LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Travis Unified School District
CDS Code: 4870565
School Year: 2026-27
LEA contact information:
Nick Girimonte
Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services
ngirimonte@travisusd.org
(707) 437-4604

School districts receive funding from different sources: state funds under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), other state funds, local funds, and federal funds. LCFF funds include a base level of funding for all LEAs and extra funding - called "supplemental and concentration" grants - to LEAs based on the enrollment of high needs students (foster youth, English learners, and low-income students).

Budget Overview for the 2026-27 School Year



This chart shows the total general purpose revenue Travis Unified School District expects to receive in the coming year from all sources.

The text description for the above chart is as follows: The total revenue projected for Travis Unified School District is $98,103,374, of which $69,464,946 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), $16,824,118 is other state funds, $6,014,834 is local funds, and $5,799,476 is federal funds. Of the $69,464,946 in LCFF Funds, $5,604,730 is generated based on the enrollment of high needs students (foster youth, English learner, and low-income students).

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

The LCFF gives school districts more flexibility in deciding how to use state funds. In exchange, school districts must work with parents, educators, students, and the community to develop a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) that shows how they will use these funds to serve students.



This chart provides a quick summary of how much Travis Unified School District plans to spend for 2026-27. It shows how much of the total is tied to planned actions and services in the LCAP.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: Travis Unified School District plans to spend $94,642,233 for the 2026-27 school year. Of that amount, $10,612,763 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and $84,029,470 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:

Increased or Improved Services for High Needs Students in the LCAP for the 2026-27 School Year

In 2026-27, Travis Unified School District is projecting it will receive $5,604,730 based on the enrollment of foster youth, English learner, and low-income students. Travis Unified School District must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Travis Unified School District plans to spend $5,702,747 towards meeting this requirement, as described in the LCAP.

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Update on Increased or Improved Services for High Needs Students in 2025-26



This chart compares what Travis Unified School District budgeted last year in the LCAP for actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students with what Travis Unified School District estimates it has spent on actions and services that contribute to increasing or improving services for high needs students in the current year.

The text description of the above chart is as follows: In 2025-26, Travis Unified School District's LCAP budgeted $5,589,715 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Travis Unified School District actually spent $5,445,465 for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2025-26.

Local Control and Accountability Plan

The instructions for completing the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) follow the template.

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

Plan Summary [2026-27]

General Information

A description of the LEA, its schools, and its students in grades transitional kindergarten–12, as applicable to the LEA. LEAs may also provide information about their strategic plan, vision, etc.

Travis Unified serves 5,405 students in grades TK-12. The district is located between Fairfield and Vacaville, adjacent to Travis Air Force Base. 33% of our students are from military-affiliated families, and 46.1% of our students are socioeconomically disadvantaged. 3.2% of our students are learning English, and about 16.25% receive Special Education services. Homeless and Foster Youth students make up .1% of our population. Our student body is diverse, with no ethnic group making up more than a third of the population and more than 80 reported languages spoken in our families' homes.

We enjoy strong community support for our schools, and there is a great deal of parent involvement at school and in decision-making. Our programs, both in school and outside of school (athletics, band, robotics), are greatly enhanced through the efforts of parent volunteers.

We serve the community's children through five elementary schools, one middle school, one comprehensive high school, and an alternative high school. The alternative high school, TEC, has been designated as a Model Continuation High School, and our comprehensive high school, Vanden, was designated as a California Distinguished School in 2026. Our schools provide strong core academic programs along with rich experiences in the arts, music, STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics), athletics, and Career Technical Education.

Reflections: Annual Performance

A reflection on annual performance based on a review of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) and local data.

We have had marked success with our graduation rates and English Learner Progress in recent years. Currently we have 98.1% graduation rate, with every measured student group performing at the highest level, save for our students with disabilities, who increased to a 90% graduation rate, a percent which far outpaces statewide data. Chronic absenteeism continues to stabilize post-pandemic, and has dropped 3.4% to 13.4% in the past 2 years.

