2023–24 Local Control and Accountability Plan Annual Update

The instructions for completing the 2023–24 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Annual Update follow the template.

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Travis Unified School District	Tiffany Benson Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services	tbenson@travisusd.org (707) 437-4604 x1204

DRAFT

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
1	Focus on instructional and institutional excellence to promote equity for all, close the achievement gap, and improve student learning in preparation for opportunities beyond high school including college and career.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Metric 1 State Priority 2A, 2B Implementation of academic and ELD (English Language Development) content and performance standards as adopted by the State Board and Dashboard Local Indicator Implementation of State Academic Content Standards	Data from 2019 teacher survey measuring implementation on a 5-point scale. Target is 4.0 or above; focus on the academic core for reporting, although all subject areas are monitored. Elementary Schools English Language Arts: 4.2 ELD: 3.9 Mathematics: 4.2 NGSS Science: 3.7 History-Social Science: 3.5 Middle School English Language Arts: 4.2 ELD: 3.4 Mathematics: 4.0	Data from 2022 teacher survey measuring implementation on a 5-point scale. Target is 4.0 or above; focus on the academic core for reporting, although all subject areas are monitored. 2022 Elementary Schools English Language Arts: 4.5 ELD: 3.7 Mathematics: 4.5 NGSS Science: 3.5 History-Social Science: 3.9 Middle School English Language Arts: 3.9 ELD: 3.0	Data from 2022-23 teacher survey measuring implementation on a 5point scale. Target is 4.0 or above; focus on the academic core for reporting, although all subject areas are monitored. 2022-2023 Elementary Schools English Language Arts: 4.5 ELD: 4.2 Mathematics: 4.6 NGSS Science: 3.6 History-Social Science: 3.6 Middle School English Language Arts: 5.0 ELD: 3.0	Data from 2023-24 teacher survey measuring implementation on a 5point scale. Target is 4.0 or above; focus on the academic core for reporting, although all subject areas are monitored. It was determined from our instructional leaders that differentiating between grade levels was not helpful in discussing overall trends. For that reason, we have grouped responses by subject for grades TK-12.	Implementation of all academic core standards = 4.0.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	NGSS Science: 4.0 History-Social Science: 4.0 High Schools English Language Arts: 3.7 ELD: 3.9 Mathematics: 3.3 NGSS Science: 3.6 History-Social Science: 3.8	Mathematics: 3.7 NGSS Science: 3.6 History-Social Science: 4.2 High Schools English Language Arts: 3.8 ELD: 3.6 Mathematics: 3.7 NGSS Science: 3.6 History-Social Science: 4.4	Mathematics: 3.0 NGSS Science: 4.3 History-Social Science: 5.0 High Schools English Language Arts: 4.7 ELD: 4.0 Mathematics: 4.6 NGSS Science: 2.8 History-Social Science: 4.6	English Language Arts: 4.44 ELD: 3.99 Mathematics: 4.31 NGSS Science: 3.55 History-Social Science: 3.72	
Metric 2 State Priority 4A, 2B Statewide assessments in English Language Arts and the Dashboard State Academic Indicator English Language Arts (grades 3-8 and 11)	Data from Fall 2019 Dashboard: English Language Arts Distance from Standard +8.9 points Maintained –0.7 points Red • Students with Disabilities Orange • African American • English Learners • Homeless • Low Income	CAASPP data is not available this year. Winter 2022 NWEA MAP ELA scores for grades 3-8 predicted that the following percentages of students would have scored Met/Exceeded standards had the assessment been given. MAP is a different metric, but it has value in identifying students who need academic support. This report includes all students and the six groups identified as of concern on the Spring	Dashboard color gauges are not available on the Dashboard this year. Instead, there are cell phone signal strength charts based on performance without the change factor included in the gauges. Very Low • Students with Disabilities Low • African American • English Learners • Hispanic	Data from Fall 2023 Dashboard (2022-23 data); Color: Orange 7.7 points below average with a decline of 11.7 points Red: Students with Disabilities Orange: African American English Learners Hispanic Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	All students Distance from standard = +18 points District overall and all student groups in yellow, blue, or green.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	• Pacific Islander For comparison, the state Distance from Standard was -2.5 points.	2019 CAASPP assessment Dashboard. All Students: 47.9% Students with Disabilities: 16.4% African American: 34.8% Homeless: 40.0% Low Income: 39.0% Pacific Islander: 57.1%	• Homeless • Low Income For comparison, the state Distance from Standard was -12.2 points.	For comparison, State data is 13.6 points below standard. Percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards from (Aeries Analytics CAASPPS data 2022-23): All Students: 47.9% Grades 3-6: 45.8% Grades 7-8: 52.0% Grade 11: 48.4% Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard 1. Students with Disabilities (SWD) District-wide: 87.9 points below standard Cambridge: 86 points below standard Scandia: 83.5 points below standard Golden West: 95.7 points below standard	
Metric 3 State Priority 4A, 2B Statewide assessments in	Data from Fall 2019 Dashboard: Mathematics	CAASPP data is not available this year. Winter 2022 NWEA MAP Math scores for	Dashboard color gauges are not available on the Dashboard this year.	Data from Fall 2023 Dashboard (2022-23 data):	All students Distance from standard = –11 points

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
mathematics and the Dashboard State Academic Indicator Mathematics (grades 3-8 and 11)	Distance from Standard –20.3 points Maintained +1.7 points Red • Students with Disabilities Orange • African American • Low Income For comparison, the state Distance from Standard was -33.5 points.	grades 3-8 predicted that the following percentages of students would have scored Met/Exceeded standards had the assessment been given. This is a different metric, but it has value in identifying students who need academic support. This report includes all students and the three groups identified as of concern on the Spring 2019 CAASPP assessment Dashboard. All Students: 32.7% Students with Disabilities: 10.7% African American: 21.4% Low Income: 25.0%	Instead, there are cell phone signal strength charts based on performance without the change factor included in the gauges. Very Low • Students with Disabilities Low • African American • English Learners • Hispanic • Two or More Races • Low Income • White For comparison, the state Distance from Standard was -51.7 points.	Color: Orange 39.7 points below average with a decline of 1.1 points, which the CDE defines as maintained status. Students with Disabilities Orange: African American Two or More Races White Socioeconomically Disadvantaged For comparison, State data is 49.1 points below standard. Percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards (from Aeries Analytics CAASPP data 2022-23): All Students: 35.7% Grades 3-6: 37.5% Grade 7-8: 36.4% Grade 11: 28.5%	District overall and all student groups in yellow, blue, or green.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
				Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard 1. Students with Disabilities (SWD) District-wide: 118 points below standard Golden West: 152.9 points below standard	
Metric 4 State Priority 4A, 2B Statewide assessments in Science (California Science Test CAST) in grades 5, 8, and high school	Data from state CAASPP website 2019 37.42% Met or Exceeded Standards State Met/Exceeded = 29.93%	No science testing is available because CAASPP was suspended during the pandemic.	Data from state CAASPP website 2022 33.62% Met or Exceeded Standards State Met/Exceeded = 29.45%	CAST 2022-23 All Students who met or exceeded standards: 37.2%	Met or Exceeded Standards = 50%.
Metric 5 State Priority 4D, 2A, 2B, 4A The percentage of English learner pupils who make progress toward English proficiency as measured by ELPAC, which is the Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator (move up one level or become reclassified as proficient in English)	Data from Fall 2019 Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator High State: 48.3% making progress toward English Language Proficiency.	Data from 2020-21 was affected by the pandemic. 10 of 22 students who tested both years moved up one level (45.5%) on the ELPAC (California English Language Development Test), but the number of students who tested both years is low.	State: 50.3% making progress toward English Language Proficiency.	Data from Fall 2023 Dashboard (2022-23 data): Color: Green 53.2% making progress, an increase of 2.7% This is defined as English learners who increase ELPI levels as measured on the annual ELPAC test.	69% making progress toward English language proficiency Performance Level High or Very High

