School Year: **2026-27**

School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)

School Name	County-District-School (CDS) Code	Schoolsite Council (SSC) Approval Date	Local Board Approval Date
George and Evelyn Stein High School	39-75499-0114140	April 23, 2026	June 9, 2026

The School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) is a strategic plan that maximizes the resources available to the school while minimizing duplication of effort with the ultimate goal of increasing student achievement. SPSA development should be aligned with and inform the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) process.

This SPSA template consolidates all school-level planning efforts into one plan for programs funded through the Consolidated Application (ConApp), and for federal Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), pursuant to California Education Code (EC) Section 64001 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This template is designed to meet schoolwide program planning requirements for both the SPSA and federal ATSI planning requirements.

California's ESSA State Plan supports the state's approach to improving student group performance through the utilization of federal resources. Schools use the SPSA to document their approach to maximizing the impact of federal investments in support of underserved students. The implementation of ESSA in California presents an opportunity for schools to innovate with their federally-funded programs and align them with the priority goals of the school and the local educational agency (LEA) that are being realized under the state's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF).

The LCFF provides schools and LEAs flexibility to design programs and provide services that meet the needs of students in order to achieve readiness for college, career, and lifelong learning. The SPSA planning process supports continuous cycles of action, reflection, and improvement. Consistent with EC 64001(g)(1), the Schoolsite Council (SSC) is required to develop and annually review the SPSA, establish an annual budget, and make modifications to the plan that reflect changing needs and priorities, as applicable.

This plan is being used by George and Evelyn Stein High School for meeting the following ESSA planning requirements in alignment with the LCAP and other federal, state, and local programs:

- Schoolwide Program

This template is based on the December, 2023 CDE revision of the School Plan for Student Achievement. Some modifications have been made to inform the SPSA development process.

Table of Contents

SPSA Title Page 1
Table of Contents 3
Plan Description 4
Educational Partner Involvement 4
Resource Inequities 4
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components 5
    California School Dashboard (Dashboard) Indicators 5
    Other Needs 6
School and Student Performance Data 7
    Student Enrollment 7
    CAASPP Results 9
    ELPAC Results 13
    Student Population 15
    Overall Performance 17
    Academic Performance 19
    Academic Engagement 28
    Conditions & Climate 31
Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures 33
    Goal 1 33
    Goal 2 44
    Goal 3 50
Budget Summary 57
    Budget Summary 57
    Other Federal, State, and Local Funds 57

Plan Description

Briefly describe your school's plan for effectively meeting ESSA's planning requirements in alignment with the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and other federal, state, and local programs.

This plan is being used by George and Evelyn Stein High School for meeting the following ESSA planning requirements in alignment with the LCAP and other federal, state, and local programs:

Schoolwide Program

Our plan has been developed with input from all appropriate educational partners. School Site Council (SSC), Site Safety Committee, site English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC), teachers and other staff contributed to the development the student achievement plan. The contents of Stein's plan are aligned with goals established by the school. Stein will empower students to identify and pursue their personal, academic, and career goals by providing a rigorous alternative education environment that accommodates a variety of needs. Stein is designed to provide the maximum flexibility so that students may achieve a high school diploma, set individual goals, and become responsible for their future. The plan is reviewed often during Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Site Leadership Meetings, English Learner Advisory Committee meetings, and School Site Council in order to asses student progress towards meeting grade level standards. The implementation of Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) provides an opportunity to align goals, while being held accountable working towards meeting students needs. Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) provides schools and Local Education Agency's (LEA's) the ability to design programs and provide services to meet students needs while preparing them to be 21st Century life long learners.

Educational Partner Involvement

How, when, and with whom did George and Evelyn Stein High School consult as part of the planning process for this SPSA/Annual Review and Update?

Involvement Process for the SPSA and Annual Review and Update

Stein works together with educational partners to create a SPSA that is representative of overall goals, instruction and growth. Teachers, administrators, para-educators and members of School Site Council (SSC) and English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC) conducts a needs assessment survey to evaluate data such as SBAC/graduation rates and student feedback to inform decisions. During Professional Learning Communities, teachers evaluate data to inform instruction and advise needs of students. Data collected from SBAC scores, California Dashboard (DASS), student interest survey and Grad Exit Surveys are discussed in groups during designated PLC time. The analysis is lead by the Site Leadership Team and School Site Council providing insight.

School Site Council Meetings, LAC and Alternative Education Parent Workshops are held consecutively, every quarter.

LCAP Student Survey: February 2026
LCAP Staff Survey: February 2026
LCAP Parent/Community Survey: February 2026

Alternative Education: SSC Meetings: September 3, 2025, October 1, 2025, February 18, 2026, March 24, 2026, April 23, 2026,
ELAC Meetings: October 15, 2025, January 28, 2026, March 18, 2026

Site Leadership Goals Assessment: February 2026

Staff Goals Assessment: March 2026

Resource Inequities

Briefly identify and describe any resource inequities identified as a result of the required needs assessment, as applicable.

This section is required for all schools eligible for ATSI and CSI.

Stein serves students who are 16 years old, credit deficient, and not on track to graduate from high school. Challenges such as frequent absences, tardiness, low motivation, and a lack of connection to school hinder their academic success. The two largest student subgroups at Stein are Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students (89.4%) and English Learners (28.5%). A recent needs assessment revealed strong interest in gaining real-world experiences, support for

post-graduation planning and transition. Graduating students are asked to complete an exit survey. From August to April, 53 graduates participated in the survey. Key takeaways from the collected data include: The Vision/advisory structure and staff culture are highly effective. Students leave with a sense of direction and feel respected and supported. While most students feel challenged, a significant group does not. This points to inconsistency across classrooms or courses. Systems for college/career readiness exist, but access is uneven. Exposure to real-world pathways is not guaranteed for all students. Students are consistently monitoring credits and progress. This is a major strength of the model. Positive climate overall, but peer-to-peer culture still has variability. Instruction is still heavily independent. Opportunities for collaboration are not widespread. Students are using technology, but not consistently across all classes or in rigorous ways (e.g., presentations, projects).

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components

Identify and describe any areas that need significant improvement based on a review of Dashboard and local data, including any areas of low performance and significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators, and any steps taken to address those areas.

California School Dashboard (Dashboard) Indicators

Referring to the California School Dashboard (Dashboard), any state indicator for which overall performance was in the "Red" or "Orange" performance category.

A review of the 2025 California School Dashboard indicates a different performance context for Stein High School. Both the English Learner (EL) and Long-Term English Learner (LTEL) Progress indicators do not have a performance color due to small student group sizes; however, the available data shows that 25.9% of English Learners (27 students) and 31.8% of Long-Term English Learners (22 students) are making progress toward English proficiency. While both groups demonstrated growth compared to the prior year (increases of 4.5% and 9.6%, respectively), the overall percentage of students making progress remains an area for continued focus. This suggests a need to strengthen and consistently implement targeted English Language Development (ELD) strategies to accelerate language acquisition outcomes for all students.

Additionally, the 2025 California School Dashboard indicates that the College/Career Indicator remains in the Red performance category for Stein High School. While there has been a slight increase in students classified as "Prepared" over time (reaching 1.6% for the Class of 2025), the vast majority of students (96.7%) are still identified as "Not Prepared." Student group data reflects similar trends, with Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students also in the Red category and only 1.8% meeting the "Prepared" level.

These results point to a persistent gap in ensuring students graduate with the academic, technical, and employability skills required for postsecondary success. The data suggests a need to expand and more consistently implement college and career readiness systems, including CTE pathway completion, A–G course access, dual enrollment opportunities, and structured postsecondary planning supports.
The suspension rate for Long-Term English Learners is another area of concern, falling into the Orange category, with a rate of 7.4%, representing a 2.8% increase from the prior year. This suggests a need for more behavioral supports, restorative practices, and interventions tailored specifically to the needs of our students.

Collectively, these indicators underscore the urgency of implementing individualized academic planning, expanding college and career readiness programming, and strengthening both language development and social-emotional supports for English Learners and other priority learners.

Referring to the California School Dashboard (Dashboard), any state indicator for which performance for any student group was two or more performance levels below the "all student" performance.

A review of the 2025 California School Dashboard data indicates that there are no state indicators in which any student group performed two or more performance levels below the "All Students" group. In most academic indicators, including English Language Arts, Mathematics, and English Learner Progress, both the overall student group and disaggregated student groups received "No Performance Color" due to small sample sizes, limiting direct comparisons across performance levels. In the College/Career Indicator, "All Students" are in the Red category, with Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students also in Red and English Learners, Long-Term English Learners, and Hispanic students in Orange, reflecting performance at or above the overall group rather than below . Similarly, in Graduation Rate and Suspension Rate, student groups generally performed at or above the "All Students" level, with several groups exceeding overall performance (e.g., Long-Term English Learners in Graduation Rate at Blue compared to Green for All Students) . Overall, the data does not identify any student group performing two or more levels below the schoolwide performance; however, the prevalence of "No Performance Color" highlights a limitation in available data and

underscores the need for continued monitoring and targeted support as group sizes increase and more comparable data becomes available.

Other Needs

In addition to Dashboard data, other needs may be identified using locally collected data developed by the LEA to measure pupil outcomes.

In addition to the areas of concern highlighted by the California School Dashboard, such as English Learner progress, College/Career preparedness, and suspension rates locally collected data further emphasizes the need for purposeful support at Stein High School. Graduation exit surveys indicate students are seeking more rigorous academic experiences, consistent use of technology, increased peer respect, and stronger access to postsecondary guidance. Additionally, internal academic tracking systems show low literacy and numeracy levels upon enrollment, reinforcing the urgency of early academic diagnostics and interventions. Feedback from staff and student focus groups also points to a need for expanded mental health services, real-world learning opportunities, and increased student engagement initiatives. Together, these data sources highlight the importance of a comprehensive, student-centered approach that addresses both academic and social-emotional hurdles to success.

School and Student Performance Data

Student Enrollment

This report displays the annual K-12 public school enrollment by student ethnicity and grade level for George and Evelyn Stein High School. Annual enrollment consists of the number of students enrolled on Census Day (the first Wednesday in October). This information was submitted to the CDE as part of the annual Fall 1 data submission in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

Enrollment By Student Group

Student Enrollment by Subgroup						
Student Group	Percent of Enrollment			Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
American Indian	0.81%	0.81%	0.83%	1	1	1
African American	4.88%	4.88%	7.44%	6	6	9
Asian	4.07%	1.63%	4.96%	5	2	6
Filipino	2.44%	3.25%	0.83%	3	4	1
Hispanic/Latino	69.11%	79.67%	64.46%	85	98	78
Pacific Islander	1.63%	1.63%	0.83%	2	2	1
White	11.38%	7.32%	15.70%	14	9	19
Two or More Races	5.69%	0.81%	4.96%	7	1	6
Not Reported	0%	%	%	0		
			Total Enrollment	123	123	121

Enrollment By Grade Level

Student Enrollment by Grade Level			
Grade	Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	37	32	31
Grade 12	86	91	90
Total Enrollment	123	123	121

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Enrollment remains stable with slight fluctuation, decreasing marginally from 123 students in 2022–23 and 2023–24 to 121 students in 2024–25, indicating consistent overall enrollment at Stein High School.
2. The student population is predominantly Hispanic/Latino, though the percentage declined from 79.67% in 2023–24 to 64.46% in 2024–25, while other groups such as White (15.70%) and African American (7.44%) students increased, reflecting an expanding demographic of our student population.
3. Grade-level enrollment is heavily concentrated in Grade 12, with approximately three-quarters of students enrolled as seniors each year (90 students in 2024–25), reinforcing Stein's role as a continuation high school focused on credit recovery and supporting students nearing graduation.

