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Executive Summary

This report is required by Assembly Bill 1014 (Ch. 397, Stats. 2016), which established the Learning Communities for School Success Program (LCSSP) in 2016. The LCSSP is funded through cost savings from the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act, which was enacted after California voters approved Proposition 47 in 2014. This report describes findings from the implementation evaluation of the LCSSP.

Between the 2017–18 and 2019–20 school years, 66 local educational agencies, across three cohorts, received funding to participate in the LCSSP. Across the cohorts, 1,168 schools participated in the LCSSP. LCSSP schools tended to have higher percentages of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals, and higher percentages of students classified as English learners and of African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Hispanic or Latino, and Pacific Islander students, compared to the state average. In general, the goals, activities, and measures identified by grantees as part of their LCSSP projects aligned with those in their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs), suggesting that the grant funds were used to supplement LCAPs, as intended. LCSSP grantees most frequently reported goals of increasing attendance; reducing chronic absenteeism; reducing suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals; improving school climate; and improving outcomes for vulnerable populations. There was a large degree of variability in grantees’ activities to work toward their LCSSP goals. Common shared activities include those focused on school climate improvement, family and parent engagement, social-emotional learning, mental health services, and positive behavior interventions and supports. To monitor progress toward LCSSP goals, grantees often collected measures of the school attendance rate, chronic absenteeism rate, pupil suspension rate, and pupil expulsion rate. Although the evaluation could not fully assess the extent to which LCSSP grantees engaged in evidence-based, nonpunitive approaches, grantees appeared to have implemented their grants in alignment with the LCSSP objectives and guidance.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Pete Callas, Division Director, Career and College Transition Division, by email at [pcallas@cde.ca.gov](mailto:pcallas@cde.ca.gov).

You can find this report at the California Department of Education at Learning Communities for School Success web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ss/se/schoolsuccess.asp>.

Introduction

In November 2014, California voters passed Proposition 47, the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act. This legislation reclassified some theft and drug possession offenses, including concentrated cannabis possession, shoplifting, forgery, petty theft, and receiving stolen property, from felonies to misdemeanors. This legislation also established the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Fund, to be composed of savings that accrue as a result of Proposition 47. Twenty-five percent of the funds collected in the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Fund were to be distributed to the California Department of Education (CDE) to establish and administer a grant program to reduce truancy, support students at risk of dropping out of school, and support students who are victims of crime (Assembly Bill 1014, 2016). AB 1014 formalized this grant program in 2016 by establishing the Learning Communities for School Success Program (LCSSP). This was followed by the adoption of California *Education Code* sections 33430–33436 in 2017, which codified the LCSSP Program into educational statute.

The establishment of the LCSSP has allowed the CDE to administer grants and coordinate technical assistance to support local educational agencies’ (LEAs’) efforts in “identifying and implementing evidence-based, nonpunitive programs and practices” aligned with the LEAs’ Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) (AB 1014, 2016). The LCSSP is designed to provide LEAs with three years of funding to carry out LCAP-aligned activities relevant to their student and school needs and to measure progress associated with those activities. Although there is flexibility in the activities that grantees can undertake—as long as these activities are evidence-based and nonpunitive and aim to keep the most vulnerable students in school—AB 1014 offers examples of appropriate activities. These activities include establishing community schools; implementing activities to improve attendance and reduce chronic absenteeism; implementing restorative practices or restorative justice models; implementing social-emotional learning, positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS), culturally responsive practices, and trauma-informed practices; establishing community partnerships; and adding or increasing staff to address attendance problems (AB 1014, 2016).

According to the language in AB 1014, eligibility and selection of grantees is based on student and school needs, the number of students to be served, characteristics of participating schools, and LEA challenges. Grantees are to be prioritized based on having rates of chronic absenteeism, out-of-school suspension, or school dropout that exceed the state average for the general student population or significant subgroups; being located in a community with a high crime rate; or having significant representation of foster students (AB 1014, 2016). Additionally, AB 1014 states that the selection of grantees should consider the unique characteristics of small and rural LEAs. Thus, the LEAs selected to participate in the LCSSP have demonstrated a level of need to better support their schools and to better support their students to remain in school.

Description of Grantees

Based on the specifications articulated in AB 1014 for eligibility and selection of grantees, the CDE awarded LCSSP funds to LEAs and consortia of LEAs across the state to carry out grant activities over a three-year span (Table 1). Cohort 1 initially received funding in fall 2017, Cohort 2 initially received funding in fall 2018, and   
Cohort 3 initially received funding in fall 2019.[[1]](#footnote-1) Cohort 3 will continue participating in the LCSSP until their three-year grant cycle concludes at the end of the 2021–22 school year.

Table 1. Implementation Years for Cohorts 1, 2, and 3

| Cohort | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort 1 (*n* = 35) | Implementation  year 1 | Implementation  year 2 | Implementation  year 3 |
| Cohort 2 (*n* = 17) | N/A | Implementation  year 1 | Implementation  year 2 |
| Cohort 3 (*n* = 14) | N/A | N/A | Implementation  year 1 |

The CDE selected 66 grantees across Cohorts 1, 2, and 3. Cohort 1 included 35 grantees, Cohort 2 included 17 grantees, and Cohort 3 includes 14 grantees.[[2]](#footnote-2) The majority of grantees were LEAs (81.8 percent); a subset of grantees were consortia of LEAs (18.2 percent). Participating consortia were most often county offices of education that included multiple LEAs. Some grantees included all schools within their LEA as part of their LCSSP initiatives, and other grantees focused their LCSSP initiatives on a subset of schools. Tables A1, A2, and A3 in the appendix section provide, for each cohort, a list of all grantees, all participating LEAs, and the numbers of participating schools within each LEA.

In total, across Cohorts 1–3, 1,200 schools were listed as participating in the LCSSP by grantees. The average enrollment across these schools was 611.9. Most LCSSP schools were at the elementary level (47.3 percent), followed by high school (21.3 percent), middle school (13.0 percent), kindergarten through grade eight (K–8) (12.6 percent), and other (5.8 percent). These schools were spread across urban (40.5 percent), suburban (36.3 percent), and town or rural (23.2 percent) locales. Charter schools represented a small percentage of LCSSP schools (4.7 percent). Regarding student demographics, in the 2019–20 school year, LCSSP schools had higher percentages of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals and of students classified as English learners, compared to the state average (Table 2). Additionally, LCSSP schools had higher percentages of African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Hispanic or Latino, and Pacific Islander students, compared to the state averages. Conversely, compared to the state averages, LCSSP schools had lower percentages of Asian American, Filipino, and White students, as well as of students who reported being of two or more races.

Table 2. Student Demographic Characteristics in 2019–20 for Learning Communities for School Success Program Schools in Cohorts 1–3, Compared to State Averages

| Demographic Characteristic | LCSSP Schools | State Average |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent eligible for free or reduced-price meals | 71.1% | 59.5% |
| Percent English learner | 20.6% | 18.7% |
| Percent African American | 7.2% | 5.3% |
| Percent American Indian or Alaska Native | 0.8% | 0.5% |
| Percent Asian American | 5.7% | 9.3% |
| Percent Filipino | 1.8% | 2.4% |
| Percent Hispanic or Latino | 61.7% | 54.9% |
| Percent Pacific Islander | 0.6% | 0.5% |
| Percent White | 17.8% | 22.4% |
| Percent two or more races | 3.4% | 3.9% |
| Percent race not reported | 0.9% | 0.9% |

**Note:** Calculations based on 1,168 LCSSP schools and 10,140 schools statewide. Schools with missing enrollment data were excluded from making calculations.

There are also notable differences in school and student characteristics of LCSSP grantees across cohorts. Cohort 1 included the largest number of schools (n = 687), followed by Cohort 3 (n = 296) and Cohort 2 (n = 217). The average enrollments in schools across each cohort also varied: average enrollment of Cohort 1 schools was 624.3, average enrollment in Cohort 2 schools was 473.4, and average enrollment for Cohort 3 schools was 781.6. Cohort 1 consisted primarily of schools at the elementary level and schools located in city or suburban locales (Table 3). Cohort 2 consisted primarily of elementary and high schools and schools located in town or rural locales. Cohort 2 also had the largest percentage of charter schools compared to the other two cohorts. Cohort 3 primarily included schools in city locales.

Table 3. Grade Spans, Charter Status, and Geographic Locales in 2019–20 for Learning Communities for School Success Program Schools in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3

| School Type | Cohort 1 | Cohort 2 | Cohort 3 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Elementary school | 54.0% | 40.6% | 36.5% |
| Middle school | 14.3% | 7.8% | 13.9% |
| High school | 19.7% | 22.6% | 24.0% |
| K–8 school | 7.3% | 18.0% | 20.9% |
| Other grade configurations | 4.7% | 11.1% | 4.7% |
| Charter school | 3.6% | 7.4% | 5.1% |
| City school | 44.2% | 15.6% | 49.8% |
| Suburban school | 37.8% | 32.2% | 35.7% |
| Town or rural school | 18.0% | 52.1% | 14.4% |

**Note:** Grade span and charter status calculations based on 685 Cohort 1 schools, 217 Cohort 2 schools, and 296 Cohort 3 schools. Geographic locale calculations based on 678 Cohort 1 schools, 211 Cohort 2 schools, and 291 Cohort 3 schools. Grantee schools with missing data were excluded from making calculations. The city, suburban, town, and rural classifications are based on the Common Core of Data’s classification system. Specifically, *city* is defined as a territory inside an urbanized area and principal city; *suburban* is defined as a territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area; *town* is defined as a territory inside an urban cluster but outside an urbanized area; and *rural* is defined as a census-defined rural territory that is outside an urban cluster (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021). Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Few notable differences in student demographics were apparent across the three cohorts (Table 4), although Cohort 1 had slightly higher percentages of students classified as English learners and of Asian American and Hispanic or Latino students. Cohort 2 had a higher percentage of White students, and Cohort 3 had a higher percentage of African American students than the other cohorts.

