PLUS PROGRAM · SAMPLE GRANT · LCAP AND BLOCK GRANTS

SAMPLE LCAP GOAL AND BLOCK GRANT ACTIONS

COYOTE MESA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

SAMPLE APPLICATION FOR A FICTIONAL SCHOOL. FOR ILLUSTRATION ONLY.

ABOUT THIS SAMPLE

Coyote Mesa Unified School District is fictional. Every local figure in this sample is invented. Costs marked illustrative are estimates for the example. The facts about the PLUS Program and Direction are accurate. Writer's notes appear in quoted boxes after each section.

This sample shows how a California district can write the PLUS Program into its Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). PLUS fits state priority 5 (pupil engagement) and state priority 6 (school climate). The sample uses three funding sources. LCFF supplemental and concentration funds pay for the ongoing work. The Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG) pays for start-up. The Student Support and Professional Development Discretionary Block Grant (SSPDBG) pays the share at the district's community schools.

Status as verified on October 31, 2026:

- **LCAP.** The current template, adopted by the State Board on November 13, 2024, covers 2024-25 through 2026-27. The next three-year LCAP begins in 2027-28, and this sample is written for that cycle. Confirm the template version before you draft.
- **SSPDBG.** AB 126, Section 76 added $5 billion for 2026-27, allocated by average daily attendance. No application is required. The 2026-27 funds may be spent through 2031-32. One listed use is "community school and promising neighborhood partnerships pursuant to the California Community Schools Partnership Act."
- **LREBG.** These one-time funds support academic learning recovery and staff and pupil social and emotional well-being through 2027-28. A district must complete a needs assessment before it includes LREBG funds in the LCAP. Each LREBG action must state its rationale, its research support, at least one metric and the LREBG amount.

The PLUS class and Direction also give the district documented student input for LCAP planning. Every 30-day cycle produces survey data from a representative sample of students and a written report from a student-facilitated Forum.

Writer's note. The LCAP is a plan your board adopts and your county office reviews and approves. No one scores it. Write so a parent on your District Advisory Committee can follow it. Replace every figure with your own Dashboard data, LREBG needs assessment findings and block grant allocations. Ask your business office for the LREBG balance and the SSPDBG allocation before you set amounts.

PLAN SUMMARY EXCERPT: REFLECTIONS: ANNUAL PERFORMANCE

Coyote Mesa Unified has unexpended LREBG funds for 2027-28. The district has one LREBG action in this LCAP, Goal 3, Action 3.2. Its rationale appears in the action description. The rationale shows alignment with the allowable uses in Education Code Section 32526(c)(2) and with the district's needs assessment under Section 32526(d).

Writer's note. The template asks districts with unexpended LREBG funds to say so here and list each LREBG goal and action number. The 2027-28 LCAP must also review the LREBG rationale written in 2025-26 to judge whether the strategy worked. Add a sentence or two on that review.

GOAL 3

GOAL #	DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF GOAL
3	Middle and high school students in Coyote Mesa Unified will attend safe and connected campuses where students help find the patterns that keep them from school and lead the response alongside adults. By June 2030 the district will reduce chronic absenteeism, suspensions and reported bullying in grades 6 to 12.	Focus Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal: Priority 5 (Pupil Engagement) and Priority 6 (School Climate).

AN EXPLANATION OF WHY THE LEA HAS DEVELOPED THIS GOAL

Coyote Mesa Unified serves about 9,400 secondary students at three high schools and four middle schools. Sixty-eight percent are unduplicated students. On the 2026 Dashboard, the chronic absenteeism indicator for the middle school grades was in the orange level. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students and English learners were in the red level. DataQuest shows the same pattern in grades 9 to 12. Two high schools had suspension rates in the orange level.

The LREBG needs assessment and a spring 2027 Direction pilot at all seven schools pointed to the same pattern. Students who missed school most often described conflict and exclusion between students. In the pilot, 9.4 percent of sampled students in grades 9 to 12 reported being bullied on campus in the last 30 days. The Direction norm for grades 9 to 12 is 6 percent. Every high school received a warning indicator. In

focus groups, students named group chats, rumors and being left out at lunch as reasons some students stay home.