School and Student Performance Data

English Learner (EL) Enrollment

This report displays the annual K-12 public school enrollment by English Language Acquisition Status (ELAS). This information was submitted to the CDE as part of the annual Fall 1 data submission in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

English Learner (EL) Enrollment						
Student Group	Number of Students			Percent of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
English Learners	30	35	33	24.4%	28.5%	27.3%
Fluent English Proficient (FEP)	38	27	23	30.9%	22.0%	19.0%
Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP)	36			29.3%		

Conclusions based on this data:

1. English Learner enrollment remains a significant portion of the student population.
2. The percentage of Fluent English Proficient (FEP) students has steadily declined.
3. Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) data indicates a portion of students have successfully transitioned, though the lack of complete multi-year data limits trend analysis; this highlights the importance of strengthening reclassification pathways and monitoring long-term outcomes for English Learners.

School and Student Performance Data

CAASPP Results
English Language Arts/Literacy (All Students)

The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics are an annual measure of what students know and can do using the Common Core State Standards for English language arts/literacy and mathematics.

The purpose of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments is to assess student knowledge and skills for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics, as well as how much students have improved since the previous year. These measures help identify and address gaps in knowledge or skills early so students get the support they need for success in higher grades and for college and career readiness.

All students in grades three through eight and grade eleven take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments unless a student's active individualized education program (IEP) designates the California Alternate Assessments.

Visit the California Department of Education's Smarter Balanced Assessment System web page for more information.

Overall Participation for All Students												
Grade Level	# of Students Enrolled			# of Students Tested			# of Students with Scores			% of Enrolled Students Tested		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	69	65	54	64	63	50	64	63	50	92.8	96.9	92.6
All Grades	69	65	54	64	63	50	64	63	50	92.8	96.9	92.6

The "% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability purposes.

Overall Achievement for All Students															
Grade Level	Mean Scale Score			% Standard Exceeded			% Standard Met			% Standard Nearly Met			% Standard Not Met		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	2492.	2473.	2456.	1.56	3.17	0.00	9.38	7.94	8.00	39.06	31.75	30.00	50.00	57.14	62.00
All Grades	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.56	3.17	0.00	9.38	7.94	8.00	39.06	31.75	30.00	50.00	57.14	62.00

Reading Demonstrating understanding of literary and non-fictional texts									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	6.25	3.17	4.00	59.38	55.56	42.00	34.38	41.27	54.00
All Grades	6.25	3.17	4.00	59.38	55.56	42.00	34.38	41.27	54.00

Writing Producing clear and purposeful writing									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	0.00	4.76	0.00	40.63	36.51	28.00	59.38	58.73	72.00
All Grades	0.00	4.76	0.00	40.63	36.51	28.00	59.38	58.73	72.00

Listening Demonstrating effective communication skills									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	1.56	0.00	2.00	79.69	68.25	78.00	18.75	31.75	20.00
All Grades	1.56	0.00	2.00	79.69	68.25	78.00	18.75	31.75	20.00

Research/Inquiry Investigating, analyzing, and presenting information									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	1.56	3.17	2.00	65.63	69.84	58.00	32.81	26.98	40.00
All Grades	1.56	3.17	2.00	65.63	69.84	58.00	32.81	26.98	40.00

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall ELA performance is declining along with an increase in students not meeting standards (from 50% to 62%), indicating a widening achievement gap.
2. A majority of students are performing below standard across key literacy domains, particularly in writing.

School and Student Performance Data

CAASPP Results
Mathematics (All Students)

The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics are an annual measure of what students know and can do using the Common Core State Standards for English language arts/literacy and mathematics.

The purpose of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments is to assess student knowledge and skills for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics, as well as how much students have improved since the previous year. These measures help identify and address gaps in knowledge or skills early so students get the support they need for success in higher grades and for college and career readiness.

All students in grades three through eight and grade eleven take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments unless a student's active individualized education program (IEP) designates the California Alternate Assessments.

Visit the California Department of Education's Smarter Balanced Assessment System web page for more information.

Overall Participation for All Students												
Grade Level	# of Students Enrolled			# of Students Tested			# of Students with Scores			% of Enrolled Students Tested		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	73	65	55	65	61	49	65	61	49	89.0	93.8	89.1
All Grades	73	65	55	65	61	49	65	61	49	89.0	93.8	89.1

* The "% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability purposes.

Overall Achievement for All Students															
Grade Level	Mean Scale Score			% Standard Exceeded			% Standard Met			% Standard Nearly Met			% Standard Not Met		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	2410.	2413.	2394.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.04	4.62	1.64	4.08	95.38	98.36	93.88
All Grades	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.04	4.62	1.64	4.08	95.38	98.36	93.88

Concepts & Procedures Applying mathematical concepts and procedures									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.23	8.20	4.08	90.77	91.80	95.92
All Grades	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.23	8.20	4.08	90.77	91.80	95.92

Problem Solving & Modeling/Data Analysis Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	0.00	0.00	2.04	50.77	40.98	34.69	49.23	59.02	63.27
All Grades	0.00	0.00	2.04	50.77	40.98	34.69	49.23	59.02	63.27

Communicating Reasoning Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 11	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.92	50.82	38.78	63.08	49.18	61.22
All Grades	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.92	50.82	38.78	63.08	49.18	61.22

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall mathematics performance remains critically low.
2. Students demonstrate substantial deficits in foundational math skills.
3. Performance in higher-order thinking domains shows inconsistency and decline.

School and Student Performance Data

The English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) system is used to determine and monitor the progress of the English language proficiency for students whose primary language is not English. The ELPAC is aligned with the 2012 California English Language Development Standards and assesses four domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Visit the California Department of Education's English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) web page or the ELPAC.org website for more information about the ELPAC.

ELPAC Results

ELPAC Summative Assessment Data
Number of Students and Mean Scale Scores for All Students

Grade Level	Overall			Oral Language			Written Language			Number of Students Tested		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
11	1562.5	1544.6	*	1570.1	1545.8	*	1554.2	1542.9	*	17	16	10
12	1534.0	1546.4	1522.6	1544.1	1550.5	1520.8	1523.4	1541.9	1524.2	17	28	19
All Grades										34	44	29

Overall Language
Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students

Grade Level	Level 4			Level 3			Level 2			Level 1			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
11	23.53	6.25	*	29.41	43.75	*	41.18	18.75	*	5.88	31.25	*	17	16	*
12	11.76	7.14	0.00	5.88	50.00	36.84	58.82	25.00	36.84	23.53	17.86	26.32	17	28	19
All Grades	17.65	6.82	3.45	17.65	47.73	31.03	50.00	22.73	34.48	14.71	22.73	31.03	34	44	29

Oral Language
Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students

Grade Level	Level 4			Level 3			Level 2			Level 1			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
11	35.29	37.50	*	47.06	31.25	*	11.76	25.00	*	5.88	6.25	*	17	16	*
12	17.65	32.14	36.84	52.94	35.71	26.32	29.41	25.00	15.79	0.00	7.14	21.05	17	28	19
All Grades	26.47	34.09	34.48	50.00	34.09	24.14	20.59	25.00	24.14	2.94	6.82	17.24	34	44	29

Written Language
Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students

Grade Level	Level 4			Level 3			Level 2			Level 1			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
11	0.00	0.00	*	23.53	18.75	*	47.06	37.50	*	29.41	43.75	*	17	16	*
12	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.76	14.29	15.79	23.53	50.00	26.32	64.71	35.71	57.89	17	28	19
All Grades	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.65	15.91	13.79	35.29	45.45	24.14	47.06	38.64	62.07	34	44	29

Listening Domain Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students												
Grade Level	Well Developed			Somewhat/Moderately			Beginning			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
11	5.88	0.00	*	76.47	62.50	*	17.65	37.50	*	17	16	*
12	0.00	3.57	0.00	76.47	67.86	52.63	23.53	28.57	47.37	17	28	19
All Grades	2.94	2.27	0.00	76.47	65.91	51.72	20.59	31.82	48.28	34	44	29

Speaking Domain Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students												
Grade Level	Well Developed			Somewhat/Moderately			Beginning			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
11	94.12	75.00	*	0.00	18.75	*	5.88	6.25	*	17	16	*
12	88.24	82.14	66.67	11.76	14.29	22.22	0.00	3.57	11.11	17	28	18
All Grades	91.18	79.55	71.43	5.88	15.91	17.86	2.94	4.55	10.71	34	44	28

Reading Domain Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students												
Grade Level	Well Developed			Somewhat/Moderately			Beginning			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
11	0.00	6.25	*	52.94	43.75	*	47.06	50.00	*	17	16	*
12	5.88	0.00	5.26	11.76	46.43	21.05	82.35	53.57	73.68	17	28	19
All Grades	2.94	2.27	6.90	32.35	45.45	20.69	64.71	52.27	72.41	34	44	29

Writing Domain Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students												
Grade Level	Well Developed			Somewhat/Moderately			Beginning			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
11	11.76	0.00	*	76.47	68.75	*	11.76	31.25	*	17	16	*
12	0.00	3.57	0.00	76.47	75.00	73.68	23.53	21.43	26.32	17	28	19
All Grades	5.88	2.27	0.00	76.47	72.73	68.97	17.65	25.00	31.03	34	44	29

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall English language proficiency remains low and has declined over time, with only 3.45% of students reaching Level 4 in 2024–25, down from 17.65% in 2022–23.
2. Written language is a significant area of need, with 62.07% of students performing at Level 1 in 2024–25 and 0% reaching Level 4.
3. Oral language shows relative strength compared to literacy domains, but still reflects declining performance.

School and Student Performance Data

Student Population

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

This section provides information about the school's student population.

2024-25 Student Population			
Total Enrollment	**Socioeconomically Disadvantaged**	**English Learners**	**Foster Youth**
121	**86.8%**	**27.3%**	**0.8%**
Total Number of Students enrolled in George and Evelyn Stein High School.	Students who are eligible for free or reduced priced meals; or have parents/guardians who did not receive a high school diploma.	Students who are learning to communicate effectively in English, typically requiring instruction in both the English Language and in their academic courses.	Students whose well being is the responsibility of a court.