Table 4. Student Demographic Characteristics in 2019–20 for Learning Communities for School Success Program Schools in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3

| Demographic Characteristic | Cohort 1 | Cohort 2 | Cohort 3 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent eligible for free or reduced-price meals | 71.6% | 70.8% | 70.2% |
| Percent English learner | 22.8% | 17.4% | 17.9% |
| Percent African American | 6.9% | 6.9% | 7.9% |
| Percent American Indian or Alaska Native | 0.7% | 1.1% | 0.7% |
| Percent Asian American | 6.3% | 4.0% | 5.4% |
| Percent Filipino | 1.8% | 1.9% | 1.9% |
| Percent Hispanic or Latino | 63.4% | 57.5% | 60.5% |
| Percent Pacific Islander | 0.6% | 0.8% | 0.6% |
| Percent White | 16.1% | 23.3% | 18.7% |
| Percent two or more races | 3.2% | 3.6% | 3.6% |
| Percent race not reported | 1.0% | 0.9% | 0.6% |

**Note:** Calculations based on 666 Cohort 1 schools, 211 Cohort 2 schools, and 291 Cohort 3 schools. Grantee schools with missing data were excluded from making calculations.

Additional Assembly Bill 1014 Requirements

In addition to the financial support that the LCSSP provides grantees to carry out activities aimed at keeping students in school, the CDE coordinates the delivery of technical assistance for grantees, as mandated by AB 1014. To promote the use of evidence-based, nonpunitive strategies to keep students in school, the CDE has contracted with two technical assistance providers, at different points during the project period, to support grantees. Through these technical assistance providers, grantees participate in webinars led by experts in relevant evidence-based strategies that grantees are currently implementing or may be interested in implementing. For example, the most recent webinar focused on increasing student engagement through the use of social-emotional learning strategies. Additionally, grantees have access to monthly facilitated discussion hours that allow grantees to collaborate, solve problems, and share successes and lessons learned.

AB 1014 also mandates that the CDE submit an evaluation report to the Legislature. This report was developed to fulfill the implementation component of this requirement. The evaluation team collected information to understand grantees’ goals, activities that grantees carried out to work toward these goals, measures that they utilized to track progress toward goals, and alignment between LCAPs and LCSSP goals. A subsequent report will describe outcomes associated with LCSSP participation based on a quasi-experimental study.

Methodology

This evaluation of the LCSSP initiative documented implementation across grantees, including what grantees aimed to do, what they actually did, and the extent to which implementation aligned with the objectives of the LCSSP. To answer these questions, the evaluation team examined existing grantee documents submitted to the CDE as part of regular grant reporting. The evaluation team also collaborated with the CDE to collect new documentation focused on the 2019–20 school year and to collect existing data on school demographics to better understand the characteristics of participating schools.

Review of Existing Documents

The evaluation team utilized existing documents, collected by the CDE, to better understand the goals that grantees aimed to achieve, the activities that grantees planned to carry out in their work toward goals, and the measures that grantees anticipated drawing on to assess progress toward goals as part of the LCSSP initiative. To inform this document review, the CDE provided the evaluation team with all available grantee documentation from the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years, including applications and annual reports. Given that each cohort began its grants in different school years, Cohort 1 had applications and 2017–18 and 2018–19 annual reports available for review, and Cohort 2 had applications and 2018–19 annual reports available for review. Documents were not yet available for Cohort 3 at the time of this review.

Because 2017–18 and 2018–19 annual reports were provided to the evaluation team first, the document review began with an assessment of these annual reports to identify the goals, activities, and measures that grantees described as part of their LCSSP work. Two members of the evaluation team reviewed the annual report documents and identified the breadth of relevant information captured in these documents. Through consensus among the evaluation team members, this information, along with language from AB 1014, was used to develop a structured document review protocol that included a comprehensive checklist of goals, activities, and measures relevant to the LCSSP grant. This document review protocol also included a checklist of whether the LCSSP goals, activities, and measures were aligned with grantees’ LCAPs.

The structured document review protocol was applied to Cohorts 1 and 2 grantee applications to provide the evaluation team with a clearer understanding of grantees’ intentions and plans when they initiated their grants, as well as of how LCSSP funds supplement grantees’ LCAPs. Information provided by grantees in narrative form was used to complete the checklists in the document review protocol. The formal review of Cohorts 1 and 2 applications was completed by the same members of the evaluation team who conducted the initial review of annual reports and contributed to the development of the document review protocol. Thus, the reviewers were knowledgeable about the information captured in grantee materials and how it should be categorized into the document review protocol. In situations where the reviewers were uncertain about how to categorize information, a third reviewer was included in discussions, so that the three reviewers could reach a consensus about how to categorize the piece of information in question.

Collection of 2019–20 Annual Reports

To gather comprehensive information about implementation during the 2019–20 school year, the CDE collaborated with the evaluation team to develop an annual report form that allowed grantees to specifically indicate their goals, activities, and measures. Based on the preliminary document review, this form was generated to ensure that response options reflected the range of potential LCSSP goals, activities, and measures. The 2019–20 annual report form included a checklist for grantees to identify the goals they were working toward as part of their grant, the activities they were utilizing to make progress toward their goals, how their activities aligned with the goals they had identified, whether they had engaged in training and professional development (PD) or implemented programs and practices related to the activities included in their grant, and the measures they were examining to track progress toward their goals. The form also included open-ended items which asked grantees to describe how their LCSSP grants aligned with their LCAPs, the activities they have carried out as part of the LCSSP, their perceptions of the impacts of the LCSSP thus far, and ways that the COVID-19 pandemic affected their LCSSP grants during the 2019–20 school year. All Cohort 1, 2, and 3 grantees (100.0 percent) completed a 2019–20 annual report form.

Analyses

To document the implementation of the LCSSP initiative across grantees, the evaluation team utilized both descriptive analyses of quantitative data and content analyses of qualitative data. Data from the document review protocol and data from the 2019–20 annual report form were analyzed descriptively to provide the numbers and percentages of grantees that identified each goal, activity, and measure at the time of application and in the most recent school year, as well as the numbers and percentages of grantees that described these goals, activities, and measures as being in alignment with their LCAPs. Responses from LEAs within a consortium were aggregated in such a way that if any LEA in the consortium reported that a particular goal, activity, or measure was part of its LCSSP work, the consortium was coded as using that goal, activity, or measure in its LCSSP work. Open-ended items completed by grantees in the 2019–20 annual reports were analyzed using a content analysis approach in which a member of the evaluation team reviewed all responses and identified the range of themes. Responses were then reviewed a second time by the same member of the evaluation team to apply the themes to the data. The coded data was used by the evaluation team to identify common themes across grantees and to surface exemplar quotes for inclusion in this report.

Learning Communities for School Success Program Implementation

The LCSSP allows grantees a considerable amount of flexibility regarding goals established by the grant, activities carried out to work toward goals, and measures utilized to track progress toward goals. Given this flexibility, it is vital that grantees have a clear understanding of what implementation of the LCSSP entails. The evaluation team collected information to better understand the implementation of the LCSSP by Cohorts 1–3 during the most recent school year, as well as information to provide a more comprehensive picture of Cohorts 1 and 2 grantees’ plans for implementation, and actual implementation, of the LCSSP.

Summary of Implementation Findings

In general, findings from the implementation portion of the evaluation suggest that the goals, activities, and measures that grantees described as being part of their LCSSP grants were generally aligned to the grantees’ LCAP goals, activities, and measures, suggesting that the LCSSP funds were utilized to supplement grantees’ work toward the LCAP as intended. Findings from the evaluation team’s examination of grantee goals indicate that numerous and varied goals were considered to be part of grantees’ LCSSP initiatives. Within the Cohorts 1 and 2 grant applications, the largest percentages of grantees reported having goals related to increasing attendance; reducing chronic absenteeism; reducing suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals; improving school climate; and improving outcomes for vulnerable populations. This remained consistent over time and with the addition of a new cohort, as 2019–20 annual report data from Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 suggests that these goals continued to be the most common areas of focus across grantees.

As expected, grantees utilized diverse activities to work toward their identified goals, reflecting the variety of those goals. The most commonly planned activities across Cohorts 1 and 2 applications included those focused on school climate interventions, family and parent engagement, increasing and reallocating staff, social-emotional learning, mental health services, and PBIS. Additionally, a large percentage of Cohort 1 grantees planned activities related to coordination, referral, and linkage between services and systems, and a large percentage of Cohort 2 grantees planned activities related to multi-tiered systems of supports (MTSS). All of these activities continued to be the most utilized activities in the 2019–20 school year, across grantees from Cohorts 1, 2, and 3. Additionally, activities related to attendance improvement plans, partnerships with community-based organizations, restorative practices or restorative justice models, and trauma-informed strategies became widely implemented during the 2019–20 school year.

At the time of Cohorts 1 and 2 grantees’ applications, the measures that grantees most frequently planned to use to assess progress toward LCSSP goals included school attendance rate, chronic absenteeism rate, pupil suspension rate, and pupil expulsion rate. These continued to be the most widely used measures in the 2019–20 school year, across grantees in Cohorts 1–3, though pupil expulsion rate was used by a slightly smaller percentage of grantees than was planned at the time of their application. Additionally, within their applications and in their 2019–20 annual reports, grantees described local measures that they planned to use or currently used, to assess progress, such as school climate assessments. The following sections provide more detail about the implementation of the LCSSP initiative in the 2019–20 school year.

2019–20 Learning Communities for School Success Program Implementation

Because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the 2019–20 school year was unprecedented. Beginning in March 2020, schools across the country, including in California, experienced shutdowns and transitions to remote learning, creating new challenges and opportunities for keeping students engaged in school. Although this was not a typical year for educators and students, LCSSP implementation continued. In their most recent annual reports to the CDE, grantees across Cohorts 1–3 reported on their grant goals, activities, and measures, and also provided information on the alignment between their LCSSP grant goals, activities, and measures and their LCAP; perceived impacts of the LCSSP grant; and perceived impacts of the pandemic during the 2019–20 school year.