Every secondary school already runs PBIS, and the district uses an MTSS framework. Site teams said they had attendance and discipline data. They did not have a regular way to learn from students what drove the numbers. Teachers, principals and the District Advisory Committee asked for a focus goal that adds student voice to those systems.

> **Writer's note.** A focus goal must be specific, measurable and time-bound, and the explanation must rest on Dashboard or local data. Lead with your Dashboard levels and the student groups in the lowest levels. Then add one local source that explains the reasons behind the numbers. Name the systems PLUS will connect to in your district.

MEASURING AND REPORTING RESULTS

METRIC #	METRIC	BASELINE	YEAR 1 OUTCOME	YEAR 2 OUTCOME	TARGET FOR YEAR 3 OUTCOME	CURRENT DIFFERENCE FROM BASELINE
3.1	Chronic absenteeism, grades 7 to 12, all students (Priority 5, DataQuest)	22.6% (2025-26)	20.9% (2027-28)		16.5%	Down 1.7 points
3.2	Chronic absenteeism, grades 7 to 12, socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students and English learners (EL) (Priority 5, DataQuest)	SED 27.3%, EL 29.1% (2025-26)	SED 25.0%, EL 26.8% (2027-28)		SED 19.5%, EL 21.0%	SED and EL each down 2.3 points
3.3	Suspension rate, grades 7 to 12 (Priority 6, Dashboard)	6.1% (2025-26)	5.4% (2027-28)		4.0%	Down 0.7 points
3.4	Sampled students in grades 9 to 12 reporting they were bullied on campus in the last 30 days (Priority 6, Direction, average of nine cycles)	9.4% (spring 2027 pilot)	8.1% (2027-28)		6.0% or lower	Down 1.3 points
3.5	Sampled students in grades 6 to 12 reporting an adult on campus checked in with them in the last 30 days (Priority 6, Direction)	61% (spring 2027 pilot)	65% (2027-28)		75%	Up 4 points

METRIC #	METRIC	BASELINE	YEAR 1 OUTCOME	YEAR 2 OUTCOME	TARGET FOR YEAR 3 OUTCOME	CURRENT DIFFERENCE FROM BASELINE
3.6	PLUS cycle reports delivered to site PBIS and MTSS teams and the district office (optional local metric for student input)	0 (2026-27)	63 (2027-28)		63 each year	Up 63

Writer's note. Use the template's column names. When you first adopt a goal, the Year 1 Outcome column is blank and is filled in the next year. Sample values appear here so you can see how the columns work. Each LREBG action needs at least one metric. Each contributing action needs a metric for unduplicated students, which is the job of Metric 3.2. Direction draws a new representative sample each cycle. Its results describe the campus and never individual students. Keep Direction items in the "In the last 30 days" form so they measure experiences.

ACTIONS

ACTION #	TITLE	DESCRIPTION	TOTAL FUNDS	CONTRIBUTING
3.1	PLUS Program at all middle and high schools	See below.	$168,000 (2027-28)	Yes
3.2	PLUS start-up and Advisor preparation (LREBG action)	See below.	$59,325 (2027-28)	No

Action 3.1 description. The district will implement the PLUS (Peer Leaders Uniting Students) Program at its three high schools and four middle schools. PLUS is an evidence-based school climate program used in California schools for about 25 years. It uses youth participatory action research. Students gather and analyze data about their own school and lead the response alongside adults.

At each school, a PLUS Team of 25 to 30 students meets in a dedicated class section. The Advisor selects the team to reflect the student body. Members are not elected and hold no offices. A PLUS staff team of an administrator, a counselor or PBIS lead, and the Advisor guides the work. The district prioritizes student leadership by funding the class section in each master schedule.

Each school runs a 30-day cycle nine times a year, after an August pre-cycle where students learn the process.

1. **Protective factors.** The PLUS Team leads youth development activities during the school day that build connection and belonging.

2. **Data integration.** Direction surveys a new representative sample of less than 10 percent of the campus with the same questions each cycle. A student-facilitated Forum gathers qualitative data from a new group each month: 40 to 50 students in high school and 25 to 30 in middle school. The Forum identifies the top four critical issues.
3. **Action planning.** Students review both kinds of data and plan the activities the campus needs. A cycle report goes to the principal, counselors, PBIS and MTSS teams and the district office.
4. **Engagement.** Students carry out the activities, share the data with the school community and measure again the next cycle.