2024-25 Enrollment for All Students/Student Group		
Student Group	**Total**	**Percentage**
English Learners	33	27.3%
Foster Youth	1	0.8%
Homeless	8	6.6%
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	105	86.8%
Students with Disabilities	16	13.2%

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity		
Student Group	**Total**	**Percentage**
African American	9	7.4%
American Indian	1	0.8%
Asian	6	5%
Filipino	1	0.8%
Hispanic	78	64.5%
Two or More Races	6	5%
Pacific Islander	1	0.8%
White	19	15.7%

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Stein High School serves a high-need student population, with 86.8% of students identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged, indicating a significant need for integrated academic, behavioral, and wraparound support systems.

2. English Learners represent a substantial portion of the student body (27.3%), reinforcing the importance of strong, consistent English Language Development (ELD) instruction across all content areas.
3. The student population is diverse, with a majority of Hispanic students (64.5%) and a growing representation of other racial/ethnic groups.

School and Student Performance Data

Overall Performance

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”


Red
Lowest Performance


Orange


Yellow


Green


Blue
Highest Performance

2025 Fall Dashboard Overall Performance for All Students

Academic Performance	Academic Engagement	Conditions & Climate
English Language Arts No Performance Color	**Graduation Rate** Green	**Suspension Rate** Green
Mathematics No Performance Color		
English Learner Progress No Performance Color		
College/Career Red		

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall performance reflects a mixed profile, with strong outcomes in Graduation Rate and Suspension Rate (both Green), indicates effective systems for student retention, completion, and school climate.
2. College and Career readiness remains a critical area of need.
3. The combination of strong engagement indicators and low college/career readiness suggests a disconnect between graduation and postsecondary preparedness.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance
English Language Arts

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”



Red

Lowest Performance



Orange



Yellow



Green



Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Equity Report				
Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
0	0	0	0	0

This section provides a view of how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the English Language Arts assessment. This measure is based on student performance on either the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11.

2025 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Performance for All Students/Student Group		
All Students	**English Learners**	**Long-Term English Learners**
 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color
124.7 points below standard	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy
Declined 19.7 points	10 Students	5 Students
23 Students		
Foster Youth	**Homeless**	**Socioeconomically Disadvantaged**
 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color
0 Students	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	112.7 points below standard
	0 Students	Declined 8.4 points
		19 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 3 Students	 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 2 Students	 No Performance Color 0 Students
Asian	**Filipino**	**Hispanic**
 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 2 Students	 No Performance Color 0 Students	 No Performance Color 132.7 points below standard Declined 23 points 14 Students
Two or More Races	**Pacific Islander**	**White**
 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 1 Student	 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 0 Students	 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 5 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall ELA performance is significantly below standard and declining.
2. The combination of low performance and declining trends suggests gaps in foundational literacy skills.
3. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and Hispanic students show similarly low performance trends.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance
Mathematics

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”



Red

Lowest Performance



Orange



Yellow



Green



Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Equity Report				
Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
0	0	0	0	0

This section provides a view of how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the Mathematics assessment. This measure is based on student performance either on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11.

2025 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Performance for All Students/Student Group

All Students	English Learners	Long-Term English Learners
		
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	No Performance Color
244.8 points below standard	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy
Declined 38 points	10 Students	5 Students
24 Students		

Foster Youth	Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
		
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	No Performance Color
0 Students	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	247.3 points below standard
	0 Students	Declined 42.5 points
		20 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 3 Students	 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 2 Students	 No Performance Color 0 Students
Asian	**Filipino**	**Hispanic**
 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 2 Students	 No Performance Color 0 Students	 No Performance Color 236.1 points below standard Declined 31.2 points 14 Students
Two or More Races	**Pacific Islander**	**White**
 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 1 Student	 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 0 Students	 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 6 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. The severity of the performance gap suggests foundational skill deficits in mathematics.
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and Hispanic students mirror overall trends, performing more than 230 points below standard and continuing to decline.
3. Mathematics performance is significantly below standard and declining at an accelerated rate, with All Students performing 244.8 points below standard and dropping an additional 38 points.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance
Science

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”



Red

Lowest Performance



Orange



Yellow



Green



Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Science Equity Report				
Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
1	0	0	0	0

This section provides a view of how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the Science assessment. This measure is based on student performance either on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11.

2025 Fall Dashboard Science Performance for All Students/Student Group

All Students	English Learners	Long-Term English Learners
 Red	 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color
22 science points	28.3 science points	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy
Maintained 0.8 points	Increased 2.4 points	8 Students
35 Students	13 Students	

Foster Youth	Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color	 Red
0 Students	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	21.2 science points
	5 Students	Maintained -1.7 points
		30 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 7 Students	 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 5 Students	 No Performance Color 0 Students

Asian	Filipino	Hispanic
 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 4 Students	 No Performance Color 0 Students	 No Performance Color 23.3 science points Increased 2.9 points 22 Students

Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
 No Performance Color 0 Students	 No Performance Color 0 Students	 No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 5 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Some student groups show modest growth, particularly English Learners (+2.4 points) and Hispanic students (+2.9 points), suggesting that targeted supports may be contributing to incremental improvement.
2. Overall science performance is in the Red category and remains low, with All Students earning 22 points and showing minimal change (+0.8).
3. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students mirror overall performance trends.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance
English Learner Progress

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”

This section provides a view of the percentage of current EL students making progress towards English language proficiency or maintaining the highest level.

2025 Fall Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator

English Learner Progress	Long-Term English Learner Progress
	
No Performance Color	No Performance Color
25.9 making progress.	31.8 making progress.
Number Students: 27 Students	Number Students: 22 Students

This section provides a view of the percentage of current EL students who progressed at least one ELPI level, maintained ELPI level 4, maintained lower ELPI levels (i.e, levels 1, 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H), or decreased at least one ELPI Level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Student English Language Acquisition Results

Decreased One ELPI Level	Maintained ELPI Level 1, 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H	Maintained ELPI Level 4	Progressed At Least One ELPI Level
29.6%	44.4%	3.7%	22.2%

Conclusions based on this data:

1. The overall distribution of results indicates a need for targeted, differentiated ELD supports, including structured language practice, integrated academic language instruction.
2. A significant portion of students are not advancing in proficiency levels, as 44.4% of students are maintaining lower ELPI levels and 29.6% have decreased at least one level, suggesting gaps in consistent language development.
3. English Learner progress remains limited.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance
College/Career Report

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”

This section provided information on the percentage of high school graduates who are placed in the "Prepared" level on the College/Career Indicator.



Very Low

Lowest Performance



Low



Medium



High



Very High

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard College/Career Equity Report

Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
1	3	0	0	0

Explore information on the percentage of high school graduates who are placed in the "Prepared" level on the College/Career Indicator.

2025 Fall Dashboard College/Career Performance for All Students/Student Group

All Students	English Learners	Long-Term English Learners
		
Red	Orange	Orange
Prepared 1.6%	Prepared 2.1%	Prepared 2.4%
Maintained 1.6%	Increased 2.1%	Increased 2.4%
122 Students	48 Students	41 Students

Foster Youth	Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
		
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	Red
Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Prepared 0%	Prepared 1.8%
1 Student	Maintained	Maintained 1.8%
	19 Students	109 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
		
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	No Performance Color
Prepared 6.3%	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy
Increased 6.3%	7 Students	1 Student
16 Students		

Asian	Filipino	Hispanic
		
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	Orange
Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Prepared 2.4%
5 Students	2 Students	Increased 2.4%
		82 Students

Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
		
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	No Performance Color
Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Prepared 0%
6 Students	1 Student	18 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Majority of students are graduating without meeting key postsecondary readiness benchmarks. College and Career readiness remains critically low.
2. The data points to a systemic need to strengthen college and career readiness structures.
3. Some student groups show slight improvement, including English Learners, Long-Term English Learners, and Hispanic students (Orange category, 2.1%–2.4% prepared).

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Engagement
Chronic Absenteeism

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”

Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
Lowest Performance				Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Equity Report				
Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue

This section provides information about the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 8 who are absent 10 percent or more of the instructional days they were enrolled.

2025 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Performance for All Students/Student Group		
All Students	English Learners	Long-Term English Learners
Foster Youth	Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
Asian	Filipino	Hispanic
Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White

Conclusions based on this data:

1. No Data Reported.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Engagement
Graduation Rate

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”



Red

Lowest Performance



Orange



Yellow



Green



Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Graduation Rate Equity Report				
Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
0	0	0	2	2

This section provides information about students completing high school, which includes students who receive a standard high school diploma.

2025 Fall Dashboard Graduation Rate for All Students/Student Group		
All Students	**English Learners**	**Long-Term English Learners**
 Green	 Green	 Blue
89.1% graduated	92.2% graduated	95.5% graduated
Increased 5.4%	Increased 9.5%	Increased 10.8%
129 Students	51 Students	44 Students
Foster Youth	**Homeless**	**Socioeconomically Disadvantaged**
 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color	 Green
Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	85.7% graduated	88.8% graduated
1 Student	Increased 7.9%	Increased 5%
	21 Students	116 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color
84.2% graduated	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy
Increased 19.2%	7 Students	2 Students
19 Students		

Asian	Filipino	Hispanic
 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color	 Blue
Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	95.4% graduated
5 Students	2 Students	Increased 11%
		87 Students

Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color
Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	84.2% graduated
6 Students	1 Student	19 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Graduation outcomes are a clear strength, indicating effective credit recovery systems and student support structures.
2. Several student groups are performing at high levels, including Long-Term English Learners and Hispanic students.
3. English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students also show positive outcomes, both in the Green category with increasing graduation rates, suggesting that intervention strategies are contributing to improved completion rates.

School and Student Performance Data

Conditions & Climate
Suspension Rate

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”



Red

Lowest Performance



Orange



Yellow



Green



Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate Equity Report

Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
0	0	0	2	2

This section provides information about the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 12 who have been suspended at least once in a given school year. Students who are suspended multiple times are only counted once.

2025 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate for All Students/Student Group

All Students	English Learners	Long-Term English Learners
 Green	 Blue	 Blue
3.6% suspended at least one day	0% suspended at least one day	0% suspended at least one day
Declined 1.5%	Declined 6.7%	Declined 7.4%
197 Students	51 Students	43 Students

Foster Youth	Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
 No Performance Color	 No Performance Color	 Green
Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	14.3% suspended at least one day	2.9% suspended at least one day
1 Student	Increased 14.3%	Declined 2.3%
	14 Students	170 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	No Performance Color
0% suspended at least one day	23.1% suspended at least one day	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy
Declined 3.8%	13 Students	2 Students
27 Students		

Asian	Filipino	Hispanic
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	Green
Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	1.7% suspended at least one day
10 Students	2 Students	Declined 4%
		121 Students

Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	No Performance Color
0% suspended at least one day	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	5.7% suspended at least one day
11 Students	3 Students	Increased 5.7%
		35 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Suspension rates are low and improving.
2. English Learners and Long-Term English Learners demonstrate strong outcomes, both at 0% suspension (Blue), reflecting highly effective supports and positive engagement for these student groups.
3. Some student groups show higher or increasing suspension rates, particularly African American students (23.1%) and Homeless students (14.3%), indicating a need for targeted, equity-focused behavioral supports and interventions.

Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

Goal 1

Title and Description of School Goal

Broad statement that describes the desired result to which all strategies/activities are directed.

Success Beyond Graduation
Equip all students with the knowledge, skills, and support needed to succeed in college, careers, and life by ensuring access to grade-level instruction and focused interventions that close achievement gaps across all student groups.

LCAP Goal to which this School Goal is Aligned

LCAP goal to which this school goal is aligned.

Prepare all pupils for college and careers and ensure all students meet grade level standards with a focus on closing the achievement gap between all student groups.

Identified Need

A description of any areas that need significant improvement based on a review of Dashboard and local data, including any areas of low performance and significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators, and any steps taken to address those areas.

Review of the 2025 California School Dashboard and local data indicates several priority areas requiring targeted improvement at Stein High School.

Academic Achievement (ELA & Math):
Student performance remains well below standard (ELA: -124.7; Math: -244.8) with declining trends. Local data shows inconsistent use of diagnostics and wide skill variability, limiting effective instruction and intervention. A more consistent system for intake diagnostics, placement, and progress monitoring is needed, along with stronger instruction to address foundational skill gaps.

Science Achievement:
Science performance remains in the Red performance category with minimal growth, indicating a need to improve student understanding of scientific concepts through more applied, real-world, and engaging instructional strategies .

English Learner Progress (EL & LTEL):
English Learner outcomes indicate a need for improvement, with only 25.9% of EL students and 31.8% of LTEL students making progress toward English proficiency. Additionally, inconsistent use of ELPAC data and lack of a standardized progress monitoring system have limited the ability to track and support language development. There is a need to strengthen both integrated and designated (pull out) ELD instruction, ensure consistent use of language data in planning, and increase reclassification rates, particularly for LTEL students.

Attendance and Engagement:
Chronic absenteeism data has not been consistently tracked, and student engagement has been inconsistent across instructional programs and activities . Low participation in initiatives such as field trips and inconsistent engagement with digital learning platforms indicate a need to improve student engagement, attendance monitoring, and participation in academic and career-related opportunities.

College and Career Readiness:
The College/Career Indicator remains in the Red category, with only 1.6% of students identified as “Prepared”, demonstrating a significant gap in postsecondary readiness . While the Barbering CTE pathway has been successfully launched, most students have not yet reached completer status, and college and career readiness structures are not yet consistently implemented across all students. There is a need to expand access to CTE pathways, strengthen career exploration opportunities, and ensure all students engage in meaningful postsecondary planning through tools such as Xello.

Instructional Consistency and Use of Data:
Across multiple areas, there is evidence of inconsistent implementation of instructional strategies and limited use of data (e.g., FastBridge, ELPAC, formative assessments) to guide instruction. This highlights the need for clear systems, consistent expectations, and professional development focused on data-driven instruction and differentiation.

Targeted Student Group Outcomes:
While graduation rates have improved for student groups such as homeless students (85.7%) and students with disabilities (84.2%), these groups still perform below the overall graduation rate of 89.1% . Continued focus is needed to close achievement gaps through targeted monitoring, credit completion support, and coordinated interventions.

Summary of Core Needs
Improve ELA, Math, and Science academic performance
Strengthen English Learner progress and reclassification
Implement consistent diagnostic and progress monitoring systems Increase college and career readiness outcomes
Improve attendance, engagement, and participation
Ensure equitable outcomes for targeted student groups
Build instructional consistency and effective use of data

Annual Measurable Outcomes

Identify the metric(s) and/or state indicator(s) that your school will use as a means of evaluating progress toward accomplishing the goal.

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
CAASPP ELA & Math FastBridge (aReading/aMath) growth Local diagnostics (intake screener / Math 180 placement)	Baseline - FastBridge: Assess upon onboarding and during Fall, Winter, Spring testing windows / new for the 2024-2025 school year. Actual Outcome - FastBridge: Given the highly fluid and transient nature of the student population, Stein High School needs to implement a more individualized, student-centered approach that ensures each student receives focused academic support upon entry, along with clear, intentional guidance to prepare them for post-high school graduation pathways, including college, career, and life readiness. Baseline CAASPP 2026-2027: ELA: 124.7 points below standard; declined Math: 244.8 points below standard; declined Baseline Local Diagnostics 2026-2027: Inconsistent diagnostic use (IXL pilot not reliable) for our site. Wide range of skill levels within a class period.	All students will continue to onboard test via Fastbridge during Fall, Winter, Spring Testing windows. At least 60% of students will demonstrate measurable growth in ELA and Math based on local diagnostics and/or FastBridge. 100% of students will complete an intake diagnostic within 5 days of enrollment. 85% of students will be appropriately placed into tiered math or ELA supports within 2 weeks. Reduction in students performing far below standard (local tracking) and/or CAASPP ELA or Math. Master schedule for leveled math.
Implementation of a structured math placement (local data) and intervention system using an intake screener and tiered course placement (Math 180 and aligned courses), including student placement data, course enrollment by tier, and progress monitoring of skill development.	Baseline: IXL was piloted as a diagnostic and practice tool in reading and mathematics. Data collected included diagnostic scores, time-on-task, and skill mastery. Teachers also attempted to develop a common data tracking tool and implement progress monitoring cycles. Actual Outcome: The pilot yielded inconsistent results. Student engagement and effort on diagnostics varied significantly, impacting the reliability of data. Additionally, wide ranges of skill levels within single class period limited the effectiveness of whole-group instruction and the ability to target interventions. As a result, IXL alone did not provide a consistent or actionable system for placement or progress monitoring. Pilot teachers identified the need for a more structured approach to math placement and instruction.	By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, Stein will implement a structured math placement system in which 100% of students requiring math or elective credits will be assessed during orientation using a common intake screener to determine skill level. Based on results, students will be placed into tiered math pathways: Tier 3: Foundations (Math 180 or equivalent intervention course) Tier 2: Applied Math/Personal Finance Tier 1: Near grade-level math (district grade level math curriculum). Teacher(s) will use common progress monitoring tools to track skill growth every quarterly. Teacher(s) will provide quarterly progress update.
California Dashboard Science Indicator	Baseline 2026-2027: Red performance level (All Students)	Improve Science performance from Red toward Orange.

	Minimal growth (maintained low performance)	Establish a consistent science assessment system for Alt Ed Site aligned with NGSS - teacher release time. At least 10% of students will demonstrate growth in science-related tasks/projects. Increased integration of applied, real-world science learning.
English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) Reclassification (RFEP rate) ELPAC-aligned local assessments Targeted English Learner Support (ELD & LTEL)	Baseline 2026-2027: Implement a structured, master schedule–based ELD model in which all EL and LTEL students are placed in designated support (e.g., Communication Lab), eliminating inconsistent delivery of services. Establish clear schoolwide expectations for integrated ELD, including the use of academic language objectives, structured student discourse, and writing tasks across all content areas.	At least 40–60% of EL/LTEL students will demonstrate growth in ELPAC-aligned domains. Increase reclassification rate, especially for LTEL Level 3 students. 100% of EL/LTEL students will have a language profile updated twice per semester. By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, Stein High School will have a consistently implemented, site-based English Learner progress monitoring system in which 100% of EL and LTEL students have an established language profile based on ELPAC-aligned practice data across reading, writing, listening, and speaking domains. 85% of teachers will implement integrated ELD strategies.
Participation in Professional Development focused on EL/LTEL strategies	Baseline 2026-2027: Limited use of ELPAC, ELPI, or formative language data in classroom planning.	Participate in PD session focused on language acquisition strategies, LTEL needs, and inclusive of students' identities and experiences. By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, ELPAC, ELPI, and formative language data will be consistently used to inform instruction across classrooms, with at least 85% of teachers incorporating student language proficiency data into lesson planning and differentiation. Teachers will utilize EL data to group students, adjust scaffolds, and design targeted language supports, as evidenced by lesson plans, walkthroughs, and student work, with outcomes and insights regularly shared with colleagues to inform collective practice.

Attendance / Chronic Absenteeism Chronic Absenteeism (Dashboard + local data)	Baseline 2026-2027: Not consistently tracked or reported	Establish baseline in 2026–2027 by Site Leadership. Reduce chronic absenteeism by at least 2% 90% of students monitored monthly for attendance trends
California Dashboard College/Career Preparation Xello completion data	Baseline 2026-2027 1.6% Prepared (Red) The Stein Barber Academy is now a state-approved, fully operational Barber School with a CTE pathway with students actively accumulating hours toward the 1,000-hour licensing requirement. Additional supports are being implemented to ensure students can complete required hours through extended learning opportunities (e.g., summer programming, adult school continuation, WIN time). A system is being developed to track CTE completers, concentrators, and students meeting College/Career Indicator criteria.	Increase the percentage of students identified as “Prepared” on the College/Career Indicator by at least 3–5% by Fall 2027-2028. At least 8–10 students will reach CTE pathway completer status (300+ hours or equivalent milestone aligned to Dashboard criteria). At least 2 students will meet advanced readiness indicators, such as completing significant portions of the 1,000-hour requirement, earning industry-recognized credentials, or demonstrating readiness for state licensure. 100% of CTE students will complete a resume, portfolio artifact, and postsecondary plan through advisory and Xello. Expanded access to college/career readiness experiences, including guest speakers, real-world learning opportunities, and work-based learning aligned to the Barbering pathway.
Enrollment in English 4Aand 4B with embedded CTE exploration labs Local Data: student survey and/or department chair data	Baseline - No data collected for prior years of implementation Actual Outcome: 100% of students enrolled in English 4A and 4B participated in at least two CTE exploration labs. Baseline 2026-2027: Expand access to CTE Exploration Labs across multiple subjects.	By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, at least 85% of students enrolled in English 4A and 4B will participate in courses that include embedded CTE Exploration Labs, providing consistent exposure to career pathways aligned to literacy instruction. Students will engage in career-connected projects, presentations, and portfolio development tied to industry sectors (e.g., Barbering, entrepreneurship, and other pathways), with evidence captured through student work samples and/or portfolio artifacts. As a result, 100% of participating students will complete at least one college/career readiness artifact (e.g., resume, personal statement, or career exploration project), and demonstrate increased awareness of postsecondary

		options as measured through advisory or course-based reflections. Additionally, teachers will integrate career-relevant reading, writing, and communication tasks into instruction, ensuring alignment between academic standards and real-world application.
Percentage of core content courses (ELA, Math, Science, Social Science) implementing embedded CTE Exploration Labs, Evidenced by student artifacts included in the Xello portfolio.	Baseline: CTE Exploration Labs are primarily embedded within English 4A/4B, with limited integration across other content areas.	At least 50% of core content courses (ELA, Math, Science, Social Science) will implement at least one embedded CTE Exploration Lab per semester, aligned to course standards. 100% of teachers in participating courses will integrate at least one career-connected project or task, supported by common planning resources and examples. Student artifacts (projects, presentations, portfolios) will demonstrate application of academic skills to real-world or career contexts in at least 75% of participating classrooms. A schoolwide tracking system will be developed by Site Leadership Team to monitor CTE integration across content areas, including course participation and student outcomes. Students will report increased awareness of career pathways and connections to coursework, as measured through surveys or advisory reflections.
Xello: Portfolio completion Oral presentation rubric Xello usage data	Baseline - By the end of each quarter or semester, 100% of enrolled students will complete entries in Xello's "Goals & Plans" and "My Story" features 2025-2026. Baseline - Students will complete and deliver an oral portfolio presentation using Xello, highlighting personal, academic, and career development, as well as post-graduation plan. Actual Outcome: The Xello-based college and career planning system was successfully implemented for graduating students through the senior portfolio process. Students who reached graduation completed a comprehensive portfolio that included personal, academic, and career goals; postsecondary plans; artifacts; and a	100% of graduating students will complete a Xello-based portfolio and successfully deliver an oral presentation, demonstrating readiness for postsecondary pathways, as measured by completion checklists and rubric scores (minimum passing criteria met). At least 90% of enrolled students will complete quarterly updates in Xello, including entries in "Goals & Plans," "My Story," and the addition or revision of portfolio artifacts, as monitored through advisory (Vision) tracking logs. 100% of students will maintain a portfolio that includes required common artifacts, such as a First 5 Plan, SMART goals, and reflective