Our English Learners have also shown continued positive progress with 55.1% making progress on annual ELPAC assessments and earned the district the highest "Blue" ranking on the California School Dashboard.. These successes are in part due to the systematic intervention and support programs available TK-12 and also the targeted support for students at the secondary level to ensure on-time graduation.

Another area of overall improvement has been suspension rates as it further declined by 1.2% for an overall suspension rate of 2.4% . We have seen improvement in our rates of suspension for 12 of the 13 measured student groups. Most notably, we have seen a significant decline of 3.1% in our suspensions of African American students, a student group historically over-represented in these data.

While we did see an increase of 5.8 points in ELA performance and 2.5. points in Math, both remain areas of continued focus. This focus resulted in all students 8 of 10 students groups increasing their performance level in ELA, and not a single student group declined. Students with disabilities remains an area of need, as they scored in the lowest band in both ELA and Math; however, in ELA there was a significant increase in their performance of 17.6 points.

While academic performance remains a focus for the district, TUSD does perform in the top two for CAASPP performance in Solano County, which is mirrored in local assessments, including NWEA/MAP. The overall ELA achievement level through Winter 2025-26 was 39% (high, high average) . For math, that number is closer to 38% with high levels of growth.

The improved academic results and increased CTE offerings have positively impacted the College and Career Readiness Indicator for the district, which increased by 2.2%. This, coupled with our high graduation rate, is a strong indicator that our secondary students have access to courses and programs which are preparing them for life after high school.

Although academic achievement has continued to be an area of focus for our students with disabilities, we have shown continued success in Least Restrictive Environment targets as our special education team continues to make strong progress toward meeting targets. The percentage of students with disabilities spending 80% or more of their day in general education classrooms has gone from 64.3% in 2020-21 to 71.89% in 2024-25, exceeding the state target of 67%.

In addition to the overall successes and challenges described above, we have identified the following schools and student groups that are areas of focus (as defined by receiving the lowest performance area on one or more state indicator in the 2023 Dashboard):

District-wide these groups are areas of focus:

Academic (ELA/Math and College and Career Indicator): Students with Disabilities

Suspensions: Pacific Islander and homeless students

The following schools are areas of focus:

Academics (College and Career Indicator): Travis Education Center
Engagement (chronic absenteeism): Golden West
Climate (suspensions): Center Elementary

The following groups at each school site are areas of focus:

Cambridge Elementary:
Academics ELA: Students with Disabilities
Engagement (Attendance): English Learners and Filipino students
Climate (suspensions): none

Center Elementary:
Academics: none
Engagement (Attendance): none
Climate (suspensions): Students with disabilities, socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED), two or more races

Foxboro Elementary:
Academics: none
Engagement (Attendance): English Learners
Climate (suspensions): none

Scandia Elementary:
Academics ELA: Students with Disabilities
Engagement (Attendance): none
Climate (suspensions): none

Travis Elementary: none

Golden West Middle School:
Academics ELA and Math: Students with Disabilities
Engagement (Attendance): Socioeconomically disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, white, Hispanic
Climate (suspensions): none

Vanden High School:
Academics: none
Engagement (graduation rate): none

Climate (suspensions): white

Travis Education Center (TEC):
Academics: Socioeconomically disadvantaged (College and Career Indicator only)
Engagement (graduation rate): none
Climate (suspensions): none

Travis Independent Study (in the process of transitioning to a program)
Academics: none
Engagement (Attendance): none
Climate (suspensions): none

Travis Unified will utilize the Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant to address to address learning recovery initiatives that address the specific needs of schools and student groups in our district. After a comprehensive needs assessment that drilled down on school and student group performance, the district has identified the need to address elementary ELA and math performance to address learning gaps for targeted student groups. As such, the district will use these funds to deepen its multi-tiered systems of support, in particular Tier 2 systems which allow for early intervention for student groups demonstrating achievement gaps. Additionally, high quality academic MTSS programs are dependent on data systems that generate actionable information on student progress in academic areas. LREBG funds will be utilized to support data systems that provide practitioners with such data. (Action item 1.3)