Each Advisor is funded at 0.2 FTE. That covers the class section plus 0.1 FTE for collaboration on the site PBIS team, MTSS team and school safety committee. At Ridgeline High School and Juniper Middle School, the Advisor also serves on the community school shared decision-making team. The Advisor brings each cycle's data to those teams and carries their decisions back to the class.

Required description for a contributing action. Unduplicated students have higher chronic absenteeism than all students (Metric 3.2). In focus groups, socioeconomically disadvantaged students and English learners named exclusion and conflict between students as reasons they miss school. PLUS Teams are selected to reflect the student body. Each month's Forum draws a new representative group. Unduplicated students therefore help decide what each campus addresses. The action is schoolwide because the patterns it targets happen across each campus. Metric 3.2 measures its effect on unduplicated students.

Research support. A quasi-experimental study with propensity score matching followed 153 students in a year-long PLUS elective at six high schools in one California district. Participation significantly improved attendance compared to similar peers (*Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*). Abraczinskas et al. (2022) examine integrating youth participatory action research into schoolwide PBIS to prevent bullying and improve school climate.

Funding. LCFF supplemental and concentration: $120,000. SSPDBG: $48,000 for the Advisors at the two community schools. Metrics 3.1 to 3.5.

Action 3.2 description (LREBG action). This is an LREBG action. LREBG amount: $59,325. It funds one-time start-up costs for Action 3.1 in 2027-28: first-year PLUS Districtwide subscriptions, a five-day on-site rollout for all seven staff teams, substitute release for that training, and PLUS Advisor Institute registration, lodging and travel for seven Advisors. The research cited in Action 3.1 supports this action. The rationale follows below. Metrics 3.1, 3.2 and 3.6.

> **Writer's note.** Write each description so a reader new to PLUS understands what happens at a school each month. Present PLUS as the mechanism that connects student data to your PBIS, MTSS and community schools work. A schoolwide contributing action must state the need of unduplicated students, how the action meets it and why it is schoolwide, and the metric that measures it. An LREBG action must be labeled, state the LREBG amount, explain its research support and name a metric. Keep one-time costs in a separate action so it can leave the LCAP once the LREBG funds are spent.

LREBG NEEDS ASSESSMENT RATIONALE FOR ACTION 3.2

Coyote Mesa Unified completed its LREBG needs assessment in spring 2025 for 2025-26 through 2027-28. The county office of education supported the review under contract. The needs assessment reviewed chronic absenteeism for all students, for student groups in the "Very High" and "High" Dashboard levels and for high schools with comparatively low performance. It also reviewed English language arts and mathematics results, as the needs assessment requires, and the district addresses those findings in Goals 1 and 2. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students and English learners in grades 7 to 12 had the highest chronic absenteeism in the district. The two high schools with the highest absenteeism also had the highest rates of reported peer conflict on the district's local climate survey.

From the allowable uses in Education Code Section 32526(c)(2), the district selected integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, and staff supports and training, including programs to address social-emotional learning. Action 3.2 prepares staff to run an evidence-based program aimed at a barrier the needs assessment found. That barrier is conflict and exclusion between students that keep students home. All seven secondary schools receive the action because each showed chronic absenteeism above the state rate for its grade span. The district expects lower chronic absenteeism for all students and for unduplicated students (Metrics 3.1 and 3.2). It will confirm that student input reaches site and district teams every cycle (Metric 3.6). The district will review this rationale in the annual update and adjust the strategy if the metrics do not move.

> **Writer's note.** This paragraph carries the most legal weight. The statute asks for the rationale for selecting among permissible uses based on the needs assessment, and how the action is expected to address the need for the pupils or schools with the greatest need, based on one or more metrics. Name your needs assessment date and years, the Dashboard groups it found and the allowable use in its own terms. Tie PLUS to attendance, climate and social and emotional well-being. Do not claim academic outcomes.

