# AGENDA <br> BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING AVESON CORPORATION 

AGLAAnnex (Outdoor)<br>3053 Lincoln Avenue<br>Altadena California 91001

May 26, 2022 | 6:00 P.M.

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRESENTATIONS TO THE BOARD BY PARENTS AND CITIZENS

Aveson Corporation ("Aveson"), which operates Aveson School of Leaders and Aveson Global Leadership Academy, welcomes your participation at the Aveson's Board meetings. The purpose of a public meeting of the Board of Directors ("Board") is to conduct the affairs of Aveson in public. We are pleased that you are in attendance and hope that you will visit these meetings often. Your participation assures us of continuing community interest in our schools. To assist you in the ease of speaking/participating in our meetings, the following guidelines are provided:

1. During normal operations, agendas are available at the door to the meeting. Note that the order of business on this agenda may be changed without prior notice. For more information on this agenda, please contact: Aveson Charter Schools, 1919 Pinecrest Dr., Altadena, CA 91001. Telephone: 626-797-1440. During remote operations, agendas will be available in the Zoom meeting upon arrival. Agendas and board packets are also posted at aveson.org
2. "Request to Speak" forms are available to all audience members who wish to speak on any agenda items or under the general category of "Oral Communications." You may specify that you wish to speak on an agenda item by completing the form before the meeting is called to order. Note: Special meetings do not include Oral Communications, but members of the public may still speak to agendized items, as during regular meetings.
3. "Oral Communications" is set aside for members of the audience to raise issues that are not specifically on the agenda. However, due to public meeting laws, the Board can only listen to your issue, not engage in discussion or take action. The Board may give direction to staff to respond to your communication or you may be offered the option of returning with a citizen-requested item. These presentations are limited to three (3) minutes and total time allotted to non-agenda items will not exceed fifteen (15) minutes.
4. You will be given an opportunity to speak for up to five (5) minutes on agenda items when the Board discusses that item.
5. During remote operations, please keep your microphone muted, except when you are called upon by the Board. The chat may not be used by the public during online meetings. It shall only be used by the board to post public materials for the public.
6. When addressing the Board, speakers are requested to state their name and adhere to the time limits set forth.
7. You may request that a topic related to school business be placed on a future agenda in accordance with the guidelines in Board Policy. Once such an item is properly agendized and publicly noticed, the Board can respond, interact, and act upon the item.
8. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and upon request, Aveson may furnish reasonable auxiliary aids and services to qualified individuals with disabilities. Individuals who require appropriate alternative modification of the agenda in order to participate in Board meetings are invited to contact Aveson's main office.

## I. PRELIMINARY

## A. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order by the Board Chair at $\qquad$ .

## B. ROLL CALL

| Javier Guzman | Present | Absent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Charles Jaecker-Jones | - | - |
| Trinity Jolley | - | - |
| Jeiran Lashai | - | - |
| James Perreault | - | - |
| Elsie Rivas Gómez | - | - |
| Kat Ross | - | - |
| Marisa White-Hartman |  |  |

Core Practice
Guiding Principle: Your commitment is to make others around you successful.

## II. COMMUNICATIONS

A. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: Non-agenda items: no individual presentation shall be for more than three (3) minutes and the total time for this purpose shall not exceed fifteen (15) minutes. Ordinarily, Board members will not respond to presentations and no action can be taken. However, the Board may give direction to staff following a presentation.

## III. PUBLIC SESSION AGENDA

## A. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

1. Approval of Board Minutes: 04/28/2022
2. Approval of March bank and credit card statements
3. Approval of Amazon March statements
B. DISCUSSION ITEMS
4. Financial Report
5. Student Member Report
6. Site Directors' Reports

Topics May Include: Curriculum \& Instruction; Equity, Diversity, \& Inclusion; Events \& Community; Student Achievement \& Support;
Professional Development
a) ASL
b) AGLA
2. Executive Director's Report

Topics May Include: Curriculum \& Instruction; Equity, Diversity, \& Inclusion; Events \& Community; Student Achievement \& Support; Human Resources; Professional Development; Operations
a) Annual Fund Update
b) LCAP (ASL, AGLA)
3. Covid Compliance Report
4. ACO Report
5. AGLA Leadership Subcommittee Study
C. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approve A-G Grant Plan -AGLA
2. Approve Employee Tax Credit Organization Selection
3. Approve Universal Pre-Kindergarten Implementation Grant -ASL
4. Approve virtual meeting due to emergency circumstances per AB 361

## IV. ADJOURNMENT

## © charterwise MANAGEMENT

 A CHRISTY WHITE SOLUTION ${ }^{\text {™ }}$
# Financial Update 

Thursday, May 26, 2022

## Presentation Agenda

- Budget Timeline
- Governor's Budget May Revise
- Monthly Financials
- Compliance Update


## Budge† Timeline

## October-February

Continue to monitor projected budget as more actual information is available. Revise as needed.

## August/September

Revision to Projected Budget reflecting actual funding, enrollment, personnel and nonpersonnel historical data (as needed)

## January-April

In January, the governor presents preliminary budget proposal for next fiscal year

Begin preliminary budget draft for the next school


The governor releases May Revise

Revise tentative multi- year budget draft based on the May Revise

## June

The governor signs final
budget
The board adopts initial budget for the following school year


Begin Revisions to Projected Budget (as needed)

End of June
CDE Budget Due
Budget due to Authorizer

## Gov May Revise Proposals

- Details are still being released as of $5 / 18$
- \$55 billion higher than January's Proposal
- 6.56\% statutory cost-of-living-adjustment (COLA) increase
- \$2.1 billion ongoing Prop 98 LCFF base funding - "to mitigate the impacts of rising pension obligations, increased costs for goods and services, and other ongoing local budget concerns."

| Grade Span | 2021-22 Base Grant Per ADA | 6.56\% COLA | 2022-23 Base Grant Per ADA |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| TK-3 | $\$ 8,093$ | $\$ 531$ | $\$ 8,624$ |
| $4-6$ | $\$ 8,215$ | $\$ 539$ | $\$ 8,754$ |
| $7-8$ | $\$ 8,458$ | $\$ 555$ | $\$ 9,013$ |
| $9-12$ | $\$ 9,802$ | $\$ 643$ | $\$ 10,445$ |

## Enrollment/ADA

- $\$ 3.3$ billion in ongoing General Fund plus an additional $\$ 463$ million in one-time Proposition 98 General Fund dollars.
- To mitigate the drop in enrollment, and subsequent ADA that is being experienced in 2021-22 by local educational agencies (LEAs) due to the pandemic.
- Allow all classroom-based LEAs the ability to be funded in 2021-22 on the greater of their current-year ADA or their current-year enrollment adjusted for pre-COVID-19 absence rates.
- The proposal to allow school districts the use of the average of the three prior years' ADA for LCFF funding purposes will be adjusted to allow for this change in 2021-22.


## One Time Discretionary Funds

- \$8 billion one-time funds based on per-pupil basis for all K-12 LEAs.
- Administration's intent that these discretionary onetime dollars be used to address student learning challenges, protecting staff levels and supporting the mental health and wellness of students and staff.
- Current estimate $=\$ 1,300$ per student for 22-23 (subject to change)


## Universal TK

- LEAs will be required to offer TK to any student whose fifth birthday occurs between September 2 and February 2, inclusively, and maintain average TK classroom ratios of 12 to 1 .
- TK add on = \$2,813 per TK ADA to pay for the additional cost of lower classroom ratios
- No additional funding for TK facilities


## Nutrition

- \$596 million to provide two free meals per day to any student who requests a meal
- Added \$611.8 million in the May Revise to maintain meal reimbursement rates in 2022-23 to allow the continuation of offering high-quality, nutritious subsidized meals.


## Expanded Learning <br> Opportunities Program(ELO-P)

- $\$ 4.8$ billion ongoing funds
- \$2,500 per eligible unduplicated (UDP) student
- Aveson would be required to offer the program to unduplicated students in grades TK-6 and provide access to at least half of these students
- 9 hour school days and 30 intersession days
- Additional \$63 million to one-time ELOP infrastructure funds
- Intended for infrastructure and arts and music programming needs for the ELOP.


## Minimum Wage

- Projected to increase to $\$ 15.50$ per hour for all workers effective January 1, 2023
- Triggered by increasing costs due to inflation with official numbers coming in this summer (August)
- Labor Code Section 1182.12(c)(1)


## Other May Revise Items

- Educator Workforce
- Categorical Program COLA
- Community Engagement
- Community Schools
- Facilities
- Early Childhood Education
- No significant changes from the Jan Proposal for special education, school transportation, independent study, college and career preparation, and early literacy.


## FY21-22 Combined Master Summary

|  | FY21-22 | FY21-22 | FY21-22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AGLA SECOND <br> INTERIM <br> BUDGET <br> FORECAST | ASL SECOND <br> INTERIM <br> BUDGET <br> FORECAST | COMBINED |
| Enrollment | 264 | 368 | 632 |
| FY ADA | 241 | 337 | 577 |


| TOTAL INCOME | \$ | 4,514,176 | \$ | 5,044,410 | \$ | 9,558,586 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total 1000 Certificated Salaries | \$ | 1,685,531 | \$ | 2,056,008 | \$ | 3,741,540 |
| Total 2000 Classified Salaries | \$ | 588,579 | \$ | 919,311 | \$ | 1,507,890 |
| Total 3000 Employee Benefits | \$ | 410,576 | \$ | 489,933 | \$ | 900,509 |
| Total 4000 Supplies | \$ | 457,048 | \$ | 503,105 | \$ | 960,152 |
| Total 5000 Services and Other Operating Expenditures | \$ | 1,321,391 | \$ | 1,132,622 | \$ | 2,454,013 |
| Total 6000 Capital Outlay | \$ | 34,791 | \$ | 20,474 | \$ | 55,265 |
| TOTAL EXPENSE | \$ | 4,497,916 | \$ | 5,121,453 | \$ | 9,619,369 |

NET INCREASE (DECREASE) IN FUND BALANCE \$ $\quad 16,260 \quad \$ \quad(77,043) \$ \quad(60,783)$
LCFF DECREASE DUE TO ENROLLMENT DROP FROM FY20-21 $\$ \quad(519,259) \$(469,145) \$(988,404)$

| ONE-TIME RESTRICTED FUNDS IN BUDGET | $\$$ | $1,081,205$ | $\$$ | 811,516 | $\$$ | $1,892,721$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| BEGINNING FUND BALANCE | $\$$ | 893,545 | $\$$ | 581,647 | $\$$ | $1,475,191$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## FY21-22 Comparision to Approved Budget

|  | FY21-22 <br> SECOND <br> INTERIM <br> BUDGET <br> APPROVED | FY21-22 <br> SECOND INTERIM BUDGET FORECAST | Variance from Approved Budget | \% Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enrollment | 632 | 632 | 0 |  |
| FY ADA | 577 | 577 | 0 | 0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL INCOME | \$ 9,377,035 | \$ 9,558,586 | \$ 181,551 | 2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total 1000 Certificated Salaries | 3,875,239 | \$ 3,741,540 | \$ $(133,699)$ | -3\% |
| Total 2000 Classified Salaries | \$ 1,449,490 | \$ 1,507,890 | \$ 58,400 | 8\% |
| Total 3000 Employee Benefits | \$ 928,173 | \$ 900,509 | \$ $(27,663)$ | -3\% |
| Total 4000 Supplies | \$ 963,754 | \$ 960,152 | \$ $(3,602)$ | -1\% |
| Total 5000 Services and Other Operating Expenditures | \$ 2,285,246 | \$ 2,454,013 | \$ 168,767 | 9\% |
| Total 6000 Capital Outlay | 55,205 | \$ 55,265 | \$ 60 | 0\% |
| TOTAL EXPENSE | \$ 9,557,107 | \$ 9,619,369 | \$ 62,262 | 1\% |