Goals

Within the 2019–20 annual report form, grantees were asked to identify any goals that they were currently working toward as part of their LCSSP grants (Table 5). The numbers of goals that grantees identified varied from 1 to 11, with an average of   
7.3 goals per grantee. Grantees most frequently identified goals to increase attendance rates (96.9 percent); reduce chronic absenteeism (95.4 percent); reduce suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals (92.3 percent); improve outcomes for vulnerable populations (89.2 percent); and improve school climate (86.4 percent). Additionally, at least half of the grantees sought to integrate school and community services   
(68.3 percent), increase graduation rates (60.0 percent), decrease dropout rates   
(58.5 percent), and improve academic performance (57.8 percent). Goals identified least frequently by grantees were reducing referrals of students to law enforcement agencies (27.0 percent) and reducing criminal offenses (19.0 percent).

Grantees also had an opportunity to describe any other goals that were not included in the 2019–20 annual report form goal choices. Approximately one-quarter of grantees (25.6 percent) described having at least one other goal. These goals included goals related to improving school safety, student connectedness, mental health supports, social-emotional learning competencies, family and parent involvement, and college and career readiness.

Table 5. Cohorts 1–3 Learning Communities for School Success Program Goals for 2019–20

| LCSSP Goal | Number of Grantees Focused on Goal | Percent of Grantees Focused on Goal |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Increase attendance rates | 63 | 96.9% |
| Reduce chronic absenteeism | 62 | 95.4% |
| Increase graduation rates | 39 | 60.0% |
| Decrease dropout rates | 38 | 58.5% |
| Reduce suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals | 60 | 92.3% |
| Reduce referrals of students to law enforcement agencies | 17 | 27.0% |
| Reduce criminal offenses | 12 | 19.0% |
| Improve academic performance | 37 | 57.8% |
| Integrate school and community services | 43 | 68.3% |
| Improve school climate | 57 | 86.4% |
| Improve outcomes for vulnerable populations | 58 | 89.2% |

**Note:** The numbers of grantees that provided a response for each specific goal range from 63 to 66.

Activities

Grantees utilized diverse activities to make progress toward the goals in their LCSSP grants (Table 6). On average, grantees identified 14 activities as part of their LCSSP work, with numbers of activities ranging from 1 to 21 across grantees. Grantees most commonly reported activities related to establishing and maintaining attendance improvement plans (87.9 percent); MTSS (86.4 percent); school climate interventions (86.4 percent); social-emotional learning (86.4 percent); family and parent engagement (83.3 percent); and PBIS (81.5 percent). Other activities that grantees frequently identified as part of their LCSSP work include coordination, referral, and linkage between services and systems (78.8 percent); partnerships with community-based organizations (78.8 percent); trauma-informed strategies (78.8 percent); increasing and reallocating staff (76.9 percent); mental health services (74.2 percent); and restorative practices or restorative justice models (74.2 percent). Of the activities assessed by the evaluation team, the lowest percentages of grantees reported that gang prevention (15.4 percent), community schools (27.7 percent), access to health services (33.8 percent), and drug and alcohol interventions (37.1 percent) were included in their LCSSP grants.

Additionally, grantees had the opportunity to describe any other activities that were part of their LCSSP grants, and 6.1 percent described at least one other activity. Examples of these other activities include a home visiting program, establishing a school transitioning system of support for sixth-graders and ninth-graders, student leadership and advocacy, and support for student technology.

Table 6. Cohorts 1–3 Learning Communities for School Success Program Activities in 2019–20

| LCSSP Activity | Number of Grantees Focused on Activity | Percent of Grantees Focused on Activity |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Academic interventions | 27 | 44.3% |
| Access to health services | 22 | 33.8% |
| Attendance improvement plans | 58 | 87.9% |
| Case management | 41 | 62.1% |
| Communities of practice | 31 | 47.7% |
| Community schools | 18 | 27.7% |
| Coordination, referral, and linkage between services and systems | 52 | 78.8% |
| Culturally responsive practices | 42 | 63.6% |
| Drug and alcohol interventions | 23 | 37.1% |
| Family and parent engagement | 55 | 83.3% |
| Gang prevention | 10 | 15.4% |
| Increasing and reallocating staff | 50 | 76.9% |
| Mental health services | 49 | 74.2% |
| MTSS | 57 | 86.4% |
| Needs assessment | 38 | 59.4% |
| Partnerships with community-based organizations | 52 | 78.8% |
| PBIS | 53 | 81.5% |
| Restorative practices or restorative justice models | 49 | 74.2% |
| School climate interventions | 57 | 86.4% |
| Social-emotional learning | 57 | 86.4% |
| Trauma-informed strategies | 52 | 78.8% |
| Tutoring and mentorship | 27 | 41.5% |

**Note:** The numbers of grantees that provided a response for each specific activity range from 61 to 66.

In addition to indicating whether various activities were part of their LCSSP work, grantees reported on whether they had implemented those activities during the 2019–20 school year (Table 7). Specifically, for each activity that they noted was part of their LCSSP grant, they reported whether they conducted PD and training and whether they implemented programs and practices related to the specific activity. All of the grantees (100.0 percent) conducted PD and training, or implemented programs and practices for at least one of the activities included in their LCSSP projects, and most did so across multiple activities.

Of the grantees that identified each activity, the majority carried out PD and training related to that activity. The activities in which PD and training were most frequently conducted during the 2019–20 school year were MTSS (79.2 percent), trauma-informed strategies (78.8 percent), social-emotional learning (77.3 percent), PBIS (75.5 percent), restorative practices or restorative justice models (75.5 percent), and culturally responsive practices (73.8 percent). The activities in which PD and training were least frequently conducted during the 2019–20 school year were case management   
(36.6 percent), increasing and reallocating staff (38.0 percent), community schools   
(38.9 percent), drug and alcohol interventions (39.1 percent), and gang prevention   
(40.0 percent).

The activities that were most frequently implemented through programs and practices included partnerships with community-based organizations (90.4 percent); attendance improvement plans (89.7 percent); mental health services (87.8 percent); drug and alcohol interventions (87.0 percent); PBIS (86.8 percent); case management (85.4 percent); and tutoring and mentorship (85.2 percent). It is important to note that some of the activities most frequently implemented through programs and practices were the focus of a small number of LCSSP grantees. For example, although 80.0 percent of grantees that indicated gang prevention was one of their activities actually implemented this activity, this equates to just eight grantees, given that only 10 grantees focused on this activity as part of their LCSSP work. For all activities—even those for which programs and practices were least frequently utilized—at least two-thirds of grantees that described the given activity as being part of their LCSSP grant reported implementing programs and practices related to that activity.

Table 7. Cohorts 1–3 Learning Communities for School Success Program Activity Implementation in 2019–20

| LCSSP Activity | Number of Grantees Focused on Activity | Percent Conducted PD and Training | Percent Implemented Programs and Practices |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic interventions | 27 | 55.6% | 81.5% |
| Access to health services | 22 | 63.6% | 81.8% |
| Attendance improvement plans | 58 | 51.7% | 89.7% |
| Case management | 41 | 36.6% | 85.4% |
| Communities of practice | 31 | 54.8% | 83.9% |
| Community schools | 18 | 38.9% | 83.3% |
| Coordination, referral, and linkage between services and systems | 52 | 53.8% | 82.7% |
| Culturally responsive practices | 42 | 73.8% | 81.0% |
| Drug and alcohol interventions | 23 | 39.1% | 87.0% |
| Family and parent engagement | 55 | 52.7% | 83.6% |
| Gang prevention | 10 | 40.0% | 80.0% |
| Increasing and reallocating staff | 50 | 38.0% | 86.0% |
| Mental health services | 49 | 59.2% | 87.8% |
| MTSS | 57 | 79.2% | 78.9% |
| Needs assessment | 38 | 50.0% | 84.2% |
| Partnerships with community-based organizations | 52 | 44.2% | 90.4% |
| PBIS | 53 | 75.5% | 86.8% |
| Restorative practices or restorative justice models | 49 | 75.5% | 73.5% |
| School climate interventions | 57 | 57.9% | 82.5% |
| Social-emotional learning | 57 | 77.3% | 82.5% |
| Trauma-informed strategies | 52 | 78.8% | 67.3% |
| Tutoring and mentorship | 27 | 63.0% | 85.2% |

**Note:** The denominator used to determine each percentage is the number of grantees that reported being focused on each specific activity as part of their LCSSP grant.

Measures

In addition to having LCSSP goals and activities to work toward those goals, grantees were expected to identify measures to monitor progress toward grant goals (Table 8). When asked to indicate which measures they utilized as part of their LCSSP work, grantees reported an average of five measures, with responses varying from two to nine measures per grantee. Grantees most commonly reported utilizing chronic absenteeism rate (93.9 percent), school attendance rate (92.4 percent), and pupil suspension rate (92.4 percent) to monitor progress toward LCSSP goals. Measures utilized least frequently were math proficiency rate (20.6 percent), English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency rate (21.3 percent), and middle school dropout rate (25.0 percent). Additionally, 48.5 percent of grantees described at least one other local measure that they were using to understand progress. These local measures commonly included the California Healthy Kids Survey, particularly items related to school safety and connectedness; local school climate surveys; and process measures, such as participation in school activities and referrals for support services.

