

RIVER CHARTER SCHOOLS



# 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
Lighthouse Charter School - River Charter Schools	Roxanna Villasenor Superintendent	rvillasenor@rivercharterschools.org 916-744-1212

# Goals and Actions

## Goal

Goal #	Description
1	Goal 1: Rigorous Curriculum Aligned to Standards Lighthouse Charter School provides a broad and rigorous course of study in alignment with the CCSS, NGSS, ELDS, and CSS that develops content knowledge, conceptual understanding, and critical thinking for all students – those who struggle, those who are high-achieving, those in applicable subgroups, and the general population as a whole.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Schoolwide scores on ELA as measured by the CAASPP distance from standard will improve until goal of a rating of Blue is met, overall and for all numerically significant subgroups.	On the 2019 School Dashboard, LCS scored 11 points above standard.	No Dashboard Data from the State	On the 2022 Dashboard LCS scored 34.5 points below standard	For 22-23 Dashboard ELA was Schoolwide Yellow and was 25.5 points below standard. This was an increase of 8.9 points.  EL and White students were Orange level and Hispanic and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students were Yellow level.	LCS will annually improve CAASPP distance from standard score in ELA to maintain at least a Green rating on the CA School Dashboard
Schoolwide scores on Math as measured by the CAASPP distance from standard will improve annually until	On the 2019 School Dashboard, LCS scored 2.6 points below standard.	No Dashboard Data from the State	On the 2022 Dashboard LCS scored 46.8 points below standard.	For 22-23 Dashboard, Math was rated Orange level schoolwide and was 45.4 points below	LCS will annually improve CAASPP distance from standard score in Math to maintain at

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
goal of a rating of Blue is met, overall and for all numerically significant subgroups.				standard. This was an increase of 1.4 points.  EL, Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and White students were Orange level.	least a Green rating on the CA School Dashboard
Percent of students who meet projected growth targets in ELA as measured by the NWEA MAP will improve annually until a goal of 80% is met, overall and for all numerically significant subgroups.	Percent of students who meet projected growth target in ELA as measured by the NWEA MAP was 54%	Percent of students who meet projected growth target in ELA as measured by the NWEA MAP was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall – 43%</li> </ul>	Percent of students who meet projected growth target in ELA as measured by the NWEA MAP was 37%	Percent of students who meet projected growth target in ELA as measured by the NWEA MAP was 34%  For 2023-24, percent of students who scored proficient in ELA as measured by iReady diagnostic was 47%.	LCS will annually improve the percent of who meet projected growth targets in ELA.
Percent of students who meet projected growth targets in Math as measured by the NWEA MAP will improve annually until a goal of 80% is met, overall and for all numerically significant subgroups.	Percent of students who meet projected growth target in Math as measured by the NWEA MAP was 44%	Percent of students who meet projected growth target in Math as measured by the NWEA MAP was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall – 43%</li> </ul>	Percent of students who meet projected growth target in Math as measured by the NWEA MAP was 42%	Percent of students who meet projected growth target in Math as measured by the NWEA MAP was 35%  For 2023-24, percent of students who scored proficient in mat as measured by iReady diagnostic was 37%.	LCS will annually improve the percent of who meet projected growth targets in Math.

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
100% of students will participate in project based learning unit as measured by annual curriculum audit.	The percent of students participating in a project based learning unit as measured by annual curriculum audit was: 100%	The percent of students participating in a project based learning unit as measured by annual curriculum audit was: 100%	The percent of students participating in a project based learning unit as measured by annual curriculum audit was: 100%	The percent of students participating in a project based learning unit as measured by annual curriculum audit was: 100%	The percent of students participating in a project based learning unit as measured by annual curriculum audit was: 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.

Lighthouse faced shortages of qualified teachers which was complicated by the challenges of the pandemic. Of the 21 teachers this year, 2 are interns and 6 are new to Lighthouse. Teacher burnout and turnover further strained efforts to maintain academic standards and support student learning. Teacher training for new teachers was not consistently provided. Teachers struggled to effectively implement curriculum materials and Project Based Learning with the lack of adequate training, support, or resources needed. Inconsistent implementation may have exacerbated this issue, which led to disparities in teacher preparedness and confidence in delivering instruction.

In addition, Lighthouse changed their math curriculum to Achievement First Navigator Math in 2021-2022, and then replaced the math curriculum again to iReady in 2023-24. Navigator Math was an open-source curriculum that contained many errors and required teachers to create their own answer keys and photocopy large packets for daily assignments. iReady Math provided more support for teachers to focus on teaching math and better alignment to iReady assessments and SBAC.

