

Lodi Unified School District

Learning Recovery Education Block Grant
District Needs Assessment Report

**Tia Taylor, Alicia Bowman, and
Jennifer Zoffel**

March 5, 2025

© 2025 WestEd. All rights reserved.



WestEd is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that aims to improve the lives of children and adults at all ages of learning and development. We do this by addressing challenges in education and human development, increasing opportunity, and helping build communities where all can thrive. WestEd staff conduct and apply research, provide technical assistance, and support professional learning. We work with early learning educators, classroom teachers, local and state leaders, and policymakers at all levels of government.

For more information, visit [WestEd.org](https://www.wested.org). For regular updates on research, free resources, solutions, and job postings from WestEd, subscribe to the E-Bulletin, our semimonthly e-newsletter, at [WestEd.org/subscribe](https://www.wested.org/subscribe).

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Selection of Schools	2
Priority Need Student Groups for ELA and Math	2
Identified Math Need: Concepts and Procedures	2
Identified ELA Need: Writing	3
Identified Math Need: Concepts and Procedures	3
Identified ELA Need: Writing	3
Priority Need Student Groups for Chronic Absenteeism	3
Priority Needs for School Climate	4
District Climate Needs	4
Priority Student Group Climate Needs	4
Interview Themes	6
Priority Needs Programs and Services	6
Needs and Gaps	6
Current Initiatives	7
Current Progress and Drivers of Success	7
<i>Areas of Progress</i>	7
<i>Drivers for Success</i>	8
Barriers to Success	8
Decision Making on Interventions, Professional Development and Access to Resources	9
Current Data and Additional Data Needs	10
<i>Data Currently Used</i>	10
<i>Additional Data That Would Be Helpful</i>	10
Other Departments or Interest Groups to Include	11
Additional Considerations from District Leadership	11

Four Domains CALL Survey Results for Priority Schools	13
Existing LCAP Actions	14
Additional District Focus Areas to Address Emerging Needs	15
Additional District Focus Areas to Address Emerging Needs	15
Appendix A. Preliminary Needs Assessment	17
Appendix B. LREBG Program Information	35
Program Description	35
Allowable Uses of Funds	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Priority Need Schools	1
Table 2. Priority Student Groups for ELA and Math	2
Table 3. Priority Student Groups for Chronic Absenteeism	4
Table 4. 2024 Student Climate Survey Areas of Concern	5
Table 5. Four Domains CALL Survey Summary	13
Table 6. Four Domains CALL Survey Snapshot	14

Introduction

The follow outlines a comprehensive needs assessment conducted within the Lodi Unified School District, focusing on gaps in student success across English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics (Math), and Chronic Absenteeism. The findings in this report summarizes district level needs in alignment with the California Department of Education (CDE) recommendations for the Learning Recovery Education Block Grant (LREGB). This report is intended to support decision making to prioritize the use of LREBG funds to support allowable evidence-based strategies, to be included in the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). The **LREBG Needs Assessment Preliminary Summary of CA Dashboard Data** in Appendix A includes a summary of the Dashboard data and key findings that generated the basis for the selection of schools.

Based on a review of the 2024 California School Dashboard (Dashboard) on the ELA, Math, and Chronic Absenteeism progress indicators, a list priority needs schools were identified and selected in collaboration with district leadership. Table 1 lists the priority need schools by area.

Table 1. Priority Need Schools

Area 1	Area 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Creekside Elementary• Davis Elementary• Delta Sierra Middle• Oakwood Elementary• Parklane Elementary• Bear Creek HS• Plaza Robles Continuation HS• Ronald E. McNair HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Beckman Elementary• Clyde W. Needham Elementary• Leroy Nichols Elementary• Victor Elementary• Lawrence Elementary• Liberty HS• Independence HS• Turner Academy at Tokay Colony

Selection of Schools

Priority need schools were selected using the following required Dashboard criteria:

- status of Very Low in ELA and Math indicator,
- status of Very Low in ELA or Math and Very High on the K-8 Chronic Absenteeism indicator
- status of Low or Very Low in ELA and Math and a decline or significant decline on at least two progress indicators from the prior year.

Priority Need Student Groups for ELA and Math

Priority need student groups were selected using the following required Dashboard criteria:

- status of Very Low in ELA and Math
- red dashboard indicator in either ELA or Math
- red dashboard indicator in any area and a decline in status from the prior year.

Table 2 lists the priority student groups for ELA and Math.

Table 2. Priority Student Groups for ELA and Math¹

Student Group
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• African American• American Indian/Alaskan Native• English Learners• Long-Term English Learners• Students with Disabilities

Identified Math Need: Concepts and Procedures

A review of local assessment data and 2024 Smarter Balanced Math Assessment data indicated that for the identified schools, 30% or more of assessed students were two or more grade levels

¹ Note: Although Homeless and Foster Youth students qualified under these criteria, it was decided that these student groups were making significant progress with current initiatives.

below in math on local assessments and 40% or more were not meeting standard on the Smarter Balanced Math Assessment.

Further, the Smarter Balanced Math Assessment data identified a common area of greatest need in Mathematics of Concepts and Procedures. This was the lowest scoring area in Math for all but three of the identified schools, with an overall average of 62% of students, scoring below standard in this area.

Identified ELA Need: Writing

A review of local assessment data indicated that for the identified schools, 40% or more of assessed students were two or more grade levels below in on the local reading assessment, with an average of 46%. A review of the 2024 Smarter Balanced ELA Assessment data for the identified schools indicated that 40% or more of the Elementary and Middle school students were not meeting standard on the Smarter Balanced ELA Assessment, with an average of 50%. At the High School level, there was significant variance in performance with an average of 32% of students at the larger comprehensive High Schools not meeting standard, and an average of 68% of students at the smaller Continuation high Schools not meeting standard.

Further, the Smarter Balanced ELA Assessment data identified a common area of greatest need in Writing. This was the lowest scoring area in ELA for all of the identified schools, with an overall average of 49% of students, scoring below standard in this area.

Identified Math Need: Concepts and Procedures

The Smarter Balanced Math Assessment data identified a common area of greatest need in Mathematics of Concepts and Procedures. This was the lowest scoring area in Math for all of the identified student groups, with an overall average of 68% of students, scoring below standard in this area.

Identified ELA Need: Writing

The Smarter Balanced ELA Assessment data identified a common area of greatest need in Writing. This was the lowest scoring area in ELA for all of the identified student groups, with an average of 60% of students in the identified student groups scoring below standard in writing.

Priority Need Student Groups for Chronic Absenteeism

Although all identified schools had Very High indicators for chronic absenteeism, there has been a significant decline across district schools due to significant district improvements in utilizing data in combination with communication and outreach efforts.