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
				For comparison, 48.7% of English learners in the state made progress in the same period.	
Metric 6 State Priority 4E, 4A English Learner reclassification rate From DataQuest: RFEP (reclassified) divided by the sum of EL (English learners) and RFEP	Data from CDE DataQuest 2019-20 Reclassification rate 72.7% State rate was 49.7%	Data from CDE DataQuest for 2020-21 Reclassification rate 68.6% State rate was 49.8%	Data from CDE DataQuest for 2021-22 Reclassification rate 63.3% State rate was 46.0%	Reclassification rates for 2022-23 (DataQuest) 67.1% For comparison, the reclassification rates for the state for this period is 45.5%.	Reclassification rate above the state percentage.
Metric 7 State Priority 4C, 8A College/Career Indicator College/Career Indicator from California School Dashboard	Data from Fall 2019 Dashboard: College and Career Indicator Prepared for College/Career 47.2% prepared Maintained 0.1% Orange • White State: 44.1% prepared.	This year, no indicator will be posted on the California School Dashboard, but the CDE provided some of the associated data. Data is for June 2021 high school seniors • 15.8% scored 3 or higher on two Advanced Placement exams • 10.4% completed a	The CCI continued to be suspended.	Data from the 2023 Dashboard (2022-23 data): Status: Medium 45% prepared *College and Career data is still in the purple bar graph, status only, report for 2022-23, but will return to the performance level metrics in 2023-24. Data was interrupted	Data from Fall 2019 Dashboard College and Career Indicator All students = 50% prepared District overall and all student groups in yellow, blue, or green.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
		Career Technical Education (CTE) pathway • 44.1% completed the UC or CSU requirements • 4.3% completed UC/CSU requirements and a CTE pathway • 0.7% completed two semesters (or 3 trimesters) of college credit courses		due to Covid-19, which make year-to-year progress data unavailable in 2022-23. Very low: Students with Disabilities Low: African American Hispanic For comparison, State data reports 43.9% of students prepared. Students with areas of focus (very low on the Dashboard): Travis Education Center (TEC) All TEC Students: 3.4% prepared Socioeconomically disadvantaged; 5.3% prepared	
Metric 8 State Priority 4C, 7A, 8A The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the	June 2020 All students = 50% African American = 41% Hispanic = 43% Low Income = 34% White = 44%	June 2021 All students = 46% African American = 36% Hispanic = 35% Low Income = 33% White = 46%	June 2022 All students = 51% African American = 48% Hispanic = 36% Low Income = 39% White = 56%	Aeries Analytics data June 2023 (2022-23 data): All 12th graders: 50.4%	Class of 2023: percent of students completing college entrance requirements will increase by 10% from baseline for all

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
requirements for entrance to the UC or CSU College entrance requirements completion data (Percent of 12th grade students in the district completing A-G college entrance requirements); data from Aeries Analytics A/G Readiness Dashboard, student groups with 65 or more students included.			Data from DataQuest.	African American: 33.9% Hispanic: 39.6% White: 48.9% Students with Disabilities: 0.0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 37.9% TEC: All Students: 0.0% Vanden: All Students: 51.0% For comparison, the state data represents 46.1% of students meeting A-G eligibility.	students and each listed student group.
Metric 9 State Priority 4B, 7A, 8A Seniors completing career technical education sequences or programs of study that align with State Board approved career technical education standards and frameworks Number of Vanden seniors completing Career Technical	2019-20 Automotive = 5 Business Management = 4 Education = 9 Engineering = 4 Patient Care = 26 Video Production = 6	2020-21 Automotive = 2 Business Management = 1 Education = 7 Engineering = 8 Patient Care = 23 Video Game Design = 1 Video Production = 4	2021-22 Automotive = 4 Business Management = 1 Patient Care = 15 Video Game Design = 2 Video Production = 9	2023-24 (predicted completers as of May 1, 2024) Seniors completing CTE pathways All pathways: 41 Automotive: 4 Business Management: 9 Patient Care: 23 Video Production: 5	Career Technical Education program completers: 20 or more in each pathway