The LREBG needs assessment also surfaced data which demonstrate our comprehensive high school requires more support to enhance systems of support specific to attendance. Attendance at Vanden has been slower to recover as compared to our other sites, and LREBG funds will be used to enhance MTSS programs that are specific to attendance, are responsive to community input, and rooted in the CASEL framework. (Action item 2.1)

LREBG funds will also be used to train teachers on the English-Language Arts Framework. The needs assessment revealed a need to focus on ELA outcomes for students, especially in the early grades. (Action item 1.5)

Reflections: Technical Assistance

As applicable, a summary of the work underway as part of technical assistance.

Currently, Travis Unified is involved in two levels of technical assistance: Compliance and Improvement Monitoring (CIM) and Differentiated Assistance (DA).

For DA, the academic performance (ELA/Math CAASPP scores and CCI) of our students with disabilities is the focal point. In partnership with our county partners at the Solano County Office of Education, Travis has been researching the various structures in place (or not) to meet the needs of struggling students at individual sites. Additionally, the team has focused on ensuring high quality first instruction for all

students, including those with disabilities. Additionally, we have engaged in math specific professional development at the middle school level to address the low performance of students.

TUSD is eligible for Differentiated Assistance based on the 2024 CA Dashboard for Students with Disabilities student group in ELA and Math-Red (Priority #4) and College & Career-Red (Priority #8).

On the 2025 CA Dashboard, it is eligible for student groups Homeless Youth in Chronic Ab (Priority #5) and Suspension (Priority #6) and Students with Disabilities in ELA-Orange and Math-Red (Priority #4) and College & Career (Priority #8).

In CIM, the district exited monitoring for disproportionate suspensions of African-American students with disabilities. This was achieved through a focused and thoughtful consideration of district practices, mindset, and policies, and has resulted in positive programs and outcomes for our students.

TUSD is currently in Intensive monitoring for our preschool age students who have limited access to non-Special Education programming. The district has formed a team and is working with staff from CDE to identify opportunities for our young students with disabilities to have access to these programs.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

An LEA with a school or schools eligible for comprehensive support and improvement must respond to the following prompts.

Schools Identified

A list of the schools in the LEA that are eligible for comprehensive support and improvement.

Not applicable

Support for Identified Schools

A description of how the LEA has or will support its eligible schools in developing comprehensive support and improvement plans.

Not applicable

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

A description of how the LEA will monitor and evaluate the plan to support student and school improvement.

Not applicable

Engaging Educational Partners

A summary of the process used to engage educational partners in the development of the LCAP.

School districts and county offices of education must, at a minimum, consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units, parents, and students in the development of the LCAP.

Charter schools must, at a minimum, consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, parents, and students in the development of the LCAP.

An LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also consult with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for each applicable school.

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
Parents and guardians	Educational partners, staff, students and community members were engaged through surveys, in person and zoom meetings and focus groups. The year began with site meetings at each of our schools, then all partners and students grades TK-12 were invited to participate in surveys in November-December 2025. There were also additional topic specific meetings held for parents and community members throughout the year. LCAP drafts were shared with staff and administration and then final review was given by the Superintendents Parent Advisory Group and District English Language Advisory Committee. The LCAP draft was also posted on the TUSD website for community comment and feedback. People had an opportunity to provide feedback at the following meetings: LCAP Family Survey (November, 2025 - January, 2026); 495 responses (Elementary: 254, Middle School: 79, High School: 143, Alternative High School: 19 PTA/PTO meetings (2 meetings per elementary site; 10 meetings total); site parent meetings (2 at Golden West; 1 at TEC and 1 at Vanden)