Table 3 includes the priority student groups that had increased chronic absenteeism from the prior year.

Table 3. Priority Student Groups for Chronic Absenteeism

Student Group
<ul style="list-style-type: none">American Indian/Alaskan NativeHomeless

Further assessment needs to be done to determine the root causes of these declines in order to provide focused support to address the needs of chronic absenteeism specific to American Indian/Alaskan Native and Homeless student groups.

Priority Needs for School Climate

The 2024 School Climate Survey data for students surfaced the following areas of concern for the district overall, priority schools, and identified racial and ethnic groups. Areas of concern have been identified as statements with less than 75% agreement. Priority needs have been identified as statements with 65% or less agreement. Data was not available for the other identified student groups. Further root cause analysis is needed to determine if school climate in these areas is a contributing factor to academic performance or chronic absenteeism.

District Climate Needs

- Survey data reflects a district-wide need to support students to resolve disagreements with each other and to address students being picked on due to their background.

Priority Student Group Climate Needs

- Based on the data, African American students are experiencing a significantly more negative experience with their peers, overall safety and social acceptance, and how they are treated by adults.
- For American Indian/Alaska Native students, overall experience is much closer to the overall student experience across the district and the priority schools, but this group

has a significantly more negative experience with students getting along with each other and fairness of discipline.

Table 4 is a summary of the areas of concern from 2024 Student Climate Survey.

Table 4. 2024 Student Climate Survey Areas of Concern

Survey Statements	Average Percent of Students in Agreement			
	District -wide	Priority School Average	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Black/ African American
Students at school try to work out their disagreements with other students.	56%	58%	57%	46%
Students at school are not picked on about their background, such as race/ethnicity, gender, disability, or other personal characteristics.	59%	57%	59%	47%
Students at school get along with each other.	77%	75%	70%	64%
I feel safe at school.	76%	77%	79%	66%
I feel socially accepted at school.	80%	78%	80%	71%
Adults working at school treat all students respectfully.	80%	78%	80%	73%
Discipline is fair at school.	71%	70%	66%	62%

Priority Needs	Statements with 65% or less agreement
Areas of Concern	Statements with 75% or less agreement

Interview Themes

Priority Needs Programs and Services

The following outlines several themes and insights from various interviews concerning student success, educational interventions, and strategic planning within school district. The purpose of the interviews was to ask a few questions gather additional information that district leadership have about Lodi schools, current supports, and possible needs, that are not always obvious from looking at data sets. Overall, while there are frameworks in place for making decisions about interventions and professional development, challenges related to consistency, communication, and resource allocation persist, necessitating ongoing efforts to improve these processes.

Needs and Gaps

The following identifies **needs and gaps** related to student success in math, ELA, and chronic absenteeism:

1. **Inconsistent Instructional Strategies:** There is a lack of consistent implementation of effective instructional strategies across schools, leading to disparities in student outcomes.
2. **Widening Achievement Gaps:** Diagnostic data indicates that achievement gaps in literacy and math widen as students advance through grade levels, especially after third grade.
3. **Need for Targeted Interventions:** There is a critical need for timely and targeted support for English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) to address specific skill deficits among students, particularly in foundational literacy and math skills.
4. **Professional Development Alignment:** Professional development opportunities are not sufficiently aligned with district goals, limiting teachers' effectiveness in addressing student needs.
5. **Chronic Absenteeism Challenges:** Transient student populations face significant challenges with chronic absenteeism, which negatively impacts their learning and engagement.
6. **Data Utilization:** There is a need for improved processes for utilizing both qualitative and quantitative data to inform decision-making and resource allocation effectively.
7. **Cultural Shift:** A cultural shift within the district is necessary to foster high expectations for all students, including those from low-income or challenging backgrounds.
8. **Collaboration Among Educators:** Enhanced collaboration and communication among educators and departments are essential to identify and address gaps in student support and instruction.
9. **Systematic Approaches Needed:** The absence of systematic approaches for backtracking and addressing specific learning gaps contributes to ongoing challenges in student achievement.

Current Initiatives

The following outlines several initiatives that are already **in place or planned** to address the identified needs and gaps related to student success in math, ELA, and chronic absenteeism:

1. **Early Literacy Programs:** Structured supports have been implemented to enhance early literacy skills, focusing on consistent instructional practices.
2. **Professional Development:** Ongoing professional development is being provided to educators, emphasizing effective instructional strategies and alignment with district goals.
3. **Co-Teaching Models:** Innovative co-teaching strategies are being utilized to provide more personalized instruction and support for students, especially in integrated math classes.
4. **Parent Outreach Efforts:** Increased resources are allocated for parent outreach to improve engagement and attendance among families, addressing chronic absenteeism.
5. **Curriculum Updates:** New curriculum adoptions are being made to bridge content gaps and provide differentiated resources for teachers to better meet student needs.
6. **Site-Level Targeted Interventions:** Schools are developing targeted intervention plans based on data reviews to support students performing below expectations, particularly in foundational areas like literacy and math.

Current Progress and Drivers of Success

The following highlights several **areas of progress** in the focus areas of math, ELA, and chronic absenteeism, along with **key drivers for success**:

Areas of Progress

1. **Early Literacy Improvements:** Progress is being seen in early literacy programs due to structured supports and consistent instructional practices, leading to better reading outcomes among students.
2. **Increased Graduation Rates:** There has been a noticeable improvement in graduation rates, indicating successful interventions and support systems that are effectively engaging students.
3. **Attendance Enhancements:** Attendance rates have improved as a result of proactive disciplinary practices and increased parent outreach efforts, which help foster greater student engagement.
4. **Innovative Instructional Practices:** The implementation of co-teaching models and team-based teaching strategies has contributed positively to student learning experiences and engagement in classrooms.
5. **Data-Driven Decision Making:** The use of local assessments like DIBELS and i-Ready has facilitated targeted support based on student performance data, allowing educators to address specific needs more effectively.
6. **Visible Learning Approach:** Strategies derived from John Hattie's visible learning framework have enhanced teaching effectiveness by promoting clarity in learning objectives and assessment practices.

7. **Community Building Efforts:** Initiatives aimed at fostering a sense of community within schools have created supportive environments that contribute to overall school improvement.
8. **Leadership Engagement:** Strong site-based leadership and commitment to effective instructional practices have been linked to successful program implementation and positive student outcomes.