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Education programs; data from Aeries					
Metric 10 State Priority 4F, 7A Advanced Placement exam pass rate Percentage of 12th grade Vanden students who passed one or more AP tests with a 3 or higher during their high school career, data from Aeries Analytics.	2019-20 All Students = 31.4% African American = 17.7% Hispanic = 29.4% Low Income = 19.6%	2020-21 All Students = 23.5% African American = 1.7% Hispanic = 15.4% Low Income = 11.6%	2021-22 All Students = 24.0% African American = 16.5% Hispanic =21.0% Low Income = 18.2%	2022-23 All students = 13.99% Asian = 17.39% African American = 10.71% Filipino = 22.0% Hispanic = 9.8% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander = 33.33% Two or More Races (multi-racial) = 16.95% White = 12.24%	Target: 33% or more for all students and listed student groups.
Metric 11 State Priority 4G EAP English Language Arts Data for Vanden students. 11th grade students who score Level 4 (exceeds standards) on the state test are exempted from placement testing by many colleges; CAASPP results from CDE CAASPP website	2019 Vanden CAASPP results from CDE CAASPP website 2018-19 All Students = 27.1% African American = 13.6% Hispanic = 19.4% Low Income = 13.7% State All Students = 27.1%	CAASPP data is not available this year.	2022 Vanden CAASPP results from CDE CAASPP website 2021-22 All Students = 29.6% African American = 16.3% Hispanic = 24.5% Low Income = 25.3% State All Students = 20.5%	2023 (2022-23) Vanden CAASPP results from Aeries Analytics and CDE CAASPP website All Students: 21.3% African American: 16.3% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 20.5% Two or More Races (multi-racial): 14.5%	Vanden will exceed state All Students percentage by 5% or more. 20% or more of Vanden students in listed groups will score at a Level 4 on the ELA CAASPP.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
				All Students (state wide): 20.7%	
Metric 12 State Priority 4G EAP Mathematics This information comes from the CAASPP website. Vanden 11th grade students who score Level 4 (exceeds standards) on the state test are exempted from placement testing by many colleges.	2019 Vanden CAASPP results from CDE CAASPP website All Students = 7.3% African American = 1.7% Hispanic = 6.4% Low Income = 4.9% State All Students = 13.9%	CAASPP data is not available this year.	2022 Vanden CAASPP results from CDE CAASPP website 2021-22 All Students = 6.7% African American = 4.7% Hispanic = 1.1% Low Income = 4.8% State All Students = 16.1%	2023 (2022-23) Vanden CAASPP results from Aeries Analytics and CDE CAASPP website All Students: 10.1% African American: 2.9% Hispanic: 1.0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED): 6.8% Two or More Races (multi-racial): 7.3% All Students (state wide): 17.1%	Vanden will exceed the state All Students percentage by 3% or more. 10% or more of students in listed groups will score at a Level 4 on the Math CAASPP.
Metric 13 State Priority 7A, 7B Access to a broad course of study described in §51210 and §51220 (a) to (i); programs developed	Percentage of unduplicated (low income, English learner, foster youth) 11th and 12th grade students enrolled in Advanced	Percentage of unduplicated (low income, English learner, foster youth) 11th and 12th grade students enrolled in Advanced Placement courses in 2021-22	Percentage of unduplicated (low income, English learner, foster youth) 11th and 12th grade students enrolled in Advanced Placement courses in 2022-23	AP course enrollment for 2023-24 Percentage of 11th and 12th grade students enrolled in AP courses as of May 1, 2024.	Increase the percentage of unduplicated students enrolled in Advanced Placement classes to 35%.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
and provided to unduplicated students Course Access: Advanced Placement Data from Aeries course enrollment records	Placement courses in 2020-21 26.1% Percent of all 11th and 12th grade students enrolled in AP courses in 2020-21 = 35.4%	17.7%	13.8% Percent of all 11th and 12th grade students enrolled in AP courses in 2022-23 = 19.7%	All students: 35.3% Unduplicated students: 29.7%	
Metric 14 State Priority 7C, 7A Access to a broad course of study described in §51210 and §51220 (a) to (i); programs and services developed and provided to individuals with exceptional needs Course Access: Core English and Math courses Data from CDE Local Level Annual Performance Reports	Data from CDE Local Level Annual Performance Report 2018-19; State Least Restrictive Environment Targets Percentage of students spending 80% or more of their day in general education classrooms 48.4% Was 43.99% in 2017-18, improved State target = 52.2% (2019) Percentage of students spending less than 40% of their day in general education classrooms 14.9% State target = 21.6% (2019)	Data from CDE Local Level Annual Performance Report 2019-20; State Least Restrictive Environment Targets Percentage of students spending 80% or more of their day in general education classrooms 54.1% State target = 53.2% (2020) Percentage of students spending less than 40% of their day in general education classrooms 11.0% State target = 20.6% (2020)	Data from CDE Local Level Annual Performance Report 2020-21; State Least Restrictive Environment Targets Percentage of students spending 80% or more of their day in general education classrooms 64.3% State target = 53.2% (2020) Percentage of students spending less than 40% of their day in general education classrooms 9.9% State target = 20.6% (2020)	Data from CDE Local Level Annual Performance Report 2022-23; State Least Restrictive Environment Targets Percentage of students spending 80% or more of their day in general education classrooms: 70.68%	Meet or exceed the state Least Restrictive Environment targets each year.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Metric 15 State Priority 7A, 7B, 8A Pupil outcomes in subject areas described in §51210 and §51220 (a) to (i) as applicable; programs developed and provided to unduplicated students Algebra 1 success Information comes from records of student grades in Aeries. Students count as having had success in Algebra 1 if they have earned a C or better in both semesters of Algebra 1, either in middle school or during grade 9. A C- counts as a C.	Vanden 2018-19 data from Aeries 2018-19 All Students = 73.0% African American = 60.3% Hispanic = 65.5% Low Income = 63.9% White = 78.7%	Vanden 2020-21 data from Aeries 2020-21 All Students = 61.0% African American = 39.1% Hispanic = 61.4% Low Income = 52.4% White = 61.5%	Vanden 2021-22 data from Aeries 2021-22 All Students = 56.5% African American = 44.9% Hispanic = 52.8% Low Income = 46.9% White = 57.5%	Vanden 2022-23 data from Aeries Analytics: All Students: 60.71% African American: 50% Hispanic: 52.42% Low Income: 54.21% White: 63.16% Two or more races (multi-racial): 66.13%	All students and student groups = 80%.
Metric 16 State Priority 8A, 7A, 7B, 7C Pupil outcomes in subject areas described in §51210 and §51220 (a) to (i) as applicable; programs developed and provided to unduplicated students;	Spring 2019 All Students = 57.0% African American = 38.5% Hispanic = 40.0% Low Income = 49.1% Students with Disabilities = 24.4%	Spring 2021 All Students = 53.8% African American = 35.7% Hispanic = 37.6% Low Income = 38.6% Students with Disabilities = 15.0%	Spring 2022 All Students = 53.2% African American = 36.4% Hispanic = 47.7% Low Income = 44.4% Students with Disabilities = 24.0%	NWEA MAP Spring 2023 (2022-23 data) (Students who have a reading score of 199 or above) All Students: 49.6% Special Ed.: 29.4%	For all students and listed student groups, 80% or more will be reading on grade level.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
programs and services developed and provided to individuals with exceptional needs Data: Percent of 3rd graders meeting end of year Spring reading benchmark, from Aeries Analytics Students who read proficiently by the end of third grade (Standard Met on CAASPP) are prepared for school success. 3rd graders whose NWEA MAP reading score is 199 or above meet this target.				Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 43.2% African American: 32.6% Hispanic: 49.2% White: 53.5% EL: 7.1% CAASPP 3rd grade ELA data 2023 (2022-23 data) All Students who met or exceeded standard: 43.2% Special Ed.: 24.2% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 38.7% African American: 33.8% Hispanic: 44.2% White: 43.6% EL: 0.0%	
Metric 17 State Priority 8A, 7A, 7B, 7C Pupil outcomes in subject areas described in §51210 and §51220 (a) to (i) as applicable; programs developed and provided to	Percent of students demonstrating readiness 2019-20* All Students = 53.6% African American = 39.5% Hispanic = 46.9% Low Income = 38.8%	Due to quarantine and pass/fail grading, this metric is not available for 2020-21. Data for 2021-22 will be available in the fall.	Percent of students demonstrating readiness 2021-22 All Students = 35.6% African American = 27.0% Hispanic = 28.9% Low Income = 27.4%	Percent of students demonstrating readiness CORE Metric Score of 5 or greater 2022-23 All Students: 30.30%	All schools and listed groups demonstrating readiness at 70% or above.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
unduplicated students; programs and services developed and provided to individuals with exceptional needs Percent of students (grades 6-10) who demonstrate readiness for next grade based on multiple measures: • GPA of 2.5 or better (except 6th grade which has no GPA) • Attendance 96% or better • C- or better in ELA • C- or better in math No suspensions during the year	Special Education = 27.3% White = 53.6% Cambridge = 54.5% Center = 59.5% Foxboro = 44.6% Scandia = 66.1% Travis = 69.8% Golden West = 51.4% Vanden = 54.6% *Pandemic spring grading was pass/fail and not included.		Special Education = 19.0% White = 36.3% Cambridge = 43.2% Center = 33.0% Foxboro = 41.7% Scandia = 48.2% Travis = 63.0% Golden West = 35.8% Vanden = 35.3%	American Indian/Alaskan Native: 16.67% Asian: 51.06% African American: 25.00% Filipino: 42.86% Hispanic: 23.05% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 9.09% Two or more races (multi-racial): 36.75% White: 29.22% Special Education: 19.58% 6th Grade: 40.40% 7th Grade: 27.93% 8th Grade: 27.22% 9th Grade: 28.83% 10th Grade: 28.18%	
Metric 18 State priority 8A, 7A, 7B Pupil outcomes in subject areas described in §51210 and §51220 (a) to (i) as applicable; programs developed and provided to	2018-19 Data from Aeries Class Load Analysis (6.19) Algebra 2 = 356 enrolled 21.2% of total Vanden students (all grades)	2021-22 Data from Aeries Class Load Analysis (3.26.22) Algebra 2 = 315 enrolled 19.3% of total Vanden students (all grades)	2022-23 Data from Aeries Class Load Analysis (12.13.22) Algebra 2 = 259 enrolled 15.9% of total Vanden students (all grades)	Data from 2023-24 Aeries Class Load Analysis (5.21.24) Algebra 2 = 249 enrolled 18.46% of total Vanden students (all grades)	25% of students enrolled in Algebra 2, the equivalent of the average number of students in one grade (students may take Algebra 2 in any grade).