ENGAGING EDUCATIONAL PARTNERS EXCERPT

EDUCATIONAL PARTNER(S)	PROCESS FOR ENGAGEMENT
Students	Spring 2027 Direction pilot at all seven secondary schools. Student focus groups at each school in March 2027. Student members of the District Advisory Committee. From 2027-28, nine PLUS cycle reports per school each year.
Teachers and other school personnel	Site staff meetings in February 2027. PBIS and MTSS team input sessions. Staff survey.
Principals and administrators	Secondary principals' meetings in January and March 2027.

EDUCATIONAL PARTNER(S)	PROCESS FOR ENGAGEMENT
Local bargaining units	Meetings with certificated and classified units in April 2027.
Parents and families	District Advisory Committee and District English Learner Advisory Committee. Parent survey by QR code in English and Spanish.
SELPA administrator	Meeting in April 2027.

A description of how the adopted LCAP was influenced by the feedback provided by educational partners.

Students shaped Goal 3 more than any other goal. The Direction pilot showed bullying and exclusion above the norm at every high school. Focus groups connected those experiences to absences. Students asked for a way to keep telling adults what was happening throughout the year. That request led to Action 3.1 and Metric 3.6. PBIS teams asked that any new program feed the teams they already had, which led to the 0.1 FTE collaboration time. The District English Learner Advisory Committee asked that PLUS Teams reflect English learners. That request is now in the Action 3.1 description. Bargaining units asked for a defined Advisor role, set at 0.2 FTE.

From 2027-28, PLUS gives the district a standing record of student input. Each cycle report states the top four critical issues students named, the data behind them and the activities the PLUS Team carried out. Direction adds results by grade level and student group, trends over time and a report for the board. The year's cycle reports and Direction trends become student input for the next annual update. Information moves up from the PLUS class to the site administrator, PBIS and MTSS teams, district office and school board. Decisions come back down to the class and the campus.

> **Writer's note.** Students are a required partner group. Most districts hear from students once a year. PLUS and Direction produce documented student input nine times a year at every PLUS school. Say who saw the cycle reports, which decisions they informed and what changed. Show influence for each partner group.

THREE-YEAR COST AND FUNDING PLAN FOR GOAL 3

The LCAP shows each action's funds one year at a time. This table shows the three-year plan behind those amounts. The Advisor cost uses an illustrative $120,000 salary and benefits.

LINE ITEM	ACTION	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	TOTAL
PLUS Advisor, 0.2 FTE at seven schools ($24,000 each, illustrative)	3.1	$168,000	$168,000	$168,000	$504,000
PLUS Districtwide site subscriptions, seven at $1,495	3.2, then 3.1	$10,465	$10,465	$10,465	$31,395

LINE ITEM	ACTION	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	TOTAL
PLUS Districtwide district subscription	3.2, then 3.1	$2,995	$2,995	$2,995	$8,985
On-site rollout training, five days at $3,500	3.2	$17,500	$0	$0	$17,500
Trainer travel and lodging (illustrative)	3.2	$2,500	$0	$0	$2,500
Substitute release, 42 days at $200 (illustrative)	3.2	$8,400	$0	$0	$8,400
Advisor Institute registration, seven at $1,495	3.2	$10,465	$0	$0	$10,465
Advisor Institute lodging, seven at 3 nights x $250	3.2	$5,250	$0	$0	$5,250
Advisor Institute travel, seven at $250	3.2	$1,750	$0	$0	$1,750
Total		**$227,325**	**$181,460**	**$181,460**	**$590,245**

FUNDING SOURCE	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	TOTAL
LCFF supplemental and concentration (Action 3.1)	$120,000	$130,470	$130,470	$380,940
SSPDBG, community school share (Action 3.1)	$48,000	$50,990	$50,990	$149,980
LREBG (Action 3.2)	$59,325	$0	$0	$59,325
Total	**$227,325**	**$181,460**	**$181,460**	**$590,245**