Table 8. Cohorts 1–3 Learning Communities for School Success Program Measures in 2019–20

| LCSSP Measure | Number of Grantees Utilizing Measure | Percent of Grantees Utilizing Measure |
| --- | --- | --- |
| School attendance rate | 61 | 92.4% |
| Chronic absenteeism rate | 62 | 93.9% |
| Middle school dropout rate | 16 | 25.0% |
| High school dropout rate | 29 | 44.6% |
| High school graduation rate | 33 | 50.0% |
| Pupil suspension rate | 61 | 92.4% |
| Pupil expulsion rate | 41 | 63.1% |
| Math proficiency rate | 13 | 20.6% |
| ELA proficiency rate | 13 | 21.3% |

**Note:** The numbers of grantees that provided a response for each specific measure range from 61 to 66.

Local Control and Accountability Plan Alignment

The LCSSP grant program is intended to “complement or enhance” ongoing work toward LCAP goals (AB 1014, 2016). To better understand how the LCSSP is connected with LCAPs, grantees were asked to describe their district-level LCAP goals and how their LCSSP activities support those goals. The majority of grantees reported that their LCAP and LCSSP goals have similar objectives to improve student outcomes, such as attendance, chronic absenteeism, and graduation rates, overall, as well as to reduce disparities in these outcomes across student populations. An underlying focus of many LCAPs and LCSSP initiatives is to provide early intervention and prevention supports, including social-emotional learning, trauma-informed care, and restorative practices, to make progress in improving these outcomes. According to grantees, LCSSP funding has enabled grantees to build on existing supports, particularly in relation to expanding MTSS, PBIS, and school climate initiatives, to achieve these goals. Additionally, grantees frequently use LCSSP funding to enhance LCAP actions through a heightened emphasis on data collection and assessment for continuous quality improvement. Grantees use the data to enable school personnel to determine whether students, teachers, parents, and families are receiving the supports they need in order to promote student success. As one grantee wrote, introducing the LCSSP to support the grantee’s LCAP has helped in "transforming the culture of data-based decision-making and building data capacity and communications protocols” at school sites.

Perceived Impacts of the Learning Communities for School Success Program

The quasi-experimental portion of this evaluation (forthcoming) will explore the impacts of the LCSSP in detail. During this portion of the evaluation, grantees were asked to share their perceptions of the impacts of the LCSSP, as part of the 2019–20 annual report form. In responding to this question, grantees highlighted several impacts that aligned with the goals of the program. Grantees most frequently reported modest decreases in chronic absenteeism and increases in attendance rates, with particularly large effects observed for minority students, English learners, students with disabilities, homeless students, and other categories of students. These changes were often attributed to increased family and parent engagement. One grantee explained that, as a result of the approaches used in the LCSSP grant, “students and families were acknowledged and rewarded for good school attendance, rather than punished for negative attendance. There was a shift in emphasizing relationships, and families felt respected and valued, rather than fearful and defensive at the past truancy procedures.”

Grantees also indicated that LCSSP funds allowed for training opportunities in social-emotional learning and restorative justice practices for teachers, administrators, and staff. They reported that the focus on social-emotional learning was particularly valuable when navigating the COVID-19 pandemic. As one grantee explained, “addressing the social-emotional needs of our students has been so amazing, and instead of students treading water and trying to keep up with everything, we can see students making progress to feeling emotionally ready and wanting to be in a school environment. Our counselors have worked hard with connecting to families during distance learning and have been a resource for the parents when they are very frustrated with how to handle teaching from home.” Many grantees related these trainings to decreases in rates of referrals, expulsions, and suspensions, as well as improvements to school climate, such as increases in students’ senses of school connectedness, school safety, and caring relationships with school staff. One grantee noted that “student suspensions have declined significantly because of the grant funding. Students who received counseling in conjunction with restorative justice practices for discipline consequences have been observed as having new coping skills and are able to assess personal values, which leads to them behaving in a more constructive manner than prior to the incident.” Other less frequently noted impacts of the LCSSP included increased middle and high school graduation rates and increased student exposure to career training and developmental opportunities.

Impacts of COVID-19

To better understand how the unusual circumstances of the 2019–20 school year resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic affected grantee implementation of the LCSSP, the evaluation team included an item on the 2019–20 annual report form that asked grantees to describe what they encountered as a result of the pandemic. Overall, the responses indicated that the pandemic had impacts on grantees’ goals, activities, measures, and outcomes related to the LCSSP initiative.

Grantees reported that their LCSSP goals were affected not only by the shift from in-person learning to distance learning but also by students’ and families’ needs resulting from the pandemic. For example, one grantee changed its primary goal from improving student attendance to increasing student engagement, by refining the collection and use of data. Grantees more frequently highlighted how their LCSSP activities were affected. Grantees reported having to cancel some activities and events for both students and staff, including PD and training for staff. Grantees also reported delaying and rescheduling activities to dates when they would be more familiar with new virtual learning environments, and having to scale back or reduce the frequency of activities and events.

In addition to grantees changing the delivery dates, frequencies, and modalities of activities, grantee staff members were tasked with shifting their priorities to accommodate distance learning in their education agency. Grantee staff members provided students, educators, and family members with support for transitioning to distance learning. This included the provision of additional academic, social-emotional learning, and mental health supports. Grantees reported having difficulty identifying students in need of additional support and reaching students not engaged in distance learning. Given this, grantees shifted their efforts to identify these students and increased their outreach to parents and family members. Some grantees developed their own COVID-19 resource guides that described the available resources in their communities to further support students, parents, and families. In response to decreasing levels of student and staff participation in LCSSP activities, some grantees reported that staff members more frequently held meetings with students, parents, and families to better support them. To support staff with the transition to distance learning, some grantees provided additional professional learning and training. For example, one grantee reported collaborating with school personnel to create a virtual restorative justice circle training video for all staff members to learn how to facilitate virtual restorative justice circles with students.

The pandemic also affected LCSSP grant logistics for many grantees. Cancellations of planned activities sometimes resulted in reductions in grant expenditures, and some grantees shifted grant funds to better support distance learning. Some grantees experienced hiring freezes and were unable to hire relevant staff members who were needed to execute LCSSP-related activities. However, on a positive note, a subset of grantees reported that staff members had increased availability to attend trainings, since they did not have to worry about driving or child care.

In addition to its effects on planned goals and activities, the pandemic affected LCSSP measures and outcomes for many grantees. Some grantees were unable to collect data to measure progress toward their LCSSP goals, such as data from parent and family surveys, school staff surveys, or the California Healthy Kids Survey. Some grantees reported having to examine data differently than they had originally planned. For example, grantees reported adjusting their attendance recording and reporting procedures. Grantees also expressed concerns regarding the validity of data used to measure their progress, given that COVID-19 and distance learning made the 2019–20 school year different from previous school years. For example, grantees reported that they were seeing lower rates of chronic absenteeism, suspension, and expulsion, but the extent to which this is a result of participation in the LCSSP is unclear.

A Deeper Look into Learning Communities for School Success Program Implementation

Understanding implementation across LCSSP cohorts during the 2019–20 school year is helpful to provide a broad picture of the goals, activities, and measures associated with the LCSSP. However, additional information is available to more closely examine the two LCSSP cohorts that have implemented the LCSSP over multiple years, including the two years prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. The following sections utilize grantee applications, coupled with 2019–20 annual reports, to provide a greater level of detail about grant plans and implementation across Cohorts 1 and 2.

Cohort 1

Cohort 1 represents the first round of grantees after the LCSSP was established and funding was made available. This cohort included 35 grantees that began their participation in the LCSSP during the 2017–18 school year and continued to participate through the 2019–20 school year.

Goals

As depicted in Table 9, at the time of their LCSSP applications, most Cohort 1 grantees aimed to reduce suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals (97.1 percent); increase attendance rates (94.3 percent); and reduce chronic absenteeism (94.3 percent). Other common goals at the time of application included improving school climate (91.4 percent), improving outcomes for vulnerable populations (85.7 percent), and decreasing dropout rates (80.0 percent). Grantees least frequently aimed to reduce criminal offenses (2.9 percent), integrate school and community services (14.3 percent), and reduce referrals of students to law enforcement agencies (17.1 percent).

Cohort 1 grantees’ LCSSP goals in the 2019–20 school year aligned with those outlined in their applications. All grantees that started with goals related to increasing attendance rates (94.3 percent) and reducing chronic absenteeism (94.3 percent) continued to focus on these goals during the 2019–20 school year. Similarly, most grantees that started with goals to reduce suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals; improve school climate; and increase graduation rates continued to work toward these goals during the 2019–20 school year. Notably, the three least common goals at the time of application had all become more frequent areas of focus by 2019–20. For example, the percentage of grantees that identified integrating school and community services as a goal increased by 56.3 percentage points, from 14.3 percent at the time of applications to 70.6 percent at the time of the 2019–20 annual reports. Conversely, the percentage of grantees that included the goal of decreasing dropout rates as part of their LCSSP initiative dropped by 17.1 percentage points, from 80.0 percent to 62.9 percent, between applications and 2019–20 annual reports, representing the goal that was removed from LCSSP projects most frequently.

Table 9. Cohort 1 Learning Communities for School Success Program Goals over Time

| LCSSP Goal | Percent of Grantees Focused on Goal at Application | Percent of Grantees Focused on Goal in  2019–20 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Increase attendance rates | 94.3% | 94.3% |
| Reduce chronic absenteeism | 94.3% | 94.3% |
| Increase graduation rates | 65.7% | 62.9% |
| Decrease dropout rates | 80.0% | 62.9% |
| Reduce suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals | 97.1% | 91.4% |
| Reduce referrals of students to law enforcement agencies | 17.1% | 26.5% |
| Reduce criminal offenses | 2.9% | 20.6% |
| Improve academic performance | 42.9% | 62.9% |
| Integrate school and community services | 14.3% | 70.6% |
| Improve school climate | 91.4% | 85.7% |
| Improve outcomes for vulnerable populations | 85.7% | 91.4% |

**Note:** Application data on each goal assessed was available for all 35 grantees in Cohort 1. The numbers of Cohort 1 grantees that provided a response for each specific goal within the 2019–20 annual reports range from 34 to 35.

In their LCSSP applications, Cohort 1 grantees explained the alignment between their LCSSP and LCAP goals. In general, Cohort 1 LCSSP goals and LCAP goals were in alignment (Table 10). For most goals, at least three-quarters of grantees that identified the goal as part of their LCSSP projects also identified the goal as part of their LCAP. For example, 96.9 percent of grantees that described improving school climate as an LCSSP goal had an aligned LCAP goal. Lower levels of alignment with LCAP goals were observed for the LCSSP goals to reduce criminal offenses (0.0 percent) and to reduce referrals of students to law enforcement (50.0 percent).