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
unduplicated students; programs and services developed and provided to individuals with exceptional needs Number of students enrolled in Algebra 2					
Metric 19 State Priority 5A School attendance rates This data comes from Aeries Analytics. Data is not available for alternative education schools because attendance is accounted in a different way. Because student groups have similar attendance, we are not disaggregating data for this metric.	Data from Aeries for 2020-21. Percent of students with attendance of 95% or better (data through 3.31.21): 79.09% 2019-20 attendance of 95% or better through 2.29.20 was 74.84%.	Data from Aeries for 2021-22. Percent of students with attendance of 95% or better (data through 3.25.22): 47.7% This reduction in students with good attendance is due to pandemic-related quarantine and increased absences.	Data from Aeries for 2022-23. Percent of students with attendance of 95% or better (data through 12.22.22): 55.8% This reduction in students with good attendance is due to an increase in the number of students absent with several respiratory viral illnesses. Home to school transportation, provided at no-cost to low-income students, increased daily attendance for unduplicated students by 2%.	Percentage of students with attendance of 95% or higher (Aeries Data as of 3/1/24) All students: 50.99% Focus Student Groups (due to Red Dashboard metrics for one or more school site): EL students: 46.49% Filipino students: 61.81% SED students: 45.37% SWD students: 48.24% White students: 52.11% Hispanic students: 43.57%	82% of students will have attendance of 95% or better.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Metric 20 State Priority 5B Chronic absenteeism rate and Dashboard State Chronic Absenteeism Indicator Students are considered chronically absent when they miss 10% or more of school days.	Data from Fall 2019 Dashboard: Chronic Absenteeism Chronically Absent 4.8% Maintained 0.3% Orange • African American • Homeless • Low Income Data for 2020-21 to 4.20.2021 • District 3.66%, 204 students • African American • 4.98%, 30 students Homeless 14.39%, 2 students • Low Income 4.78%, 110 students State Chronic Absenteeism: 10.1%	Data from Aeries Analytics (3.25.22) shows 19.8% of students qualify as chronic absentees, meaning they have missed 10% or more of school days. Student absences have increased because of quarantine and illness. We do not believe it is due to decreased engagement in school. A student absent more than 13 days on the date this data was collected would be counted as a chronic absentee.	Data from Fall 2022 Dashboard: Chronic Absenteeism High • Asian • Filipino Very High • African American • English Learners • Foster Youth • Hispanic • Two or More Races • Pacific Islander • Low Income • Students with Disabilities • White For comparison: State Chronic Absenteeism: 30.0%	Data from 2023 (2022-23) Dashboard: Chronic Absenteeism District-wide: Yellow 17.1% Chronically Absent All subgroups are in yellow. This is a decline of 6.1%. For comparison, the state rate is 24.3% chronically absent.	District overall and all student groups in yellow, blue, or green.

Goal Analysis

DRAFT

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

There were few substantive differences in our plan and actual implementation from last year. We were unable to hire an elementary intervention teacher for one of our Elementary schools, Center Elementary, which resulted in decreased intervention services for those students by specialized staff, but classroom based WIN (what I need) programs continued to serve unduplicated students. Additionally, we had planned to offer additional ELD training for our new teachers; however, after the initial training at the beginning of the year our new teachers were overwhelmed with the multiple coaching opportunities and most chose to focus on the New Teacher Induction coaching. We then shifted the ELD training to enhance the services provided by our ELD teachers (at secondary) and designated ELD interventionists (at elementary). We continued to provide weekly "guidance" classes for TEC students (65% are unduplicated) focusing on skills and academic attainment.

After school tutoring was also slow to start at Golden West, due to low staff interest. After initial efforts to find secondary teachers, we increased student tutors and elementary teachers in our tutoring centers.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

Budgeted: $4,993,729.00
Actual: $4,662,077.47

Difference: $331,651.53

There were very few programmatic changes in our budgeting plan. One exception was in intervention staffing at the elementary schools. We were unable to fill one full time position, and although we supplemented some services, we were unable to provide this at Center Elementary. With fewer specialized teachers, we continued to focus on providing class-based intervention for unduplicated students with teacher teams grouping students. We also had fewer teachers provide elementary after school tutoring, particularly at the schools on the Air Force Base. We posited that because there were additional after school opportunities on Base (through the Youth Center) that fewer students were interested. To facilitate use of these services we did add free bussing for our low-income students to the Youth Center.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

Throughout the past three years, we utilized MAP and ESGI assessments to pinpoint learning gaps. Instruction, including intervention and English Language Development, was provided as scheduled. Both print and digital reading materials were made available. Students engaged in Khan Academy and credit recovery programs. However, instruction outside of school hours was limited due to staffing shortages

DRAFT

and low student participation. We have started to see this increase in our after-school tutoring programs, primarily at Golden West and Vanden, but tutoring at the elementary schools has remained low following the Covid pandemic. We closely examined MAP data for unduplicated students and introduced Lifeguard, our new digital tool that highlights students facing challenges in learning, grades, attendance, and behavior. This tool helps administrators, counselors, and support staff ensure that all students receive the necessary assistance. In our second year of implementation, we saw wider use at secondary schools and piloted a version for our elementary administrators. This has increased data driven decisions for intervention placement and monitoring. This, in concert with our fuller PBIS and MTSS implementation, has resulted in better data management. For these reasons, the data management systems, staff and training were considered effective.

Math coaching at Vanden High was not well-received, with minimal participation and interest. Guidance classes faced difficulties in establishing a structured and effective tutorial environment. Although counselors have planned the Guidance curriculum and are prepared to enhance Naviance implementation, these plans have yet to be executed. Math coaching at Golden West, on the other hand, was much more welcomed by the math teachers and was more successful. Math CAASPP scores for middle school students reflects an increase in the past two years, and for these reasons we deem this successful.

ELA and ELD coaching has been successful based on our continued high reclassification rates and making progress rates for our multi-lingual students. Our reclassification rates rose in the last year to 67.1%, which along with are making progress rates, is in the green on the Dashboard.

Although CAASPP data for some previous year is unavailable, our internal MAP reading and math scores indicate some post-pandemic improvement, though they have not yet reached pre-pandemic levels. We see persistent issues for our students with disabilities in both ELA and math achievement and also college and career indicators. Although this trend exists district-wide, we see some positive movement at Foxboro Elementary, where students with disabilities are scoring in the yellow on Dashboard metrics. We credit this to a systematic focus on ELA, specifically informational texts, which will impact our strategies going forward. We are hopeful since overall CAASPP and CAST scores have increased, with CAST scores showing 37.2% meeting or exceeding standards. Although this did not meet our goal of 50%, it did show continued growth.

Attendance rates have shown improvement over the past years. Chronic Absenteeism decreased to 17.1% (yellow on the CA Dashboard), which is an improvement of 6.1% over the prior year. For unduplicated students, there was a 2% overall increase in attendance rates across grade levels for the 2022-23 school year, which we attribute to the active attendance campaign and the increase ridership of our home-to school transportation, which is provided at no cost for low-income families. Among unduplicated students who used bus transportation, 57% of schools saw improved attendance rates.

Overall, the evidence presented here and in the accompanying tables demonstrates that our actions and services positively impact unduplicated students. One of the most important metrics for this is our high graduation rates. Overall graduation rates increased from 96.7% to 98.7% with steady performance or increases in every student group. This is also true at TEC, the school with our highest unduplicated count, which also increased the overall graduation rates. However, we have not yet closed the achievement gap and must continue refining our support strategies to achieve better results, especially for our students with disabilities.