Drivers for Success

1. **Strong Leadership:** Effective leadership at both the district and school levels plays a crucial role in driving initiatives forward and ensuring accountability.
2. **Collaboration Among Educators:** Increased collaboration and communication among teachers and departments enhance resource sharing and collective problem-solving.
3. **Professional Development:** Ongoing professional development focused on best practices and alignment with district goals empowers educators to improve their instructional methods.
4. **Data Utilization:** The strategic use of data to inform decision-making allows for timely interventions and adjustments to meet student needs effectively.
5. **Community and Family Engagement:** Building strong relationships with families and the community fosters a supportive network that encourages student attendance and participation.

Barriers to Success

The following identifies several significant **barriers to success** in math, ELA, and chronic absenteeism:

1. **Inconsistent Instructional Practices:** There is a lack of uniformity in effective instructional strategies across schools, leading to disparities in student outcomes.
2. **Limited Support for English Language Learners (ELL):** Insufficient resources and targeted interventions for ELL students hinder their academic progress, particularly in content areas like math and ELA.
3. **Widening Achievement Gaps:** As students' progress through grades, achievement gaps in literacy and math widen, especially after third grade, indicating that early interventions may not be sufficient.
4. **Chronic Absenteeism Challenges:** Transient student populations face significant challenges related to chronic absenteeism, which negatively impacts their learning and engagement.
5. **Cultural Mindsets:** There is a presence of a deficit mindset regarding student capabilities which leads to low expectations and reduced motivation among both educators and students, affecting overall performance.
6. **Resource and Staffing Shortages:** Challenges in hiring and retaining qualified educators and support staff restrict the ability to provide consistent and effective interventions.
7. **Strategic Professional Development Alignment:** There is an abundance of professional development options without strategic alignment which overwhelms educators, detracting from focused improvement efforts.

8. **Data Utilization Issues:** Ineffective use of data for decision-making results in missed opportunities for timely interventions and adjustments based on student needs.
9. **Lack of Engagement Strategies:** Insufficiently engaging instruction fails to motivate students to attend school regularly, contributing to chronic absenteeism.
10. **Systematic Barriers:** The absence of systematic approaches for addressing specific learning gaps and providing tiered supports can hinder student progress and achievement.

Decision Making on Interventions, Professional Development and Access to Resources

The following outlines several perspectives on how **decisions regarding interventions, professional development, and access to limited resources are made** within the district:

1. **Data-Driven Decision Making:** While there is an emphasis on using data to inform decisions, it is noted that not all decisions are consistently data-driven. Some choices may be influenced by anecdotal evidence or the opinions of those with stronger relationships or louder voices.
2. **Collaborative Processes:** Decisions about interventions and professional development often involve collaboration among various stakeholders, including educators, administrators, and specialists. However, this collaboration can sometimes occur in silos, leading to inconsistencies across schools.
3. **Centralized vs. Site-Based Decisions:** There is a mix of centralized decision-making at the district level and site-based autonomy. For example, while some interventions are determined centrally, individual schools may have the flexibility to tailor their approaches based on specific needs and contexts.
4. **Professional Development Planning:** Professional development opportunities are typically planned by dedicated teams within the district, but there is a disconnect if site leaders or teachers are not adequately informed about these initiatives. This leads to a lack of alignment between what is offered and what is needed at the school level.
5. **Resource Allocation Challenges:** Access to limited resources is often dictated by budget constraints and funding sources. Decisions are often influenced by the availability of grants or other funding mechanisms.
6. **Feedback Mechanisms:** There is a recognition of the need for better feedback mechanisms to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions and professional development. Gathering input from teachers and principals about what works and what does not is crucial for refining strategies.
7. **Focus on Access:** Efforts are being made to ensure access to resources and support, particularly for Title I schools and underserved populations. However, disparities still exist for priority student groups, and addressing these gaps remains significant.

Current Data and Additional Data Needs

The following outlines several types of **data currently used to make decisions** regarding interventions, professional development, and resource allocation, as well as additional data that would be beneficial:

Data Currently Used

1. **State Assessment Data:** This includes standardized test scores such as CAASPP (California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress) which provide insights into overall student performance on statewide assessments.
2. **Local Assessment Data:** Tools like DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) and i-Ready are utilized to assess student progress in literacy and math, helping identify specific areas where students may need support.
3. **Attendance Data:** Chronic absenteeism rates and attendance records are analyzed to understand patterns and inform strategies for improving student engagement.
4. **Suspension and Behavior Data:** Information on student behavior, including suspension rates, is reviewed to address disciplinary issues and their impact on learning.
5. **Qualitative Feedback:** Anecdotal evidence and feedback from teachers, principals, and parents can provide context to the quantitative data, although this type of data is not always systematically collected or analyzed.
6. **Program Evaluation Metrics:** Data related to the effectiveness of specific programs and initiatives, including participation rates and outcomes, are considered when assessing what works.

Additional Data That Would Be Helpful

1. **Qualitative Data:** More structured qualitative data, such as surveys or interviews with teachers and students, could provide deeper insights into the effectiveness of interventions and professional development.
2. **Longitudinal Data:** Tracking individual student progress over time would help in understanding the long-term impact of interventions and instructional strategies.
3. **Cultural and Contextual Factors:** Data that captures the socio-economic background, cultural context, and other environmental factors affecting students could enhance understanding of barriers to success.
4. **Feedback on Professional Development:** Gathering data on the perceived effectiveness of professional development sessions from participants would help refine future training offerings.
5. **Resource Utilization Data:** Information on how resources are allocated and utilized at different schools could highlight disparities and inform a more needs-based distribution.
6. **Engagement Metrics:** Data on student engagement levels, such as participation in class activities and extracurricular programs, could provide insights into factors influencing chronic absenteeism.

7. **Parent and Community Input:** Collecting data from families about their experiences and perceptions of school support could inform strategies for increasing family engagement and addressing barriers to attendance.

By expanding the types of data collected and analyzed, the district could make more informed decisions that better address the needs of all students.

Other Departments or Interest Groups to Include

The following suggests several **departments and other interest groups that should be included in the needs assessment process** to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and opportunities within the district:

1. **Site Principals:** Engaging school principals is crucial as they have firsthand knowledge of their school's specific needs, challenges, and successes.
2. **Teachers:** Including teachers from various grade levels and subject areas can provide valuable insights into classroom practices, student engagement, and instructional effectiveness.
3. **Community Liaison or Family Engagement Coordinators:** Their involvement can enhance communication between schools and families, ensuring that community perspectives are considered.
4. **Mental Health and Counseling Services:** Including mental health professionals can address social-emotional factors affecting student success and well-being.
5. **Local Community Organizations:** Partnerships with local organizations can provide additional resources and support for students and families, particularly in underserved areas.

By involving these groups, the needs assessment process can capture a holistic view of the educational landscape, leading to more effective strategies and interventions tailored to the diverse needs of students.