Inconsistent implementation in math and ELA led to disparities in learning opportunities among students, as some may have received a higher quality of instruction or exposure to essential concepts and skills compared to others. These inconsistencies in curriculum delivery may have disrupted the continuity of learning, making it challenging for students to build upon foundational knowledge and progress smoothly from one grade level to the next. This may have also affected assessment practices and most likely led to discrepancies in how student learning was measured and evaluated. In addition, this misalignment between curriculum implementation and assessments made it difficult to accurately assess instructional effectiveness.

Inconsistency in teaching and learning impacted student engagement. During the pandemic and still today, some students continue to be disinterested, unmotivated, or have greater emotional needs that are difficult to support and impact learning. Without consistent curriculum implementation, ongoing professional development for educators, and ensuring equitable learning opportunities for all students, LCS continues to work at rebuilding the educational program it had prior to the pandemic.

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.

No material difference

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

Project Based Learning was not implemented effectively to support ELA and math as desired. This was due to lack of training and support provided to new and inexperienced teachers. Monitoring and evaluating student data was impacted by student engagement and teacher inexperience. Small group instruction was implemented but needs stronger alignment and improved practice to better meet the needs of students.

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.

Lighthouse moved from NWEA MAP to iReady assessments in math and ELA because MAP was not user friendly for teachers. They needed more professional development on how to use the data and share it with parents. MAP's in-service support was limited. Parents were confused about what the scores actually meant in relation to their child's success. IReady on the other hand, provided focused activities to support WINN (small group) instruction as well as student support through My Plate. Navigator Math curriculum was added in 2021-22, and then changed again to iReady math curriculum in 2023-24. Project Based Learning was not taught with fidelity due to return from COVID and high turnover in staff.

Feedback provided through stakeholder meetings and surveys, largely focused into these primary areas for Goal 1:

1.1 Rigorous curriculum and instructional materials – Teacher and administrator feedback expressed a need for stronger vertical alignment and a stronger social studies curriculum.

1.2 Ongoing professional development, observation, feedback, and coaching – Teacher and administrator feedback, the district will add a vice-principal position to coach and support teachers. In addition, feedback expressed the need for professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals in English Language Development and building a stronger integrated/designated program, and continued development of teaching and learning practices with a focus on improving Project Based Learning (PBL) units. After reviewing teacher and administrator feedback, the district will hire a lead paraprofessional position to train and support the paraprofessional staff.

1.5 Monitor and Evaluate Student Data – Teachers and families expressed a need to strengthen progress monitoring and increase communication with students and families regarding progress.



**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	Goal 2: Addressing Gaps to Ensure Equity Lighthouse Charter School will close the achievement gap, if any, between subgroups of students and the general population.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Schoolwide scores on ELA as measured by the CAASPP distance from standard will improve until goal of a rating of Blue is met, overall and for all numerically significant subgroups.	In 2018-19, Schoolwide level was orange. No performance levels for subgroups.	No Statewide Dashboard data was available.	In 2021-22, Schoolwide level was low, Hispanic and Socioeconomic Disadvantaged was low, and English Learners was very low.	For 22-23 Dashboard ELA was Schoolwide Yellow and was 25.5 points below standard. This was an increase of 8.9 points.  EL and White students were Orange level and Hispanic and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students were Yellow level.	Schoolwide scores on ELA as measured by the CAASPP distance from standard will improve until goal of a rating of Blue is met, overall and for all numerically significant subgroups.
Schoolwide scores on Math as measured by the CAASPP distance from standard will improve until goal of a rating of Blue is met,	In 2018-19, Schoolwide level was yellow. No performance levels for subgroups.	No Statewide Dashboard data was available.	In 2021-22, Schoolwide level was low, Hispanic, Socioeconomic Disadvantaged and	For 22-23 Dashboard, Math was rated Orange level schoolwide and was 45.4 points below	Schoolwide scores on Math as measured by the CAASPP distance from standard will improve until goal of a rating of Blue is met,



Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
overall and for all numerically significant subgroups.			English Learners was low.	standard. This was an increase of 1.4 points.  EL, Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and White students were Orange level.	overall and for all numerically significant subgroups.
The percent of English Learners making annual progress will increase by 1% annually until the goal of 85% is met.	The percent of English Learners making annual progress was: 38.5%	No Statewide testing available.	The percent of English Learners making annual progress was: 41%	For 22-23, 27.3% of EL's were making progress towards English Language Proficiency.	The percent of English Learners making annual progress will be: 65%
100% of 4th, 5th and 6th grade students will participate in project based learning that promotes college awareness, readiness, and the development of a college-going identity as measured by annual curriculum audit.	The percent of 4th, 5th and 6th grade students who participated in project based learning that promotes college awareness, readiness, and the development of a college-going identity as measured by annual curriculum audit was 100%	The percent of 4th, 5th and 6th grade students who participated in project based learning that promotes college awareness, readiness, and the development of a college-going identity as measured by annual curriculum audit was 100%	The percent of 4th, 5th and 6th grade students who participated in project based learning that promotes college awareness, readiness, and the development of a college-going identity as measured by annual curriculum audit was 100%	The percent of 4th, 5th and 6th grade students who participated in project based learning that promotes college awareness, readiness, and the development of a college-going identity as measured by annual curriculum audit was 100%	The percent of 4th, 5th and 6th grade students who participated in project based learning that promotes college awareness, readiness, and the development of a college-going identity as measured by annual curriculum audit will be 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.

As mentioned in Goal 1 analysis, due to multiple issues lingering from COVID, staff burnout and turnover, affected implementation of curriculum and assessments negatively. Lighthouse is rebuilding to better support all students and especially EL and ELL student groups. Changing from NWEA MAP to iReady assessments and Navigator math curriculum to iReady math curriculum has improved alignment. In addition, iReady incorporates reteaching lessons and is more user friendly which helped to better assist teachers with a Multi-tiered System of support for all students.

The Intervention Assistance Team (IAT) progress monitors every 6 weeks. A MTSS coordinator was hired to oversee the implementation and support the process. This learning block includes multiple small groups for ELD and reading instruction. Teachers plan and paraprofessionals help support, but most small groups are led by teachers. The academic support occurs a minimum of 4 days a week with 20 minute rotations to include 4-5 differentiated groups for ELA. Math support occurs 5 days a week for 15 minutes to include 1-2 small groups that need support. In addition, Writers workshop is incorporated in 1st-6th grade. Guided reading strategies, high-yield ELD strategies, Soliday or SIPPS are also used in these groups for ELA. Math instruction provides scaffolded support for lesson interpretation and manipulatives for skill building.

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.

Increased demand for services

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

Teacher turnover at Lighthouse has created a need to rebuild and train for stronger implementation of the actions. It is difficult to accurately assess the effectiveness of the goals if actions were not implemented with fidelity. The continued decline in academic performance among specific groups can be attributed to a variety of factors, including students from low-income households often face challenges such as limited access to resources, unstable home environments, and insufficient support systems, all of which can impact their academic performance negatively. EL progress scored red with progress towards proficiency at 27.30%; however, scores declined from 38.5% in 2019 to 27.3% in 2023. Addressing the continued decline in academic performance among specific subgroups requires a comprehensive approach that addresses both individual and systemic barriers to success. This includes implementing culturally responsive teaching practices, providing targeted support services, addressing systemic inequities, and fostering partnerships with families and communities.

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.

Due to stakeholder input and data, there is a need to refine the goal and actions. For the 2024-25 LCAP, this goal will be changed to ..... Lighthouse changed from MAP to iReady to adopt the new math curriculum and align the assessments accordingly. MAP was not aligned to Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and not adaptive for students to address areas for growth. iReady incorporates reteaching lessons and is user friendly. The iReady platform contributed to use of data for Multi-Tiered System of support for small group instruction to address differentiated needs of students. Based on staff feedback there is a need and desire for more training in Project Based Learning, English Language Development (ELD) and Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) and to include guided reading activities and Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness and Sight Words (SIPPS) into WINN time.

Given stakeholder input and feedback, there is a desire to be more specific in this goal statement. The existing goal is written very vague and lacks clarity on the individualized needs of each student. With such a small school, there is great benefit in strengthening the use of data to address the individualized needs of students in a systematic and timely manner. As a result, this goal will be revised to be more focused on Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) for a structured approach in addressing individualized needs of students.

Feedback provided through these stakeholder meetings and surveys, largely focused into these primary areas for Goal 2:

2.4 Multi-Tiered System of Support – Feedback from teachers and families showed a need to improve the MTSS system.

2.5 Project Based Learning – Teacher and administrator feedback expressed a need to create stronger science, arts, and music integration into PBL curriculum, and to embed grade-level field trips into the curriculum.