DRAFT

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

In the years to come we plan to differentiate our data for math and ELA into separate areas, so as to more clearly call out movement in each area. We have also moved away from the "CORE" data sets which predicts student success in the next grade level. This metric included ELA, math, attendance and discipline data to create a prediction of grade readiness. Although this had been traditionally reliable, there are currently much larger percentages of "chronically absent" students due to the effects of the pandemic. Additionally, this metric has been complicated for our families to understand and therefore is being replaced with metrics on each of the individual data points (discipline, attendance and academics). We will continue to aggregate these factors in our Lifeguard data tool. We also see some challenges at increasing our college and career indicator at TEC. Students do not perform as well in the on-line classes as they do with in person instruction, and we plan to change that by having staffing at higher than needed rates to offer more in person classes. Community and staff feedback will determine the discipline of this teacher.

Additionally, we have found that some of our data for high schoolers that we use to predict college readiness, such as Algebra 2 enrollment and AP test passage could be calculated differently so that it is more meaningful for our community.

Our largest change will be our systematic focus on the academic achievement of our students with disabilities. As part of the Differentiated Assistance and Compliance and Improvement Monitoring processes, we have assembled teams from each site to implement evidence-based strategies for academic growth.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

DRAFT

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
2	Ensure a safe and productive environment using support systems to maintain calm classrooms focused on learning and to enhance student social and emotional wellness.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
State Priority 5A School attendance rates This data comes from Aeries Analytics. Data is not available for alternative education schools because attendance is accounted in a different way. Because student groups have similar attendance, we are not disaggregating data for this metric.	Data from Aeries for 2020-21. Percent of students with attendance of 95% or better (data through 3.31.21): 79.09% 2019-20 attendance of 95% or better through 2.29.20 was 74.84%.	Data from Aeries for 2021-22. Percent of students with attendance of 95% or better (data through 3.25.22): 47.7% This reduction in students with good attendance is due to pandemic-related quarantine and increased absences.	Data from Aeries for 2022-23. Percent of students with attendance of 95% or better (data through 12.22.22): 55.8% This reduction in students with good attendance is due to an increase in the number of students absent with several respiratory viral illnesses. Home to school transportation, provided at no-cost to low income students, also increased daily attendance for unduplicated students by 2%.	Percentage of students with attendance of 95% or higher (Aeries Data as of 3/1/24) All Students: 50.99% Focus Student Groups (due to Red Dashboard metrics for one or more school site): EL students: 46.49% Filipino students: 61.81% SED students: 45.37% SWD students: 48.24%	82% of students will have attendance of 95% or better.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
				White students: 52.11% Hispanic students: 43.57%	
State Priority 5B Chronic Absenteeism rate and Dashboard State Chronic Absenteeism Indicator Students are considered chronically absent when they miss 10% or more of school days.	Data from Fall 2019 Dashboard: Chronic Absenteeism Chronically Absent 4.8% Maintained 0.3% Orange • African American • Homeless • Low Income Data for 2020-21 to 4.20.2021 • District 3.66%, 204 students • African American • 4.98%, 30 students Homeless 14.39%, 2 students • Low Income 4.78%, 110 students State Chronic Absenteeism: 10.1%	Data from Aeries Analytics (3.25.22) shows 19.8% of students qualify as chronic absentees, meaning they have missed 10% or more of school days. Student absences have increased because of quarantine and illness. We do not believe it is due to decreased engagement in school. A student absent more than 13 days on the date this data was collected would be counted as a chronic absentee.	Data from Fall 2022 Dashboard: Chronic Absenteeism High • Asian • Filipino Very High • African American • English Learners • Foster Youth • Hispanic • Two or More Races • Pacific Islander • Low Income • Students with Disabilities • White For comparison: State Chronic Absenteeism: 30.0%	Data from 2023 (2022-23) Dashboard: Chronic Absenteeism District-wide: Yellow 17.1% Chronically Absent All subgroups are in yellow. This is a decline of 6.1%. For comparison, the state rate is 24.3% chronically absent.	District overall and all student groups in yellow, blue, or green.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
State Priority 5C Middle school dropout rates Dropout data from DataQuest One-Year Adjusted Dropout Rate CALPADS reports.	Data is for 2019-20. 0. Middle school dropouts	Data is for 2020-21. 0. Middle school dropouts	Data is for 2021-22. 0. Middle school dropouts	Data is from 2022-23. 0 Dropouts	Zero dropouts.
State Priority 5D High school dropout rates Dropout data comes from DataQuest Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Outcome.	Data is for 2019-20. .3. High school dropouts The 3 is equal to a dropout rate of 0.7%. For comparison, the state dropout rate was 7.0%.	Data is for 2020-21. .4. High school dropouts The 4 is equal to a dropout rate of 0.9%. For comparison, the state dropout rate was 6.4%.	Data is for 2021-22. .5. High school dropouts The 5 is equal to a dropout rate of 1.2%. For comparison, the state dropout rate was 5.6%.	Data is from 2022-23. 5 Dropouts This is a rate of 1.11%. For comparison, the state dropout rate is 10.9%.	Zero dropouts.
State Priority 5E Dashboard State Graduation Rate Indicator Graduation data comes from the Dashboard Graduation Rate Indicator, which uses the four-year cohort graduation rate.	Data from Fall 2019 Dashboard: Graduation Rate 97% graduated Declined 1.2% State Graduation Rate: 85.8%	Data from California School Dashboard's Additional Report on Graduation Rate for 2021 (no Dashboard data was produced) .94.1%. High school graduates The state graduation rate was 86.8%.	State Graduation Rate: 87.4%	Data from 2023 (2022-23) Dashboard: Graduation Rate District-wide: Blue 98.7% Graduation 2.5% Increase All reporting subgroups are in blue.	District overall and all student groups in green or blue.
State Priority 6A Suspension rate and Dashboard State	Data from Fall 2019 Dashboard: Suspension Rate	The state did not produce a Dashboard this year. One	Data from Fall 2022 Dashboard: Suspension Rate	Data from 2022-23 Dashboard:	District overall and all student groups in yellow, blue, or green.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Suspension Rate Indicator Suspension rate data comes from the Dashboard, and is also tracked internally in Aeries. Aeries data is used for tracking our progress in the current year.	4.4% suspended at least once Increased 0.6% Red • African American Orange • Asian • Filipino • Hispanic • Low Income • Pacific Islander • Students with Disabilities For comparison: State Suspension Rate: 3.4%	student was suspended in 2020-21, but with Distance Learning, the suspension rate would be expected to decrease.	High • African American • Students with Disabilities Very High • Foster Youth • Homeless For comparison: State Suspension Rate: 3.1%	Suspension Rate: 3.9% Orange Two groups in Red: Homeless and Pacific Islander Unduplicated students made up 61% of the suspensions. Percentage of students with one suspension: 66.8%. Percentage of students with two or more suspensions: 33.2%. For comparison, the state suspension rate is 3.8%.	
State Priority 6B Expulsion rate Expulsion rate data comes from DataQuest.	2019-20 data 3. Three students were expelled. Our expulsion rate was 0.05%, slightly lower than the state rate of 0.06%.	2020-21 data 0. No students were expelled, but students were at home on Distance Learning for much of the year. The state expulsion rate was also very low.	2021-22 data 3. Three students were expelled. Our expulsion rate was 0.1%, the same as the state rate of 0.1%.	2022-23 data: 0 expulsions	Expulsion rate less than half the state rate.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
State Priority 6C School climate survey data and Dashboard Local Indicator School Climate School climate and mental health data come from an annual survey and the school climate Local Indicator Report.	Percent of students responding in affirmative in these areas (E = elementary, M = middle, H = high, A = alternative education) The first percentage is for 2020-21, the second percentage is for 2018-19. Elementary included 5th and 6th this year, and 5th in 2018-19. Indicators to increase School connection: E: 35%, 79% M: 28%, 67% H: 33%, 58% A: 28%, 55% Caring adults: E: 77%, 79% M: 67%, 64% H: 60%, 56% A: 72%, 62% High expectations E: 89%, 91% M: 79%, 79% H: 78%, 68% A: 76%, 68%	Percent of students responding in affirmative in these areas (E = elementary, M = middle, H = high, A = alternative education) Data from February 2022. Elementary included grades 3-6. Elementary responses: 1,365 Secondary responses: 1,719 Indicators to increase School connection: E: 80% M: 79% H: 71% A: 82% Caring adults: E: 90% M: 79% H: 81% A: 100% High expectations: E: 85% M: 84% H: 81% A: 78%	Percent of students responding in affirmative in these areas (E = elementary, M = middle, H = high, A = alternative education) Data from December 2022. Elementary included grades 3-6. Elementary responses: 1,376 Secondary responses: 1,823 Indicators to increase School connection: E: 62% M: 42% H: 35% A: 54% Caring adults: E: 78% M: 52% H: 57% A: 86% High expectations: E: 73% M: 55% H: 56% A: 66% Feel safe at school:	Percent of students responding in affirmative in these areas (E = elementary; GW = Golden West; VHS = Vanden; TEC = Travis Education Center, alternative education) Data from December 2023. Elementary included grades 3-6. Elementary responses: 1,487 GW responses: 717 VHS: 1,319 TEC: 61 Total Responses: 3,584 Indicators to increase (agree/strongly agree) School Connection: E: 59% GW: 40% VHS: 41% TEC: 35% Caring adults: E: 78% GW: 48%	Indicators to increase Increase each indicator 2% per year, or to 90% or above. Indicators to decrease Decrease harassment and bullying by 2% per year, use mental health data to make decisions about socioemotional support. Track over time It is important to monitor chronic sadness and suicidal ideation over time as indicators of student socioemotional well-being, but performance targets are not appropriate for this type of metric.