Additional Considerations from District Leadership

The following provides several **additional thoughts for the district to consider** in order to enhance its educational strategies and improve student outcomes and overall educational experience:

1. **Strategic Planning:** Develop a clear, cohesive strategic plan that aligns all initiatives with district goals and should include defined metrics for success and accountability measures to ensure consistent implementation across schools.
2. **Enhanced Collaboration:** Foster greater collaboration among departments and between site leaders and district administration. Regular meetings and communication can help break down silos and promote shared understanding of challenges and solutions.

3. **Access to Opportunities:** Prioritize access to opportunities in resource allocation and support services, ensuring that all students, particularly those in Title I and underserved schools, have access to high-quality education and interventions.
4. **Professional Development Alignment:** Ensure that professional development opportunities are directly aligned with identified needs and district goals. Tailoring training to specific contexts and providing ongoing support can enhance teacher effectiveness. Focus on district-wide Tier 1 instruction and targeted Tier 2 and 3 site level instructional and behavioral intervention.
5. **Data Utilization Improvement:** Invest in systems and processes that allow for better data collection, analysis, and sharing. Providing educators with actionable insights from data can inform instructional practices and intervention strategies.
6. **Mental Health Support:** Increase focus on mental health resources and social-emotional learning. Addressing the holistic needs of students can improve attendance and academic performance.
7. **Cultural Competency Training:** Provide training for staff on cultural competency and inclusive practices to better serve diverse student populations and foster an environment where all students feel valued and supported.
8. **Feedback Mechanisms:** Establish regular feedback loops with teachers, students, and parents to gather input on programs and initiatives. This can help identify areas for improvement and ensure that the district is responsive to stakeholder needs.
9. **Community Engagement:** Strengthen partnerships with families and community organizations to create a supportive network around students. Engaging parents and community members in decision-making processes can lead to more relevant and effective programs.
10. **Sustainability of Initiatives:** Consider the long-term sustainability of programs funded by one-time grants. Developing plans to integrate successful initiatives into the regular budget or operational framework will help maintain progress over time.

By considering these additional thoughts, the district can create a more comprehensive approach to addressing educational challenges and fostering an environment conducive to student success.

Four Domains CALL Survey Results for Priority Schools

The Four Domains Comprehensive Assessment of Leadership for Learning (CALL)² survey measures and supports professional growth, leadership development, and comprehensive school improvement planning. The Four Domains CALL identifies challenges, uncovers opportunities for support, and informs improvement plans relative to the four domains.

Table 5 includes the description of each domain and domain indicator as well as the result summary from the CALL survey administered at priority schools that indicate a **moderate, high, or very high** need for additional focus or support.

Table 5. Four Domains CALL Survey Summary

Domain	Domain Indicator	Result Summary
Domain 1: Turnaround Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 Prioritize improvement and communicate its urgency • 1.2 Monitor Short- and Long-term Goals • 1.3 Customize and target support to meet needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 Moderate need of support • 1.2 Very High need of support • 1.3 Low need of support
Domain 2: Talent Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1 Recruit, develop, retain, and sustain talent • 2.2 Target professional learning opportunities • 2.3 Set clear performance expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1 Low need of support • 2.2 Very High need of support • 2.3 High need of support
Domain 3: Instructional Transformation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1 Diagnose and respond to student learning needs • 3.2 Provide rigorous evidence-based instruction • 3.3 Remove barriers and provide opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1 Moderate need of support • 3.2 High need of support • 3.3 Low need of support
Domain 4: Culture Shift	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1 Build a strong community intensely focused on student learning • 4.2 Solicit and act upon interest group (stakeholder) input • 4.3 Engage students and families in pursuing education goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1 Low need of support • 4.2 Moderate need of support • 4.3 Moderate need of support

² The CALL Survey was administered by WestEd to Title I school sites that are being served as part of the support to enhance the development of 2025-26 School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA).

Table 6 is a snapshot of the scores for each priority school by domain. Note that Bear Creek, Plasa Robles, and Liberty High Schools were not administered the CALL survey.

Table 6. Four Domains CALL Survey Snapshot

	Number of Responses	Turnaround Leadership			Talent Development			Instructional Transformation			Culture Shift		
		1.1	1.2	1.3	2.1	2.2	2.3	3.1	3.2	3.3	4.1	4.2	4.3
CALL National Average		3.87	3.72	3.53	3.56	3.66	3.77	3.5	3.52	3.19	3.59	3.23	3.23
Participating School Average		3.91	3.46	3.74	3.63	3.45	3.74	3.65	3.44	3.41	3.7	3.42	3.35
LREBG Group Average		3.84	3.33	3.68	3.61	3.39	3.70	3.60	3.41	3.38	3.72	3.35	3.30
Beckman Elementary School	30	4.17	3.93	4.08	3.7	3.64	3.91	3.94	3.63	3.58	3.84	3.57	3.46
Creekside Elementary School	29	3.66	2.89	3.59	3.57	3.34	3.64	3.43	3.36	3.1	3.6	3.11	3.22
Davis Elementary School	23	3.88	3.65	3.85	3.7	3.51	3.72	3.59	3.48	3.26	3.7	3.16	3.31
Delta Sierra Middle School	30	3.96	3.96	3.91	3.7	3.67	3.85	3.64	3.49	3.51	3.27	3.18	2.93
Lawrence Elementary School	26	3.86	3.24	3.56	3.65	2.99	3.75	3.79	3.35	3.43	3.73	3.09	3.49
McNair High School	82	3.53	2.76	3.26	3.37	3.04	3.18	3.38	3.13	3.26	3.08	3.08	2.77
Needham Elementary School	22	3.72	3.13	3.36	3.6	3.28	3.77	3.55	3.21	3.37	3.62	3.12	3.29
Nichols Elementary School	23	3.98	3.82	3.85	3.71	3.55	3.8	3.75	3.73	3.53	3.92	3.62	3.66
Oakwood Elementary School	23	3.94	3.22	3.82	3.46	3.18	4.0	3.79	3.31	2.93	3.34	3.05	2.91
Parklane Elementary School	14	4.03	3.45	3.94	3.78	3.74	4.03	3.43	3.42	3.75	4.07	3.89	3.43
Turner Academy	12	3.63	3.04	3.59	3.56	3.53	3.33	3.46	3.48	3.44	4.06	3.44	2.92
Victor Elementary School	10	3.43	2.53	3.33	3.33	2.96	3.07	3.25	2.99	3.22	4.03	3.38	3.59
Woodbridge Elementary School	25	4.16	3.7	3.76	3.77	3.61	3.99	3.83	3.74	3.59	4.05	3.83	3.86

Existing LCAP Actions

The district has outlined several actions within the LCAP to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, and low-income students for the 2024-25 school year that align with the allowable use of the LREGB funds (priorities). Below is a summary of the key actions that align with LREGB priorities:

- Library Media Assistant Supports:** Additional support before and after school to assist students with project-based learning, book selection, and resource materials to support academic growth in literacy.
- Professional Development Opportunities:** Providing supplemental professional development for certificated and classified staff to improve student achievement, focusing on cultural responsiveness, MTSS, differentiation, math, and ELA.
- Maintain Class Size Reduction:** Funding supplemental personnel to maintain smaller class sizes in grades K-12 to increase student/teacher contact time and improve student outcomes.
- Staff and Student Technology and Support:** Providing pupil devices, teacher technology, enhanced workstations, and staffing to increase access and improve instruction.
- Data Support:** Collecting and monitoring student achievement data to develop plans for improving student outcomes.
- New Teacher Support:** Offering professional development, teacher induction program mentors, and support for new teachers to improve lesson delivery and student achievement.