NET INCREASE (DECREASE) IN FUND BALANCE \$ $\quad(180,072)$ \$ $\quad(60,783)$ \$ $\quad 119,289$

| BEGINNING FUND BALANCE | $\$ 1,475,191$ | $\$$ | $1,475,191$ |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## FY21-22 Budget Highlights Combined YTD March 2022

## INCOME

Total 8011-8096 Local Control Funding Formula Sources
Total 8100-8299 Federal Income
Total 8300-8599 State Income
Total 8600-8799 Local Income
TOTAL INCOME
EXPENSE
Total 1000 Certificated Salaries
Total $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ Classified Salaries
Total 3000 Employee Benefits
Total 4000 Supplies
Total 5000 Services and Other Operating Expenditures Total 6000 Capital Outlay
TOTAL EXPENSE

| SECOND INTERIM BUDGET FY21-22 |  | YTD <br> Actuals |  | $2021-22$ <br> Projections |  | Budget VS Projections |  | (\$) Budget <br> Remaining | (\%) Budget Remaining |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ 5,342,835 | \$ | 3,856,322 | \$ | 5,380,545 | \$ | 37,710 | \$ | 1,486,513 | 28\% |
| 1,602,151 |  | 424,208 | \$ | 1,639,279 | \$ | 37,128 | \$ | 1,177,943 | 74\% |
| \$ 1,763,970 | \$ | 235,113 | \$ | 1,767,928 | \$ | 3,958 | \$ | 1,528,858 | 87\% |
| \$ 668,079 | \$ | 506,016 | \$ | 770,834 | \$ | 102,755 | \$ | 162,063 | 24\% |
| \$ 9,377,035 | \$ | 5,021,658 | \$ | 9,558,586 | \$ | 181,551 | \$ | 4,355,377 | 46\% |


| $\$$ | $3,875,239$ | $\$$ | $2,642,543$ | $\$$ | $3,741,540$ | $\$$ | $(133,699)$ | $\$$ | $1,232,696$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$$ | $1,449,490$ | $\$$ | $1,077,189$ | $\$$ | $1,507,890$ | $\$$ | 58,400 | $\$$ | 372,301 | $32 \%$ |
| $\$$ | 928,173 | $\$$ | 630,289 | $\$$ | 900,509 | $\$$ | $(27,663)$ | $\$$ | 297,883 | $26 \%$ |
| $\$$ | 963,755 | $\$$ | 700,047 | $\$$ | 960,152 | $\$$ | $(3,603)$ | $\$$ | 263,708 | $32 \%$ |
| $\$$ | $2,285,246$ | $\$$ | $1,766,524$ | $\$$ | $2,454,013$ | $\$$ | 168,767 | $\$$ | 572,150 | $27 \%$ |
| $\$$ | 55,205 | $\$$ | 41,782 | $\$$ | 55,265 | $\$$ | 60 | $\$$ | 13,422 | $593 \%$ |
|  | $9,557,107$ |  | $6,858,375$ | $\$$ | $9,619,369$ | $\$$ | 62,262 | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 5 2 , 1 6 1}$ | $24 \%$ |

NET INCOME (LOSS)

| $(180,072)$ | $(1,836,716)$ | $(60,783)$ | 119,289 | $1,603,216$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |

## FY21-22 Budget Highlights - AGLA YTD March 2022

## INCOME

Total 8011-8096 Local Control Funding Formula Sources
Total 8100-8299 Federal Income
Total 8300-8599 State Income

Total 8600-8799 Local Income

## TOTAL INCOME

EXPENSE
Total 1000 Certificated Salaries
Total 2000 Classified Salaries
Total 3000 Employee Benefits
Total 4000 Supplies

Total 5000 Services and Other Operating Expenditures Total 6000 Capital Outlay
TOTAL EXPENSE

NET INCOME (LOSS)

|  | SECOND <br> INTERIM <br> BUDGET <br> FY21-22 |  | YTD <br> Actuals | 2021-22 <br> Projections |  | WORKING <br> Budget VS <br> Projections |  | (\$) Budget Remaining | (\%) Budget Remaining | CWM Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 2,325,472 | \$ | 1,806,014 | \$ 2,343,055 | \$ | 17,583 | \$ | 519,458 | 22\% | Favorable PY adjustments |
|  | 969,732 |  | 196,923 | 969,732 | \$ | - | \$ | 772,808 | 80\% |  |
| \$ | 911,858 | \$ | 97,671 | \$ 914,056 | \$ | 2,198 | \$ | 783,839 | 86\% | Favorable PY adjustments |
| \$ | 206,947 | \$ | 175,350 | \$ 287,333 | \$ | 80,386 | \$ | 31,597 | 15\% | Increased revenue for field trip, donations, afterschool and food services |
| \$ | 4,414,008 | \$ | 2,275,959 | \$ 4,514,176 | \$ | 100,168 | \$ | 2,107,702 | 48\% |  |
| \$ | 1,780,301 | \$ | 1,205,901 | \$ 1,685,531 | \$ | $(94,770)$ | \$ | 574,401 | 32\% | Staffing updated to actuals |
| \$ | 571,021 | \$ | 415,724 | \$ 588,579 | \$ | 17,558 | \$ | 155,298 | 27\% | Staffing updated to actuals |
| \$ | 438,239 | \$ | 287,180 | \$ 410,576 | \$ | $(27,663)$ | \$ | 151,059 | 34\% | Staffing updated to actuals |
| \$ | 465,282 | \$ | 403,823 | \$ 457,048 | \$ | $(8,234)$ | \$ | 61,459 | 13\% | Adjusted down to YTD trends |
| \$ | 1,215,334 | \$ | 1,003,456 | \$ 1,321,391 | \$ | 106,057 | \$ | 211,878 | 17\% | Field trip expenses (revenue offsent), HD consultants and Substitutes overbudget |
| \$ | 34,791 | \$ | 26,252 | \$ 34,791 | \$ | - | \$ | 8,539 | 25\% |  |
| \$ | 4,504,968 | \$ | 3,342,335 | \$ 4,497,916 | \$ | $(7,052)$ | \$ | 1,162,633 | 26\% |  |


| $\$$ | $(90,960)$ | $\$(1,066,376)$ | $\$$ | 16,260 | $\$$ | 107,220 | $\$$ | 945,069 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## FY21-22 Budget Highlights - ASL YTD March 2022

## INCOME

Total 8011-8096 Local Control Funding Formula Sources
Total 8100-8299 Federal Income
Total 8300-8599 State Income
Total 8600-8799 Local Income
TOTAL INCOME
EXPENSE
Total 1000 Certificated Salaries
Total 2000 Classified Salaries
Total 3000 Employee Benefits
Total 4000 Supplies
Total 5000 Services and Other Operating Expenditures
Total 6000 Capital Outlay
TOTAL EXPENSE

NET INCOME (LOSS)

| SECOND <br> INTERIM <br> BUDGET <br> FY21-22 | YTD <br> Actuals | 2021-22 <br> Projections | Working <br> Budget VS <br> Projections | (\$) Budget Remaining | (\%) Budget Remaining | CWM Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ 3,017,363 | \$ 2,050,308 | \$ 3,037,490 | \$ 20,127 | \$ 967,055 | 32\% | Favorable PY adjustments |
| 632,419 | 227,285 | 669,547 | \$ 37,128 | \$ 405,134 | 64\% | Added ESSER III, removed from 22-23 |
| \$ 852,113 | \$ 137,441 | \$ 853,872 | \$ 1,760 | \$ 714,671 | 84\% | Favorable PY adjustments |
| \$ 461,132 | \$ 330,665 | \$ 483,501 | \$ 22,369 | \$ 130,467 | 28\% | Increased revenue for field trip, donations, afterschool and food services |
| \$ 4,963,027 | \$ 2,745,699 | \$ 5,044,410 | \$ 81,383 | \$ 2,217,328 | 45\% |  |
| \$ 2,094,938 | \$ 1,436,642 | \$ 2,056,008 | \$ $(38,929)$ | \$ 658,296 | 31\% | Staffing updated to actuals |
| \$ 878,469 | \$ 661,466 | \$ 919,311 | \$ 40,842 | \$ 217,003 | 25\% | Staffing updated to actuals |
| \$ 489,933 | \$ 343,109 | \$ 489,933 | \$ | \$ 146,824 | 30\% |  |
| \$ 498,473 | \$ 296,224 | \$ 503,105 | \$ 4,631 | \$ 202,249 | 41\% | Adjusted to YTD trends |
| \$ 1,069,912 | \$ 763,068 | \$ 1,132,622 | \$ 62,710 | \$ 306,844 | 29\% | Legal fees, HR and SPED consultants overbudget |
| \$ 20,414 | \$ 15,530 | \$ 20,474 | \$ 60 | \$ 4,884 | 24\% |  |
| \$ 5,052,139 | \$ 3,516,040 | \$ 5,121,453 | \$ 69,314 | \$ 1,536,099 | 30\% |  |

## Other Budget Considerations

The following accounts are examples or areas that may have budget impacts that cannot be determined at this time -

- Additional One Time Funds
- 8220 Child Nutrition Programs
- 8800 Donations
- 1000-3000 Staffing costs due to CA Supplemental Paid Sick Leave 2022 for COVID-19
- 5845 Legal Fees
- 5875 Instructional Consultants
- Prior Year Adjustments


## Additional Considerations

- Maintain enough cash on hand for monthly expenditures
- Plan ahead and consider the long term by projecting multi-year budgets
- Create backup plans, goals and deadlines
- Maintain a flexible budget as more information becomes available
- Next checkpoint for next year's FY22-23 budget is the June Budget bill


## Cash Update - Cash is King

|  | Gold <br> Standard | Cash Balance as of 3/31/2022 |  | Projected <br> Cash Balance as of 6/30/2022* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 months of payroll | \$1,577,771 |  | 1,892,792 | \$ 1,409,877 |
| Days Cash on Hand | 60 |  | 74 | 55 |

*Includes one time LOC payments Jan-June 2022

| Other Cash Analysis |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Cash Balance | \$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 9 2 , 7 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 4 0 9 , 8 7 7}$ |
| PPP Funds |  | $1,287,000$ | $1,287,000$ |
| LOC Balance | 175,000 | 125,000 |  |
| Adjusted for PPP | 605,792 | 122,877 |  |
| Adjusted for LOC | $1,717,792$ | $1,284,877$ |  |
| Adjusted for PPP \& LOC | 430,792 | $(2,123)$ |  |

*Includes one time LOC payments Jan-June 2022

## Compliance Update

Items for Board Agendas:

## June

o ELO-P Plan

- Action: 2022-23 Preliminary Budget
- Action: 2022-23 LCAP \& 2021-22 LCAP supplement
- Posted as one document and includes: Budget Overview for Parents, LCAP Supplement, LCAP template Action Tables, LCAP Instructions


| AVESON -Combined CASHFLOW PROJECTIONS FISCAL YEAR 2021-22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | © ch |  | terwise GEMEN |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | PRIO | OR Y Year P-2 |  |  |  |  |  | p.1 |  | P. | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Actual } \\ \text { Jul21 }}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Actual } \\ \text { Aug-21 }}}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Acrual } \\ \text { Sep-21 }}}{\text {. }}$ | ACTUAL Oct-21 | ACTUAL Nov-21 | ACTUAL Dec.-21 | $\underset{\substack{\text { Accual } \\ \text { dan } 22}}{ }$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Acrual } \\ \text { Feb-22 }}}{\text { and }}$ | ACTUAL Mar-22 | Forecast Apr-22 | Forecast May-22 | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{\text { Forecast } \\ \text { Jun-22 }}}$ | Accrus |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YTD } \\ \text { Actuals } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2021-22 \\ \text { Projections } \end{gathered}$ | Budget VS Projections | ${ }^{\text {(s) Budget }}$ | (\%) Budget Remaining |
| ${ }^{4700}$ Food/Food Supplies | 444,172 | ${ }^{8,782}$ | 14,432 | 29,246 | 47,441 | 28,539 | ${ }^{33,567}$ | 14,518 | 39,55 | 38,637 | 33,76 | 77,844 | 77,844 |  |  | 254,718 | 444,172 |  | 189,454 | - ${ }_{\text {O\% }}$ |
| 4720 Other food | ${ }_{4,318}^{44,172}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {c,945 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {290 }}^{29,29}$ | 4,4,412 | ${ }_{108}^{20,59}$ | ${ }_{236}^{33,266}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{39} 5$ | ${ }_{1}^{38,63}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 25,503 | 4,503 | 185 | ces, | -4\% |
| Total 4000 Supplies |  | $\underset{\substack{36,254 \\ 36,254}}{ }$ |  | S ${ }_{5}^{62,464}$ | \$ 149,688 | ${ }_{\text {S }}^{4} 43,518$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 125,538 } \\ 125,588}}$ | ¢ 69,023 |  | ${ }_{65,983}^{6598}$ | ¢ $\underbrace{46,97}_{46,907}$ | $\xrightarrow{103,196}$ | $\xrightarrow{103,196}$ | ${ }_{\substack{6,806 \\ 6,806}}$ |  | 700,047 700,047 | ¢ 960,152 | (3,603) | 263,708 |  |
| 5000 Serices and Other Operating Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{5}^{5200}$ Confererce Fees | ${ }_{\substack{2,115 \\ 7,101}}$ | 200 | 1882 |  | 974 462 | 1675 | $\begin{array}{r}1,087 \\ 100 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | 599 | 5,994 | 651 120 |  |  | - |  |  | 9,305 <br> 13384 <br> 1 | 7,190 <br> 6,283 <br> 2,58 | ${ }^{(6,539)}$ | -30\% |
| 5300 ${ }_{\text {coues and Memberships }}$ | 12,9452 | ${ }_{32,371}^{1,20}$ | 10,791 | 10,791 | 10,791 | 10,790 | 10,790 | 10,790 | - | 21,580 |  | 1,262 | 1,262 |  |  | 13,294 | 13,34 132,088 |  | ${ }_{(6,163)}^{(32)}$ | 0\% |
| 5510 Uutilites-Gas and lectric | 123,614 | 5,989 | 9,606 | 14,126 | 10,430 | 7.833 | 8,273 | 5,395 | 7,832 | 8,145 | 6,782 | 10,000 | 12,700 |  |  | ${ }^{77,628}$ | 107,110 | 16,504) | 45,986 | 37\% |
| 5515 JJanitorial, Gardening Serrices 5520 security | 19,300 | 18,712 | 18 |  |  |  | 120 |  | 120 |  | 397 | ${ }_{811}^{87}$ | ${ }_{87}^{87}$ | $:$ |  | $\begin{array}{r}18,729 \\ \hline 378\end{array}$ | 19,300 |  |  | 3\% |
| ${ }_{5520}^{520}$ security | 2,000 17,965 | $\begin{array}{r}1,318 \\ \hline 18\end{array}$ | 1,369 | 1,575 | 1,650 | 1,628 | 1,20 1,23 | 929 | 1,644 | 1,628 | 1,628 | 1,671 | 1,671 | $:$ |  | 12,995 | 17,965 |  | 4,970 | 28\% |
| 5530 utilites -Water | 25,439 | 277 | 4,092 | 351 | 3,990 | 328 | 2,893 |  | 2,755 | 319 | 2,601 | 3,917 | 3,917 | - |  | 15,004 | 25,439 |  | 10,435 | 41\% |
| 5605 Equip Renta//Lease | 27,800 | 2,385 | 2,293 | 5,378 | 2,293 | 3,933 | 2,941 | 2,366 | 2,982 | 3,220 | 2,750 | 2,500 | 2,500 |  |  | 27,652 | 35,402 | 7,602 |  | 1\% |
| ${ }_{5610}^{5615}$ Rent | $\begin{array}{r}671,103 \\ \hline 2963\end{array}$ | 99,713 | - 55.213 |  | 54,071 | 54,461 | 54,301 | 54,326 | 55,744 | 54,376 |  | 55,373 | 9,349 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r}536,292 \\ \begin{array}{r}55160\end{array} \\ \hline \text { 3, }\end{array}$ | 656,388 | (14,775) | 134,810 | 20\% |
| 5615 Repairs and Maintenance- - -uilidigs 5616 Repais and Maintenance Computers | $\underset{\substack{29,93 \\ 5176}}{17,98}$ | 8,453 | 9,880 | 2,175 , 31 | 3,142 | ${ }^{391}$ | 2,331 | 1,714 | ${ }^{6,783}$ | 290 | 2,644 | 2.433 | 2.433 |  |  | 35,160 311 | 37,804 5176 5 | 7.840 |  | -17\% <br> $94 \%$ <br> 180 |
| 5618 Repairs and Maintenance- - venicicle expense | ¢,689 |  | . |  | , |  |  | - | - |  | - | 2,344 | 3,344 | , |  |  | ${ }_{6,189}^{5,169}$ |  | 6,689 | 100\% |
| 5800 Prof/ Consulting |  |  |  | - |  |  | , |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% |
| 5803 Auditing Fees 5807 Leaal settements and | 23,176 | 3,360 |  |  | ${ }^{(3,360)}$ |  |  |  | 1,935 |  | : |  | 21,241 | - |  | 1,935 | 23,176 |  | 21,241 | $92 \%$ $0 \%$ |
| 5889 Banking fees | 7,000 | 468 | 965 | 327 | 378 | 1,181 | 626 | 508 | 349 | 755 | ${ }_{641}$ | 401 | 401 |  |  | 5,557 | 7,000 |  | 443 | 21\% |
| 5810 Educational Consultants 5811 AEC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \%\% |
| 5812 Business Serices | 100,000 | - | ${ }_{8,333}$ | 8,333 | 8,333 | 8,333 | ${ }^{8,333}$ | 8,333 | 8,333 | 8,398 | ${ }_{8,333}$ | 12,306 | 12,306 | 324 |  | 66,732 | 100,000 |  | 33,268 | 33\% |
| ${ }_{5824}^{5824}$ District Oversight fees | 53,428 | - |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | 3,428 |  |  | 53,428 |  | ${ }^{53,428}$ | 0\% |
|  |  | $:$ | $:$ |  | $:$ |  |  | $:$ | 5,339 | 27,30 | 6,269 |  |  | - |  | 32,569 | 38,838 | 38,838 | 53,28 [3, 2599 | 100\% |
| ${ }_{5836}^{5839}$ Eingerprititing/Liveccan | 500 |  |  |  | - |  | 50 | - | 109 |  |  | 171 | 171 | - |  | 159 | 500 |  | 341 | 68\% |
| 5839 Fundraisisg Expense 5843 interst Exeense/Misc fee | 2,316 <br> 12,000 | 年 500 | 624 969 | 969 | 938 | -1,192 | 938 |  | [430 | 3,334 731 8,26 | 2,079 | ${ }^{1.691}$ | ${ }_{1.691}$ | - |  | 6,080 8.619 | 8,158 12.000 | 5,842 | $\underset{\substack{13,764) \\ 3,381}}{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | 163\% |
| 5845 Legal fees | ${ }_{85,375}^{12,}$ | 50 | 3,894 | 3,201 | 16,502 | 12,759 | 10,243 | 12,700 | 22,062 | 8,126 | 6,073 |  |  | - |  | ${ }_{89,535}$ | 95,608 | 10,233 | (4,160) | -5\% |
| 5848 Licenses and other Fees | 3,376 | 50 |  |  |  |  | 595 |  | 3,625 |  |  |  |  | - |  | $\begin{array}{r}4,270 \\ \hline 2785\end{array}$ | 4,270 <br> 52 |  | (894) | -26\% |
|  | 58,500 73,297 | 12,520 | 4,200 <br> 7,865 | 8.510 | 4,200 10,345 |  | ( $\begin{gathered}4,200 \\ 11,448 \\ 1\end{gathered}$ | 4,200 <br> 8,120 | 4,232 11,470 | 19,580 | 4,200 11.933 | $\underset{\substack{10,667 \\ 5,000}}{ }$ | come $\begin{gathered}10,667 \\ 5000\end{gathered}$ | $:$ |  | 27,388 | - 52,2922 | (5,578) | ${ }_{\text {31, }}^{31,12}$ |  |
| 5855 Ed Consultants | 21,900 | 7,875 | 4,835 |  | 699 | 3,540 | 1,550 | 400 | 600 | 971 | 2,100 | 600 | 600 |  |  | 20,470 | 23,770 | 1,870 | 1,430 | $7 \%$ |
| ${ }_{\text {cke }}^{5856 \text { Enterpise }}$ | 31,000 25,500 250 |  | $\begin{array}{r}204 \\ 1.658 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 3,551 1,900 | 2,077 1099 | $\begin{array}{r}5,578 \\ \hline 1091\end{array}$ | 1,644 |  |  | 2,490 2,032 | 2,038 2,045 | - $\begin{array}{r}3,000 \\ 2,178 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | ${ }_{2178}^{178}$ | 2,607 |  | 23,355 | 31,000 25,500 |  | 7,645 <br> 6,400 | 25\% |
| ${ }_{5860}^{5857}$ Priyinin Sencing and Reproduction | 25,500 200 | 1,449 | 1,658 |  |  | 1,991 | 2,054 |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{100}^{2,18}$ | 100 |  |  |  | 200 |  | 200 <br> 006 | 100\% |
| 5861 PY Expenses (Unacruved) | 75380 | 6.76 | 2853 | 120 |  |  | 500 | - | - |  |  |  |  | $:$ |  |  |  |  |  | \%\% |
| ${ }^{581}$ | 75,380 | 6,767 | 2,853 | 120 | 1,615 | 682 | 4,500 | : | $:$ | 1,140 | 3,559 | 27,072 | 27,072 | $\therefore$ |  | 17,677 | 75,380 |  | 57,03 |  |
| 5874 SpEE Encroachment S875 Speg Coastunt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5877 Sppot Consultants 5876 Sports | 285,868 | 3,860 | 1,315 | 2,177 | 12,148 | 29,431 | 100,752 | ${ }^{34,509}$ | 22,951 | (1,702) | 81,542 | 21,561 | 21,561 | $\therefore$ |  | 199,981 | 324,646 | 38,778 | 85,886 | - ${ }_{\text {30\% }}$ |
| 5877 Staff Recruting//liring | 1,200 |  |  |  | - | 1,200 | - | - | - | 34 | $\cdots$ |  |  | - |  | 1,534 | 1,534 | 334 | ${ }^{(334)}$ | 28\% |
| 5878 Student Assessment | 20,300 | 3,600 4,731 | 13,358 <br> 17192 <br> 182 |  |  | 77 | 440 |  |  |  | 1932 |  |  | : |  | ${ }^{17,775}$ | 22,167 | ${ }^{1.867}$ | 2,825 | 14\% |
|  | 26,000 42,800 | 4,731 | 17,192 122 | 5,490 | 4,148 | 5,246 | 3,050 | 7,476 | 10,204 | 7,598 | 11,980 | 2, ${ }_{8,312}$ | 2,039 8,312 | $:$ |  | 21,923 43,34 | 26,000 71,988 | 29,138 | 4,077 | ${ }_{\substack{16 \% \\ 16}}$ |
| 5887 Technology Serices | 148,984 | 10,537 | 8.500 | 8,500 | 18,489 | 8,500 | 10,250 | 12,000 | 8,500 | 8,500 | 17,000 | 19,104 | 19,104 | - |  | 93,775 | 148,984 |  | 55,209 | 37\% |
| 5899 Misc operating Expenses | 54,540 |  |  |  | 21,657 |  |  |  |  | 21,657 |  | 5,613 | 5,613 | - |  | 43,314 | 54,540 |  | 11,226 | 21\% |
|  | 37,653 <br> 3,716 <br> 2,5 | 453 249 | 5,013 | 2.328 262 26 | 9,004 | 915 | [4.005 ${ }^{489}$ | 2,428 250 250 | 2,559 19 | 2,353 | 2,109 27 | 2,109 1,210 1 | 2,109 1,210 | 571 |  | 32,057 <br> 1,268 <br> 8 | 38,956 <br> 3,716 <br> 2,50 | 1,303 | 5,596 | ${ }_{\text {15\% }}^{15 \%}$ |
| 5920 communications Tolephone \& \& ax | 23,520 | 2,106 | 2,106 | 2,805 | 2,103 | 1,488 | 1,887 | 1,868 | 1,895 | 249 | 4,161 | ${ }_{1}^{1,550}$ | ${ }_{217}$ | 1,084 |  | 16,507 | 23,520 |  | 2,018 7,013 | 30\% |
| ${ }^{5999}$ Expense Suspense Total 500 Serices and other Operating Expenditures | \$ 2, 285,246 | 230,747 | ¢ 179,269 | 13,845 | S 199,028 | 5178,338 | 5252,141 | S 173,235 | \% 210,841 | 203,580 | 200,968 | 207,462 | 181,045 | 58,014 |  | 1,766,524 | ${ }^{2,454,013}$ | 168,767 |  | $\frac{0 \%}{6}$ |
|  | \$ $2,285,246$ s | S 230,747 | \$ 179,269 | \$ 138,845 | S 199,028 ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | \$ 178,838 | \$ 252,141 | ¢ 173,235 | \$ 210,841 | 203,580 | 240,968 | 207,462 | 181,045 | 58,014 |  | 1,766,524 | \$2,454,013 |  |  |  |
| 6900 Deprececition Expense | 55,205 | 5,038 | 5,148 | 4,639 | 4,482 | 4,482 | 4,482 | 4,482 | 4,482 | 4,546 | 4.482 | 4,500 | 4,500 |  |  | 41,782 | 55,265 | 60 | 13,422 | $24 \%$ |
| 6991 Amortization Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totala 6000 Capital Outlay |   <br>  55,205 <br> 5 5,205 | 5,038 | 5.148 | s 4,639 <br> 5 4 | s 4,482  | S 4.482 | \% 4,488 | S 4.482 <br> 5 4.482 | $\frac{4,482}{4,482}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4,546}{ }_{4}$ | $\frac{4,482}{4.482}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4.500}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4.500}$ | s |  | ${ }_{4}^{41,782}$ | 55,265 | 60 | 13,422 | 24\% |
| 7438 Debt Serice - Bond Payments/ \& Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total 6000 Capital Outay | . | s \% | s | s . | . | . | . | s. s | . | s | s ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 5 | s | s |  | . |  |  |  | 0\% |
|  | s | s | s | s - | s . s | s - | 5. | s - ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | s - 5 | s | s - 5 | 5. | s | 5 . | s | - | 5. |  |  |  |
| total expense | \$ 9,557,107 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ¢ 442,559 | \$ 702,701 | ¢ 718,182 | \$ 901,509 \$ | \$759,723 | \$ 971,959 | \$ 754,123 | 5 807,998 | 800,121 S | 832,510 | 834,014 | 833,183 | 261,287 |  | 6,858,375 | \$9,619,369 | 62,262 | \$2,752,161 | 29\% |
|  | \$ 9,557,107 \$ | 442,559 \$ | \$ 702,701 | \$ 718,182 | ¢ 901,509 | \$759,723 | \$ 971,959 | \$ 754,123 | \$ 807,998 | 800,121 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 832,510 \$ | 834,014 | 833,183 | 261,287 | 5 | 6,888,375 | \$9,61,369 |  |  |  |
| Net income (Loss) | \$ (180,072) ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ¢ (409, 426) | \$(509,256) | S (284,533) | \$ 119,536 | \$ (12,331) | \$(605,254) | \$ 483,235 | S (61,054) ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | \$ (557,633) | \$ 603,157 \$ | \$ (513,756) | 5 (618,010) | $5^{2,304,543}$ |  | (1,836,716) | (60,783) | 119,289 | 1,603,216 |  |
|  | ¢ ${ }_{\text {s }}(180,072)$ S | (409,426) | \$( 509,256$)$ | [284,52] | 119,536 | 112,3 | \$ 605,254 | 483,2 | (61,054) | (557,643) | 603,157 | (513,756) | (618,010) | 2,304,543 |  | 11,886,716 | s (60,783) | 119,289 | 23,081 |  |