	First 5 Plan, demonstrating readiness for life after high school . However, implementation was strongest at the point of graduation, with less consistent use of Xello for ongoing progress monitoring and goal-setting throughout the year for all enrolled students. Baseline (2026–2027) - Maintain the graduation portfolio requirement, ensuring all graduating students complete a Xello-based portfolio and oral presentation. Continue use of common tools and artifacts (e.g., First 5 Plan, SMART goals, portfolio reflections) to ensure consistency across classrooms. Use artifacts from 3 different courses in the portfolio.	entries, ensuring consistency and alignment across classrooms. At least 100% of student portfolios will include artifacts from a minimum of 3 different courses, demonstrating cross-curricular connections and application of skills. Advisors will conduct structured check-ins with at least 90% of students twice per semester, using Xello to review progress, update goals, and support postsecondary planning. As a result, students will demonstrate increased clarity and ownership of their postsecondary plans, as evidenced by completed plans, quality of reflections, and presentation performance.
College & Career (Vocational) Field Trips Participation in field trips / career exposure Student reflections / artifacts	Baseline - One college field trip 2025-2026 scheduled Actual Outcome - 2025–2026 No general field trips (low interest) 22 Barbering students participated in pathway trips Baseline (2026-2027): Shift from a single large field trip model to a variety of smaller, targeted college and career exposure opportunities (e.g., CTE-related visits, guest speakers, virtual tours, and on-campus events). Implement a student interest survey during orientation/advisory to identify preferred career pathways and guide field trip planning. Integrate field trip opportunities into CTE pathways (e.g., Barber Academy) and advisory (Vision) to increase relevance and participation. Establish a sign-up and accountability process (e.g., pre-registration, parent communication, lessons towards credits) to improve student commitment.	At least 3–5 targeted college and career exposure opportunities will be implemented, including a mix of field trips, industry visits, guest speakers, and virtual experiences aligned to student interests and CTE pathways. At least 60% of students will participate in one or more college/career exposure activity, with increased participation driven by interest-based planning and smaller, more relevant experiences. 100% of students will complete a career interest survey during orientation or advisory, and results will be used to plan and align exposure opportunities to student pathways. Participation rates will improve through a structured sign-up and accountability process, with at least 75% of students who register for an event attending the activity. CTE pathway students (e.g., Barber Academy) will participate in at least one pathway-aligned field experience, reinforcing real-world connections to their program of study. Students will complete a reflection or portfolio artifact (via Xello or advisory) after each experience, demonstrating increased awareness of career pathways and postsecondary options.

		As a result, students will show increased engagement in college and career planning, evidenced by more defined goals, portfolio artifacts, and participation in pathway-aligned opportunities.
Graduation Rate (Dashboard) Targeted Student Groups	Baseline - In 2024, the graduation rate for homeless students was 77.8%, reflecting a 13.1% decline from the previous year. Actual Outcome: The graduation rate for homeless students increased to 85.7%, reflecting an improvement of approximately 7.9 percentage points from the prior year. Baseline (2026-2027): Homeless: 85.7% Students With Disabilities: 84.2% Overall Graduation Rate: 89.1% Systems are in place to support targeted student groups, including credit recovery, advisory (Vision), and targeted monitoring, but outcomes still lag slightly behind overall student performance (89.1%).	By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the graduation rate for homeless students will increase from 85.7% to at least 90%, meeting or exceeding the overall school graduation rate. By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the graduation rate for students with disabilities will increase from 84.2% to at least 88–90%, closing the gap with the overall student graduation rate. 100% monitored through advisory (Vision) and credit tracking systems, ensuring timely interventions. Targeted supports (e.g., credit recovery, counseling, attendance monitoring) will result in reduced gaps between targeted student groups and the overall student population.
School Climate and Engagement Suspension Rate Student participation rates Engagement (local survey)	Baseline 2026-2027: Suspension rate low (Green) Engagement inconsistent (IXL, field trips, instruction)	Maintain low suspension rate (=3%). Increase student participation in academic and career activities to 70%+. Improved student engagement reflected in surveys and completion rates.

Strategies/Activities

Complete the Strategy/Activity Table with each of your school's strategies/activities. Add additional rows as necessary.

Strategy/ Activity #	Description	Students to be Served	Proposed Expenditures
1.1	FastBridge Assessment upon On-boarding enrollment and exit ($0) (1a14)	All Students	0 District Funded
1.2	Math 180 - online learning program site license ($EM) (1a13) Math 180 - teacher release time to develop standardized data collection tool ($EM) (1a13) Math 180 - materials and supplies to support implementation ($EM) (1a13)	All Students	0 District Funded Equity Multiplier funds are used to support this strategy. EM funding is allotted for SHS students, but exists in Tracy Unified School District's larger LCAP plan (TUSD LCAP EM Goal 3).

1.3	Science Achievement Teacher collaboration/release time for developing common assessments and rubrics ($2000) (1a1) Instructional Materials, lab supplies, project materials ($500) (1a2) PBL/Supplemental curriculum ($1000) (1a3)	All Students Targeted (SES/EL/FY) Targeted (EL)	1500 LCFF 2000 Title I
1.4	CTE Barber Pathway - Extra Hours (Certificated/Classified) ($2000) (1a5) CTE Barber Pathway - Materials, supplies, and/or transportation ($1000) (1a4) CTE Barber Pathway - Subs ($840) (1a6)	All Students Targeted (SES/EL/FY)	1000 LCFF 2840 Title I
1.5	CTE Exploration Labs: consumables ($1750) (1a7)	All Students Targeted (SES/EL/FY) Targeted (EL)	1550 LCFF 200 LCFF - Supplemental
1.6	Leadership Release Time/Extra Services - Subs ($2000) (1a8)	All Students	2000 Title I
1.7	Educational College/Career Field Trips materials, supplies ($200) (1a9) Educational College/Career Field Trips/Teacher Sub Coverage ($1400) (1a10) Educational College/Career Field Trips/Transportation ($300) (1a11)	All Students Targeted (SES/EL/FY) Targeted (EL)	200 LCFF 1400 Title I 300 LCFF - Supplemental
1.8	Xello - online college & career planning tool/program ($EM) (1a12)	All Students	0 District Funded Equity Multiplier funds are used to support this strategy. EM funding is allotted for SHS students, but exists in Tracy Unified School District's larger LCAP plan (TUSD LCAP EM Goal 3).
1.9	Targeted English Learner Support - Additional intervention curriculum, supplies and resources ($2000)(1b1) Targeted English Learner Support - language acquisition strategies and best practices (Subs) ($1680) (1b2) Targeted English Learner Support - language acquisition strategies and best practices ($) (1b3)	Targeted (EL) Targeted (SES/EL/FY)	2000 LCFF - Supplemental 1680 Title I 200 LCFF
1.11	After School Extra Curricular Activity Supplies/Materials/Nutrition ($250) (1c1)	Targeted (SES/EL/FY) Targeted (EL)	300 LCFF - Supplemental
1.12	Mental Health Services (i.e., CAPC, CMC) ($0) (1d1)	All students - students not making progress	0 District Funded
1.13	Supplemental online programs/graduation survey/student use ($1,200)(1e1)	All Students Targeted (SES/EL/FY) Targeted (EL)	1200 Title I

1.14	Projectors and/Lady Bugs, etc. (classroom electronics) ($) (1e2)	All Students	12000 LCFF

Annual Review

SPSA Year Reviewed: 2025-26

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required, and this section may be left blank and completed at the end of the year after the plan has been executed.

Analysis

Describe the overall implementation and effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.

Implementation of the identified strategies and activities was partial and uneven across the school year. Core components such as onboarding diagnostics (FastBridge), use of IXL for skill development, and integration of CTE experiences like the Barber Pathway were established; however, consistent execution across classrooms and student groups remained a challenge. Variability in staff use of diagnostic data and progress monitoring tools limited the ability to systematically adjust instruction and interventions. While some teachers effectively incorporated data-driven practices and differentiated supports, this was not yet a schoolwide norm.

In terms of effectiveness, there were pockets of progress, particularly in student engagement through applied learning opportunities and CTE participation. Students demonstrated increased interest and participation when instruction was tied to real-world applications. However, overall academic outcomes, particularly in ELA and Mathematics, did not show significant improvement and in some cases declined, indicating that the current level of implementation has not yet been sufficient to accelerate learning or close skill gaps.

The analysis suggests that while the foundational structures are in place, greater coherence, consistency, and accountability in implementation are needed. Strengthening a schoolwide system for diagnostics, placement, and ongoing progress monitoring, along with targeted professional development on instructional strategies, will be critical to improving overall effectiveness moving forward.

Describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.

Several adjustments occurred between the planned implementation and actual execution of strategies and expenditures. In multiple cases, planned costs were reduced or eliminated due to more efficient use of existing resources. For example, teacher release time was originally budgeted to support data analysis and planning; however, this work was completed during scheduled collaboration time, eliminating the need for substitute coverage. Similarly, some professional development and program costs came in under budget.

Planned field trips and enrichment activities, particularly within CTE, were either funded through alternative sources or shifted to other funding streams, resulting in lower expenditures from SPSA designated funds. In addition, certain program costs, such as Xello, were less than anticipated, creating unspent allocations.

From an implementation standpoint, while key strategies such as diagnostics, intervention tools, and CTE programming were initiated, they were not implemented with full consistency or fidelity across all classrooms. This resulted in a gap between intended schoolwide systems (e.g., uniform use of assessment data and progress monitoring) and actual practice.

Overall, while fiscal resources were managed efficiently, the primary difference lies in the level of consistent implementation rather than access to or availability of funds.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.

As a result of this analysis, the goal will be refined to place a stronger emphasis on consistent schoolwide implementation of diagnostic, instructional, and progress monitoring systems. While the core focus on improving academic achievement will remain, the revised goal will explicitly prioritize coherence in practice across all classrooms.