7. **Supplemental Intervention Opportunities:** Providing additional academic assistance through classroom supports, small group intervention, after-school academic assistance, and push-in support.
8. **Supplemental Enrichment Opportunities:** Offering educational study trips, hands-on learning experiences, and STEAM activities to increase background knowledge, vocabulary, and retention of information.
9. **High School Enrichment and Intervention:** Providing access to intervention and enrichment opportunities for high school students to increase connection to school and improve graduation rates.
10. **English Learner Support:** Supporting English learners through designated ELD, integrated ELD, bilingual paraprofessionals, progress monitoring, and professional development.
11. **Advanced Academic Opportunities:** Increasing access to advanced placement opportunities and providing support for GATE cluster, honors, and AP teachers.
12. **Literacy Support and Professional Development:** Offering on-site support and organizational consistencies for literacy instruction to address literacy data inequities for English learners, foster youth, and low-income students.
13. **Career and College Readiness:** Implementing AVID-like strategies to help students develop academic skills and prepare for college and career readiness.
14. **CTE (Career Technical Education):** Increasing access to CTE pathways to prepare students for college and career, with a focus on language acquisition for English learners.
15. **LUSD Supplemental Staffing and Support:** Providing additional behavioral and academic support through qualified personnel, including psychologists and behavior support paraeducators.
16. **Attendance and Behavior Supports:** Offering targeted attendance support through nurses, CWA advisors, and school-based supports to reduce chronic absenteeism and improve student outcomes.
17. **Tiered and Supplemental Behavior Supports:** Implementing PBIS and MTSS to improve student behavior and academic success.
18. **Mental Health and SEL Supports:** Providing mental health and SEL supports through therapists, counselors, professional development, and materials.
19. **Learning and Engagement Opportunities for Parents:** Engaging parents in their children's education through workshops, bilingual resources, and community programs.

Additional District Focus Areas to Address Emerging Needs

The needs assessment report does not explicitly outline specific next steps as those will be surfaced during the root cause analysis phase of the process. However, it emphasizes the need for a clear cohesive plan and accountability among district leaders and principals. Additionally,

there was mention of gathering more data and including site leaders to prioritize actions related to tier one instruction and support.

Below are additional focus areas district leadership is intending to explore to address emerging needs:

- Identify professional development opportunities for high-priority areas.
- Expand enrichment and intervention programs for students.
- Continue to support College and Career resources to increase A-G and CTE.
- Enhance school safety and security resources.
- Provide access to mental health resources and nursing support to address student well-being and health needs.
- Collaborate with school sites and Maintenance and Operations to ensure adequate groundskeeping and custodial support.
- Strengthen efforts to increase parent involvement.

Appendix A. Preliminary Needs Assessment

Needs Assessment Preliminary Summary of CA Dashboard Data for the Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG)

February 2025

ELA Status by School

Based on the 2024 CA State Dashboard ELA Progress Indicator, Lodi Unified School District has twelve (12) schools that received a very low rating, and 28 schools that received a low rating.

Of the very low schools, compared to the prior year status, four (4) schools declined significantly, three (3) schools declined, three (3) schools maintained, and one (1) increased. One school had a student population that was less than 11 students.

Very Low ELA Schools with Change Levels

School	Change Level
Turner Academy at Tokay Colony	Declined Significantly
Plaza Robles Continuation High	*
Independence High	Declined Significantly
Liberty High	Declined Significantly
Davis Elementary	Maintained
Clyde W. Needham Elementary	Maintained
Oakwood Elementary	Declined
Parklane Elementary	Declined
Creekside Elementary	Maintained
Delta Sierra Middle	Increased
Beckman Elementary	Declined

*N size less than 11 students

Of the low schools, compared to the prior year status, ten (10) schools declined significantly, six (6) schools declined, seven (7) schools maintained, eight (8) schools increased, and two (2) schools increased significantly.

Low ELA Schools with Change Levels

School	Change Level
Lois E. Borchart Elementary	Declined
Ansel Adams	Maintained
Millswood Middle	Maintained
Christa McAuliffe Middle	Maintained
Manlio Silva Elementary	Maintained
Ronald E. McNair High	Declined Significantly
George Lincoln Mosher	Increased
Woodbridge Elementary	Increased
Valley Robotics Academy	Increased Significantly
Bear Creek High	Declined
Tokay High	Declined Significantly
Lodi High	Declined Significantly
Erma B. Reese Elementary	Declined
George Washington Elementary	Declined
Lakewood Elementary	Increased
Lawrence Elementary	Declined
Leroy Nichols Elementary	Declined Significantly
Live Oak Elementary	Increased
Lockeford Elementary	Increased
Morada Middle	Maintained

Lodi Middle	Maintained
Heritage Elementary	Increased
Victor Elementary	Declined Significantly
Clairmont Elementary	Increased
Wagner-Holt Elementary	Maintained
Westwood Elementary	Increased
Sutherland Elementary	Increased Significantly
Julia Morgan Elementary	Declined
Ronald E. McNair High	Declined Significantly
Tokay High	Declined Significantly
Lodi High	Declined Significantly
Leroy Nichols Elementary	Declined Significantly
Victor Elementary	Declined Significantly

Math Status by School

Based on the 2024 CA State Dashboard Math Progress Indicator, Lodi Unified School District has twelve (12) schools that received a very low rating, and 28 schools that received a low rating.

Of the very low schools, compared to the prior year status, two (2) schools declined significantly, three (3) schools declined, two (2) schools maintained, three (3) school increased, and one (1) school increased significantly. One school had a population that was less than 11 students.