BUDGET NARRATIVE

1. **PLUS Advisor, 0.2 FTE per school ($504,000).** Each Advisor teaches the class section and spends 0.1 FTE on the site PBIS team, MTSS team and school safety committee. This time is how each cycle's data reaches the adults who make decisions. SSPDBG pays for the Advisors at Ridgeline High School and Juniper Middle School, where PLUS is part of the community school partnership. LCFF supplemental and concentration funds pay for the other five.
2. **PLUS Districtwide subscriptions ($40,380).** Districtwide pricing applies at five or more sites. Each school receives the online subscription with unlimited Direction and the activity resource database, the PLUS curriculum, one conference registration and one 2-Day training registration for a new staff member each year. The district subscription adds results across sites and student groups, district alerts, raw data download and a report for the board. LREBG pays for Year 1. After that, SSPDBG pays $2,990 a year for the two community schools and LCFF pays $10,470.
3. **On-site rollout ($17,500) with trainer travel and lodging ($2,500).** Days 1 and 2 are the 2-Day PLUS Program Development Training. Day 3 covers data implementation, Day 4 activity implementation and Day 5 a final follow-up. It prepares all seven staff teams to run the program schoolwide.

4. **Substitute release ($8,400).** Three members of each of the seven staff teams are released for two training days.
5. **PLUS Advisor Institute ($17,465).** The Institute is held each June in Temecula. It prepares each Advisor to teach the PLUS class and lead its activities. It provides lunches and refreshments, and the district covers lodging and travel. The $995 renewal is due every three years, outside this cycle.

> **Writer's note.** PLUS recommends that each Advisor attend the Institute in the June before teaching the first PLUS class. If your LCAP year begins after that June, fund the first Institute from the prior year's funds or plan for Advisors to attend before their second year. 6. **Student leadership training.** This optional training carries an added cost. The district will request a quote before deciding on it for Year 2.
>
> **Writer's note.** Check every row and total. In the LCAP action tables, SSPDBG and LREBG go in the other state funds column. Use current pricing from plusprogram.org/costs or call 866.403.9484. With fewer than five sites, use the single school price of $3,495 for the first year and $1,495 a year after with a three-year agreement. Confirm with your business office that each SSPDBG cost fits a listed use.

SUSTAINABILITY

Ongoing costs fall on the district's most stable source. After 2027-28, LCFF supplemental and concentration funds carry most of the cost. SSPDBG covers the community school share through 2029-30. The 2026-27 funds remain available through 2031-32. The next LCAP will plan for LCFF to absorb that share when SSPDBG is spent. Each year's subscription includes a 2-Day training registration for a new staff member. Staff changes do not add training costs. Cycle reports and Direction trends go to the board each year with the annual update.

> **Writer's note.** Name the year each source ends and what replaces it. You may note that more than 80 percent of PLUS schools renew each year, and that Stockton Unified (since 2012), Hemet Unified (since 2010) and Lake Elsinore Unified (over 10 years) have sustained PLUS.

EVIDENCE BASE

PLUS meets the ESSA level of moderate evidence (Tier 2), which rests on at least one well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study.

1. "Youth Participatory Action Research in the High School Curriculum: Education Outcomes for Student Participants in a District-Wide Initiative." *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness.* PDF
2. Abraczinskas, M., Kornbluh, M., Golden, A. R., Glende, J., Velez, V., Vines, E., and Ozer, E. J. (2022). "Preventing Bullying and Improving School Climate Through Integrating Youth Participatory Action Research Into School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports." *Journal of Prevention and Health Promotion,* 3(2). PDF

3. Cohen, A. K., Ozer, E. J., Abraczinskas, M., Voight, A., Kirshner, B., and Devinney, M. (2019). "Opportunities for Youth Participatory Action Research to Inform School District Decisions." *Evidence and Policy.* PDF
4. Gauna, R. (2017). "The Peer Leaders Uniting Students (PLUS) Program: The Impact on School Climate, Student Engagement, and Student Mentoring." Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University Irvine. PDF

Research teams at UC Berkeley, the University of Oregon and the University of Florida continue to study PLUS. A five-year University of Oregon study of student voice in California high schools, funded by the William T. Grant Foundation, is underway.

SOURCES

- CDE: Student Support and Professional Development Discretionary Block Grant
- CDE: Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant Program Information
- CDE: LCAP Template Instructions
- CDE: Local Control and Accountability Plan
- CDE: LCFF State Priority Resources
- CDE: CSI LEA Authorized Use of Funds (ESSA evidence levels)