testing administered until 2022.	No CAASPP testing administered until 2022.	In 2021-22 50% of students met or exceeded standards in ELA and 59.26% met or exceeded standards in Math	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
% of students enrolled in a broad course of study (Source: Local)	100%	2021-22: 100%	100%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)

New 2023-24: Staff Surveys	70% of staff feel proud to tell people where they work and 70% would recommend working at Navigator to a good friend.	N/A	96% of staff feel proud to tell people where they work and 86% would recommend working at Navigator to a good friend.	94% feel proud and 64% would recommend working at Navigator.	At least 96% of staff feel proud to tell people where they work and 86% would recommend working at Navigator to a good friend.
New 2023-24: Parent Surveys	70% of parents feel their child is safe and supported on campus and 70% are satisfied with their child's academic results.	N/A	100% of parents feel their child is safe and supported on campus and 100% are satisfied with their child's academic results.	91% of parents feel their child is safe and supported on campus, and 98% are satisfied with their child's academic results.  (Source: Annual Parent Survey, May 2024)	At least 90% of parents feel their child is safe and supported on campus and 90% are satisfied with their child's academic results.
New 2023-24: Student Surveys	70% feel proud to belong to HC most or all of the time, 70% feel that adults at the school cared about them most or all of the time, and 70% agree that they felt safe at school	N/A	67% feel proud to belong to HC most or all of the time, 73% feel that adults at the school cared about them most or all of the time, and 87% agree that they felt safe at school	71% feel proud to belong to HC most or all of the time, 97% feel that adults at the school cared about them most or all of the time, and 94% agree that they felt safe at school	At least 67% feel proud to belong to HC most or all of the time, 73% feel that adults at the school cared about them most or all of the time, and 87% agree that they felt safe at school
New 2023-24: Suspension Rates	Less than 2%	N/A	0.70%	0%	Less than 2%
New 2023-24: Student Attendance Rates, as a measure of student engagement.	96% ADA	N/A	94.68%	94.87%	96%
New 2023-24: Chronic Absenteeism	Less than 10%	N/A	5.70%	11.80%	Less than 6%



## 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.

There were no substantive differences between the planned actions and implementation. We were able to successfully utilize the actions laid out in this goal to help create a culture of excellence within the school community.

- In Action 1, HCC was able to successfully staff their leadership team and bi-lingual office staff, who worked hard to maintain a positive school culture.
- In Action 2, HCC was able to maintain a safe climate for students and staff by keeping the facilities in good repair, as shown on the latest Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT).
- In Action 3, HCC received services from the Support Office and staff felt supported and proud to work at Navigator, as shown in our staff survey results (94% felt proud).

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.

There was not a material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.

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

When reflecting on the successful achievement of our metric targets, we see that many of our actions were implemented with substantial success, although we did not meet all targets completely. We therefore see these actions as partially effective.

- The target for chronic absenteeism was less than 6%, which was the success we saw in 2022-23. We missed the goal with a rate of 11.80%. Office staff will have a renewed focus on our chronic absenteeism with additional family outreach in partnership with the Community Schools Coordinator.
- The target for average daily attendance was 96%, and this was also missed by 1.13% with an ADA of 94.67% (an increase from the previous year). The office staff and Community Schools Coordinator will work with leadership to ensure the rate continues to increase and chronic absenteeism decreases.
- The target was for 96% of staff who feel proud to work at Navigator and 86% of staff who would recommend Navigator to a friend. We did not achieve this target, with 94% feeling proud and 64% willing to recommend Navigator to a friend. We will continue to team-build with our staff and will have regular check-ins with them to ensure they are feeling heard and seen.

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 will continue to foster a culture of excellence in our school by re-establishing metrics targets and modified actions (as noted above) associated with this Goal in our 2024-27 LCAP.

Goal #	Description
2	All students will receive Data-Driven Instruction in Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and other California State Standards (ELD, Social Studies) from appropriately credentialed teachers and staff.