Very Low Math Schools with Change Levels

School	Change Level
Ronald E. McNair High	Declined Significantly
Turner Academy at Tokay Colony	Increased
Bear Creek High	Declined significantly
Plaza Robles Continuation High	*
Independence High	Declined
Liberty High	Maintained
Davis Elementary	Maintained
Oakwood Elementary	Increased
Parklane Elementary	Declined
Creekside Elementary	Declined
Delta Sierra Middle	Increased significantly

Of the low schools, compared to the prior year status, one (1) schools declined significantly, nine (9) schools declined, six (6) schools maintained, and eight (8) schools increased, and three (3) schools increased significantly.

Low Math Schools with Change Levels

School	Change Level
Lois E. Borchart Elementary	Maintained

Ansel Adams	Increased
Millswood Middle	Declined
Christa McAuliffe Middle	Declined
George Lincoln Mosher	Increased
Woodbridge	Declined
Podesta Ranch Elementary	Increased
Valley Robotics Academy	Increased Significantly
Tokay High	Declined
Lodi High	Declined
Erma B. Reese Elementary	Declined
George Washington Elementary	Maintained
Lakewood Elementary	Increased
Lawrence Elementary	Maintained
Leroy Nichols Elementary	Declined Significantly
Live Oak Elementary	Increased Significantly
Lockeford Elementary	Increased
Morada Middle	Increased
Clyde W. Needham Elementary	Increased
Lodi Middle	Increased
Heritage Elementary	Maintained
Victor Elementary	Declined
Clairmont Elementary	Maintained
Wagner-Holt Elementary	Maintained

Beckman Elementary	Declined
Westwood Elementary	Increased
Sutherland Elementary	Increased Significantly
Julia Morgan Elementary	Declined

Chronic Absenteeism Status By School

Based on the 2024 CA State Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Progress Indicator, Lodi Unified School District has 28 schools that received a very high rating, and thirteen (13) schools that received a high rating. No schools have a Red designation for Chronic Absenteeism.

Of the very high schools, compared to the prior year status, one (1) school increased, six (6) schools declined, and 21 schools declined significantly.

Very High Chronic Absenteeism Schools with Change Levels

School	Change Level
Ansel Adams	Declined
Independence	Declined
Victor Elementary	Declined
Parklane Elementary	Declined
Delta Sierra Middle	Declined
Lois E. Borchardt Elementary	Declined Significantly
Millswood Middle	Declined Significantly
Christa McAuliffe Middle	Declined Significantly
George Lincoln Mosher	Declined Significantly
Davis Elementary	Declined Significantly
George Washington Elementary	Declined Significantly
Lakewood Elementary	Declined Significantly
Lawrence Elementary	Declined Significantly
Live Oak Elementary	Declined Significantly
Morada Middle	Declined Significantly
Clyde W. Needham Elementary	Declined Significantly
Lodi Middle	Declined Significantly
Heritage Elementary	Declined Significantly
Oakwood Elementary	Declined Significantly
Creekside Elementary	Declined Significantly
Clairmont Elementary	Declined Significantly
Wagner-Holt Elementary	Declined Significantly

Beckman Elementary	Declined Significantly
Westwood Elementary	Declined Significantly
Sutherland Elementary	Declined Significantly
Julia Morgan Elementary	Declined Significantly
Turner Academy at Tokay Colony	Increased

Of the schools, compared to prior year status, two (2) schools declined, and eleven (11) schools declined significantly.

High Chronic Absenteeism Schools with Change Levels

School	Change Level
Woodbridge	Declined
Joe Serna Jr. Charter	Declined
Ellerth E. Larson Elementary	Declined Significantly
Manlio Silva Elementary	Declined Significantly
Podesta Ranch Elementary	Declined Significantly
Aspire Benjamin Holt Middle	Declined Significantly
Erma B. Reese Elementary	Declined Significantly
Leroy Nichols Elementary	Declined Significantly
Lockeford Elementary	Declined Significantly
Vinewood Elementary	Declined Significantly
John Muir Elementary	Declined Significantly
Aspire Vincent Shalvey Academy	Declined Significantly
Aspire River Oaks Charter	Declined Significantly

English Learner Status by School

Based on the 2024 CA State Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator, Lodi Unified School District has four (4) schools that received a very low rating, and 12 schools that received a low rating.

Of the very low schools, compared to the prior year status, one (1) school increased significantly, one (1) school declined, and two (2) schools declined significantly.

Schools with Very Low Progress for EL Students

School	Change Level
Woodbridge	Declined Significantly
Podesta Ranch Elementary	Declined Significantly
Live Oak Elementary	Decline

Of the low schools, compared to the prior year status, one (1) school increased significantly, three (3) schools increased, three (3) schools maintained, three (3) schools declined, and two (2) schools declined significantly.

Schools with Low Progress for EL Students

School	Change Level
Manlio Silva Elementary	Declined Significantly
Ronald E. McNair High	Maintained
George Lincoln Mosher	Declined
Plaza Robles Continuation High	Increased Significantly
Tokay High	Maintained
Liberty High	Increased
Lodi High	Declined
George Washington Elementary	Increased
Lakewood Elementary	Increased

Clyde W. Needham Elementary	Declined
Creekside Elementary	Maintained
John Muir Elementary	Declined Significantly

Student Group Data from CA Dashboard

ELA Status by Student Group

Lodi Unified School district has fourteen (14) student groups that are included on the CA State Dashboard. In ELA, six (6) of these student groups received a very low rating, eight (7) student groups received a low rating, and one (1) student group received a high rating.

Of the very low student groups, compared to the prior year status, three (3) student groups declined, one (1) student group maintained, one (1) student group increased, and one (1) student group increased significantly.

Student Groups with Very Low Status in ELA

Student Group	Change Level
English Learners	Maintained
Long-Term English Learners	Declined
Foster Youth	Increased
Homeless	Increased significantly
Students with Disabilities	Declined
African American	Declined

Of the low student groups, compared to the prior year status, one (1) student group declined significantly, two (2) student groups declined, three (3) student groups maintained, and one (1) student group increased.

Student Groups with Low Status in ELA

Student Group	Change Level
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Maintained
American Indian or Alaska Native	Declined significantly
Asian	Maintained

Hispanic	Declined
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Increased
White	Declined
Two or More Races	Maintained

Math Status by Student Group

Lodi Unified School district has fourteen (14) student groups that are included on the CA State Dashboard. In Math, six (6) of these student groups received a very low rating, eight (8) student groups received a low rating, and one (1) student group received a medium rating.

Of the very low student groups, compared to the prior year status, one (1) student group declined, two (2), four (4) student groups maintained, and one (1) student group increased significantly.

Student Groups with Very Low Status in Mathematics

Student Group	Change Level
English Learners	Maintained
Long-Term English Learners	Declined
Foster Youth	Maintained
Homeless	Increased significantly
Students with Disabilities	Maintained
African American	Maintained

Of the low student groups, compared to the prior year status, one (1) student group declined significantly, one (1) student group declined, five (5) student groups maintained, and one (1) student group increased.