**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	Goal 3: Student, Family, and Community Engagement Students and families at Lighthouse Charter School are engaged and empowered, in service of supporting students' overall development and well-being.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Percent of students who feel socially and emotionally safe, engaged, and empowered at school as measured by annual survey will increase by +1% until goal of 90% is met.	Percent of students who feel socially and emotionally safe, engaged, and empowered at school as measured by annual survey was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe – 80%</li> <li>• Expected to do their best – 89%</li> <li>• Can go to teacher with a problem – 73%</li> </ul>	Percent of students who feel socially and emotionally safe, engaged, and empowered at school as measured by bi-annual survey was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe – 93%,</li> <li>• Expected to do their best – 96%,</li> <li>• Can go to teacher with a problem – 90%,</li> </ul>	Percent of students who feel socially and emotionally safe, engaged, and empowered at school as measured by bi-annual survey was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe – 93%,</li> <li>• Expected to do their best – 96%,</li> <li>• Can go to teacher with a problem – 90%,</li> </ul>	Student and parent surveys will be completed in Spring of 2024	Percent of students who feel socially and emotionally safe, engaged, and empowered at school as measured by annual survey will be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe – greater than 90%</li> <li>• Expected to do their best – greater than 90%</li> <li>• Can go to teacher with a problem – greater than 90%</li> </ul>
Percent of families who feel their students	Percent of families who feel their students	Percent of families who feel their students	Percent of families who feel their students	Student and parent surveys will be	Percent of families who feel their students

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
are socially and emotionally safe, engaged, and empowered at school as measured by annual survey will increase by +1% until goal of 90% is met.	are socially and emotionally safe, engaged, and empowered at school as measured by annual survey was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe – 98%</li> <li>• Environment where children can succeed – 94%</li> </ul>	are socially and emotionally safe, engaged, and empowered at school as measured by bi-annual survey was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe – 98%</li> <li>• Environment where children can succeed – 97%</li> </ul>	are socially and emotionally safe, engaged, and empowered at school as measured by annual survey was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe – 98%</li> <li>• Environment where children can succeed – 97%</li> </ul>	completed in Spring of 2024	are socially and emotionally safe, engaged, and empowered at school as measured by annual survey will be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe – greater than 90%</li> <li>• Environment where children can succeed – greater than 90%</li> </ul>
Student attendance rate will increase by +1% until goal of 95% or higher is met.	Student attendance rate was: 95.4%	Student attendance rate was 94.6%	Student attendance rate was 93.9%	Student Attendance rate for the 23-24 school year is 92.33% as of the first week in April, 2024.	Student attendance rate will be 95.0% or higher
Student chronic truancy rate will decrease annually until level Green is reached	Student chronic truancy rate was rated Orange.	No state dashboard data was available.	Student chronic truancy rate was rated very high.	Chronic Truancy was at 28.3% for 22-23, which was a reduction of 4.9%	Student chronic truancy rate will be at least Green.
Student Suspension rate will decrease annually until level Green is reached	Student suspension rate was blue level.	No state dashboard data was available.	Student suspension rate was very low	Suspension rate was 0.6% which resulted in a yellow rating	Student chronic truancy rate will be at least Green.
School will meet the State Standard for Basics: Teachers,	School will meet the State Standard for Basics: Teachers,	School will meet the State Standard for Basics: Teachers,	School will meet the State Standard for Basics: Teachers,	Lighthouse continues to meet the State Standard for Basics: Teachers,	School will meet the State Standard for Basics: Teachers,

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Instructional Materials, and Facilities.	Instructional Materials, and Facilities.	Instructional Materials, and Facilities.	Instructional Materials, and Facilities.	Instructional Materials, and Facilities.	Instructional Materials, and Facilities.
School will meet the State Standard for Implementation of Academic Standards	School will meet the State Standard for Implementation of Academic Standards	School will meet the State Standard for Basics: Teachers, Instructional Materials, and Facilities.	School will meet the State Standard for Basics: Teachers, Instructional Materials, and Facilities.	Lighthouse continues to meet the State Standard for Basics: Teachers, Instructional Materials, and Facilities.	School will meet the State Standard for Implementation of Academic Standards

## 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.

Lighthouse started the Intervention Assistance Team (IAT) to progress monitoring every 6 weeks. The team brainstorms intervention ideas for behavior and academic support. Staff must follow specific action steps before referring students to the Student Support Team (SST). Daily SEL check-ins to identify patterns that may necessitate interventions at the Tier 2 or 3 levels provided by counselor. An additional counselor was added to support this process.

This is the third year of PBIS implementation. Lighthouse uses Tier Fidelity Implementation Rubric from PBIS World. The PBIS Leadership team consists of teachers, support/classified staff and parents. Meetings are held 1-2 times a month to review action steps with implementation efforts and Tier I effectiveness reviewing school wide data and grade level data from "office discipline referrals" (ODR). ODR data is added to AERIES (minors) and both minors and majors are added into School Wide Information System (SWIS). PBIS Leadership team supports teachers with Tier I strategies and provides support with Tier II interventions for students with support from school counselor. This team also supports training teachers on how to collect Tier II data with ABC data (antecedent, behavior, consequence) which supports Tier III intervention and/or services. This team also reviewed data for progress monitoring to determine when to phase students back to Tier I.