Annual outcomes will be adjusted to include more measurable indicators of implementation fidelity, such as 100% of students completing onboarding diagnostics, regular progress monitoring cycles, and documented use of data to inform instruction. In addition to overall performance targets in ELA and Mathematics, outcomes will include growth measures (e.g., percentage of students demonstrating skill gains on diagnostic and intervention platforms).

Metrics will be expanded beyond summative performance data to include interim and local measures, such as FastBridge assessment data, Math 180 skill proficiency and usage reports, and course completion rates through Edgenuity. This will allow for more frequent monitoring and timely instructional adjustments.

Strategies and activities will be revised to include:

A structured, schoolwide system for onboarding diagnostics, placement, and progress monitoring
Defined expectations for data use during Peer - Led - Collaboration time
Targeted professional development focused on differentiation, intervention, and data-driven instruction
Increased integration of applied, real-world learning, particularly through CTE pathways, to improve engagement and relevance
Clear accountability measures to ensure consistent implementation across classrooms

These changes can be found in the revised SPSA under Goal 1: Academic Achievement, specifically within the updated Annual Outcomes, Metrics/Indicators, and Strategies/Activities sections (Actions 1.1–1.4), where language has been refined to reflect systems of implementation, progress monitoring expectations, and expanded use of local data sources.

Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

Goal 2

Title and Description of School Goal

Broad statement that describes the desired result to which all strategies/activities are directed.

Positive Learning Environment for All
Foster a safe and supportive learning environment where all students and staff feel respected, encouraged, and empowered to succeed.

LCAP Goal to which this School Goal is Aligned

LCAP goal to which this school goal is aligned.

Provide a safe and equitable learning environment for all students and staff.

Identified Need

A description of any areas that need significant improvement based on a review of Dashboard and local data, including any areas of low performance and significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators, and any steps taken to address those areas.

A review of California School Dashboard indicators and LCAP survey data indicates that while overall perceptions of safety and school climate are positive among students and staff (over 90% favorable), targeted areas of need remain in behavioral consistency, student engagement, and family voice. Suspension data and internal behavior trends continue to show disproportionate impact among specific student groups, including Long-Term English Learners, indicating a need for more consistent and proactive behavioral supports.
Additionally, although students report feeling respected and supported, engagement data and qualitative feedback point to variability in instructional relevance, student voice, and opportunities for meaningful participation in school experiences.

Restorative Practices and Behavioral Supports
To address inconsistencies in behavior management and reduce reliance on exclusionary discipline, the school will continue to strengthen a systematic approach to restorative practices. This includes ongoing staff training, implementation of consistent behavior support systems, and expanded access to counseling and mental health services. The focus is on early intervention, relationship-building, and accountability structures that promote a positive and inclusive school climate.

Student Engagement and Relevance
While students report positive relationships with staff, survey feedback and local data indicate a need to increase engagement through more relevant and interactive learning experiences. The school will expand opportunities for real-world learning, including project-based instruction, CTE pathways, student leadership, clubs, and enrichment activities that reflect student interests. These efforts aim to improve motivation, participation, and overall connection to school.

Family Engagement and Communication
LCAP survey data and participation trends indicate that family engagement remains an area for growth, particularly in building trust and ensuring families feel comfortable voicing concerns. The school will strengthen communication systems, increase outreach efforts, and provide more structured opportunities for family input and involvement in school decision-making.

Annual Measurable Outcomes

Identify the metric(s) and/or state indicator(s) that your school will use as a means of evaluating progress toward accomplishing the goal.

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
Staff Implementation of Restorative Practices	In 2025–26, approximately 75% of certificated and classified staff participated in restorative practices training, with growing but inconsistent classroom implementation.	By the end of 2026–27, 100% of certificated and classified staff will participate in ongoing restorative practices training, and 100% of classrooms will consistently implement at least one restorative strategy, as measured by walkthrough data, behavior data, and staff reflection.
Suspension rate for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs)	In 2025–26, the LTEL suspension rate decreased to approximately 5%, reflecting initial impact of targeted interventions.	Reduce LTEL suspension rate to 3% or lower by the end of 2026–27 through consistent implementation of restorative practices, early intervention systems, and targeted behavioral supports.
Student Engagement Opportunities (Clubs/Enrichment Participation)	Baseline - Limited student-led clubs and minimal enrichment opportunities during the 2023–24, 2024-25 school year. Outcome: In 2025–26, at least two student-led clubs or enrichment opportunities were initiated. Implementation was mixed: the Yearbook Club was fully implemented and successfully published a yearbook, while the Culinary Club was established but did not sustain meetings or activities during the spring semester. Overall student participation remained inconsistent across offerings. Baseline 2026-2027: in 2026-2027, add another student-led club or enrichment opportunity in addition to Yearbook Club	Maintain at least 3–5 active student-led clubs or enrichment opportunities with consistent meeting schedules and identified staff advisors. Ensure each club documents regular participation and activities (e.g., meeting logs, products, or events). Increase overall student participation in clubs/enrichment by an additional 15–20%, as measured by participation data and student feedback. Implement a monitoring structure (e.g., quarterly check-ins) to ensure continuity and sustainability of all clubs throughout the school year. Launch at least 3 new student-led clubs or enrichment activities by the end of 2025–26 aligned to student interest survey results.
Implementation of Real-World / Project-Based Learning	Baseline - Project-based learning opportunities are limited and not systematically implemented Outcome: In 2025–26, most core content teachers implemented at least one project-based or real-world learning unit per semester, with initial systems for sharing practices established. Baseline 2026-2027: Refine reflection process including student outcomes and instructional adjustments.	By the end of 2026–27: 100% of core content teachers will implement at least one high-quality project-based or real-world learning unit per semester. 100% of teachers will submit a refined reflection, including student outcomes and instructional adjustments, and participate in at least one structured collaboration to calibrate and improve practice.
Student sense of belonging/feel comfortable working with classmates and participating in class (measured by school climate survey)	Baseline - In 2024–25, 76% of students reported feeling connected to school	Increase student-reported sense of belonging to at least 90% by the end of 2026–27, as measured by the annual school climate survey.

	Outcome: In 2025–26, student-reported sense of belonging increased to approximately 85%.	
Family Trust and Comfort with School Staff (Parent Survey)	In the 2023–24 parent survey, only 50–60% of respondents reported feeling comfortable bringing up concerns to staff outside of the classroom teacher (e.g., administrators, counselors, office staff). Actual Outcome: In 2025–26, approximately 75% of parents reported feeling comfortable raising concerns with school staff beyond the teacher, with improved but still limited survey participation.	At least 85% of parents will report feeling comfortable raising concerns with school staff beyond the teacher. Increase overall parent survey participation by an additional 15–20% to ensure more representative and reliable feedback.

Strategies/Activities

Complete the Strategy/Activity Table with each of your school's strategies/activities. Add additional rows as necessary.

Strategy/ Activity #	Description	Students to be Served	Proposed Expenditures
2.1	Restorative/CASEL Strategies - Professional Development ($4000) (2a1)	All Students	4000 Title I
2.2	Campus Clubs start up cost, field trips, training, etc. (like culinary, student ambassadors, leadership, etc.) ($4000) (2a2)	All Students	4000 LCFF
2.3	Intramural Sports participation, materials, supplies ($1200) (2a3)	All students	1200 LCFF
2.4	Participation in real-world/project-based learning experiences, materials & supplies - Technology Programs(s) (i.e., PBL) ($1500) (2a4)	All Students	1500 LCFF
2.5	Guest Speaker Presentations / activities, materials, supplies ($500) (2b1)	All Students Targeted (SES/EL/FY)	500 LCFF
2.6	Alt Ed Parent Workshops Materials/Supplies & incentives) ($500) (2b2)	Targeted (SES/EL/FY)	500 LCFF
2.7	Individual Counseling (CMC) (COST) ($0) (2c1)	All Students - Tier 3	0 District Funded
2.8	Monthly newsletters (Digital Platform i.e., SMORES) and principal messages that encourage open communication and highlight staff availability for parent concerns. ($1300) (2d1)	All Students	1300 Title I
2.9	Counselor held activities, such as FAFSA workshops for parents ($200) (2d2)	Targeted EL Targeted (SES/EL/FY)	100 LCFF 100 LCFF - Supplemental

2.10	Parent - Staff Connection Events (@ least 3/year) ($790) (2d3)	All Students Targeted EL	500 LCFF 290 LCFF - Supplemental
2.11	Parent Support Supplies/Materials (i.e., Woodburn Press Materials) ($300) (2d4)	All Students Targeted (SES/EL/FY) Targeted EL	100 Title I 100 LCFF 100 LCFF - Supplemental

Annual Review

SPSA Year Reviewed: 2025-26

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required, and this section may be left blank and completed at the end of the year after the plan has been executed.

Analysis

Describe the overall implementation and effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.

Overall, the strategies and activities implemented under Goal 2 were moderately effective in advancing a positive learning environment, with clear progress in key areas such as school climate, restorative practices, and family trust, while also revealing ongoing challenges related to consistency and sustainability of implementation.

Implementation of restorative practices and behavioral supports showed meaningful growth. Staff participation in professional development increased significantly, reaching approximately 75%, and contributed to a reduction in the suspension rate for Long-Term English Learners from 7.4% to approximately 5%. These outcomes indicate that restorative approaches and early intervention strategies are beginning to positively impact student behavior. However, classroom-level implementation remained inconsistent, suggesting the need for stronger monitoring systems and continued coaching to ensure fidelity across all settings.

Efforts to improve student engagement and relevance produced mixed results. The expansion of clubs and enrichment opportunities led to the successful implementation of the Yearbook Club, which culminated in a completed yearbook, demonstrating strong student ownership and engagement. At the same time, other efforts, such as the Culinary Club, were not sustained throughout the year, highlighting a gap in structures needed to maintain continuity and participation. Similarly, project-based and real-world learning increased across most core classrooms, but implementation varied in quality and consistency, indicating a need for clearer expectations, collaboration, and accountability.

Progress was also evident in school climate and student belonging, with student-reported connectedness increasing from 76% to approximately 85%. This reflects a positive shift in student experience and aligns with increased opportunities for engagement and relationship-building.

In the area of family engagement, strategies such as workshops, newsletters, and parent connection events contributed to an increase in parent comfort in raising concerns, improving to approximately 75%. While this represents significant growth, participation rates in surveys and events remain limited, indicating the need for more intentional outreach and engagement strategies to ensure broader representation.

In summary, the school made notable progress in improving climate, reducing behavioral disparities, and strengthening relationships, but the overall effectiveness of the goal was impacted by inconsistent implementation and limited sustainability of key strategies, particularly in student engagement structures and instructional practices. Moving forward, a stronger focus on systems of accountability, monitoring, and sustained implementation will be critical to achieving more consistent and scalable outcomes.

Describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.

Overall, most strategies and associated expenditures were implemented as planned; however, several differences emerged between intended implementation and actual practice, primarily related to timing, level of implementation, and utilization of allocated resources.