Student Groups with Low Status in Mathematics

Student Group	Change Level
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Maintained
American Indian or Alaska Native	Declined significantly
Asian	Maintained

Hispanic	Maintained
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Increased
White	Maintained
Two or More Races	Declined

Preliminary Findings from CA Dashboard Data

Schools with the Most Overall Critical Needs

Schools with Very Low status in ELA and Math, and/or Very High on the K-8 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

School	ELA Status	Change Level ELA	Math Status	Change Level Math	Chron, Abs Status	Change Level Chron. Abs.
Turner Academy at Tokay Colony	Very Low	Declined Significantly	Very Low	Increased	Very High	Increased
Plaza Robles Continuation High	Very Low	*	Very Low	*	N/A	N/A
Independence High	Very Low	Declined Significantly	Very Low	Declined	Very High	Declined
Liberty High	Very Low	Declined Significantly	Very Low	Maintained	N/A	N/A
Davis Elementary	Very Low	Maintained	Very Low	Maintained	Very High	Declined Significantly
Clyde W. Needham Elementary	Very Low	Maintained	Low	Increased	Very High	Declined Significantly
Oakwood Elementary	Very Low	Declined	Very Low	Increased	Very High	Declined Significantly
Parklane Elementary	Very Low	Declined	Very Low	Declined	Very High	Declined
Creekside Elementary	Very Low	Maintained	Very Low	Declined	Very High	Declined Significantly
Delta Sierra Middle	Very Low	Increased	Very Low	Increased Significantly	Very High	Declined
Beckman Elementary	Very Low	Declined	Low	Declined	Very High	Declined Significantly
Ronald E. McNair High	Low	Declined Significantly	Very Low	Declined Significantly	N/A	N/A
Bear Creek High	Low	Declined	Very Low	Declined Significantly	N/A	N/A
Woodbridge	Low	Increased	Low	Declined	High	Declined

*Fewer than 11 students, No color means that there were fewer than 30 students

Additional Schools that Declined significantly in Math

School	Math Status	Change Level Math	Avg. Distance from Standard
Leroy Nichols Elementary	Low	Declined Significantly	-63.9

Additional Schools that Declined Significantly in ELA

School	ELA Status	Change Level ELA	Avg. Distance from Standard
Tokay High	Low	Declined Significantly	-42.3
Lodi High	Low	Declined Significantly	-15
Leroy Nichols Elementary	Low	Declined Significantly	-52.4
Victor Elementary	Low	Declined Significantly	-49.8

Preliminary Priority Schools

Schools with Very Low indicators in Both ELA and Math

- Independence High
- Davis Elementary
- Parklane Elementary
- Creekside Elementary
- Oakwood Elementary
- Turner Academy at Tokay Colony
- Plaza Robles Continuation High
- Lodi High
- Liberty High
- Delta Sierra Middle

Schools Demonstrating the Greatest Need for ELA Learning Recovery Supports (Need to be confirmed with additional local data)

- Turner Academy at Tokay Colony
- Plaza Robles Continuation High
- Independence High
- Liberty High
- Davis Elementary
- Creekside Elementary
- Delta Sierra Middle
- Beckman Elementary
- Ronald E. McNair High
- Tokay High

- Clyde W. Needham Elementary
- Oakwood Elementary
- Parklane Elementary
- Lodi High
- Leroy Nichols Elementary
- Victor Elementary

Student Groups with Overall Most Critical Needs

Student Groups with Very Low status in ELA and Math, and/or Very High on the K-8 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

Student Group	ELA Status	Change Level	Math Status	Change Level	Chronic Absenteeism	Change Level
English Learners	Very Low	Maintained	Very Low	Maintained	Very High	Declined Significantly
Long-Term English Learners	Very Low	Declined	Very Low	Declined	Very High	Declined Significantly
Foster Youth	Very Low	Increased	Very Low	Maintained	Very High	Declined Significantly
Homeless	Very Low	Increased significantly	Very Low	Increased Significantly	Very High	Increased Significantly
Students with Disabilities	Very Low	Declined	Very Low	Maintained	Very High	Declined Significantly
African American	Very Low	Declined	Very Low	Maintained	Very High	Declined Significantly
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Low	Maintained	Low	Maintained	Very High	Declined Significantly
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Low	Declined Significantly	Low	Declined Significantly	Very High	Increased

Student Groups with Two or More Very Low Indicators

- English Learners
- Homeless
- Long-Term English Learners
- Students with Disabilities
- Foster Youth
- African American

Schools with Very Low English Learner Progress

School	ELA Status	Change Level ELA	Math Status	Change Level Math	EL Progress Status	Change Level EL Progress
Woodbridge	Low	Increased	Low	Declined	Very Low	Declined Significantly
Podesta Ranch Elementary	Medium	Increased	Low	Increased	Very Low	Declined Significantly
Live Oak Elementary	Low	Increased	Low	Increased Significantly	Very Low	Declined
Manlio Silva Elementary	Low	Maintained	Medium	Maintained	Low	Declined Significantly

Discussion Questions

- What **insights** do you have based on what you’re seeing in the data? Is there anything in the data that **surprises** you?
- Are there specific **trends or patterns** you are interested in exploring?
- How should we prioritize **schools** and **student groups** based on the data? Which schools will be targeted with these funds?
- What additional local **data** should we use to enhance our overall understanding of District needs?
- What other feedback **or input is needed** to help inform the District’s needs?

Resource: CDE Needs Assessment Questions

ELA Questions by School

1. Based on the schools with status levels of "low" and "very low" in ELA, which schools are demonstrating the greatest need for learning recovery supports in ELA?
2. Based on the list of students with scale scores in the lowest achievement level, or at the low end of the second lowest achievement level in ELA, are there any schools with a high number of students with low achievement levels in ELA?
3. Based on local metrics for ELA/Literacy that are being administered in the current school year (screeners, diagnostics, interim assessments), are any schools demonstrating progress in the current year? If so, should they be removed from the list of "greatest need"?

Determine additional qualitative data to collect to confirm the list of "schools in greatest need of learning recovery supports." This can include but is not limited to school focus groups, interviews with educational partners, assessment of current school priorities/initiatives, and school/classroom observations. Once qualitative data is collected and analyzed, finalize the list of "Schools in Greatest Need of Learning Recovery Supports."