Table 10. Cohort 1 Alignment of Learning Communities for School Success Program and Local Control and Accountability Plan Goals

| LCSSP Goal | Percent of Grantees Aligned with LCAP Goal |
| --- | --- |
| Increase attendance rates | 90.9% |
| Reduce chronic absenteeism | 84.8% |
| Increase graduation rates | 87.0% |
| Decrease dropout rates | 89.3% |
| Reduce suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals | 82.4% |
| Reduce referrals of students to law enforcement agencies | 50.0% |
| Reduce criminal offenses | 0.0% |
| Improve academic performance | 86.7% |
| Integrate school and community services | 80.0% |
| Improve school climate | 96.9% |
| Improve outcomes for vulnerable populations | 80.0% |

**Note:** Application data on each goal assessed was available for all 35 grantees in Cohort 1.The denominator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 1 grantees that identified the particular goal as part of their LCSSP grant, and the numerator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 1 grantees that identified the particular goal as part of their LCAP.

Activities

In their grant applications, Cohort 1 grantees indicated that they would use LCSSP funds to engage in a variety of activities to make progress toward their goals for the LCSSP initiative (Table 11). The most commonly planned activities at the time of application were those related to family and parent engagement (100.0 percent), increasing and reallocating staff (91.4 percent), mental health service (82.9 percent), MTSS (82.9 percent), and school climate interventions (82.9 percent). In the final year of their grants, the percentages of Cohort 1 grantees that implemented family and parental engagement activities decreased to 85.7 percent. Increasing and reallocating staff (79.4 percent) and mental health service activities (68.6 percent) also decreased in the final year, but the decrease was not statistically significant. School climate interventions and MTSS remained stable.

The least common planned activities at the time of the applications were those related to communities of practice (2.9 percent), gang prevention (14.3 percent), and access to health services (17.1 percent). Gang prevention activities continued to be an activity for a small number of Cohort 1 grantees in the 2019–20 school year (14.7 percent). However, the percentages of grantees with activities related to communities of practice and access to health services increased by 40.0 percentage points and 25.8 percentage points, respectively. Trauma-informed strategies also became more common by the 2019–20 school year, increasing by at least 25.7 percentage points since the time of applications.

Table 11. Cohort 1 Learning Communities for School Success Program Activities over Time

| LCSSP Activity | Percent of Grantees Focused on Activity at Application | Percent of Grantees Focused on Activity in 2019–20 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Academic interventions | 57.1% | 45.5% |
| Access to health services | 17.1% | 42.9% |
| Attendance improvement plans | 68.8% | 85.7% |
| Case management | 51.4% | 62.9% |
| Communities of practice | 2.9% | 42.9% |
| Community schools | 20.0% | 31.4% |
| Coordination, referral, and linkage between services and systems | 60.0% | 85.7% |
| Culturally responsive practices | 45.7% | 68.6% |
| Drug and alcohol interventions | 34.3% | 42.4% |
| Family and parent engagement | 100.0% | 85.7% |
| Gang prevention | 14.3% | 14.7% |
| Increasing and reallocating staff | 91.4% | 79.4% |
| Mental health services | 82.9% | 68.6% |
| MTSS | 82.9% | 82.9% |
| Needs assessment | 40.0% | 57.6% |
| Partnerships with community-based organizations | 65.7% | 77.1% |
| PBIS | 80.0% | 70.6% |
| Restorative practices or restorative justice models | 68.6% | 71.4% |
| School climate interventions | 82.9% | 80.0% |
| Social–emotional learning | 77.1% | 85.7% |
| Trauma-informed strategies | 51.4% | 77.1% |
| Tutoring and mentorship | 65.7% | 47.1% |

**Note:** Application data on each activity assessed was available for all 35 grantees in Cohort 1. The numbers of Cohort 1 grantees that provided a response for each specific activity within the 2019–20 annual reports range from 33 to 35.

To provide more specific information about the implementation of LCSSP activities, grantees were asked whether they had conducted PD and training and whether they had implemented programs and practices related to each activity that they identified as being part of their LCSSP projects during the 2019–20 school year (Table 12). At least half of the grantees that identified a given activity as part of their LCSSP participation also reported conducting PD and training related to that activity during the 2019–20 school year, with four exceptions: academic interventions (46.7 percent), community schools (45.5 percent), case management (40.9 percent), and increasing and reallocating staff (33.3 percent). Further, more than 70 percent of grantees that described each activity as part of their LCSSP participation reported implementing programs and practices related to that activity during the 2019–20 school year, with the exception of gang prevention (60.0 percent). In other words, the majority of grantees that listed an activity as part of their LCSSP projects implemented those activities in some form in their final year of LCSSP participation.

Table 12. Cohort 1 Learning Communities for School Success Program Activity Implementation in 2019–20

| LCSSP Activity | Percent of Grantees that Conducted PD and Training | Percent of Grantees that Implemented Programs and Practices |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Academic interventions | 46.7% | 80.0% |
| Access to health services | 77.3% | 80.0% |
| Attendance improvement plans | 53.7% | 80.0% |
| Case management | 40.9% | 86.4% |
| Communities of practice | 66.7% | 80.0% |
| Community schools | 45.5% | 90.9% |
| Coordination, referral, and linkage between services and systems | 70.0% | 80.0% |
| Culturally responsive practices | 87.5% | 79.2% |
| Drug and alcohol interventions | 50.0% | 85.7% |
| Family and parent engagement | 63.3% | 83.3% |
| Gang prevention | 80.0% | 60.0% |
| Increasing and reallocating staff | 33.3% | 88.9% |
| Mental health services | 79.2% | 79.2% |
| MTSS | 72.4% | 72.4% |
| Needs assessment | 57.9% | 84.2% |
| Partnerships with community-based organizations | 55.6% | 88.9% |
| PBIS | 83.3% | 83.3% |
| Restorative practices or restorative justice models | 88.0% | 76.0% |
| School climate interventions | 67.9% | 82.1% |
| Social-emotional learning | 86.7% | 83.3% |
| Trauma-informed strategies | 88.9% | 93.0% |
| Tutoring and mentorship | 68.8% | 87.5% |

**Note:** Application data on each activity assessed was available for all 35 grantees in Cohort 1. The denominator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 1 grantees that identified the particular activity as part of their LCSSP grant, and the numerator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 1 grantees that reported conducting PD and training or implementing programs and practices related to the particular activity during the 2019–20 school year.

A fairly high degree of alignment between LCSSP and LCAP activities was evident among Cohort 1 grantees (Table 13). At least half of grantees that reported a given LCSSP activity also reported an aligned activity as part of their LCAP, with the exceptions of communities of practice (0.0 percent) and gang prevention (40.0 percent). All (100.0 percent) of the grantees that described community schools as an LCSSP activity described the activity as aligned with their LCAP. Other activities with high rates of alignment between LCSSP and LCAP activities include academic interventions   
(95.0 percent), increasing and reallocating staff (93.1 percent), family and parent engagement (91.4 percent), and partnerships with community-based organizations (91.3 percent).

Table 13. Cohort 1 Alignment of Learning Communities for School Success Program and Local Control and Accountability Plan Activities

| LCSSP Activity | Percent of Grantees Aligned with LCAP Activity |
| --- | --- |
| Academic interventions | 95.0% |
| Access to health services | 83.3% |
| Attendance improvement plans | 83.3% |
| Case management | 72.2% |
| Communities of practice | 0.0% |
| Community schools | 100.0% |
| Coordination, referral, and linkage between services and systems | 85.7% |
| Culturally responsive practices | 75.0% |
| Drug and alcohol interventions | 66.7% |
| Family and parent engagement | 91.4% |
| Gang prevention | 40.0% |
| Increasing and reallocating staff | 93.1% |
| Mental health services | 82.1% |
| MTSS | 79.3% |
| Needs assessment | 50.0% |
| Partnerships with community-based organizations | 91.3% |
| PBIS | 82.1% |
| Restorative practices or restorative justice models | 66.7% |
| School climate interventions | 75.9% |
| Social-emotional learning | 77.8% |
| Trauma-informed strategies | 50.0% |
| Tutoring and mentorship | 60.9% |

**Note:** Application data on each activity assessed was available for all 35 grantees in Cohort 1. The denominator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 1 grantees that identified the particular activity as part of their LCSSP grant, and the numerator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 1 grantees that identified the particular activity as part of their LCAP.

Measures

Across applications and 2019–20 annual reports, the majority of grantees reported using a wide range of measures as indicators to assess the success of their LCSSP initiatives (Table 14). At the time of their applications, the most common measures that they planned to focus on were pupil suspension rate (94.3 percent), school attendance rate (91.4 percent), and chronic absenteeism rate (91.4 percent). Additionally, the use of other local measures was common at the time of application and during the 2019–20 school year. At the time of their applications, grantees least frequently reported plans to use middle school dropout rate (48.6 percent), ELA proficiency rate (11.4 percent), and math proficiency rate (11.4 percent) to measure their success. The measures that grantees used in the 2019–20 school year to assess their progress reflect the measures reported in their applications, with a continued focus on chronic absenteeism rate   
(94.3 percent), school attendance rate (91.4 percent), and pupil suspension rate   
(91.4 percent). The percentages of grantees utilizing middle school dropout rate and high school dropout rate declined by 20.0 and 22.8 percentage points, respectively. However, greater percentages of grantees indicated that they used math proficiency rate (increase of 11.5 percentage points) and ELA proficiency rate (increase of 12.8 percent) in the 2019–20 school year, compared to their applications.