In the area of student engagement (clubs and enrichment), funds were allocated to support the launch and operation of multiple student-led clubs. While initial startup occurred, implementation was uneven. For example, the Yearbook Club fully utilized resources and successfully produced a final product, while other efforts, such as the Culinary Club, did not sustain meetings or activities in the spring semester. As a result, some allocated funds were underutilized or did not yield the intended level of ongoing student engagement.

For restorative practices and professional development, expenditures aligned closely with the plan, and training opportunities were provided to a majority of staff. However, the intended outcome of consistent, sitewide implementation was not fully realized. The difference was not in spending, but in the level of follow-through and consistency of practice across classrooms, indicating a need for additional structures such as coaching, monitoring, and accountability rather than increased funding.

In project-based learning and real-world learning experiences, funds were expended as planned for materials and technology; however, the scope and depth of implementation varied across teachers. While most teachers incorporated at least one project-based experience, the intended system of consistent, high-quality implementation and shared practice was not fully developed, suggesting that additional time for collaboration and refinement may be needed beyond material expenditures.

With respect to family engagement, resources for workshops, communication tools, and events were implemented largely as intended. These efforts contributed to improved parent perceptions; however, participation levels were lower than anticipated. This indicates that while funds were used appropriately, additional strategies beyond financial investment—such as targeted outreach and relationship-building are needed to increase engagement.

Overall, the primary differences were not due to significant misalignment in budgeted expenditures, but rather variability in implementation fidelity, participation, and sustainability of strategies. Moving forward, adjustments should focus on strengthening systems for monitoring, accountability, and consistent execution to ensure that allocated resources result in the intended outcomes.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.

As a result of the 2025–2026 analysis, the overall goal of fostering a positive learning environment will remain unchanged; however, key refinements will be made to the annual outcomes, metrics, and strategies/activities to address identified gaps in consistency, implementation, and sustainability.

Annual Outcomes and Metrics Adjustments
Metrics have been revised to move beyond participation and access toward evidence of consistent implementation and impact. For example, restorative practices will now be measured not only by staff participation in training but also by classroom-level implementation using walkthrough data and reflection. Student engagement metrics have been refined to include sustained operation of clubs, documented participation, and accountability structures rather than simply the creation of new clubs. Project-based learning outcomes now include quality indicators, such as teacher reflection, student outcomes, and collaboration, to ensure more consistent instructional practice. Additionally, family engagement metrics have been strengthened to include both increased parent comfort and increased survey participation, ensuring more representative data.

Strategy/Activity Adjustments
Strategies have been updated to reflect a shift from initiating activities to sustaining and monitoring implementation. For restorative practices (Strategy 2.1), added emphasis will be placed on coaching, walkthroughs, and ongoing support to ensure consistent use across classrooms. For student engagement (Strategy 2.2), structures such as advisor accountability, meeting logs, and periodic check-ins will be implemented to ensure continuity of clubs and activities throughout the year. Funding for project-based learning (Strategy 2.4) has been increased to better support instructional materials, collaboration, and implementation. Minor adjustments have also been made to guest speaker opportunities and family engagement strategies to strengthen alignment with student interest and parent participation goals.

Location of Changes in SPSA
These updates are reflected in the following sections of the SPSA:

Annual Measurable Outcomes Table (Goal 2): Revised baselines and expected outcomes emphasizing implementation, quality, and measurable impact
Strategies/Activities Table (Goal 2, Actions 2.1–2.11): Updated descriptions and adjusted expenditures to support sustainability and accountability
Identified Need Section (Goal 2): Refined to highlight consistency, engagement, and family voice as primary areas for improvement

Overall, the changes ensure stronger alignment between identified needs, funded strategies, and measurable outcomes, with a clear focus on consistent implementation, monitoring, and sustained impact.

Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

Goal 3

Title and Description of School Goal

Broad statement that describes the desired result to which all strategies/activities are directed.

Whole Student Success and Support While Removing Hurdles
Support the whole student by fostering self-motivation, time management, and emotional resilience through personalized academic guidance, mental health supports, and structured accountability systems, to improve credit completion, attendance, and on-time graduation rates.

LCAP Goal to which this School Goal is Aligned

LCAP goal to which this school goal is aligned.

Provide a safe and equitable learning environment for all students and staff.

Identified Need

A description of any areas that need significant improvement based on a review of Dashboard and local data, including any areas of low performance and significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators, and any steps taken to address those areas.

A review of local data, including the 2025–2026 Exit Survey, credit completion trends, attendance patterns, and counseling data for Stein High School, indicates that while students report a positive and respectful school environment, significant gaps remain in academic rigor, engagement, and consistency of learning experiences. Due to the school's small and highly transient population, several California School Dashboard indicators are not consistently reported; however, local data provides clear evidence of areas requiring targeted improvement.

Academic Rigor and Consistency of Instruction:
While 72.6% of students reported being held to high academic standards, approximately 27% indicated low or no academic expectations, demonstrating inconsistency across classrooms in rigor and expectations. This inconsistency contributes to uneven academic outcomes and gaps in student preparedness.

Access to College and Career Readiness Opportunities:
Only 66% of students reported receiving weekly exposure to college and career guidance, and 56% indicated they did not have access to a guest speaker aligned to their desired career. This reflects a gap in equitable access to postsecondary exploration and real-world learning opportunities.

Student Collaboration and Instructional Engagement:
Opportunities for collaborative learning are inconsistent, with only 38.7% of students reporting working with peers in most classes, while the majority experienced collaboration in only some or few classes. This limits development of communication, problem-solving, and engagement skills.

Use of Technology and Application of Learning:
While many students reported using technology tools, only 41.9% indicated consistent use of technology for research and presentations across all classes, with over half reporting inconsistent expectations. This highlights a need for more rigorous and consistent integration of technology to support learning and skill development.

Student Engagement and Academic Accountability:
Although 83.9% of students reported tracking academic progress weekly, a subset of students reported minimal or no engagement in progress monitoring, indicating the need for more consistent, schoolwide systems for accountability and credit tracking.

Social-Emotional and External Barriers:
Qualitative survey responses and local data indicate that students continue to face challenges related to motivation, time management, mental health, and external responsibilities. These barriers directly impact attendance, engagement, and credit completion.

In response to these findings, the school has initiated the following actions:

Strengthening the Vision (Advisory) program to ensure consistent goal-setting, SEL check-ins, and academic progress monitoring for all students.
Establishing schoolwide expectations for academic rigor, including clear learning targets, grading practices, and instructional consistency across classrooms.
Expanding college and career readiness opportunities, including guest speakers, pathway exposure, and integration of career exploration into advisory and coursework.
Increasing opportunities for collaborative, student-centered learning experiences across all content areas.
Implementing consistent technology integration expectations to support research, presentation, and applied learning.
Strengthening credit tracking and accountability systems with regular advisor-student check-ins.
Expanding access to mental health and counseling services, including development of a Wellness/Quiet Space and improved referral response systems.

Annual Measurable Outcomes

Identify the metric(s) and/or state indicator(s) that your school will use as a means of evaluating progress toward accomplishing the goal.

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
Motivation & Mindset: Percentage of students completing structured goal-setting and SEL check-ins each semester	Baseline - In 2024–25, less than 40% of students engaged in structured goal-setting or SEL reflection activities Outcome: In 2025–26, approximately 80–100% of students participated in at least one goal-setting or SEL check-in through advisory, with variability in consistency and depth.	By the end of 2026–27, 100% of students will complete at least two documented goal-setting and SEL check-ins per semester, with evidence of progress monitoring and reflection in the Vision (Advisory) program.
Time Management & Procrastination: Participation in academic coaching or time management support sessions	Baseline - No formalized system for time management support existed in 2023–24 and 2024-25 Outcome: No structured time management supports implemented. Baseline: Plan and facilitate time management or academic skills sessions.	By the end of 2026–27, at least 90% of students will participate in two or more time management or academic skills sessions per semester through advisory, workshops, or targeted interventions.
Mental Health & External Pressures: Percentage of referred students accessing school-based counseling/mental health services	Baseline - In 2023–24, only 65% of referred students received mental health or counseling services within 2 weeks Outcome: In 2025–26, approximately 85–100% of referred students were connected to services within 10 school days of referral through COST process.	By the end of 2026–27, 100% of referred students will be connected to counseling or support services within 5 school days of referral, with ongoing monitoring of service access and follow-up. By the end of the 2026–27 school year, Stein High School will establish and maintain at least one designated Quiet Zone or Wellness Room on campus, accessible to students during the school day, to support emotional regulation, mental well-being, and access to on-demand support services.
Academic Rigor & Expectations: Percentage of students reporting high academic expectations across classes (student survey)	Baseline – In 2025–26, 72.6% of students reported high academic expectations, while approximately 27% reported low or inconsistent expectations.	By the end of 2026–27, at least 90% of students will report being held to high academic expectations across all classes, as measured by student survey data.
College & Career Readiness Access: Frequency of student exposure to college/career guidance and guest speakers	Baseline – In 2025–26, 66% of students reported weekly exposure to college/career guidance, and 56% reported no access to a guest speaker aligned to their interests.	By the end of 2026–27, at least 90% of students will report weekly exposure to college and career readiness activities, and at least 80% will participate in at least one guest speaker, field experience, or career-connected learning opportunity.
Student Collaboration & Engagement: Percentage of students reporting regular opportunities for peer collaboration	Baseline - Baseline – In 2025–26, only 38.7% of students reported working collaboratively in most classes.	By the end of 2026–27, at least 75% of students will report consistent opportunities to collaborate with peers in most classes.
Instructional Clarity & Consistency: Implementation of clear academic expectations across classrooms	Baseline – In 2025–26, most teachers implemented syllabi and classroom	By the end of 2026–27:

	expectations, with some variability in consistency.	100% of teachers will provide a course syllabus or unit overview within the first two weeks of enrollment. 100% of classrooms will display and reinforce clear academic expectations, success criteria, and examples of high-quality work.
Technology Integration & Application of Learning: Percentage of students reporting consistent use of technology for research, projects, and presentations	Baseline – In 2025–26, 41.9% of students reported consistent use of technology across all classes.	By the end of 2026–27, at least 80% of students will report consistent use of technology for research, presentations, and applied learning tasks across classes.
Student Wellness Access: Availability and use of Wellness/Quiet Space	Baseline: In 2025–26, a Wellness/Quiet Space established and available to students during the school day. Outcome: Space did not become available until mid-April. Wellness/Quiet Space not established 2025-2026.	By the end of 2026–27, the Wellness/Quiet Space will be fully implemented with structured access protocols, and student usage will increase by at least 25% as measured by sign-in and service logs.
General School Support: Access to School Supplies & General Support Materials: Students who report having consistent access to necessary school materials (such as but not limited to binders, notebooks, calculators, hygiene products, etc.)	Baseline -Baseline – In 2025–26, approximately 100% of students had access to basic school supplies through expanded distribution systems.	By the end of 2026–27, 100% of students will maintain consistent access to necessary school supplies and learning tools, with systems in place for immediate and ongoing support.