### **Measuring and Reporting Results**

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Parent Survey: % who feel engaged in decision-making (Source: Local)	2021: 90.2%	2022: 96%	2023: Data not collected	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
Parent Survey: % indicating satisfaction with school safety and school connectedness (Source: Local)	2021: 100%	2022: Safety: 87% Connectedness: 96%	2023: 100%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
Student Survey: % indicating satisfaction with school safety and school connectedness (Source: Local)	2021: No survey yet administered since we only have TK-2	2022: No survey yet administered since we only have TK-3	2023: 87%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
Teacher survey: % indicating satisfaction with school safety and school connectedness (Source: Local)	2021: 80%	2022 Safety: 97% Connectedness: 97%	2023: 94%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
Suspension rate for all students and all numerically significant subgroups	0%	2021-22: 0%	2022: .07%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)

Expulsion Rate for all students and all numerically significant subgroups	0%	2021-22: 0%	2022: 0%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
Average Daily Attendance (Source: Local)	84% (8/19/19-2/28/20)	2021-22: 96.11% Data Source: CALPADS P-2	2023: 94.68%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
Chronic Absence Rate for all students and all numerically significant subgroups (Source: Dataquest)	All students: 8.7%	2020-21 All: 0.9% SED: 1.4% Hispanic: 1.4%	2022: 5.7%	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
Gauge that facilities meet the “good repair” standard (Source: Local)	Facilities in Good Repair	2021-22: Good Repair	2023: Good repair	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)
Seek parent input & promote parental participation in programs for unduplicated students and students with exceptional needs (Source: Local Indicator CA Dashboard)	Full Implementation and Sustainability	Full Implementation and Sustainability	Full Implementation and Sustainability	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)	N/A - Shifted to alternate metrics (see below)

New 2023-24: SBAC scores, English Learner progress and Science and SS assessments will be added when determined by the CDE	SBAC Math +3 from 2021-22 DFS	N/A	Not available yet	64.87% Met or Exceeded the standard for Math from the 22 - 23 CAASPP; most current state data available from the <a href="http://caaspp-elpac.ets.org">caaspp-elpac.ets.org</a> state website  DF +3 from California State Dashboard: 18.7 Points Above Standard	SBAC Math +3 from 2022-23 DFS
New 2023-24: SBAC scores, English Learner progress and Science and SS assessments will be added when determined by the CDE	SBAC ELA +3 from 2021-22 DFS	N/A	Not available yet	67.56% Met or Exceeded the standard for ELA from the 22 - 23 CAASPP; most current state data available from the <a href="http://caaspp-elpac.ets.org">caaspp-elpac.ets.org</a> state website  DF +3 from California State Dashboard: 29.9 Points Above Standard	SBAC ELA +3 from 2022-23 DFS
New 2023-24: English Learner Progress	Set from the California Dashboard for 2022 the English Learner Progress was 46.7%	N/A	46.7% making progress towards English language proficiency	62.1% from the California Dashboard for 2023 the English Learner Progress	At least 46.7%

## 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 goal was implemented as planned. Students received data-driven instruction from appropriately credentialed teachers and staff.

- In Action 1, all teachers were appropriately assigned, trained and credentialed and used data-driven instruction.
- In Action 2, Teachers in Training served as substitutes to provide our teachers time for coaching and collaboration with partner teachers.
- In Action 3, Small Group Instructors provided small group instruction to students using data driven instruction at the appropriate level for the students.
- In Action 4, English Learners were provided access to CCSS and ELD standards for instruction. Staff were provided professional development and increased planning time in order to implement ELD standards into instructional time.
- In Action 5, all standards-aligned instructional materials that were needed were purchased at the beginning of the school year.
- In Action 6, physical education was provided to grades K through 5.

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.

There were some material differences between planned expenditures and estimated actual expenditures:

- For Action 2, the Estimated Actual Expenditures were \$144,427, while the Budgeted Expenditures were \$121,292. This is an increase of 19%. This was due to highly-qualified staff hired at a higher compensation rate than originally expected.
- For Action 3, Estimated Actual Expenditures were 30% higher than budgeted (~\$73,000) due to additional staff added to help reduce learning loss.
- For Action 5, Instructional materials, there was cost savings of approximately 50% (~\$50,000) due to an overestimation of necessary materials for implementation of the curriculum.
- For Action 6, Physical Education, there were lower costs (~\$20,000 or 25%) due to an unfilled position for a portion of the year.