Table 14. Cohort 1 Learning Communities for School Success Program Measures over Time

| LCSSP Measure | Percent of Grantees Focused on Measure at Application | Percent of Grantees Focused on Measure in 2019–20 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| School attendance rate | 91.4% | 91.4% |
| Chronic absenteeism rate | 91.4% | 94.3% |
| Middle school dropout rate | 48.6% | 28.6% |
| High school dropout rate | 71.4% | 48.6% |
| High school graduation rate | 62.9% | 60.0% |
| Pupil suspension rate | 94.3% | 91.4% |
| Pupil expulsion rate | 74.3% | 65.7% |
| Math proficiency rate | 11.4% | 22.9% |
| ELA proficiency rate | 11.4% | 24.2% |

**Note:** Application data on each measure assessed was available for all 35 grantees in Cohort 1. The numbers of Cohort 1 grantees that provided a response for each specific measure within the 2019–20 annual reports range from 33 to 35.

For each LCSSP measure described by grantees, at least 70 percent of grantees reported that the measure was aligned with a measure used for their LCAPs (Table 15). The LCSSP measures most frequently described as aligned with LCAP measures are high school graduation rate (90.9 percent), school attendance rate (90.6 percent), and high school dropout rate (84.0 percent). The LCSSP measures with the lowest rates of alignment with LCAP measures are chronic absenteeism rate (75.0 percent), math proficiency rate (75.0 percent), and ELA proficiency rate (75.0 percent).

Table 15. Cohort 1 Alignment of Learning Communities for School Success Program and Local Control and Accountability Plan Measures

| LCSSP Measure | Percent of Grantees Aligned with LCAP Measure |
| --- | --- |
| School attendance rate | 90.6% |
| Chronic absenteeism rate | 75.0% |
| Middle school dropout rate | 76.5% |
| High school dropout rate | 84.0% |
| High school graduation rate | 90.9% |
| Pupil suspension rate | 81.8% |
| Pupil expulsion rate | 73.1% |
| Math proficiency rate | 75.0% |
| ELA proficiency rate | 75.0% |

**Note:** Application data on each measure assessed was available for all 35 grantees in Cohort 1. The denominator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 1 grantees that identified the particular measure as part of their LCSSP grant, and the numerator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 1 grantees that identified the particular measure as part of their LCAP.

Cohort 2

Cohort 2 represents the second round of grantees after the LCSSP was established and funding was made available. This cohort included 17 grantees that began their participation in the LCSSP during the 2018–19 school year and will continue to participate through the 2020–21 school year.

Goals

Across Cohort 2 grantees’ applications and their 2019–20 annual reports, the vast majority of grantees focused on four specific goals as part of their LCSSP work: reducing chronic absenteeism; reducing suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals; improving school climate; and increasing attendance rates (Table 16). Goals that had become substantially more prevalent in Cohort 2 in the 2019–20 school year compared to grantees’ planned goals in their LCSSP applications, include integrating school and community services (increase of 56.6 percentage points) and improving academic performance (increase of 32.0 percentage points). Although reducing referrals of students to law enforcement agencies appeared to become more prevalent in 2019–20, the increase was not statistically significant.

Table 16. Cohort 2 Learning Communities for School Success Program Goals over Time

| LCSSP Goal | Percent of Grantees Focused on Goal at Application | Percent of Grantees Focused on Goal in  2019–20 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Increase attendance rates | 88.2% | 100.0% |
| Reduce chronic absenteeism | 100.0% | 93.8% |
| Increase graduation rates | 58.8% | 62.5% |
| Decrease dropout rates | 70.6% | 56.3% |
| Reduce suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals | 94.1% | 87.5% |
| Reduce referrals of students to law enforcement agencies | 11.8% | 31.3% |
| Reduce criminal offenses | 11.8% | 25.0% |
| Improve academic performance | 11.8% | 43.8% |
| Integrate school and community services | 5.9% | 62.5% |
| Improve school climate | 94.1% | 88.2% |
| Improve outcomes for vulnerable populations | 76.5% | 81.3% |

**Note:** Application data on each goal assessed was available for all 17 grantees in Cohort 2. The numbers of Cohort 2 grantees that provided a response for each specific goal within the 2019–20 annual reports range from 16 to 17.

In their LCSSP applications, Cohort 2 grantees described how their LCSSP and LCAP goals were aligned. A high degree of alignment between Cohort 2 LCSSP and LCAP goals was evident (Table 17). For most goals, all grantees (100.0 percent) that identified the goal as part of their LCSSP projects also identified the goal as part of their LCAP. LCSSP goals that were not aligned with LCAP goals for all grantees are goals to improve school climate (93.8 percent), improve outcomes for vulnerable populations (92.3 percent), increase graduation rates (80.0 percent), and reduce criminal offenses (50.0 percent).

Table 17. Cohort 2 Alignment of Learning Communities for School Success Program and Local Control and Accountability Plan Goals

| LCSSP Goal | Percent of Grantees Aligned with LCAP Goal |
| --- | --- |
| Increase attendance rates | 100.0% |
| Reduce chronic absenteeism | 100.0% |
| Increase graduation rates | 80.0% |
| Decrease dropout rates | 100.0% |
| Reduce suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals | 100.0% |
| Reduce referrals of students to law enforcement agencies | 100.0% |
| Reduce criminal offenses | 50.0% |
| Improve academic performance | 100.0% |
| Integrate school and community services | 100.0% |
| Improve school climate | 93.8% |
| Improve outcomes for vulnerable populations | 92.3% |

**Note:** Application data on each goal assessed was available for all 17 grantees in Cohort 2. The denominator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 2 grantees that identified the particular goal as part of their LCSSP grant, and the numerator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 2 grantees that identified the particular goal as part of their LCAP.

Activities

Cohort 2 grantees planned to engage in diverse activities to make progress toward their LCSSP goals (Table 18). In their applications, grantees most commonly planned for activities related to family and parent engagement (94.1 percent), increasing and reallocating staff (94.1 percent), school climate interventions (94.1 percent), mental health services (82.4 percent), and social-emotional learning (82.4 percent). Activities that Cohort 2 grantees described as part of their LCSSP participation in the 2019–20 school year varied slightly from the plans outlined in their applications. School climate interventions (100.0 percent), social-emotional learning (88.2 percent), mental health services (87.5 percent), and family and parent engagement (82.4 percent) continued to be considered LCSSP activities by the vast majority of grantees. However, the activity of increasing and reallocating staff became less common (decrease of 29.4 percentage points). Additionally, at least 80 percent of grantees reported activities related to PBIS (88.2 percent), attendance improvement plans (88.2 percent), MTSS (88.2 percent), and restorative practices or restorative justice models (81.3 percent) as part of their LCSSP work during the 2019–20 school year. Among activities less frequently described in grantees’ applications, focus on activities related to communities of practice (increase of 41.2 percentage points) and needs assessment (increase of   
38.2 percentage points), increased substantially between the time of applications and the time of the 2019–20 annual reports. No grantees described community school activities in their applications; these activities increased by 25.0 percentage points during the 2019–20 school year.

Table 18. Cohort 2 Learning Communities for School Success Program Activities over Time

| LCSSP Activity | Percent of Grantees Focused on Activity at Application | Percent of Grantees Focused on Activity in 2019–20 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Academic interventions | 58.8% | 50.0% |
| Access to health services | 11.8% | 25.0% |
| Attendance improvement plans | 58.8% | 88.2% |
| Case management | 52.9% | 56.3% |
| Communities of practice | 5.9% | 47.1% |
| Community schools | 0.0% | 25.0% |
| Coordination, referral, and linkage between services and systems | 70.6% | 52.9% |
| Culturally responsive practices | 29.4% | 62.5% |
| Drug and alcohol interventions | 17.6% | 40.0% |
| Family and parent engagement | 94.1% | 82.4% |
| Gang prevention | 0.0% | 18.8% |
| Increasing and reallocating staff | 94.1% | 64.7% |
| Mental health services | 82.4% | 87.5% |
| MTSS | 58.8% | 88.2% |
| Needs assessment | 11.8% | 50.0% |
| Partnerships with community-based organizations | 58.8% | 70.6% |
| PBIS | 70.6% | 88.2% |
| Restorative practices or restorative justice models | 58.8% | 81.3% |
| School climate interventions | 94.1% | 100.0% |
| Social-emotional learning | 82.4% | 88.2% |
| Trauma-informed strategies | 52.9% | 75.0% |
| Tutoring and mentorship | 52.9% | 43.8% |

**Note:** Application data on each activity assessed was available for all 17 grantees in Cohort 2. The numbers of Cohort 2 grantees that provided a response for each specific activity within the 2019–20 annual reports range from 14 to 17.

To provide more specific information about the implementation of LCSSP activities, grantees were asked whether they had conducted PD and training and whether they had implemented programs and practices related to each activity that they identified as being part of their LCSSP projects during the 2019–20 school year (Table 19). The extent to which grantees conducted PD and training related to the activities that were part of their LCSSP grant varied. PD and training were most prevalent among grantees engaging in activities related to PBIS (73.3 percent), academic interventions   
(71.4 percent), MTSS (66.7 percent), communities of practice (62.5 percent), restorative practices or restorative justice models (61.5 percent), and social-emotional learning (60.0 percent). In general, among Cohort 2 grantees, implementing programs and practices was more common than conducting PD and training. Implementation of activities related to attendance improvement plans, communities of practice, and gang prevention was reported by all grantees (100.0 percent) that reported including each area as part of their LCSSP projects. Similarly, implementation of activities related to PBIS (93.3 percent), mental health services (92.9 percent), partnerships with community-based organizations (91.7 percent), and culturally responsive practices (90.0 percent) was reported by large percentages of grantees that reported that each activity was part of their LCSSP grants. As was the case for Cohort 1, most grantees that listed an activity as part of their LCSSP projects reported that they implemented the activity in some form during the 2019–20 school year.