## A-G Completion Improvement Grant Plan

| Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name | Total Grant Allocation |
| :--- | :--- |
| Aveson Global Leadership Academy | $\$ 43,314$ |

## Plan Descriptions

A description of how the funds will be used to increase or improve services for foster youth, low-income students, and English learners to improve A-G eligibility
Due to the pandemic and learning loss that has occurred in unduplicated students over the past two years, Aveson Global Leadership Academy (AGLA) has recognized the need to target interventions and credit recovery for these particular students. Beginning in summer 2021 and continuing with the help of the A-G completion implementation grant plan, AGLA plans to administer a credit recovery option for Unduplicated Pupils (UDP) during summer of 2022. With the aid of an online platform, EdGenuity, and certified instructors in content areas, AGLA will offer a targeted approach to student recovery needs. The targeted approach begins with creating a list of students who need credit recovery who received a D/F/Fail grade in 2020-21 and reaching out to individuals and creating course based options through our EdGenuity platform and hiring instructors to match the students needs in the summer. This will allow the students to work on an individually paced program with support from an advisor who will help them consistently each day. AGLA recognizes that learning loss has hit targeted student populations more directly during the pandemic and as such we are offering additional hours/day where students can learn and engage and recover from that learning loss.

During the 2022-23 school year, AGLA staff will meet regularly with UDP students to ensure their A-G success. This staff member will develop individual plans with each student and follow up on progress monitoring towards A-G completion. This staff member will identify the needs, wishes, hopes and desires of these students and to connect their aspirations with credit recovery.

A description of the extent to which all students, including foster youth, low-income students, and English learners, will have access to A-G courses approved by the University of California.
All students who need credit recovery will be offered the option for summer intervention. In addition, foster youth, low-income students, and English learners will be reached out to individually to ensure participation. The programming software that we have allows for individually tailored courses aligned with student needs that increases accessibility for all students, including unduplicated students. The additional staffing for the summer program can help students who need extra support and guidance as they earn A-G credits.

The number of students who were identified for opportunities to retake A-G approved courses in which they received a "D", "F", or "Fail" grade in the 2020 spring semester or the 2020-21 school year and a description of the method used to offer the opportunity retake courses.

## Number of Students: 122

Identify students based on the D/F list and additional identify unduplicated students and individually meet with students to have them register for credit recovery during the summer and continue to monitor and measure progress towards A-G completion during the 2022-23 school year.

A description of how the plan and described services, and associated expenditures, if applicable, supplement services in the Local Control and Accountability Plan and Learning Recovery Plan.
Credit recovery began in Summer 2021 with certificated teachers offering tutoring and support to students on the D/F list. With the help of the A-G completion implementation grant plan, AGLA plans to continue to administer credit recovery options during summer of 2022 and into the school year 2022-23.

Plan Expenditures

| Programs and services to increase or improve A-G completion | Planned Expenditures |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

## Innovation Refunds

Founded 2020
https://www.innovationrefunds.com/
855-653-1083
25\% Rate - due after checks are received
Did not go with them due to newer company, less liability assurance given and higher rate.

## Alliant Group

Founded 2002
https://explore.alliantgroup.com/lp/employee-retention-credit-erc/
713-552-5542
25\% Rate - due after checks are received
Did not go with them because of higher percentage

## SDP Payroll

Founded 1986
https://www.sdppayroll.com/
469-444-2755
20\% Rate - due at the time of 941x submittal
Did not go with them because they wanted payment up front.

## ERTC Express

Founded 2021
https://ertc.com/
www.ercassist.com
20\% Rate - due after checks are received

Did not go with them because they are new with less liability
HigherUp HCM
Founded 1993 (1,400 customers)
www.gohigherup.com
20\% Rate - due after checks are received (no up-front cost)
Chose this company because of transparency, length of time in business, liability assurance, references and referrals and experience of staff.
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## Universal Prekindergarten in California

Decades of research demonstrate that an early and strong foundation for learning matters. Children who have effective learning opportunities before kindergarten have an advantage in school and in life over children who do not, especially children with adverse childhood experiences. Children who attend quality preschool programs are more prepared for school in terms of their early literacy, language, and math skills, their executive function, and social emotional development. In some cases, preschool participants are less likely to be identified for special education services or to be held back in elementary school than children who do not attend developmentally-informed preschool programs that include strong educational components.

California is poised to realize universal prekindergarten (UPK) for all four-year-old children, and to expand services for three-year-old children through bold leadership and the unprecedented investments in the Budget Act of 2021, including universal transitional kindergarten (UTK) and expansion of the California State Preschool Program (CSPP).

The tumult of the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated a call to action to ensure a strong educational foundation for all children, emphasizing the critical role of our education system in supporting children and families' needs and how local flexibility fuels community capacity to meet their needs. California's leaders responded with historic investments in family support, child development and care, and education. Yet, as the Master Plan for Early Learning and Care highlights, realizing the promise of early childhood investments will require all partners-across early learning and care, early education, elementary education, and expanded learning and extended care communities-to work together to create a stronger system designed to meet the needs of the whole child.

## The California Universal Prekindergarten Planning and Implementation Grant Program - Overview

California seeks to set children on a trajectory of lifelong success by investing in early and equitable learning experiences, including infant and toddler supports, such as family leave and access to infant and toddler care, universal preschool for all four-year-old children, and enhanced educational experiences across an aligned preschool to third grade system.

The 2021-22 State Budget package established the UPK Planning and Implementation Grant Program as a state early learning initiative with the goal of expanding access to prekindergarten programs at local educational agencies (LEAs). This grant program provides $\$ 200$ million for the California Department of Education (CDE) to allocate directly to LEAs based on a statutory formula to support planning and implementation costs associated with expanding prekindergarten options, such as universally-available transitional kindergarten (TK), CSPP, and Head Start for eligible students, and other local and community-based partnerships. It is important for LEAs to include partners such as CSPP, Head Start, and other early learning and care providers in the co-creation of the local plan. Engaging all partners in the community will enhance resources for families and children and fully utilize and coordinate available resources, including facilities, staff, and funding.