Restorative Practices are modeled by behavior support staff/PBIS Coordinator, school counselor and Principal. Staff training is needed with a specific framework for consistency.

Chronic absenteeism has been difficult to combat since COVID. Overall, Lighthouse rated Yellow, but Students with Disabilities and Students of Two Races or More have rated Red for Chronic Absenteeism. To counter this trend in attendance, Lighthouse has done the following: Positive Reinforcement for students that are in school during trimester awards assemblies (H. E.R.O. = Here, Everyday, Read for learning, On-time) = 0 absences, 0 early outs, 0 tardy in the trimester)  
Recognize students that have had "improved attendance" in the trimester (all students)  
"WE ARE ALL HERE" Campaign (classes build this phrase and when they have the phrase complete they get a popcorn party)

Home visits with principal and counselor  
MTSS and office staff make calls phone to help determine reasons why students are not making it to school  
Office staff send out attendance letters at 3, 8, 15 days and after 17 we hold SARB meetings with parents  
Principal calls home and communicates through Parent Square to parents of students with high absenteeism to determine supports, needs and set interventions and support in place.

An additional need is to review River Charter School's Attendance Policy and revise current board approved Independent Study policy and practices. To support parents more, we would like to kick-off a carpool system based on areas or neighborhoods where families live.

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.

Increased demand for services

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

Chronic Attendance and the attendance rate

As mentioned before, inexperienced teachers and turnover affected the implementation of PBIS and restorative practices. There is a need for training and rebuilding the PBIS structure for student support. The number of extreme behaviors exhibited has grown over the last few years. Two part time counselors supported Tier 1 and 2 students, and a part time educational psychologist served Tier 3 students. Parent and community support continues to be an on-going challenge for the school.

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.

Feedback provided through these stakeholder meetings and surveys, largely focused into these primary areas for Goal 3:

3.1 Restorative Practices and Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports - Parent and teacher feedback expressed a need for developing additional mental health support such as bringing in a social-emotional curriculum and training staff in Restorative and Trauma Informed practices. A need for transportation to help offset the Chronic Absenteeism rate for the school

3.2 Mental Health Professionals – Parents voiced the need for support with student behaviors and additional resources in the community.

**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	Goal 4: Strong and Sound Organization Lighthouse Charter School is a sound organization with the staff, curriculum, and capital in place to support and advance the goals, actions, and measures as detailed in the LCAP.

## Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Annual budget revenue and expenses are aligned and accounted for on an annual basis, as measured through annual submission of the LCAP Annual Update.	Annual budget revenue and expenses are aligned and accounted for on an annual basis, as measured through annual submission of the LCAP Annual Update.	Annual budget revenue and expenses are aligned and accounted for on an annual basis, as measured through annual submission of the LCAP Annual Update.	Annual budget revenue and expenses are aligned and accounted for on an annual basis, as measured through annual submission of the LCAP Annual Update.	Expenses are running above revenues due to revenue shortages caused by lower than expected enrollment.	Annual budget revenue and expenses will be aligned and accounted for on an annual basis, as measured through annual submission of the LCAP Annual Update.

## 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 Superintendent and Chief Business Official met with the principal to plan and adjust the budget as needed. School enrollment has declined since COVID. As a result, it was necessary to revisit the staffing ratios to ensure a positive budget, without compromising the quality of the program. Additionally, many reductions to top organizational staffing were made to maximize the support available at the school site. All spending practices are being evaluated to ensure need and effectiveness of the programs.

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.

No material difference

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

COVID funding allowed for an increased staffing ratio. With the expiration of these funding sources, there has been the need to make staffing adjustments for a positive and sustainable budget. The business department is exploring how to make all aware of their budgets and a more conservative approach to spending has made staff intentional of what is deemed priority for the greatest instructional impact. Enrollment has also declined over time, impacting our funding source. Efforts to priority enrollment have been taken to increase the number of students that are interested in attending Lighthouse Charter School.

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.

Through discussions had since the LCAP Mid-Year Review, it was recognized that many of the expenses associated with the actions in this goal were redundant to the previous goals. For transparency and a greater alignment to goals, actions and metrics associated with the 8 State Priorities, this goal will be eliminated for greater transparency and accountability.

**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.
  - 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