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
	Feel safe at school E: 72%, 85% M: 72%, 68% H: 71%, 62% A: 79%, 64% Indicators to decrease Experienced harassment or bullying E: 2%, 39% M: 1%, 40% H: 1%, 31% A: 0%, 37% Experienced chronic sadness E: 12%, 13% M: 17%, 26% H: 20%, 33% A: 30%, 62% Suicidal ideation E: N/A, N/A M: N/A, 12% H: N/A, 18% A: N/A, 50%	Feel safe at school: E: 80% M: 72% H: 75% A: 93% Indicators to decrease: Experienced harassment or bullying: E: 33% M: 20% H: 11% A: 10% Experienced chronic sadness: E: 41% M: 40% H: 44% A: 39% Suicidal ideation: E: N/A M: 16% H: 12% A: 16%	E: 70% M: 41% H: 44% A: 73% Indicators to decrease: Experienced harassment or bullying: E: 26% M: 19% H: 11% A: 7% Experienced chronic sadness: E: 29% M: 34% H: 38% A: 36% Suicidal ideation: E: N/A M: 12% H: 11% A: 9%	VHS: 55% TEC: 82% High expectations: E: 70% GW: 58% VHS: 58% TEC: 67% Feel safe at school: E: 65% GW: 43% VHS: 48% TEC: 69% Place to go with problems: E: 78% GW: 53% VHS: 56% TEC: 76% Indicators to decrease Experienced harassment or bullying: E: 26% GW: 14% VHS: 10% TEC: 10% Experienced chronic sadness: E: 31% GW: 24%	

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
				VHS: 31% TEC: 22% Suicidal ideation: E: N/A GW: 8% VHS: 7% TEC: 8%	

Goal Analysis

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.
A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

Our plan was implemented without substantive differences.

We provided Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) principally directed toward and effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students by addressing socio-emotional barriers to learning and school success:

- Improved and expanded socio-emotional support to meet current student needs
- Continued to provide School Social Workers and Social Work interns for unduplicated students needing socio-emotional support.
- Promoted safe and inclusive play in elementary schools to help students stay active and to provide practice with valuable social and emotional life skills.
- Refined implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS), focusing on Tier II supports, refinement of Tier I supports, and implementation of social-emotional learning instruction, including digital citizenship.
- Improved campus climate as experienced by unduplicated students using Student Support Specialists and other staff to provide additional Check-in Check-out support (CICO), individual student support, and engaging campus activities; provide TOSA support focused on school climate improvement.
- Provided Wellness Centers at all schools to help students regulate emotions so they can focus on learning.

DRAFT

- Provided Care Solace referral services to support our families in accessing needed mental health and substance abuse treatment matched to their needs and health care coverage.

- Enhanced orientation for students transitioning between schools to ensure unduplicated and military students get a smooth, positive start using WEB (Where Everybody Belongs), Link Crew, and Anchored 4 Life programs.

We also supported these initiatives by providing staff training and professional development in the following areas:

1. SEL instruction, including Digital Citizenship, PBIS, and relationship-building.

2. developing environments to promote safe and inclusive play.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

Budgeted: $1,989,173.00
Actual: $2,053,150.99

Difference: -$63,977.99

There were no material differences in our planned and estimated actual expenditures. The increase in costs resulted from additional training that we provided for staff, both in hourly costs and increased contract cost for additional supports.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

Our actions focused on improving staff support (through hiring and training) and resources for our students regarding their mental health and wellness and school climate. We were able to fully implement Wellness Centers at each site and hire (although there was staffing turnover) for all budgeted positions. The metrices we looked at were primarily attendance, student survey data, resource access (Wellness Center and Care Solace usage) and discipline data. Based on these metrics, our actions were successful.

School climate efforts, including teachers on special assignment, specialized engagement activities and PBIS training were successful when looking at our student survey data, specifically the decline in chronic sadness and self-harm ideation in our secondary students:

Golden West chronic sadness 24%, down from 34%;

DRAFT

considered self-harm 8%, down from 12%

Vanden chronic sadness 31%, down from 38%;
considered self-harm 7%, down from 11%

TEC chronic sadness 22%, down from 36%;
considered self-harm 8%, down from 9%

Unfortunately, we did not see the same decrease for our elementary students (Elementary chronic sadness 31%, up from 29%), which continues to be an area of focus. Based on this data, we plan to change some of our strategies for elementary students and shift away from Playworks teacher training to more targeted trainings, including cultural awareness and PBIS.

Attendance rates have shown improvement over the past years, which we believe is also linked to the positive movement for school climate. Chronic Absenteeism decreased to 17.1% (yellow on the CA Dashboard), which is an improvement of 6.1% over the prior year.

We have also seen that increased supports, such as specialized staff and Wellness Centers, have had a positive impact on student when they are experiencing challenges. We believe this based on student responses to the following questions (and their affirmative answers):

Q: I know who to go to for help with my problems.

Elementary: 78%
GW: 53%
VHS: 56%
TEC: 76%

Q: I know where to go with mental health problems. (secondary only question)

GW: 62%
VHS: 60%
TEC: 65%

We also believe that our PBIS implementation, along with our CIM teamwork, has positively impacted student behavior and engagement. Travis Unified had been identified as disproportionate in our discipline data for African American students with disabilities, but through our partnership with the County Office of Education and our CIM team work, we were able to reverse that data. Overall, we did see a slight increase in overall suspensions (1.2%), but are hopeful that on-going measures will continue to have positive impacts for our student groups.