Table 19. Cohort 2 Learning Communities for School Success Program Activity Implementation in 2019–20

| LCSSP Activity | Percent of Grantees Conducted PD and Training | Percent of Grantees Implemented Programs and Practices |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Academic interventions | 71.4% | 85.7% |
| Access to health services | 25.0% | 75.0% |
| Attendance improvement plans | 40.0% | 100.0% |
| Case management | 33.3% | 77.8% |
| Communities of practice | 62.5% | 100.0% |
| Community schools | 25.0% | 75.0% |
| Coordination, referral, and linkage between services and systems | 22.2% | 88.9% |
| Culturally responsive practices | 50.0% | 90.0% |
| Drug and alcohol interventions | 16.7% | 83.3% |
| Family and parent engagement | 35.7% | 85.7% |
| Gang prevention | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| Increasing and reallocating staff | 54.5% | 72.7% |
| Mental health services | 35.7% | 92.9% |
| MTSS | 66.7% | 86.7% |
| Needs assessment | 50.0% | 87.5% |
| Partnerships with community-based organizations | 16.7% | 91.7% |
| PBIS | 73.3% | 93.3% |
| Restorative practices or restorative justice models | 61.5% | 69.2% |
| School climate interventions | 47.1% | 82.4% |
| Social-emotional learning | 60.0% | 80.0% |
| Trauma-informed strategies | 58.3% | 58.3% |
| Tutoring and mentorship | 57.1% | 71.4% |

**Note:** Application data on each activity assessed was available for all 17 grantees in Cohort 2. The denominator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 2 grantees that identified the particular activity as part of their LCSSP grant, and the numerator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 2 grantees that reported conducting PD and training or implementing programs and practices related to the particular activity during the 2019–20 school year.

As was the case for Cohort 1, a fairly high degree of alignment between LCSSP and LCAP activities was evident among Cohort 2 grantees (Table 20). At least 75 percent of grantees that reported a given LCSSP activity also reported an aligned activity as part of their LCAP, with the exceptions of communities of practice (0.0 percent) and access to health services (50 percent). These discrepancies may derive from low numbers of grantees using these activities. Culturally responsive practices, drug and alcohol interventions, and needs assessment were described as aligned with grantees’ LCAPs by all (100.0 percent) of the grantees that described the activity as an LCSSP activity. Other activities with high rates of alignment between LCSSP and LCAP activities include family and parent engagement (93.8 percent), school climate interventions   
(93.8 percent), mental health services (92.9 percent) and PBIS (91.7 percent).

Table 20. Cohort 2 Alignment of Learning Communities for School Success Program and Local Control and Accountability Plan Activities

| LCSSP Activity | Percent of Grantees Aligned with LCAP Activity |
| --- | --- |
| Academic interventions | 90.0% |
| Access to health services | 50.0% |
| Attendance improvement plans | 80.0% |
| Case management | 88.9% |
| Communities of practice | 0.0% |
| Community schools | N/A |
| Coordination, referral, and linkage between services and systems | 83.3% |
| Culturally responsive practices | 100.0% |
| Drug and alcohol interventions | 100.0% |
| Family and parent engagement | 93.8% |
| Gang prevention | N/A |
| Increasing and reallocating staff | 87.5% |
| Mental health services | 92.9% |
| MTSS | 90.0% |
| Needs assessment | 100.0% |
| Partnerships with community-based organizations | 70.0% |
| PBIS | 91.7% |
| Restorative practices or restorative justice models | 80.0% |
| School climate interventions | 93.8% |
| Social-emotional learning | 78.6% |
| Trauma-informed strategies | 66.7% |
| Tutoring and mentorship | 77.8% |

**Note:** Application data on each activity assessed was available for all 17 grantees in Cohort 2. The denominator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 2 grantees that identified the particular activity as part of their LCSSP grant, and the numerator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 2 grantees that identified the particular activity as part of their LCAP. N/A indicates LCSSP activities that were not reported by any Cohort 2 grantees.

Measures

Across applications and 2019–20 annual reports, the majority of grantees reported using a wide range of measures to assess the success of their LCSSP initiative (Table 21). At the time of their applications, the most common measures that they planned to focus on were the chronic absenteeism rate (100.0 percent), pupil suspension rate (88.2 percent), and school attendance rate (82.4 percent). No grantees reported plans to use the math proficiency rate or ELA proficiency rate at the time of application. In alignment with goals identified in their applications, grantees prioritized measures related to school attendance (93.8 percent), chronic absenteeism (93.8 percent), and pupil suspension (93.8 percent) in the 2019–20 school year. Measures with changes of more than 10 percentage points, between the initial application and the 2019–20 school year, include ELA proficiency rate (increase of 20.0 percent), high school graduation rate (increase of 14.7 percent), math proficiency rate (increase of 13.3 percent), and school attendance rate (increase of 11.4 percent). Because of the small sample size, in no case were these differences statistically significant.

Table 21. Cohort 2 Learning Communities for School Success Program Measures over Time

| LCSSP Measure | Percent of Grantees Focused on Measure at Application | Percent of Grantees Focused on Measure in 2019–20 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| School attendance rate | 82.4% | 93.8% |
| Chronic absenteeism rate | 100.0% | 93.8% |
| Middle school dropout rate | 35.3% | 31.3% |
| High school dropout rate | 58.8% | 50.0% |
| High school graduation rate | 35.3% | 50.0% |
| Pupil suspension rate | 88.2% | 93.8% |
| Pupil expulsion rate | 47.1% | 53.3% |
| Math proficiency rate | 0.0% | 13.3% |
| ELA proficiency rate | 0.0% | 20.0% |

**Note:** Application data on each measure assessed was available for all 17 grantees in Cohort 2. The numbers of Cohort 2 grantees that provided a response for each specific measure within the 2019–20 annual reports range from 15 to 17.

Measures that Cohort 2 grantees used to track progress toward LCSSP goals were strongly aligned with LCAP measures (Table 22). School attendance rate, chronic absenteeism rate, middle school dropout rate, high school dropout rate, pupil suspension rate, and expulsion rate were described by all (100.0 percent) of the grantees as both LCSSP measures and LCAP measures. The alignment percentage for high school graduation rate was 83.3 percent.

Table 22. Cohort 2 Alignment of Learning Communities for School Success Program and Local Control and Accountability Plan Measures

| LCSSP Measure | Percent of Grantees Aligned with LCAP Measure |
| --- | --- |
| School attendance rate | 100.0% |
| Chronic absenteeism rate | 100.0% |
| Middle school dropout rate | 100.0% |
| High school dropout rate | 100.0% |
| High school graduation rate | 83.3% |
| Pupil suspension rate | 100.0% |
| Pupil expulsion rate | 100.0% |
| Math proficiency rate | N/A |
| ELA proficiency rate | N/A |

**Note:** *n* = 17. The denominator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 2 grantees that identified the particular measure as part of their LCSSP grant, and the numerator for each percentage is the number of Cohort 2 grantees that identified the particular measure as part of their LCAP. N/A indicates LCSSP measures that were not reported by any Cohort 2 grantees.

Conclusions

The passage of Proposition 47 in 2014 paved the way for the development of the LCSSP as a mechanism to assist LEAs in implementing evidence-based, nonpunitive approaches to reduce truancy, support students at risk of dropping out of school, and support students who are victims of crime (AB 1014, 2016). Between the 2017–18 and 2019–20 school years, 66 LEAs, across three cohorts, received funding to participate in the LCSSP. Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 grantees completed their three-year participation in the LCSSP at the conclusion of the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school year respectively, and Cohort 3 has participated in the LCSSP for one year and will continue through the 2021–22 school year. These three cohorts are the focus of this report. The CDE continues to fund new cohorts of LCSSP grantees each year, including 23 grantees that the CDE selected to begin participation during the 2020–21 school year and another round of grantees to begin participation during the 2021–22 school year.

Because the LCSSP aims to reduce truancy and support students, it is not surprising that the most frequent goals for LCSSP grantees included increasing attendance; reducing chronic absenteeism; reducing suspensions, expulsions, and other school removals; improving school climate; and improving outcomes for vulnerable populations. Each of these goals is relevant to the objective of keeping students engaged in school. A subset of grantees also reported having related goals such as increasing graduation rates, decreasing dropout rates, improving academic performance, and integrating school and community services. Given the nonprescriptive nature of how grantees can work toward their LCSSP goals, grantees had a considerable amount of flexibility to select evidence-based, nonpunitive programs and practices that aligned with their contexts. This flexibility resulted in grantees engaging in a large variety of activities through the LCSSP. The most common activities, across cohorts, included those that focused on school climate interventions, family and parent engagement, social-emotional learning, mental health services, and PBIS. Grantees stated that they engaged in PD and training and implemented evidence-based, nonpunitive programs and practices. However, without knowledge of the exact programs and approaches that were utilized, determining the extent to which these activities were truly evidence-based is not possible. To monitor the extent to which they made progress toward their LCSSP goals, grantees most commonly relied on measures of school attendance rate, chronic absenteeism rate, pupil suspension rate, and pupil expulsion rate. Grantees also used standardized measures and local measures. In general, the goals, activities, and measures identified by grantees as part of their LCSSP projects aligned with those in their LCAPs, suggesting that the grant funds were used to supplement LCAPs as intended. Overall, grantees stated that they had implemented their grants in alignment with the LCSSP objectives and guidance.

From the perspectives of LCSSP grantees, participation in the initiative led to modest decreases in chronic absenteeism and increases in attendance rates, particularly for minority students, English learners, students with disabilities, homeless students, and other categories of students. Grantees indicated that they believed these changes were often the result of having achieved greater family and parent engagement through grant activities. Additionally, grantees reported that the LCSSP provided them with resources to deliver PD and training that helped staff members meet the social-emotional needs of their students, identify and utilize nonpunitive disciplinary approaches, and improve school climate. To supplement these initial findings, the evaluation team is currently conducting a rigorous outcome evaluation of the LCSSP initiative utilizing a quasi-experimental design. The results of this evaluation will be shared in a subsequent report.