Under the provisions of California Education Code (EC) Section 8281.5, grant funds are allocated to school districts, charter schools, and county offices of education (COEs) with kindergarten enrollment in specific years, according to a specified formula. In addition, funds are allocated to COEs to support countywide planning and capacity building around UPK.

Grant funds may be used for costs associated with creating or expanding CSPP or TK programs, or to establish or strengthen partnerships with other providers of prekindergarten education within the LEA, including Head Start programs, to ensure that high-quality options for prekindergarten education are available for four-year-old children. Allowable costs include, but are not limited to: (1) planning costs, (2) hiring and recruitment costs, (3) staff training and professional development, (4) classroom materials, and (5) supplies.

As a condition of receiving grant funds, state law requires each LEA to create a plan articulating,
how all children in the attendance area of the LEA will have access to full-day learning programs the year before kindergarten that meet the needs of parents, including through partnerships with the LEA's expanded learning offerings, the After-School Education and Safety Program, the California state preschool program, Head Start programs, and other community-based early learning and care programs (EC Section 8281.5).

Under state law, the plan must be developed for consideration by the LEA's governing board or body at a public meeting on or before June 30, 2022, after which the LEA must provide data, as specified by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, to the CDE. The CDE must encumber funds by June 30, 2024. LEAs will have until June 30, 2025, to use the funds.

In addition, the 2021-22 State Budget also established the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELO-P). The intent of the program is that all LEAs offer all unduplicated students in classroom-based instructional programs access to comprehensive afterschool and intersessional expanded learning opportunities. The ELO-P requires LEAs to offer inperson before or after-school expanded learning opportunities that, when added to the core instructional day, are no fewer than nine hours of combined instructional time and expanded learning opportunities per instructional day (EC Section 46120).

In 2021-22, all LEAs must offer all TK through sixth grade (TK-6) classroom-based, unduplicated pupils an ELO-P and provide access to 50 percent of TK-6 enrolled, classroom-based, unduplicated pupils. Commencing in 2022-23, as a condition of apportionment, LEAs with an Unduplicated Pupil Percentage (UPP) at or above 80 percent must offer an ELO-P to all TK-6 classroom-based pupils and provide access to all TK-6 classroom-based pupils upon parent or guardian request. LEAs with an UPP below 80 percent must offer an expanded learning opportunity to all TK-6 classroom-based, unduplicated pupils and provide access to 50 percent of TK-6 enrolled classroom-based, unduplicated pupils. LEAs receiving ELO-P funding must meet all TK-6 requirements, which include, but are not limited to, offering a minimum of a nine-hour day for students TK-6 during the school year, providing pupil access, and offering 30 non-school days of programming, such as during summer and intersession periods.

Summer and intersession programming are also offered through many other early learning programs such as CSPP, Head Start, and early learning and care providers. Sharing costs, staff, and resources can support implementation of TK that provides for full-day supports while also meeting parental needs and supporting parental choice of program and setting type. LEAs should consider how these services will be offered as part of their UPK Plan. For key definitions related to UPK in California, see Appendix I.

## Planning Template Purpose

The UPK Planning Template has been created to: (1) offer planning questions for LEA consideration in developing comprehensive plans for UPK that meet community and family needs, and (2) outline the data that will be required for submission to the CDE to meet the requirements of EC Section 8281.5.

This template includes recommended and required planning questions. Collectively, the recommended and required questions form a set of core planning questions the CDE believes are critical to supporting the development of a comprehensive, responsive, and community-centered UPK Plan.

- Recommended Questions: LEAs are highly encouraged to incorporate answers to these questions in their UPK Plans. Responses to these questions are not required for submission to the CDE but do support more holistic planning that meets the intent of these funds.
- Required questions: LEAs will be required to answer the required data questions outlined in this template in a survey that will be issued by the CDE following the June 30, 2022, deadline for LEAs to present their plans to their governing boards.

The CDE will be collecting information on the answers to the required questions after July 30, 2022, in a survey. This will allow the CDE to learn about how LEAs are planning to implement UPK, and to identify what additional support may be needed to help LEAs as they move along the implementation process.

The questions required for submission to the CDE should be answered based on what the LEA plans to implement in the 2022-23 school year. However, the CDE encourages that LEAs, when developing their UPK Plan for consideration by their local governing board, look beyond the first year of implementation and lay the foundation for the full implementation period. The CDE also encourages LEAs to look to their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) to identify where their LCAPs already include relevant opportunities for alignment, and to consider the results of the UPK planning and implementation efforts as it pertains to future updates to their LCAPs.

The UPK Planning Template is organized as follows:

1. Self-Certification
2. Projected Enrollment and Needs Assessment
3. Focus Area Planning
a. Vision and Coherence
b. Community Engagement and Partnerships
c. Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning
d. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
e. LEA Facilities, Services, and Operations
4. Technical Assistance Questions

The CDE encourages COEs to use this template as a guide for developing their own plans for how they will support the districts in their county to assess options, make decisions, and construct a plan that includes the required questions and considers the recommended questions found in this template.

## Accompanying Guidance

To help introduce LEA leaders to early education concepts, agencies, and structures, the CDE will release an accompanying Guidance Document in early 2022, that will include information on the following:

1. Local LEA indirect service agencies and partners (for example, child care local planning council [LPC], Resource and Referral program [R\&R], Alternative Payment Program [APP]);
2. Allowable ways to layer funding sources and programs to achieve full-day programming for four-year-old children;
3. Requirements for TK and early education facilities;
4. UPK workforce requirements for CSPP and TK educators, including the Early Learning Career Lattice, Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Child Development Teacher Permit information, information on the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential requirements, and TK educator professional learning;
5. Other available resources for UPK Implementation:
a. Workforce development grants and funds that can be accessed to help candidates obtain early education and TK qualifications (for example, federal stimulus funds, Educator Effectiveness Block Grant, and others);
b. Funding sources that can be utilized for facilities;
c. Funding sources that can be utilized for extended learning and care;
6. Research on the importance of participating in quality early education and research demonstrating the long-term impact on attendance, behavior, graduation rates, and academic and career success; and
7. Other resources aligned with the questions presented in the UPK Planning Template.

Additionally, the CDE will work with partners to ensure the release of additional information and technical assistance in the form of guidance, resources, tools, and regularly-scheduled webinars. Topics will include workforce, support for multilingual learners, and inclusive early education practices, among others.

## Directions, Timeline, and Suggested Planning Process

LEAs are encouraged to use this template to fulfill the EC Section 8281.5 requirement to create a UPK Plan that articulates how the LEA will facilitate access to full-day learning for all children the year before kindergarten, including their partnerships with CSPP, Head Start, other preschool partners, and extended learning and care partners. The CDE will
disseminate a survey to collect responses to the required questions in this template following the June 30, 2022, deadline for presenting plans to the local governing board.

The CDE recommends the following process and timeline after the release of this UPK Planning Template in December 2021:

1. LEAs convene a planning team, including staff from the early learning department and Head Start (if these exist), curriculum and instruction, student programs, workforce and human resources (HR), business services, special education, multilingual education, expanded and after-school learning, and facilities.
2. The CDE, along with partners, will release guidance, resources, and additional information to support LEAs in the development of their UPK plan. LEAs should review this guidance as part of their planning process, and COEs should use the guidance to inform the support they offer to LEAs.
3. COEs develop plans for how they will support LEAs in their county to assess options, make decisions, and construct plans that address the required questions and consider the recommended questions found in this template. COEs should communicate with the LEAs in their county about the types of information, resources, and technical assistance the COE is able to offer to support the UPK planning process.
4. LEAs conduct outreach and engagement activities with local R\&Rs, LPCs, and existing extended learning and care providers including early learning and child care providers operating within the LEA's enrollment attendance boundary.
5. LEAs convene a public engagement process to gather input and perspectives to inform the plan. This engagement process should include parents, early learning communities (including CSPP, Head Start, and the Head Start Policy Council), and expanded learning communities (including the After-School Education and Safety [ASES] Program). To ensure meaningful engagement, the CDE recommends LEAs complete this by March 1, 2022.
6. If the LEA wants technical assistance from their COE, the CDE recommends LEAs submit a draft of the UPK Plan to their COE for review by April 15, 2022.
7. Planning teams meet with the COE to discuss the LEA's draft, including local constituency input, by June $1,2022$.
8. Planning teams present a draft plan to the school board by June $30,2022$.
9. The plan shall demonstrate how families will have access to full-day learning programs the year before kindergarten that meet the needs of parents, including through partnerships with the LEA's expanded learning offerings, the ASES Program, CSPP, Head Start programs, and other community-based early learning and care programs.

Following the presentation of the plan to the LEA's school board, the LEA shall respond to the CDE's subsequent requests for information no later than July 31, 2022.

## Key Considerations

## Transitional Kindergarten Implementation Timeline

As a condition of receipt of apportionment, school districts and charter schools must implement universally available TK for all four-year-old children by 2025-26 (EC 48000[c][1]). LEAs are encouraged to consider how this implementation timeline will impact elements of their UPK Plan, including whether implementing UTK on a fast timeline will allow the LEA to reach economies of scale with regard to the number of classrooms and TK teachers needed. The table below illustrates the UTK implementation timeline, including eligibility and ratios.

Table: TK Eligibility, Ratio, and Class Size Requirements by Fiscal Year

| Type of <br> Requirement | 2021-22 | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2 - 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 3 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4 - 2 5}$ | 2025-26 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Eligibility | Turn five between <br> September 2 and <br> December 2; at <br> district discretion, | Turn five between <br> September 2 and <br> February 2; at <br> district discretion, | Turn five between <br> September 2 and <br> April 2; at district <br> discretion, turn | Turn five between <br> September 2 and <br> June 2; at district <br> discretion, turn | Turn four by <br> September 1 |


| Type of <br> Requirement | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2 - 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 3 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4 - 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5 - 2 6}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | turn five between <br> December 3 and <br> the end of the <br> school year | turn five between <br> February 3 and <br> the end of the <br> school year | five between April <br> 3 and the end of <br> the school year | five between June <br> 3 and the end of <br> the school year |  |
| Ratios | Not specified | $1: 12$ | $1: 10^{* *}$ | $1: 10^{* *}$ | $1: 10^{* *}$ |
| Class Size | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |

* average class size across the school site
** Subject to future legislative appropriation


## Supporting a Preschool through Third Grade Continuum

The CDE recently launched a Preschool through Third Grade ( $\mathrm{P}-3$ ) Alignment Initiative rooted in research that suggests the gaps in children's opportunities and learning outcomes demand system-level reform at the state, county, district, school, and community level. Through this work, the CDE hopes to disrupt inequities, address bias, and promote equitable opportunities for California's early learners. UPK implementation presents a critical opportunity to strengthen P-3 alignment, as a means of sustaining and accelerating the improved child outcomes associated with high-quality, early learning experiences.

To ensure the LEA's plan is aligned with the vision of a P-3 continuum, the development team for the LEA UPK Plan (for which this document is a template) should include staff from the early education department (if there is one), curriculum and instruction, student programs, workforce, HR, business services, special education, multilingual education, expanded learning and afterschool, and facilities. Furthermore, to create a strong UPK system that meets families' needs, the voices and choices of parents should be centered. Furthermore, LEAs should conduct outreach to the early learning and care providers that operate within the zip codes that the LEA serves to include them in informing the development of the LEA's UPK Plan.

As a best practice, the CDE recommends LEAs convene a public engagement process to gather input and perspectives to inform the plan by March 1, 2022. This engagement process should include parents, early education communities (including CSPP and Head Start), expanded learning communities (including the ASES Program), and early learning and care (including center- and home-based child care) in order to gather information from impacted communities to inform the development of this plan.