DRAFT

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

Moving forward, we plan to continue our PBIS implementation work, but shift from tier 1 to tier 2. Because of school success at PBIS Tier I implementation for supports needed by all students, the focus for next year will shift to Tier II, low-intensity individual and small group support for students needing something more than is provided to all students. Additionally, we plan to move to a maintenance model with Playworks -- continued program implementation, but no longer have intensive trainings.

Additionally, our work with the CIM team identified some areas of social emotional support that may be impacting our students of color, specifically need for cultural competency training more holistically. With this in mind, we plan to add staff training and also plan for monthly CIM team meetings. This had not been included previously as we were not identified for this support until after we had completed our needs assessments for last year's LCAP.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

DRAFT

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
3	Enhance constructive communication within and outside the school community with a special focus on involving parents as active partners in their child's education.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Parent Education Program Participation	15 Parents participating in parent education program in 2019-20	6 Parents participating in parent education program in 2020-21	12 Parents participating in parent education program in 2022-23	Attendees to Parent Education Program as of 3/1/2024 611	30 parents participating in parenting education programs
Parent Informational Events Held	63 Informational events held in 2019-20	47 Informational events held in 2021-22 (3.25.22); many using teleconference	47 Informational events held in 2022-23 (1.18.23)	Parent Engagement and community events as of April 30, 2024 399	40 informational events held
Launchpad Logins through May 1	357,324 Launchpads logins in 2019-20 through 3.13.20 862,500 Launchpad logins for 2020-21 through 4.20.21	495,600 495,600 Launchpads logins in 2021-22 through 3.25.22. Launchpad login through end of year: 636,400	410,889 410,8890 Launchpads logins in 2022-232 through 1.17.23. Launchpad logins through the end of the year: 722,884	Logins as of April 30, 2024 642,000	Launchpad logins equivalent to 50 times per year per student

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Parents using Aeries Portal to Access Progress Information (Number of parent accounts used divided by number of parent accounts established. In many families, one parent logs in and shares information with the other, so usage will always be below 100%)	91% Parents using Aeries portal in 2020-21 to get information about their child's attendance, grades, and assessments, up from 74% in 2018-19	73% Parents using Aeries portal in 2020-21 to get information about their child's attendance, grades, and assessments (3.25.22)	75% Parents using Aeries portal in 2022-23 to get information about their child's attendance, grades, and assessments (5.31.23)	Parent Portal Access 2023-24, logins as of April 30, 2024 All Schools: 73% Cambridge: 60% Center: 55% Foxboro: 56% Scandia: 61% Travis: 62% Golden West: 98% Vanden: 86% TEC: 100%	90% of parents using the portal to access information about their child's attendance, grades, and assessments
Family Survey Responses	907 Responses to family survey in 2019-20 9,362 Responses to family surveys in 2020-21	1,416 Responses to family surveys in 2021-22 through March 2022	661 Responses to family surveys in 2022-23 through December 2022	2023-24 Family LCAP Survey Responses 657	1,000 responses to family surveys
State Priority 3A, 3B, 3C, and Dashboard Local Indicator Section 1: Building relationships between school staff and families, including families of unduplicated students and students with special needs	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP survey Q 17, 18, 19, 24, 26, 28; Family survey Q 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 27 2023-24 LCAP Survey	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
State Practice 1. Rate the LEA's progress in developing the capacity of staff (i.e., administrators, teachers, and classified staff) to build trusting and respectful relationships with families.					
State Practice 2. Rate the LEA's progress in creating welcoming environments for all families in the community	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP survey Q 17, 18, 19, 24, 26, 28; Family survey Q 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 27 2023-24 LCAP Survey	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability
State Practice 3. Rate the LEA's progress in supporting staff to learn about each family's strengths, cultures, languages, and goals for their children	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	3 – Initial Implementation	4 – Full Implementation	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP survey Q 17, 18, 19, 24, 26, 28; Family survey Q 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 27 2023-24 LCAP Survey	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
State Practice 4. Rate the LEA's progress in developing multiple opportunities for the LEA and school sites to engage in 2-way communication between families and educators using language that is understandable and accessible to families.	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	4 – Full Implementation	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP survey Q 17, 18, 19, 24, 26, 28; Family survey Q 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 27 2023-24 LCAP Survey	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability
State Priority 3A, 3B, 3C, and Dashboard Local Indicator Section 2: Building partnerships for student outcomes State Practice 5. Rate the LEA's progress in providing professional learning and support to teachers and principals to improve a school's capacity to partner with families.	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	4 – Full Implementation	4 – Full Implementation	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP staff survey Q 20, 21, 22, 29; Family survey: Q 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26 2023-24 LCAP Surveys	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability
State Practice 6. Rate the LEA's progress in providing families with information and resources to support student learning and	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	4 – Full Implementation	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP staff survey Q 20, 21, 22, 29; Family survey:	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
development in the home.				Q 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26 2023-24 LCAP Surveys	
State Practice 7. Rate the LEA's progress in implementing policies or programs for teachers to meet with families and students to discuss student progress and ways to work together to support improved student outcomes.	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	4 – Full Implementation	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP staff survey Q 20, 21, 22, 29; Family survey: Q 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26 2023-24 LCAP Surveys	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability
State Practice 8. Rate the LEA's progress in supporting families to understand and exercise their legal rights and advocate for their own students and all students.	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP staff survey Q 20, 21, 22, 29; Family survey: Q 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26 2023-24 LCAP Surveys	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability
State Priority 3A, 3B, 3C, and Dashboard Local Indicator Section 3: Seeking	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	4 – Full Implementation	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability	4 - Full Implementation	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
input for decisionmaking State Practice 9. Rate the LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decisionmaking.				Data Source: LCAP Family survey Q 31, 32, 33 2023-24 LCAP Surveys	
State Practice 10. Rate the LEA's progress in building the capacity of and supporting family members to effectively engage in advisory groups and decision-making.	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	4 – Full Implementation	4 – Full Implementation	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP Family survey Q 31, 32, 33 2023-24 LCAP Surveys	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability
State Practice 11. Rate the LEA's progress in providing all families with opportunities to provide input on policies and programs, and implementing strategies to reach and seek input from any underrepresented	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	3 – Initial Implementation	4 – Full Implementation	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP Family survey Q 31, 32, 33 2023-24 LCAP Surveys	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
groups in the school community.					
State Practice 12. Rate the LEA's progress in providing opportunities to have families, teachers, principals, and district administrators work together to plan, design, implement and evaluate family engagement activities at school and district levels.	No baseline in 2020-21, the state added this new required metric for 2021-22.	3 – Initial Implementation	4 – Full Implementation	4 - Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP Family survey Q 31, 32, 33 2023-24 LCAP Surveys	5 – Full Implementation and Sustainability

Goal Analysis

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.
A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

We implemented this goal as planned; however, we saw lower participation in our community Equity Action Team and decreased our planned meetings to trimester meetings. We were also able to increase our offerings to families in our Parent University program by partnering with outside agencies, including our SELPA and local security agencies (for a fentanyl training).

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

Budgeted: $176,153.00
Actual obligated: $143,630.89

Difference: $32,522.11

Cost savings were realized within our Parent University program as we were able to host most of the offerings internally, using expertise of staff and our students in the Video Production CTE pathway.