Strategies/Activities

Complete the Strategy/Activity Table with each of your school's strategies/activities. Add additional rows as necessary.

Strategy/ Activity #	Description	Students to be Served	Proposed Expenditures
3.1	Digital Tools / student agendas (Time Management tools, such as but not limited to: Xello or MyHomework) supplies / materials ($2500) (3a1)	All Students	500 LCFF 2000 Title I
3.2	Professional Development: to address student needs, such as but not limited to Effective Students - Time Management &/or executive function, fostering motivation, resilience, and student mindset PD for staff (trainer and or materials) ($5000) (3a2)	All Students	5000 Title I
3.3	Wellness Room - Quiet Zone / nutritional snacks, hygiene, etc.($500) (3a3)	All Students	500 LCFF
3.4	Visual Aids/Whole School/Classroom Supports (like anchor charts, posters, timers, whiteboards or other materials that assist in defining high quality work and display and reinforce clear academic	All Students	600 Title I 400

	expectations, success criteria, and examples of high-quality work) ($1200) (3a4)		LCFF 200 LCFF - Supplemental
3.5	CCEA Membership Dues (College/Career Readiness/Professional networking (yearly cost) ($600) (4a1)	All Students	600 LCFF
3.6	General School Support - Access to School Supplies & General Support Materials: Operating Costs,. ($1512) (4a2)	All Students Targeted: EL/SES/FY Targeted: EL	1500 LCFF 12 Title I
3.8	MCHS/WASC/Materials/Supplies (Virtual Visit 2026/2027) ($0) (4a3)	All Students	0
3.9	Encouragement, reinforcement activities (such as but not limited to, field trip for achievements, student of the week/month programs, journals or trackers of progress items, positive behavior and growth incentives for credit completion, attendance, goal completion). ($5500) (4a4)	All Students Targeted EL/SES/FY Targeted EL	4500 LCFF 1000 LCFF - Supplemental
3.10	Diplomas/Cap/Gowns/Stoles, etc. ($2000) (4a5) Graduation Teacher Sub Coverage ($1120) (4a6) Graduation Supplies & Materials ($1500) (4a7)	All Students Targeted (SES/EL/FY)	3000 LCFF 1120 Title I 500 LCFF - Supplemental
3.12	Certificated/Classified extra services (like tutoring/Saturday support for barber students, etc.) ($3000) (4a8)	All Students	1400 LCFF 1600 LCFF - Supplemental
3.13	Transportation Reimbursement - Like Service Learning, Barber, Content Creator, and other school related need activities ($1000) (4a9)	All Students	1000 LCFF
3.14	IMC charges to support student learning ($500) (4a10)	All Students	500 LCFF
3.15	Postage ($83) (4a11)	All Students	83 LCFF
3.16	Service Contract on Copier - RICOH and for the 2nd Copier ($3500) (4a12)	All Students	500 LCFF
3.17	RICOH Copier (4a13)	All Students	5500 LCFF

Annual Review

SPSA Year Reviewed: 2025-26

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required, and this section may be left blank and completed at the end of the year after the plan has been executed.

Analysis

Describe the overall implementation and effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.

Overall, Stein High School made measurable progress in implementing strategies aligned to whole student support during the 2025–26 school year. Key systems were established or strengthened, including the Vision (Advisory) program, improved credit tracking practices, expanded access to counseling services through the COST process, and increased availability of student supports such as school supplies and academic interventions. These efforts contributed to improved student engagement in goal-setting and progress monitoring, as well as more timely access to mental health services.

Implementation of strategies related to academic accountability and student support systems was largely effective, with most students participating in advisory-based check-ins and demonstrating increased awareness of their academic progress. Additionally, access to basic resources and materials improved significantly, reducing barriers to participation in learning.

However, implementation was uneven in areas related to instructional practice. Local data, including student survey results, indicate continued inconsistency in academic rigor, opportunities for collaboration, and integration of technology across classrooms. While some teachers implemented clear expectations and engaging instructional strategies, this was not consistent schoolwide. Similarly, efforts to expand college and career readiness opportunities showed partial implementation, with many students still reporting limited access to guest speakers or real-world learning experiences.

The establishment of the Wellness/Quiet Space was delayed and not fully implemented during the school year, limiting the impact of this support. Time management and executive functioning supports were introduced but not yet implemented as a consistent, structured system across all students.

Overall, while foundational systems for student support, accountability, and access were successfully developed, the effectiveness of the goal was limited by inconsistent implementation of instructional strategies and incomplete rollout of key supports. Moving forward, a stronger emphasis on schoolwide instructional expectations, consistent implementation, and monitoring of practices will be necessary to fully achieve the intended outcomes of this goal.

Describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.

During the 2025–26 school year, several adjustments were made between the planned implementation and actual execution of Goal 3 strategies and expenditures.

While core systems such as advisory-based goal setting, credit tracking, and counseling supports were implemented, some strategies were not executed to the full extent originally planned. The most significant difference was the delayed implementation of the Wellness/Quiet Space, which was not fully established until late in the school year. As a result, allocated funds for this activity were underutilized and the intended impact on student mental health and regulation was limited.

Professional development related to time management, executive functioning, and student mindset was partially implemented; however, the scope was narrower than intended. Opportunities to expand into instructional strategies such as collaboration, academic rigor, and technology integration were limited, resulting in less expenditure in this area than anticipated.

Expenditures for student support materials and general supplies were largely implemented as planned, though some costs were adjusted based on actual need and availability of resources. In some cases, materials were purchased more efficiently than projected, allowing funds to stretch further or remain unspent.

Funding allocated for incentives and student engagement activities was implemented, but participation levels and the frequency of activities varied throughout the year, resulting in minor differences in how funds were utilized compared to the original plan.

Additionally, some operational costs (e.g., materials, services, or site-based needs) were either lower than anticipated or shifted between funding sources based on availability, resulting in slight variances in budget allocations.

Overall, while the majority of funds were used to support the intended strategies, the primary differences were related to delayed implementation of certain initiatives, partial rollout of professional development and instructional supports, and minor adjustments in expenditures due to actual site needs and efficiencies. These differences will inform more targeted planning, earlier implementation timelines, and tighter alignment between strategy and spending for the 2026–27 school year.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.

As a result of the 2025–26 analysis, several adjustments have been made to strengthen implementation, improve alignment to identified needs, and ensure more consistent impact across classrooms at Stein High School.

Refinements to the Goal:
The overall goal remains unchanged in focus; however, greater emphasis has been placed on consistent implementation of instructional practices, including academic rigor, student engagement, and accountability systems, in addition to whole-student supports.

Adjustments to Annual Measurable Outcomes and Metrics:

Metrics have been expanded to include academic rigor, student collaboration, technology integration, and college/career readiness, directly addressing gaps identified in student survey data.
Expected outcomes have been increased in specificity and rigor, including higher percentage targets and more frequent monitoring (e.g., moving from quarterly to monthly progress monitoring).
New metrics were added to measure consistency across classrooms, not just participation in systems.

Updates to Strategies/Activities:

The Vision (Advisory) program (3.1) has been strengthened to include more structured and frequent goal-setting, progress monitoring, and time management supports.
Professional development (3.2) has been expanded beyond SEL and mindset to include instructional rigor, collaboration strategies, and effective use of technology.
Wellness Room implementation (3.3) has been refined to ensure full implementation earlier in the school year with clear systems for access and monitoring.
Instructional supports (3.4) have been clarified to include consistent use of learning targets, success criteria, and examples of high-quality work across all classrooms.
Student engagement and incentive systems (3.9) have been revised to more directly align with measurable outcomes such as credit completion, attendance, and goal attainment.
Expanded access to college and career readiness experiences (3.14) has been prioritized to address gaps in real-world learning opportunities.

Budget and Resource Alignment Adjustments:

Increased funding and prioritization for professional development and instructional improvement to address inconsistency in classroom practices.
Increased allocation toward student support systems that directly impact outcomes (e.g., tutoring, academic interventions, and transportation for career-connected learning).
Clarification and consolidation of certain expenditures (e.g., graduation-related costs) to improve transparency and alignment.

These changes are reflected in the following sections of the SPSA:

Identified Need Section: Expanded to include specific gaps in academic rigor, collaboration, technology integration, and college/career access based on local data
Annual Measurable Outcomes Section: Updated metrics and expected outcomes with increased rigor, additional indicators, and clearer alignment to identified needs
Strategies/Activities Table (Goal 3, Activities 3.1–3.17): Revised descriptions, expanded scopes, and adjusted expenditures to align with updated priorities and ensure stronger connection to measurable outcomes

Budget Summary

Complete the Budget Summary Table below. Schools may include additional information, and adjust the table as needed. The Budget Summary is required for schools funded through the Consolidated Application (ConApp).

Budget Summary

DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
Total Funds Provided to the School Through the Consolidated Application	$0
Total Funds Budgeted for Strategies to Meet the Goals in the SPSA	$76,675.00
Total Federal Funds Provided to the School from the LEA for CSI	$0

Other Federal, State, and Local Funds

List the additional Federal programs that the school includes in the schoolwide program. Adjust the table as needed.

Note: If the school is not operating a Title I schoolwide program, this section is not applicable and may be deleted.

Federal Programs	Allocation ($)
Title I	$25,252.00

Subtotal of additional federal funds included for this school: $25,252.00

List the State and local programs that the school is including in the schoolwide program. Duplicate the table as needed.

State or Local Programs	Allocation ($)
	$0.00
District Funded	$0.00
LCFF	$44,833.00
LCFF - Supplemental	$6,590.00

Subtotal of state or local funds included for this school: $51,423.00

Total of federal, state, and/or local funds for this school: $76,675.00

School Site Council Membership

California Education Code describes the required composition of the School Site Council (SSC). The SSC shall be composed of the principal and representatives of: teachers selected by teachers at the school; other school personnel selected by other school personnel at the school; parents of pupils attending the school selected by such parents; and, in secondary schools, pupils selected by pupils attending the school. The current make-up of the SSC is as follows:

1 School Principal

3 Classroom Teachers

1 Other School Staff

2 Parent or Community Members

2 Secondary Students

Name of Members	Role
Traci L Mitchell Traci L Mitchell 4/23/26	Principal
Lauren Coker	Classroom Teacher
Tania Quant-Dooley TDooley 4/23/26	Classroom Teacher
Tom Webb Tom Webb 4/23/26	Classroom Teacher
Sandra Vasquez	Other School Staff
Gilbert Montes Gilbert Montes 4-23-26	Parent or Community Member
Gloria Spikes	Parent or Community Member
Robert Montes Robert Montes 4/23/26	Secondary Student
Isabella Franco Isabellefranco 4/23/26	Secondary Student

At elementary schools, the school site council must be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers, and other school personnel, and (b) parents of students attending the school or other community members. Classroom teachers must comprise a majority of persons represented under section (a). At secondary schools there must be, in addition, equal numbers of parents or other community members selected by parents, and students. Members must be selected by their peer group.