## Full-Day, Extended Learning and Care

State law does not require LEAs to operate a TK program that offers full-day early learning to all children the year before kindergarten; however LEAs must articulate how they plan to offer full-day, early learning programming to all students, and how they are partnering or plan to partner with other programs, such as those listed in the statute, to ensure that every child has access to extended learning and care that, combined, equates to a full-day of programming that meets the community's needs.

Additionally, starting in the 2022-23 school year, LEAs receiving ELO-P funding must offer nine hours of combined instructional time and expanded learning opportunities per instructional day to all unduplicated children enrolled in TK and at least 30 intersession days; however, LEAs are not required to exclusively use ELO-P funding to meet the requirement. LEAs can instead partner with Head Start, CSPP, ASES, or other community-based child care programs to fund and provide the additional extended learning and care hours needed to reach nine hours. (EC Section 46120). This would allow the LEA to use ELO-P funds to provide additional service hours or services for additional children.

## Creating Joint or Aligned Plans

LEAs are permitted to partner in creating a joint UPK Plan and may submit the same plan for multiple LEAs. Small and rural LEAs serving similar communities, especially those with low TK or kindergarten average daily attendance (ADA), are strongly encouraged to consider creating a joint UPK Plan which includes non-district learning programs serving four-yearold children. LEAs are also encouraged to consider partnering with other nearby LEAs to submit a joint UPK Plan or with their COE to create a single, countywide plan. These joint plans should be developed in conjunction with CSPP, Head Start, other preschool programs, and early learning and care providers.

## UPK Planning Template <br> Self-Certification

In the data collection survey submitted to the CDE, LEAs must self-certify they developed a plan that was presented for consideration by the governing board or body at a public meeting on or before June 30,2022 , for how all children in the attendance area of the LEA will have access to full-day learning programs the year before kindergarten that meet the needs of parents, including through partnerships with the LEA's expanding learning offerings, ASES, CSPP, Head Start programs, and other community-based early learning and care programs.

1. Please complete the following table:

| LEA Name | Contact Name and Title of the <br> Individual Self-Certifying the <br> Statement Above | Email | Phone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aveson School of Leaders | Casey Rasmussen | caseyrasmussen@aveson. <br> org | 6267971440 |

2. Did the LEA develop a joint plan with multiple LEAs (for example, multiple small and rural LEAs serving similar communities or countywide plans developed with support of the COE for all LEAs in the county)? [select one]

## No

3. If the LEA answered Yes to Question 2, what other LEAs are part of this joint plan?

## Projected Enrollment and Needs Assessment Recommended Planning Questions

The CDE recommends LEAs prioritize these questions as part of their UPK Plan in addition to required questions.

1. What do existing data sources indicate about parental needs and preferences related to early learning and care programs for three- and four-year-old children in the LEAs attendance area? (LEAs are encouraged to work with local early learning and care partners such as CSPP, Head Start programs, LPCs, R\&Rs, and APPs, and utilize data sources such as LPC Needs Assessment data, Head Start Needs Assessments, and so on)
2. Using the projected TK enrollment for the LEA provided by the CDE, make modifications to the LEA's TK student estimates and make cumulative facilities and staffing estimates needed each year from school year 2022-23 to 2025-26. Complete the following tables.

Table: Projected Student Enrollment

| Type of Student | 2019-20 | Current <br> (TK-eligible children turn five between September 2 and December 2, inclusive) | 2022-23 <br> (TK-eligible children turn five between September 2 and February 2, inclusive) | 2023-24 <br> (TK-eligible children turn five between September 2 and April 2, inclusive)4 | 2024-25 <br> (TK-eligible children turn five between September 2 and June 2, inclusive) | 2025-26 <br> (TK-eligible children turn four by September 1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TK Students | 27 | 12 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| CSPP (if applicable) | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Table: Facilities Estimates (Cumulative)

| Type of Facility | 2019-20 | Current | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | 2025-26 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TK Classrooms | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| CSPP Classrooms | n/a | n/a | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a |
| Head Start or Other Early Learning and Care Classrooms | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Table: Staffing Estimates (Cumulative)

| Type of Staff | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 - 2 0}$ | Current | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2 - 2 3}$ | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | 2025-26 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TK | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| TK Teacher's <br> Assistants | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
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| Type of Staff | 2019-20 | Current | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CSPP (if applicable) | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Other CSPP <br> Classroom Staff (if <br> applicable) | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Early Education <br> District-level staffing <br> (if applicable) | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  |

3. As part of the ELO-P requirements, EC Section 8281.5 requires LEAs to offer or partner in offering in-person before school or after-school expanded learning opportunities that, when added to daily instructional minutes, are no fewer than nine hours of combined instructional time and expanded learning opportunities per instructional day, including through partnerships with the LEA's expanding learning offerings, ASES, CSPP, Head Start programs, and other community-based early learning and care programs.

Consider your estimated number of TK students. Estimate the number of TK students that will utilize extended learning and care services in addition to the instructional minutes. Then, working with local early learning and care and expanded learning partners, estimate the number of slots available for TK students in the following programs:

Table: Projected Number of TK Students Utilizing Extended Learning and Care

| 2019-20 | Current | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | $2025-26$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12 | 24 | 24 | 24 |  |

Table: Projected Number of Slots Available for TK Students

| Slot Type | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 - 2 0}$ | Current | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2 - 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 3 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4 - 2 5}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CSPP |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Head Start | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| ASES Program/ELO-P |  | 0 | 00 | 0 |  |

## Required Questions

CDE will be requiring this information be completed after the plan is presented to the governing board.
There are no required questions in this section.

## Focus Area A: Vision and Coherence

In order to provide equity of access for all students and their families, it is vital for the LEA, in partnership with early learning and care programs, to develop a coherent educational system that begins with UPK, includes access to TK and other options for all four-year-old children, and provides nine hours of programming per day through a combination of instructional time and extended learning and care opportunities for those families who choose this option.

In planning for UPK, consider how the LEA's administrative structure will support school leadership in building connections between them and expanded learning programs as well as early learning and care programs (CSPP, Head Start, other subsidized or privately administered preschool and child care programs) to provide UPK programing and before school and after-school, intersession, and summer learning and care.

## Recommended Planning Questions

The CDE recommends LEAs prioritize these questions as part of their UPK Plan in addition to required questions.

1. What is the LEA's vision for UPK?

We believe in Universal Pre-K, that is experiential and play based in structure. Our vision for our work centers around Personalized Mastery Learning; where students and advisors craft curiosities together, and students, through discovery, find paths of learning and success. We anticipate that our Pre-K program will continue to grow based on the interest from the surrounding community in our model and focus.
2. In addition to TK, what service delivery models will be integrated to offer UPK programming, including the nine hours of total extended learning and care programming around the TK instructional time for families that opt in? In developing this component of the plan, LEAs should include partners such as CSPP, Head Start, and other early learning and care providers to ensure local services and funding are maximized and coordinated in response to parental needs and choice.
Our model will include the additional after school care afforded our LEA based upon the ELO-P grant dollars. These resources will allow for additional programming enrichment in Science, Lego Connections, TK Play Based Club, and Art and Yoga. We additionally will reach out to our local providers and partners to determine their ability to connect with our after school programming supports.
3. Describe the planned administrative structure that will support and monitor the UPK program and facilitate connections with the ELO-P as well as non-LEA-administered early learning and care programs that will support the extended learning components of UPK.
We currently have a lead Pre-K teacher, who is supervised by our Site Director and Assistant Site Director. These administrators coordinate offerings of the ELO-P to ensure student participation at the Pre-K level. On a regular basis, the local administrators meet with the Lead Pre-K teacher to ensure that needs are determined and supported for the efficiency and efficacy of the program.
4. Identify and assign each individual that will be responsible for key functions pertaining to implementing UPK (for example, academic or educational services, early childhood, facilities, human resources and labor, special education, English learner or multilingual programs, partnerships, including early learning and care and ELO-P, assessment and data collection, professional learning, workforce recruitment and preparation support, or others).
Academic and Educational Services: Supported by Lead TK teacher and Curriculum and Instruction Director.
Early Childhood: Lead Pre-K Teacher, Assistant Director.
Facilities: Site Director and Assistant Site Director
Human Resources: Human Resource Consultant
Special Education: Executive Director of Special Education
English Learners: Site Director/Assistant Site Director
Partnerships: Executive Director and Site Director
ELO-P: After School Program Coordinator
Assessment and Data Collection: Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Lead Teacher
5. Identify how UPK leadership will be integrated in the decision-making process at the executive or cabinet level. The Site Director and Assistant Site Director will meet regularly with the UPK team of educators. The Site Director and Assistant Site Director meet weekly to report out and share UPK needs and decisions that need to be made.
6. Describe how the LEA's proposed UPK model will be integrated with the district's LCAP.

The current LCAP addresses social justice, math and inclusion goals. The UPK curriculum will be aligned to LCAP goals, addressing the development needs of UPK students with in the stated goals and needs.
7. Describe how the LEA plans to ensure the inclusion of students with disabilities in UPK classrooms and who will be involved in the process.
Aveson School of Leaders is a fully included school. Students with disabilities would learn in the classroom setting and would be supported by the Inclusion Team.
8. Describe how the LEA plans to support sites in building connections between them and ELO-P, as well as early learning and care partners.
TK students are a part of the developing ELO-P plan.

## Required Questions

## CDE will be requiring this information be completed after the plan is presented to the governing board.

1. Which of the following model(s) of service delivery does the LEA plan to implement for UPK for all four-year-old children, including classes fully inclusive of children with disabilities, to provide access to the least restrictive environment for learning? [select all that apply]

## TK offered at all sites

2. Does the LEA plan to implement full-day TK, part-day TK, or both? [select one]

Both
3. Describe how the model(s) of service delivery selected in the preceding two questions will be implemented across the LEA's sites and why.
In order to serve all TK students' developmental, academic and SEL readiness for school, both a half-day and full-day program will be offered in addition to extended learning opportunities during the after school camp program. One Tk teacher and one TK aide will deliver academic and social curriculum to their TK students.
4. Does the LEA plan to begin operating a CSPP or expand its current CSPP contract? [select one]

No - the LEA has no plans to begin or expand a CSPP contract in future years
5. If the LEA answered yes in question four, what age of children does the LEA plan to serve through a CSPP contract? [select all that apply]
6. Please indicate if the LEA plans to serve students eligible for early admittance TK, for children whose fifth birthday occurs after the enrollment date for the year of implementation (see implementation timeline above)?
a. 2022-23 (Birthdays February 3 or after) [select one]

No
b. 2023-24 (Birthdays April 3 or after) [select one]

No
c. 2024-25 (Birthdays June 3 or after) [select one]

No

## Focus Area B: Community Engagement and Partnerships

To successfully implement UPK and create a P-3 continuum, LEAs will need to cultivate relationships and collaborate with both internal and external partners.

## Recommended Planning Questions

The CDE recommends LEAs prioritize these questions as part of their UPK Plan in addition to required questions.

1. How does the LEA's UPK Plan prioritize parental needs and choices?

Parent parental needs and choices are prioritize by offering choice in programming: full day, half day and after school camp care.
2. How does the LEA plan to meaningfully engage extended learning and care partners in the development of the LEA's UPK Plan?

Our after school camp director works extensively with community partners to provide developmentally appropriate TK enrichment classes during the after school camp program.

## Required Questions

CDE will be requiring this information be completed and submitted to the CDE after the plan is presented to the governing board.