ELA Questions by Student Group

1. Based on the student groups with status levels of "low" and "very low" in ELA, which student groups are demonstrating the greatest need for learning recovery supports in ELA?
2. Based on the list of students with scale scores in the lowest achievement level, or at the low end of the second lowest achievement level, are there any student groups with a high number in the lowest achievement levels in ELA?
3. Based on local metrics for ELA/Literacy that are being administered in the current school year (screeners, diagnostics, interim assessments), are any student groups demonstrating progress in the current year? If so, should they be removed from the list of "greatest need"?

Determine additional qualitative data to collect to confirm the list of "student groups in greatest need of learning recovery supports." This can include but is not limited to student focus groups, interviews with educational partners, assessment of current priorities/initiatives, and school observations. Once qualitative data is collected and analyzed, finalize the list of "Student Groups in Greatest Need of Learning Recovery Supports."

Mathematics Questions by School

1. Based on the schools with status levels of "low" and "very low" in Mathematics, which schools are demonstrating the greatest need for learning recovery supports in mathematics?
2. Based on the list of students with scale scores in the lowest achievement level, or at the low end of the second lowest achievement level in mathematics, are there any schools with a high number of students with low achievement levels in mathematics?
3. Based on local metrics for mathematics that are being administered in the current school year (screeners, diagnostics, interim assessments), are any schools demonstrating progress in the current year? If so, should they be removed from the list of "greatest need"?

Determine additional qualitative data to collect to confirm the list of "schools in greatest need of learning recovery supports." This can include but is not limited to school focus groups, interviews with educational partners, assessment of current school priorities/initiatives, and school/classroom observations. Once qualitative data is collected and analyzed, finalize the list of "Schools in Greatest Need of Learning Recovery Supports."

Mathematics Questions by Student Group

1. Based on the student groups with status levels of "low" and "very low" in mathematics, which student groups are demonstrating the greatest need for learning recovery supports in math?
2. Based on the list of students with scale scores in the lowest achievement level, or at the low end of the second lowest achievement level, are there any student groups with a high number in the lowest achievement levels in mathematics?
3. Based on local metrics for mathematics that are being administered in the current school year (screeners, diagnostics, interim assessments), are any student groups demonstrating progress in the current year? If so, should they be removed from the list of "greatest need"?

Determine additional qualitative data to collect to confirm the list of "student groups in greatest need of learning recovery supports." This can include but is not limited to student focus groups, interviews with educational partners, assessment of current priorities/initiatives, and school observations. Once qualitative data is collected and analyzed, finalize the list of "Student Groups in Greatest Need of Learning Recovery Supports."

Chronic Absenteeism Questions by School

1. Based on the schools with status levels of "high" and "very high" in Chronic Absenteeism or comparable rates at high schools, which schools are demonstrating the greatest need for learning recovery supports in attendance?
2. Based on the list of chronically absent students, are there any schools with a high number of chronically absent students?
3. Based on local metrics for chronic absenteeism (daily attendance rates, numbers of unexcused absences, etc.), are any schools demonstrating progress in the current year? If so, should they be removed from the list of "greatest need"?

Determine additional qualitative data to collect to confirm the list of "schools in greatest need of learning recovery supports." This can include but is not limited to school focus groups, interviews with educational partners, assessment of current school priorities/initiatives, and school/classroom observations. Once qualitative data is collected and analyzed, finalize the list of "Schools in Greatest Need of Learning Recovery Supports."

Chronic Absenteeism Questions by Student Group

1. Based on the student groups with status levels of "high" and "very high" in Chronic Absenteeism or comparable rates at high schools, which student groups are demonstrating the greatest need for learning recovery supports in attendance?
2. Based on the list of chronically absent students, are there any student groups with a high number of chronically absent students?
3. Based on local metrics for chronic absenteeism (daily attendance rates, numbers of unexcused absences, etc.), are any student groups demonstrating progress in the current year? If so, should they be removed from the list of "greatest need"?

Determine additional qualitative data to collect to confirm the list of "student groups in greatest need of learning recovery supports." This can include but is not limited to student focus groups, interviews with educational partners, assessment of current priorities/initiatives, and school observations. Once qualitative data is collected and analyzed, finalize the list of "Student Groups in Greatest Need of Learning Recovery Supports."

Using identified priority lists of schools and student groups identify the following for each school and Group:

- Based on quantitative and qualitative data, what is the greatest need for each identified school and student group?
- Using the Evidence-Based Resources tab, which resource aligns to the identified need(s)?

Appendix B. LREBG Program Information

The Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG) provides one-time funds to county offices of education (COEs), school districts, and charter schools for learning recovery initiatives through the 2027–28 school year that, at a minimum, support academic learning recovery and staff and pupil social and emotional well-being.

Program Description

The LREBG was established in response to the emergency caused by the COVID-19 pandemic to assist schools serving pupils in the long-term recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic, including addressing pupil learning, mental health, and overall well-being.

The LREBG allocates \$6,800,050,000 to LEAs, including COEs, school districts, and charter schools beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022–23 through FY 2027–28.

Allowable Uses of Funds

Pursuant to [EC Section 32526\(c\)\(2\)\(A-F\)](#), funds received for the LREBG shall only be expended for the following purposes:

- A. Instructional learning time for the **2022–23 through 2027–28** school years by:
 - i. **increasing the number of instructional days or minutes** provided during the school year,
 - ii. providing **summer school or intersessional instructional programs**, or taking any **other evidence-based action** that **increases or stabilizes the amount of instructional time or services** provided to pupils, or **decreases or stabilizes staff-to-pupil ratios**, based on pupil learning needs.
- B. Accelerating progress to close learning gaps through the implementation, expansion, or enhancement of evidence-based learning supports, such as:
 - i. **Tutoring or other one-on-one or small group learning supports** provided by certificated or classified staff.
 - ii. **Learning recovery programs and materials** designed to accelerate pupil academic proficiency or English language proficiency, or both.
 - iii. Providing **early intervention and literacy programs for pupils in preschool to grade 3**, inclusive, including, but not limited to, **school library access**.
 - iv. Supporting **expanded learning opportunity program services** pursuant to [Section 46120](#).
 - v. Providing **instruction and services** consistent with the [California Community Schools Partnership Act \(Chapter 6 \(commencing with Section 8900\) of Part 6\)](#)

regardless of grantee status.

- vi. Providing **professional development and coaching** on either or both of the following:
 - I. The [2023 Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve](#).
 - II. The [English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve](#).
- C. Integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, and staff supports and training, such as the **provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, access to school meal programs, before and after school programs, or programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupil needs.**
- D. **Access to instruction for credit-deficient pupils** to complete graduation or grade promotion requirements and to increase or improve pupils' college eligibility.
- E. Additional academic services for pupils, such as **diagnostic, progress monitoring, and benchmark assessments** of pupil learning.
- F. **Conducting the needs assessment** pursuant to subdivision (d).