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

While we did meet most of our metric targets, we are finding that learning loss due to the Pandemic is still a concern. The metrics available for this LCAP annual update reflect testing in 2022-23, though, so we cannot fully reflect on our actions during this school year. Nonetheless, we will continue to address learning loss so we can meet all our assessment targets in the future.

- The target for math and ELA SBAC was +3 percent from the 2021-22 SBAC scores. We did not meet the math goal with a growth of +1.1, however, we far exceeded the goal for ELA at +14.55
- English Learner progress was up significantly from the previous year of 46.7% of students making progress to 62.1% making progress.

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 will continue to staff all classrooms with properly credentialed teachers, small group instructors, and teachers in training. We will continue to push for high academic achievement via standards-aligned personalized instruction, as outlined in Goal 1, Action 1 of our 2024-27 LCAP.

Goal #	Description
3	Provide weekly coaching and feedback to all staff to support continuous improvement for teaching and student learning.

**Measuring and Reporting Results**

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Coaching Log/Meeting Records	Weekly coaching for teachers an average of 20 times a school year	N/A	Weekly coaching for teachers an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for teachers an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for teachers an average of 20 times a school year
Coaching Log/Meeting Records	Weekly coaching for small group instructors an average of 20 times a school year	N/A	Weekly coaching for small group instructors an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for small group instructors an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for small group instructors an average of 20 times a school year
Coaching Log/Meeting Records	Weekly coaching for administrators an average of 20 times a school year	N/A	Weekly coaching for administrators an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for administrators an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for administrators an average of 20 times a school year

**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 for this Goal were implemented as planned. School leadership staff prioritized their calendaring at the beginning of the school year to ensure weekly 30-minute academic coaching meetings for each instructional staff member. School leadership staff also prioritized calendaring of weekly staff observation times. All school leadership received professional development at the beginning of the year on Navigator’s coaching structure so that they were adequately prepared to lead academic coaching meetings.

- In Action 1, school leadership provided weekly coaching to all teachers, Teachers in Training and Small Group Instructors to continuously improve instruction for students and growth for staff.
- In Action 2, the Director of Schools provided weekly coaching to Principal, and the Director of Student Services provided weekly coaching to Special Education Resource Teachers.

Additionally, Navigator prioritized in-the-moment coaching for all staff members, as well as group coaching when there was a common need, as we have found both strategies to be best practices in meeting their larger goal of supporting continuous improvement for teaching and student learning. These additional actions will continue in the coming years.

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.

There were no explicit costs associated with this Goal.

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

The coaching actions at the school site were effective in reaching the metric targets.

- The goal of weekly coaching for all staff was achieved, with 100% of staff being coached weekly with an average of 20 time during the school year.

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 will continue to provide weekly coaching to all staff at Navigator, as it is one of our main priorities in continually improving. This is reflected in Action 7 of Goal 1 for the 2024-27 LCAP.

Goal #	Description
4	Ensure equitable access to curriculum, programs, and pathways for student success through a multi-tiered system of supports.

**Measuring and Reporting Results**

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
% of All Students placed in inclusive environment	99%	N/A	100%	100%	100%
% of Students not meeting standards who are offered intervention support	99%	N/A	100%	100%	100%

**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.

There were no substantive differences between planned actions and actual implementation. We continued to implement a robust MTSS team process, which included leadership, counselors, educational specialists and a school psychologist. The special education team ensured that all students in need of services were provided specialized services.