DRAFT

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

Families maintained high engagement levels, responding to surveys and actively participating in decision-making processes. The Launchpad single sign-on service, which parents had requested, remained highly effective, logging over 640,000 sign-ins this year (by April). Survey responses indicated that parents feel well-informed about school events. Parent University sessions were positively received with 611 parents viewing or attending our educational events. This is an increase from the year prior, which we attribute to our newly promoted YouTube channel and variety of topic which were based on last year's survey data. For these reasons, we see all of the actions in this goal as effective.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

Although our overall family data is positive, we see two areas of growth as communication and customer service. We have routinely asked our families about their experiences on our campuses and school events, and we have our lowest metrics around the welcoming environment for campus guests. We also hear from families that communication is not always timely enough and that our website is not easy to navigate. This issue was raised particularly by our military connected families who shared that our website is how they first experience our district when they learn that they will be moving to the Travis Air Force Base.

Classified staff also often requests increased training opportunities. This was raised by our CSEA president in our LCAP planning sessions for the 2024-25 LCAP. There are many opportunities for classified staff with more instructional roles, such as instructional aides and paraprofessionals, but other members of the classified team would like more opportunities.

Taking all of these items together, we plan to increase our staff trainings, specifically focusing on positive environment and communication. This will parallel training for our administrative teams on similar topics. We are also in process of a full overhaul of our website, which will include focused training for our site and district level web design teams.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

DRAFT

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
4	Provide basic services and manage resources responsibly while maintaining the collaborative budget process. Enhance, create, and modernize facilities that support lifelong educational programs.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
State Priority 1A and Dashboard Local Indicator Basic Services Teacher assignments Teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject areas and for the students they are teaching (Williams Act)	2020-21 data from Human Resources (January 2021) 0. Misassignments of teachers of English learners 0. Total teacher misassignments 0. Vacant teacher positions	2021-22 data from Human Resources (February 2022) 0. Misassignments of teachers of English learners 0. Total teacher misassignments 0. Vacant teacher positions	2022-23 data from Human Resources (October 2022) 0. Misassignments of teachers of English learners 3 Total teacher misassignments 1 Vacant teacher positions	TAMO data on the 2023-24 CA Dashboard local indicator (reporting year 2021-22) Total Teaching FTE: 251.51 Clear (% of teaching FTE): 90.4% Above statewide average 2023-24 data from Human Resources (as of CBEDs Day, Oct. 2023) Misassignment of teachers of English learners: 0 Total teacher misassignments: 0	Misassignments of teachers of English learners = 0 Total teacher misassignments = 0 Vacant teacher positions = 0

DRAFT

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
				Vacant teacher positions: 5	
State Priority 1B and Dashboard Local Indicator Basic Services Instructional materials Every student has sufficient access to standards-aligned instructional materials (Williams Act)	2020-21 data 100%. Percent of students with required instructional materials	2021-22 data (9.14.21) 100%. Percent of students with required instructional materials	2022-23 data (9.13.22) 100%. Percent of students with required instructional materials	2023-24 data Percent of students with required instructional materials: 100%	100% of students have required instructional materials
State Priority 1C and Dashboard Local Indicator Basic Services Facilities maintenance School facilities are maintained in good repair (Williams Act)	2020-21 data Percent of schools rated GOOD or EXEMPLARY overall on the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT) 100%.	2021-22 data (January 2022) Percent of schools rated GOOD or EXEMPLARY overall on the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT) 100%.	2022-23 data (January 2023) Percent of schools rated GOOD or EXEMPLARY overall on the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT) 100%.	2023-24 data Percent of schools rated good exemplary overall on the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT): 100%	All schools rated GOOD or EXEMPLARY overall on the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT)

Goal Analysis

DRAFT

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

We implemented our plan as intended, but had some additional expenditures related to these plans. We chose to expend more funds and keep our actions intact instead of making substantive changes to our plans. We provided standards aligned curriculum at all grade levels, maintained our facilities (in accordance with FIT standards) and had appropriately credentialed teachers in classrooms.

Our largest additional service in this area was the creation of a New Teacher Summer Institute, which provided curricular and pedagogical support for new teachers before the school year started. Summer Institute included required sessions specifically dedicated to skills and techniques to serve unduplicated students.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

Budgeted: $3,059,828
Actual: $3,886,992.75

Difference: -$827,164.75

There were some facilities issues that were not planned, including our Golden West boiler failing mid-year that impacted our facilities budget. Additionally, we extended some of our digital licenses and student supplies that had previously been included in our textbook subscriptions but had expired at the end of last year or mid-year this year. We did realize some savings in our teacher induction costs due to more newly hired teachers not needing the induction support. However, we shifted some of those funds to support teachers who were new to the profession and not yet induction eligible.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

The New Teacher Summer Institute was extremely successful. New teachers reported high value for the training and TUTA leadership cited the program as a positive incentive for hiring and recruitment. Travis Unified continues to have a high percentage of cleared teachers (90%). Basic materials and facility needs (as measured by FIT) are being met.

DRAFT

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

Overall this goal continues to be necessary and current actions are proving effective. We continue to improve our New Teacher Summer Institute and induction programs. We are in the process of exploring opportunities to manage more of these trainings locally, either with our staff or in partnership with SCOE to reduce cost while maintaining service levels to our staff and students. We are also approaching new textbook adoption in math and expect additional expenditures and staff focus on this in the years ahead.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

DRAFT

Instructions

For additional questions or technical assistance related to the completion of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) template, please contact the local county office of education (COE), or the California Department of Education's (CDE's) Local Agency Systems Support Office, by phone at 916-319-0809 or by email at lcff@cde.ca.gov.

Complete the prompts as instructed for each goal included in the 2023–24 LCAP. Duplicate the tables as needed. The 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update must be included with the 2024–25 LCAP.

Goals and Actions

Goal(s)

Description:

Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Measuring and Reporting Results

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Metric:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Baseline:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Year 1 Outcome:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Year 2 Outcome:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Year 3 Outcome:

- When completing the 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies.

Desired Outcome for 2023–24:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Timeline for completing the "**Measuring and Reporting Results**" part of the Goal.

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for Year 3 (2023–24)
Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Enter information in this box when completing the 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Goal Analysis

Using actual annual measurable outcome data, including data from the Dashboard, analyze whether the planned actions were effective in achieving the goal. Respond to the prompts as instructed.

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

DRAFT

- Describe the overall implementation of the actions to achieve the articulated goal. Include a discussion of relevant challenges and successes experienced with the implementation process. This must include any instance where the LEA did not implement a planned action or implemented a planned action in a manner that differs substantively from how it was described in the adopted LCAP.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

- Explain material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and between the Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services, as applicable. Minor variances in expenditures or percentages do not need to be addressed, and a dollar-for-dollar accounting is not required.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

- Describe the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle. "Effectiveness" means the degree to which the actions were successful in producing the desired result and "ineffectiveness" means that the actions did not produce any significant or desired result.
    - In some cases, not all actions in a goal will be intended to improve performance on all of the metrics associated with the goal.
    - When responding to this prompt, LEAs may assess the effectiveness of a single action or group of actions within the goal in the context of performance on a single metric or group of specific metrics within the goal that are applicable to the action(s). Grouping actions with metrics will allow for more robust analysis of whether the strategy the LEA is using to impact a specified set of metrics is working and increase transparency for educational partners. LEAs are encouraged to use such an approach when goals include multiple actions and metrics that are not closely associated.
    - Beginning with the development of the 2024–25 LCAP, the LEA must change actions that have not proven effective over a three-year period.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

- Describe any changes made to this goal, expected outcomes, metrics, or actions to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis and analysis of the data provided in the Dashboard or other local data, as applicable.
    - As noted above, beginning with the development of the 2024–25 LCAP, the LEA must change actions that have not proven effective over a three-year period. For actions that have been identified as ineffective, the LEA must identify the ineffective action and must include a description of the following:
        - The reasons for the ineffectiveness, and
        - How changes to the action will result in a new or strengthened approach.

California Department of Education
November 2023

DRAFT