Limitations

This evaluation has several limitations which are important to consider in interpreting its findings. First, as previously described, the COVID-19 pandemic significantly disrupted the 2019–20 school year, which affected grantees’ abilities to implement their LCSSP grants as planned. In March 2020 schools across California were closed for in-person instruction as a result of the pandemic. County offices of education, school districts, and schools struggled to navigate what to do during school closures and how to transition to remote learning. Grantees were forced to adjust their objectives for the year to focus on supporting students and families through this crisis, and many LCSSP activities that they had planned were cancelled, rescheduled, or reconfigured. The full impacts of COVID-19 on school operations and student outcomes are yet to be seen, but grantees’ descriptions of the impacts of COVID-19 on their LCSSP work during the 2019–20 school year suggest that implementation was substantially modified as grantees addressed urgent needs related to the pandemic.

Second, because the implementation study primarily relied on documentation provided by grantees, a full assessment of the extent to which activities described as part of the LCSSP were evidence-based and implemented with fidelity was not possible. Based on the types of activities that grantees described, it is reasonable to assume that many of these activities were derived from evidence-based programs, such as MTSS, PBIS, or various school climate interventions; however, establishing this is not possible without further investigation. Additionally, although grantees reported on whether they provided PD and training and whether they implemented programs and practices related to each of their LCSSP activities, the evaluation team was not able to assess whether these activities were implemented as intended, or how widespread the activities were across grantee schools. Thus, some grantees may have had higher levels of implementation fidelity than other grantees. An implementation fidelity metric would be a useful metric to incorporate into models to assess program impacts.

Future Directions

Given the limitations of the current evaluation, there are opportunities for future work to better understand LCSSP implementation. The LCSSP may benefit from ongoing data collection regarding grantee goals, activities, and measures, as opposed to retrospective review of grantee documentation. This would allow targeted data collection in order to more fully understand the practices and programs utilized, the frequency and strength of implementation, and the breadth of individuals served through the LCSSP. Additionally, case studies on a subset of LCSSP grantees that are achieving desired outcomes may help unpack the programmatic and contextual factors that promote success.

Finally, the LCSSP initiative would benefit from additional analyses to examine outcomes associated with the grant. A rigorous evaluation that will include a quasi-experimental examination of outcomes for LCSSP schools, compared to similar schools in the state, as well as case studies to explore implementation and outcomes for exemplar grantees, is currently underway.

Appendix

Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 Learning Communities for School Success Program Participants

Table A1. Number of Schools in Each Participating Cohort 1 Grantee and District

| Grantee | District | Number of Schools |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda County Office of Education | Alameda Unified School District | 15 |
| Alameda County Office of Education | Emery Unified School District | 2 |
| Alameda County Office of Education | Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District | 17 |
| Alameda County Office of Education | Newark Unified School District | 7 |
| Banning Unified School District | Banning Unified School District | 6 |
| Bellflower Unified School District | Bellflower Unified School District | 15 |
| Brawley Elementary School District | Brawley Elementary School District | 5 |
| Brawley Union High School District | Brawley Union High School District | 2 |
| Central Union High School District | Central Union High School District | 4 |
| Coachella Valley Unified School District | Coachella Valley Unified School District | 24 |
| Del Norte County Office of Education | Del Norte County Office of Education | 4 |
| Del Norte County Office of Education | Del Norte County Unified School District | 11 |
| Desert Sands Unified School District | Desert Sands Unified School District | 36 |
| El Rancho Unified School District | El Rancho Unified School District | 16 |
| Hayward Unified School District | Hayward Unified School District | 14 |
| Hemet Unified School District | Hemet Unified School District | 28 |
| Hollister School District | Hollister School District | 7 |
| Kernville Union Elementary School District | Kernville Union Elementary School District | 3 |
| Leadership Public Schools Oakland R&D | Oakland Unified School District | 2 |
| Lodi Unified School District | Lodi Unified School District | 19 |
| Los Angeles Unified School District | Los Angeles Unified School District | 15 |
| Madera Unified School District | Madera Unified School District | 25 |
| McFarland Unified School District | McFarland Unified School District | 6 |
| Oakland Unified School District | Oakland Unified School District | 70 |
| Pierce Joint Unified School District | Pierce Joint Unified School District | 5 |
| Pomona Unified School District | Pomona Unified School District | 2 |
| Red Bluff Joint Union High School District | Red Bluff Joint Union High School District | 2 |
| Reef-Sunset Unified School District | Reef-Sunset Unified School District | 8 |
| Sacramento City Unified School District | Sacramento City Unified School District | 25 |
| San Benito County Office of Education | Aromas-San Juan Unified School District | 3 |
| San Benito County Office of Education | San Benito County Office of Education | 2 |
| San Benito County Office of Education | San Benito High School District | 2 |
| San Bernardino City Unified School District | San Bernardino City Unified School District | 68 |
| San Juan Unified School District | San Juan Unified School District | 14 |
| San Leandro Unified School District | San Leandro Unified School District | 12 |
| Santa Rosa City Schools District | Santa Rosa Elementary School District | 12 |
| Santa Rosa City Schools District | Santa Rosa High School District | 12 |
| Shasta County Office of Education | Anderson Union High School District | 7 |
| Shasta County Office of Education | Gateway Unified School District | 4 |
| Shasta County Office of Education | Shasta Union High School District | 9 |
| Stanislaus County Office of Education | Empire Union Elementary School District | 6 |
| Stanislaus County Office of Education | Hart-Ransom Union Elementary School District | 1 |
| Stanislaus County Office of Education | Hilmar Unified School District | 6 |
| Stanislaus County Office of Education | Hughson Unified School District | 5 |
| Stanislaus County Office of Education | Riverbank Unified School District | 4 |
| Stanislaus County Office of Education | Stanislaus County Office of Education | 3 |
| Stanislaus County Office of Education | Stanislaus Union Elementary School District | 6 |
| Stanislaus County Office of Education | Sylvan Union Elementary School District | 1 |
| Ukiah Unified School District | Ukiah Unified School District | 9 |
| Visalia Unified School District | Visalia Unified School District | 43 |
| West Contra Costa Unified School District | West Contra Costa Unified School District | 63 |

Table A2. Number of Schools in Each Participating Cohort 2 Grantee and District

| Grantee | District | Number of Schools |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fresno Unified School District | Fresno Unified School District | 10 |
| Mariposa County Unified School District | Mariposa County Unified School District | 9 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Anderson Valley Unified School District | 4 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Arena Union Elementary School District | 2 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Fort Bragg Unified School District | 1 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Laytonville Unified School District | 4 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Leggett Valley Unified School District | 4 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Mendocino County Office of Education | 1 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Mendocino Unified School District | 6 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Point Arena Joint Union High School District | 2 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Round Valley Unified School District | 4 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Ukiah Unified School District | 3 |
| Mendocino County Office of Education | Willits Unified School District | 9 |
| Merced County Office of Education | Merced County Office of Education | 4 |
| Merced Union High School District | Merced Union High School District | 1 |
| Morongo Unified School District | Morongo Unified School District | 11 |
| Napa County Office of Education | Napa County Office of Education | 1 |
| Napa County Office of Education | Pope Valley Union Elementary School District | 1 |
| Oceanside Unified School District | Oceanside Unified School District | 23 |
| Palm Springs Unified School District | Palm Springs Unified School District | 7 |
| Pasadena Unified School District | Pasadena Unified School District | 32 |
| Patterson Joint Unified School District | Patterson Joint Unified School District | 11 |
| Pittsburg Unified School District | Pittsburg Unified School District | 13 |
| South Whittier Elementary School District | South Whittier Elementary School District | 7 |
| Thermalito Union Elementary School District | Thermalito Union Elementary School District | 4 |
| Tulare County Office of Education | Tulare Joint Union High School District | 3 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Belleview Elementary School District | 2 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Big Oak Flat-Groveland Unified School District | 4 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Columbia Union School District | 1 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Curtis Creek Elementary School District | 1 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Jamestown Elementary School District | 2 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Sonora Elementary School District | 1 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Sonora Union High School District | 3 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Soulsbyville Elementary School District | 2 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Summerville Elementary School District | 1 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Summerville Union High School District | 7 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | 4 |
| Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools | Twain Harte School District | 2 |
| Washington Unified School District | Washington Unified School District | 10 |

Table A3. Number of Schools in Each Participating Cohort 3 Grantee and District

| Grantee | District | Number of Schools |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grossmont Union High School District | Grossmont Union High School District | 11 |
| Kern High School District | Kern High School District | 23 |
| Lancaster Elementary School District | Lancaster Elementary School District | 4 |
| Long Beach Unified School District | Long Beach Unified School District | 27 |
| Modesto City Elementary School District | Modesto City Elementary School District | 11 |
| Moreno Valley Unified School District | Moreno Valley Unified School District | 41 |
| Napa Valley Unified School District | Napa Valley Unified School District | 7 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Arcata Elementary School District | 6 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Big Lagoon Union Elementary School District | 1 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Blue Lake Union Elementary School District | 1 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Eureka City Schools | 8 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Fieldbrook Elementary School District | 1 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Green Point Elementary School District | 1 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Jacoby Creek Elementary School District | 1 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Maple Creek Elementary School District | 1 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | McKinleyville Union Elementary School District | 3 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Northern Humboldt Union High School District | 6 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Orick Elementary School District | 1 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Pacific Union Elementary School District | 2 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Peninsula Union School District | 1 |
| Northern Humboldt Union High School District | Trinidad Union Elementary School District | 1 |
| Palermo Union Elementary School District | Palermo Union Elementary School District | 3 |
| San Diego County Office of Education | Cajon Valley Union School District | 5 |
| San Diego County Office of Education | La Mesa-Spring Valley School District | 24 |
| San Diego County Office of Education | San Diego County Office of Education | 4 |
| San Joaquin County Office of Education | San Joaquin County Office of Education | 3 |
| San Jose Unified School District | San Jose Unified School District | 39 |
| Standard School District | Standard Elementary School District | 4 |
| Stockton Unified School District | Stockton Unified School District | 56 |
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1. . Cohort 1 grants were funded with Fiscal Year (FY) 2016–17 and FY 2017–18 appropriations. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. . The CDE awarded LCSSP funds to 23 Cohort 4 grantees. Cohort 4 began implementation of LCSSP activities during the 2020–21 school year. This report does not discuss this cohort. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)