- In Action 1, with support from the Director of Student Services and the Resource Teacher, Special Education Paraprofessionals provided an inclusive instructional setting by ""pushing in"" with support in the classrooms. At times, a 1:1 ratio was needed and provided by the Special Education Paraprofessional.
- In Action 2, a .10 FTE School Psychologist was maintained and provided intervention support for students not achieving at grade level.
- For Action 3, Summer school has not happened for 2023-24 yet, however summer school is planned to take place for four weeks from June to July.
- In Action 4, students were provided food service for breakfast, lunch and snacks at no cost to them. The food service staff made sure that all students has equitable opportunities to enjoy nourishing food.
- In Action 5, through staffing and independent contractors, students were able to receive speech therapy, occupational therapy, and counseling, or any specialized support for identified needs.

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.

There were several areas where estimated actual expenditures varied from budgeted expenditures:

- For Action 1, costs were 18% lower than budgeted due to vacant positions for certain parts of the year.

- For Action 2, estimated actual expenditures are 10% higher than budget due to an additional stipend provided to the Psychologist for acting as MTSS coordinator.
- For Action 3, estimated actual expenditures were similar to budget.
- For Action 4, costs are estimated to be significantly higher (33%) due to additional meal kits provided to students during school breaks which were not budgeted.
- For Action 5, costs are estimated to be significantly lower, by 35%, due to vacant positions on the Student Services team for certain parts of the year.

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

The actions planned within this goal were determined to be effective because we exceeded our goal of 99% inclusivity for our special education students.

- 100% of students were placed in an inclusive environment.
- 100% of students who were not at grade level received intervention support

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 will continue to provide specialized services to all students and meet our target of 99% inclusivity for our special education students and 99% for intervention. Our supports for Special Education students specifically will be reflected in our 2024-27 LCAP in Goal 1, Action 4.

Goal #	Description
5	Use cutting edge instructional technology to encourage student engagement, increase staff effectiveness to improve student learning, and prepare students for the future.

**Measuring and Reporting Results**

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
% of Students with a 1:1 I-pad ratio	100%	N/A	53%	59%	65%
% of Students with access to adaptive applications to support personalized learning	100%	N/A	100%	100%	100%
% Customer Satisfaction rates: IT job tickets resolved satisfactorily	93%	N/A	94%	96%	94%

**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.

There were no substantive differences between our planned actions and and the implementation of these actions. The full time site administrator for IT was able to support staff and students with their technology needs.

- For Action 1, a full time IT Admin was present on site to provide staff and students with IT support.
- For Action 2, Illuminate was used for student assessment and reporting for data-driven student support. Tableau software was utilized to enhance data reporting so that staff could easily identify student needs.
- For Action 3, more iPads were purchased and we will continue to work towards a 1:1 iPad device ratio.
- For Action 4, all staff was provided up-to-date technology for lesson planning, instruction and, when necessary, meetings.
- For Action 5, high-speed internet was provided throughout the campus to accommodate the use of technology for learning.

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.

For Actions 1, 2, and 5, there was no material difference between planned and estimated actual expenditures. For Actions 3 and 4, estimated actual expenditures varied by more than 10% from budgeted expenditures:

- For Action 3, devices that were originally planned to be replaced were assessed and were in better condition than anticipated, so they were not replaced. This reduced costs by approximately \$24,000.

- For Action 4, an unbudgeted new staff member needed teaching technology, increasing estimated actual costs by \$4,800 (~43%).

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

The actions we implemented were effective, although we did not reach the original goal for the 1:1 iPad ratio for students.

- The goal for 1:1 iPad ratio was 65% and we ended the year with 59% of students having an iPad. Although we did not hit our goal, we increased the ratio from the previous year of 53%. This was primarily due to a slower transition from Chromebooks to iPads. The instructional staff wanted to make this transition more slowly than originally planned, keeping some Chromebooks for one additional year. This did not compromise the instructional support in any way.

- The goal was 100% of students having access to adaptive applications to support personalized learning, and this goal was met.

- The goal was 93% customer satisfaction (IT job tickets resolved satisfactorily), and this goal was exceeded with a satisfaction rating of 96%, helping us see that our support system, processes, and staff are effective.

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 will continue to have a technology focus for our students and staff. In 2024-25, all students will have a 1:1 iPad device ratio.

**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](mailto: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.

- o 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.
  - o 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