1. Identify which of the following opportunities the LEA implemented to obtain public input on the UPK Plan. [Select all that apply]

Family or parent surveys
Parent Teacher Association Meetings
Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)
LCAP educational partners input sessions
Co-hosting events with community-based organizations (CBOs)
2. Select which programs the LEA plans to combine with the TK instructional day to offer a minimum of nine hours per day of programming (instructional day plus programming) for children whose families opt in for extended learning and care. [select all that apply]

Expanded learning programs on an LEA site (ASES, 21st Century Community Learning Centers [21st CCLC], ELO-P)

## Focus Area C: Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning

Based on the projected enrollment and needs described in Focus Area A, LEAs should create a plan to recruit, train, and support the new TK, preschool, early learning and care, and expanded learning staff needed to support full-day early education options for all children the year before kindergarten.
(Note: All LEAs will need to plan for workforce development considerations as part of this planning work. There is a separate $\$ 100$ million allocation for the Prekindergarten Planning and Implementation Grant - Competitive, also known as the Early Education Teacher Development Grant, that will be competitively awarded and is not part of this planning template.)

EC Section $48000(\mathrm{~g})(4)$ specifies that credentialed teachers who are first assigned to a TK classroom after July 1,2015 , have, by August 1, 2023, one of the following:
a. At least 24 units in early childhood education, or childhood development, or both.
b. As determined by the LEA employing the teacher, professional experience in a classroom setting with preschool age children that is comparable to the 24 units of education described in subparagraph (a).
c. A Child Development Teacher Permit issued by the CTC.

EC Section 8295 specifies that teachers in CSPP shall either possess a permit issued by the CTC authorizing service in the care, development, and instruction of children in a child care and development program; or meet the following criteria:
a. Possess a current credential issued by the CTC authorizing teaching service in elementary school or a single subject credential in home economics; and
b. Possess twelve units in early childhood education or child development, or both, or two years' experience in early childhood education or a child care and development program.

## Recommended Planning Questions

The CDE recommends LEAs prioritize these questions as part of their UPK Plan in addition to required questions.

1. How does the LEA plan to recruit the educators needed to implement its UPK Plan (including CSPP teachers, assistant teachers, TK teachers, and TK teachers' instructional aides and assistants)?
Through job postings and recruitment fairs.
2. What is the LEA's planned strategy for providing professional learning for educators across the LEA's P-3 continuum? Plans might include the following:
a. Who will receive this professional learning?
i. By role (lead teachers, assistant teachers, administrators, coaches, and so forth)
ii. By grade (TK staff, kindergarten through third grade staff, on-site preschool staff, off-site preschool staff, and so forth)
b. What content will professional learning opportunities cover?
i. Effective adult-child interactions
ii. Children's literacy and language development (aligned with the California Preschool Learning Foundations and the California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks)
iii. Children's developing math and science (aligned with the California Preschool Learning Foundations and the California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks)
iv. Children's social-emotional development (aligned with the California Preschool Learning Foundations and the California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks)
v. Implicit bias and culturally- and linguistically-responsive practice
vi. Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and trauma- and healing-informed practice
vii. Curriculum selection and implementation
viii. Creating developmentally-informed environments
ix. Administration and use of child assessments to inform instruction
$x$. Support for multilingual learners, including home language development and strategies for a bilingual classroom
xi. Serving children with disabilities in inclusive settings, including Universal Design for Learning
xii. Engaging culturally- and linguistically-diverse families
c. How will professional learning be delivered?
i. Coaching and mentoring
ii. Classroom observations and demonstration lessons with colleagues
iii. Workshops with external professional development providers
iv. Internally-delivered professional learning workshops and trainings
v. Operating an induction program
vi. Partnerships with local QCC professional learning in CSPP settings
vii. In mixed groupings (for example, TK and CSPP teachers)

Aveson School of Leaders plans to increase the following competencies and provide professional learning for educators in the following ways:

Providing instruction in inclusive classrooms -
All staff receive professional development at the beginning of the year from our Special Education Team regarding how to implement IEPs with fidelity, how to provide classroom management that is inclusive all learners, as well as how to deliver instruction in Universal Design best practices. In addition, our Special Education Local Plan Area will provide professional development specific to explicit direct instruction in early literacy foundational skills that will address struggling readers, dual language learners and learners who have dyslexia.

Providing culturally responsive instruction -
All staff receive professional development at the beginning of the year from our social justice curriculum representatives, the Pollyanna curriculum which enhances racial literacy knowledge and equity practices. In addition, our own Antiracist Educators Team will provide continuous professional development in the areas of: diversity, equity and inclusion, restorative practices and implicit biases. Staff will continue to work with Leaving the Village on restorative practices as it relates to alternatives to suspension.

Providing support for dual language learners -
All literacy staff, will take part in professional development on our newly adopted curriculum, SIPPS from the Collaborative Classroom, which is a research based, foundational skills program to aid readers, including English Language Learners. This professional development will take place in collaboration with our Special Education Local Plan Area which will also support our work in building inclusive classrooms.

Providing enhanced social emotional learning -
All staff will participate in beginning of the year professional development in our current SEL programs of Conscious Discipline and MindUp. In addition, all staff will receive ongoing professional development with our inhouse MFT Program Coordinator on the importance of SEL for all students, especially out youngest TK and Kinder students, which will include professional development on trauma informed practices.

## Required Questions

## CDE will be requiring this information be completed after the plan is presented to the governing board.

1. Which of the following strategies does the LEA intend to use to support diverse and effective prospective TK teachers, including multilingual educators, to earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential? [select all that apply]

None of the above, the LEA currently has enough Multiple Subject Teaching Credential holders to meet the need for TK educators
2. Which of the following strategies does the LEA intend to employ to support diverse and effective prospective TK teachers, including multilingual educators, to meet the requirements under EC Section 48000(g)(4)? [select all that apply]

None of the above; the LEA currently has enough Multiple Subject Teaching Credential holders who have at least 24 units in early childhood education, or childhood development, or both; professional experience in a classroom setting with preschool-age children that is comparable to the 24 units of education described in subparagraph (a); or a Child Development Teacher Permit issued by the CTC.
3. Which of the following strategies does the LEA intend to employ to support diverse and effective prospective CSPP teachers, including multilingual educators, to obtain a Child Development Teacher Permit [select all that apply]

None of the above, the LEA is not planning to support prospective CSPP educators in obtaining a Child Development Teacher Permit
4. On which child observational assessments does the LEA intend to offer professional learning to TK, CSPP, and other early education teachers during the 2022-23 school year? [select all that apply]

LEA-based, grade level benchmarks and a report card
5. On what topics does the LEA intend to offer professional learning regarding early childhood education to site leaders and principals? [select all that apply]

ACEs and trauma- and healing-informed practice
Implicit bias and culturally- and linguistically-responsive practice
Serving children with disabilities in inclusive settings, including Universal Design for Learning
Engaging culturally- and linguistically-diverse families

## Focus Area D: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

It is critical for each LEA and preschool program partner to plan for how they will develop or select curriculum or curricula that are developmentally-informed and aligned with the strengths of all students, including multilingual students and students with disabilities, as well as how they will ensure curricula are implemented with fidelity to support intentional, quality instruction for all students. LEAs and preschool program partners should consider how they will provide coherent, culturally- and linguistically-responsive UPK curriculum or curricula anchored in the California Preschool Learning Foundations (https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/psfoundations.asp) and the California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks (https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/psframework.asp) to support the development of skills across the domains outlined in those documents.

## Recommended Planning Questions

The CDE recommends LEAs prioritize these questions as part of their UPK Plan in addition to required questions.

1. Describe how the LEA will develop or select a curriculum for UPK classrooms that aligns with the California Preschool Learning Foundations and California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks.
Our Special Education Local Plan Area will provide professional development specific to explicit direct instruction in early literacy foundational skills that will address struggling readers, dual language learners and learners who have dyslexia. They have recommended the SIPPS Literacy Program, as well as Heggerty Literacy Program which we plan to purchase and implement. Heggerty will specifically wok with Prek/TK students in building a foundation in literacy and phonological and phonemic awareness. We will also use MindUp, CSEFEL pyramid and Conscious Discipline to meet developmental and SEL needs. Our Eureka, Great Minds program will build a beginning foundation for PreK/TK students in mathematics/number sense.
2. What actions does the LEA plan to take to support effective classroom organization practices and behavior management strategies to ensure a positive learning environment for a diverse population of UPK students?

In order to support effective classroom organization practices and behavior management strategies, staff will be trained in Conscious Discipline and MindUp and use the lessons and strategies from both in the classroom. Our school's Anti-Racist Education Team will work alongside Welcoming Schools and Pollyanna to ensure inclusivity, visibility and appropriate management strategies for all learners in a diverse population.
6. What instructional practices does the LEA plan to implement to support the language and overall development of multilingual learners?
All literacy staff, will take part in professional development on our newly adopted curriculum, SIPPS from the Collaborative Classroom, which is a research based, foundational skills program to aid readers, including English Language Learners. This professional development will take place in collaboration with our Special Education Local Plan Area which will also support our work in building inclusive classrooms.
Instructional practices such as pictures, tangible objects, role play and hands on modeling will also support language and overall development.

## Required Questions

CDE will be requiring this information be completed after the plan is presented to the governing board.

1. Does the LEA plan to provide any of the following language model(s) for TK students? [select all that apply] English-only instruction with home-language support
2. If the LEA administers CSPP, does it plan to provide any of the following language model(s) for CSPP students? [select all that apply]
English-only instruction with home-language support
3. Identify methods the LEA plans to use to support the development of social-emotional learning and executive function skills through specific instruction in these areas and by embedding and reinforcing this instruction in all curriculum areas. [select all that apply]

Designing developmentally-appropriate learning environments to allow for individual and group activities that promote social-emotional learning and executive function skills (for example, use students' pictures or words in daily routines, feelings charts)
Promote learning through play as a context for social and emotional development, including social play with teachers and peers in small or large group settings
Use developmental observations to identify children's emerging skills and support their development through daily interactions

Staff development opportunities encouraging reflective practice and cross-level support for instruction specific to social-emotional learning and executive function skills
Offer open-ended, self-directed learning opportunities that foster individual interests and curiosity and new learning
Development of lesson plans or use of a curriculum that includes specific and targeted social-emotional learning and executive function activities throughout the day of instruction
Provide training for staff on the Center on the Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) Pyramid Model
4. What instructional practices does the LEA plan to implement to support children with disabilities in UPK programming? [select all that apply]
Provide specialized services (for example, occupational therapy, physiotherapy, speech and language pathology therapy) in the classroom with peer models
Implement social-emotional strategies, such as the Pyramid Model, CSEFEL, and others
Provide additional staff to support participation in instruction
Provide adaptations to instructional materials
5. What assessments does the LEA plan to use in TK or kindergarten? [select all that apply]

LEA-based grade level benchmarks and a report card
Other [describe, open response]

Transitional Kindergarten Assessment Tool provided by California Kindergarten associations, Basic TK skills assessment done one on one by the TK teacher

## Focus Area E: LEA Facilities, Services, and Operations

It is critical to ensure that LEA facilities, services, and operations are thoughtfully aligned to support the implementation of UPK and movement towards a P-3 continuum. It is also critical for early education programs currently operating to continue to be a part of California's mixed-delivery system by creating shared space, blending funding and coordinating service delivery.

## For Facilities:

For facilities planning, draw on the Projected Enrollment and Needs Assessment section of this document and the LEA's Facilities Master Plan. The objectives of this section are to identify the availability of space for UPK, the adequacy of available space to meet the kindergarten facilities standards for meeting the needs of young children, and, if needed, to update the Facilities Master Plan to address any unmet need for developmentally-appropriate space.

## Recommended Planning Questions

The CDE recommends LEAs prioritize these questions as part of their UPK Plan in addition to required questions.

1. What strategies does the LEA plan to employ to integrate younger children and older children on the same campus and ensure safety and appropriate commingling?
The plan is to employ lunch and recess times at a staggered schedule and in separate play yards for younger and older children to ensure safety. Younger children's classrooms are located in hallways/levels that are separate from the older children's classroom. Restrooms are located appropriately near those levels, so that younger and older students have separate restrooms. TK students will their their own restroom located inside the TK classroom.
2. What strategies does the LEA intend to implement to ensure TK students have access to meals and adequate time to eat (for example, adding additional meal services and time in the cafeteria, offering breakfast after the bell [students pick up a breakfast and bring it to the classroom])? (Note: The LEA must continue to comply with all health and safety, state, and federal Child Nutrition Program regulations while implementing meal service)
All students receive breakfast/snack from the school and will have adequate time to eat in the morning. Additional time to eat will be given to any student that needs or requests it. Food will be saved for those that arrive to school late and will be given time to eat. TK students will have daily lunch time for eating, offering Free and Reduced meals, as well as an additional snack/meal eating time in the afternoon for those that stay for a full/extended day. After school programs that extend past the regular school hours will also provide snack and meal time .

## Required Questions

CDE will be requiring this information be completed after the plan is presented to the governing board.

1. To support an overall increase in UPK access, what efforts does the LEA plan to make to prevent the displacement of any early education programs on LEA campuses, including both LEA-administered and non-LEA-administered programs?
The Tk classroom is an integral part of our programming. Aveson School Leaders will include TK as part of its programming for the foreseeable future.
2. Does the LEA have adequate classroom space to meet the Projected Enrollment of TK students listed in the Projected Enrollment and Needs Assessment section of this document, for the respective implementation year? [multiple choice]
```
Yes
```

i. If no, how many more classrooms does the LEA need? [identify number, open response]
ii. If no, how might the LEA provide classrooms in the timeframe needed? [describe, open response]
$\square$
3. Does the space meet the kindergarten standards described in California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section14030(h)(2)? [multiple choice]

```
Yes
```

i. If no, what modifications need to be made? What resources are needed to make them? ( See Facilities Grant Program Funding at https://www.dgs.ca.gov/OPSC/Services/Page-Content/Office-of-Public-School-Construction-Services-List-Folder/Access-Full-Day-Kindergarten-Facilities-Grant-Program-Funding) [describe, open response]
4. Does the space contain necessary adaptive equipment, assistive technology, or other accommodations to ensure children with disabilities have access to education in the least restrictive environment? [multiple choice]

## Yes

i. If no, what modifications need to be made? What resources are needed to provide equipment or accommodations? [describe, open response]
5. Does the LEA's Facilities Master Plan adequately address the need for UPK programming? [multiple choice]

## No

i. If no, what process will the LEA use to update the Facilities Master Plan to accommodate future TK and early education programming? [describe, open response]
Aveson School of Leaders is applying for grants in order to support modifications to the play equipment and surrounding areas.
6. In which of the following areas does the LEA intend to make updates to facilities? [select all that apply]

## Apparatus area

Paved area
7. What transportation will the LEA offer to children enrolled in TK? [select all that apply]

## No transportation will be provided

8. Will the LEA offer transportation to transport TK children to extended learning and care opportunities that are at other sites than the one the child is enrolled at for TK?
Extended learning and care opportunities take place on-site. No transportation is needed.

## Technical Assistance Questions

The CDE is collecting information on the type(s) and topics of technical assistance that LEAs need to support implementation of a robust UPK Plan and effective UPK program. This information will be used to leverage existing resources and inform future technical assistance opportunities provided by CDE partners, including COEs, to help ensure that the needs of LEAs are met.

The following questions are optional. However, unlike the recommended questions included in Focus Areas A through E, the CDE will be collecting any information that LEAs wish to provide in response to these questions via the survey that the CDE administers to collect the required data questions above.

1. What technical assistance would be most helpful related to projecting enrollment and assessing needs? [select all that apply]
2. What technical assistance would be most helpful related to the elements included in Focus Area A: Vision and Coherence? [select all that apply]
3. What technical assistance would be most helpful related to the elements included in Focus Area B: Community Engagement and Partnerships? [select all that apply]
4. What technical assistance would be most helpful related to the elements included in Focus Area C: Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning? [select all that apply]
5. What technical assistance would be most helpful related to support for professional learning opportunities on specific topics? [select all that apply]
6. What technical assistance would be most helpful related to support for specific professional learning delivery mechanisms? [select all that apply]
7. What technical assistance would be most helpful related to the elements included in Focus Area D: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment [select all that apply]
8. What technical assistance would be most helpful related to implementing hands-on, interactive, and developmentallyinformed early education experiences for UPK students? [select all that apply]
9. What technical assistance would be most helpful related to the elements included in Focus Area E: LEA Facilities, Services, and Operations? [select all that apply]

## Appendix I-Definitions

The following definitions are critical for UPK planning efforts. Additional terms and definitions can be found in the Guidance Document:

- Preschool through Third Grade ( $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{3}$ ): $\mathrm{P}-3$ is a continuum of learning from preschool through third grade that can be supported by intentional practices at the classroom, school, and leadership levels that align curricula, assessment, and professional learning opportunities to ensure instruction builds on the knowledge and skills that children acquire as they transition across grades and settings.
- Universal prekindergarten (UPK): UPK refers to universal TK as well as the expanded CSPP, Head Start, and early childhood special education services that families can choose from to create rich early learning opportunities for all three- and four-year-old children during the year or two years before kindergarten. In high-needs neighborhoods, the CDE strongly encourages LEAs to consider pairing TK programs with access to Head Start and CSPP for age- and income-eligible three- and four-year-old children to further bolster program quality, either through the LEA's own Head Start or CSPP program or via a contract partnership with a CBO that administers a Head Start or CSPP.
- Transitional kindergarten (TK): TK means the first year of a two-year kindergarten program, serving four-year-old children regardless of income that uses a modified kindergarten curriculum that is age- and developmentallyappropriate (EC Section 48000 [d]).
- Universal transitional kindergarten (UTK): UTK refers to the expansion of TK by 2025-26 to serve all four-yearold children by September 1 of each year, regardless of income, providing a year of rich learning opportunities the year before kindergarten that families can choose from as part of California's public education system.
- California State Preschool Program (CSPP): CSPP is the largest state-funded preschool program in the nation. CSPP includes both part-day and full-day services to eligible three- and four-year-old children. CSPP provides a core class curriculum that is developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate for the children served. The program also provides meals and snacks to children, parent education, referrals to health and social services for families, and staff development opportunities to employees. The program is administered through LEAs, colleges, community-action agencies, local government entities, and private, nonprofit agencies.
- Expanded learning: This includes before school, after-school, summer, or intersession learning programs that focus on developing the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs and interests of pupils through handson, engaging learning experiences. It is the intent of the Legislature that expanded learning programs are pupilcentered, results-driven, include community partners, and complement, but do not replicate, learning activities in the regular school day and school year.
- Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELO-P): ELO-P provides funding for after-school and summer school enrichment programs for TK through sixth grade. The ELO-P is defined as services provided in addition to the normal school day and school year operations, to provide full-day and full-year expanded learning programs to meet the needs of working families whose children are enrolled in TK through sixth grade and also provide expanded learning enrichment programming for students. A full day is defined as in-person before school or afterschool expanded learning opportunities that, when added to daily instructional minutes, are no fewer than nine hours of combined instructional time and expanded learning opportunities per instructional day. A full year includes a minimum of 30 days of programming in the summer and intersession for no fewer than nine hours of in-person expanded learning opportunities per day.
- Early learning and care: This refers to the continuum of programs serving children from birth to preschool or school entry, as well as extended care to support school-age children with before school and after-school care as well as vacation schedules. This includes general child care, Early Head Start and Head Start, community-based early learning and care programs, family child care providers, and family, friend, and neighbor care.
- Extended learning and care: This refers to the continuum of programs and services (early learning and care options and expanded learning options) available in addition to the normal school day and school year operations, to provide full-day and full-year care to meet the needs of working families whose children are enrolled in TK or kindergarten. A full day is defined as in-person before school or after-school programming or care that, when added to daily instructional minutes, provide no fewer than nine hours of combined instructional time and
expanded learning opportunities per instructional day. A full year includes a minimum of 30 days of programming in the summer and intersession for no fewer than nine hours of in-person expanded learning opportunities per day. Funding to support extended learning and care for children enrolled in TK includes the ELO-P and the CSPP, as specified in guidance provided by the CDE's Early Education Division. Additional subsidized care opportunities may be available to families who qualify, such as child care vouchers and the General Child Care School Age program.


## Appendix II - Additional Deeper Planning Questions

This section includes optional planning questions for LEAs that are ready to develop more advanced UPK and P-3 plans.
These additional questions are designed to support the LEA's development of a more comprehensive local UPK Plan. LEAs can also use these questions as a tool for integrating UPK into existing LEA plans such as the LCAP. LEA's should assess their readiness to include any of these deeper planning questions in their initial planning process and reassess their readiness throughout the implementation of their UPK Plan.

## Focus Area A: Vision and Coherence

1. If an LEA has a California State Preschool Plan (as part of the LEA's application for its CSPP contract) what updates would the LEA like to make to the LEA's program narrative to reflect implementation of TK?
2. Does the LEA plan to establish, maintain, and facilitate ongoing LEA leadership teams to focus on effective $\mathrm{P}-3$ articulation and coordination throughout the LEA?
3. How will the LEA support sites in providing well-coordinated transitions for all $\mathrm{P}-3$ students as they move through grade levels?
4. How does the LEA plan to communicate the importance of the $\mathrm{P}-3$ continuum across a broad spectrum of audiences (including audiences internal and external to the district)?
5. Identify the processes and tools the LEA will use to strengthen understanding of early childhood development and facilitate communication between preschool and elementary school (including TK) teachers, principals, and administrators to support $\mathrm{P}-3$ alignment?

## Focus Area C: Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning

1. What strategies does the LEA plan to employ to recruit multilingual educators to teach in dual language programs?
2. How does the LEA plan to assess the implementation of its professional learning structures to ensure efficacy?

## Focus Area D: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

8. Describe how the LEA plans to establish and maintain a coherent, culturally- and linguistically-responsive P-3 continuum to provide a strong integrated curriculum anchored in the California Preschool Learning Foundations and the California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks, California Common Core State Standards, and the Curriculum Frameworks.
9. What actions does the LEA plan to take to establish or expand multilingual programs across the $\mathrm{P}-3$ continuum based on student population and family needs? (If the LEA has no plans to establish or expand multilingual programs across the $\mathrm{P}-3$ continuum, identify how the LEA will evaluate these opportunities moving forward.)
10. What planning and actions are needed to accommodate a positive meal service, and how will the LEA adapt their universal meal program for TK students?

## Focus Area E: LEA Facilities, Services, and Operations

4. Describe what changes the LEA intends to make to the LEA's Facilities Master Plan to ensure it is consistent with P-3 goals of creating seamless transitions for children and families.
5. Identify how the LEA plans to ensure TK students are included in all provisions of Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS) and, when necessary, special education instruction, with an emphasis on early intervention and inclusion practices to address supports and least restrictive environments.
6. Identify any modifications the LEA intends to make to the Student Information System (SIS) and the assessment data system to ensure teachers and administrators have access to data from preschool through third grade.