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	Superintendent's Parent Advisory Group met monthly with the Superintendent. Final review and approval of the LCAP drafts were given by the Parent Advisory group and DELAC committee at the following meetings: DELAC: 5/20/26, Parents Advisory Group: 4/21/26
Students	Educational partners, staff, students and community members were engaged through surveys, in person and zoom meetings and focus groups. The year began with site meetings at each of our schools, then all partners and students grades TK-12 were invited to participate in surveys. There were then focus groups at each school site which included students in each grade band. The LCAP draft was also posted on the TUSD website for community comment and feedback. Focus groups (November - December, 2025): 276 California Healthy Kids Survey Responses: 1,359 Student survey (January, 2026); 3,522 responses
Staff	Educational partners, staff, students and community members were engaged through surveys, in person and zoom meetings and focus groups. There were 205 responses to the staff survey conducted between December, 2025 - January, 2026. Staff were also engaged in feedback loops through a variety of site opportunities, such as Department Chairs, Leadership Teams, PBIS Team, and MTSS Team. The feedback from these teams was shared by the site principals with district leadership. There were also additional topic specific meetings held for parents and community members throughout the year. LCAP drafts were shared with staff and administration and then final review was given by the Superintendents Parent Advisory Group and District English Language Advisory Committee. The LCAP draft was also posted on the TUSD website for community comment and feedback.

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
Administrators and managers	Educational partners, staff, students and community members were engaged through surveys, in person and zoom meetings and focus groups. Data was shared at sites by principals; staff also engaged with discipline, attendance and academic data within their site leadership teams. The feedback from these teams was shared by the site principals with district leadership. There were also additional topic specific meetings held for parents and community members throughout the year. LCAP drafts were shared with staff and administration and then final review was given by the Superintendents Parent Advisory Group and District English Language Advisory Committee. The LCAP draft was also posted on the TUSD website for community comment and feedback. Administrators had many opportunities in monthly Admin Academy meetings to share their feedback on needs, actions and goals. Some additional opportunities included: Curriculum Council District English Learner Advisory Committee Specific LCAP planning meetings: Budget Meetings- January-May 2026; Goal Setting and Monitoring- Monthly August 2025-May 2026; Administrative Council Meetings- Monthly August 2025-May 2026; Administrative Academy- Monthly August 2025- June 2026.
Parents, staff and community members (representing the multilingual community)	Educational partners, staff, students and community members were engaged through surveys, in person and zoom meetings and focus groups. The year began with site meetings at each of our schools, then all partners and students grades TK-12 were invited to participate in surveys. There were also additional topic specific meetings held for parents and community members throughout the year. LCAP drafts were shared with staff and administration and then final review was given by the Superintendents Parent Advisory Group and District English Language Advisory Committee. The LCAP draft

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	was also posted on the TUSD website for community comment and feedback on June 2, 2026.
SELPA	District leadership met with the SELPA director to review district specific needs, actions and goals. LCAP drafts were available for feedback, which was incorporated into subsequent drafts. Meeting:
Classified Labor Partners, CSEA	In addition to the opportunities that were available for all staff, additional review and feedback from our labor partners was included in the planning process. District leadership met with the Travis Unified Teachers Association and CSEA throughout the year in informal and formal contexts to discuss LCAP goals, suggestions and feedback was included in the subsequent draft.
Travis Unified Teachers Association, TUTA	In addition to the opportunities that were available for all staff, additional review and feedback from our labor partners was included in the planning process. District leadership met with the Travis Unified Teachers Association and CSEA throughout the year in informal and formal contexts to discuss LCAP goals, suggestions and feedback was included in the subsequent draft.
Foster parents	Educational partners, staff, students and community members were engaged through surveys, in person and zoom meetings and focus groups. The year began with site meetings at each of our schools, then all partners and students grades TK-12 were invited to participate in surveys. There were also additional topic specific meetings held for parents and community members throughout the year, including a Foster Parent meeting that occurs monthly (September - May). LCAP drafts were shared with staff and administration and then final review was given by the Superintendents Parent Advisory Group and District English Language Advisory Committee. The LCAP draft was also posted on the TUSD website for community comment and feedback.

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

Information from educational partner consultation was categorized by goal or subject and summarized for consideration by administrators, who also considered data from previous years about the effectiveness of actions and services, educational research, and available financial resources. There was a strong consensus from multiple educational partner groups in support of the major items included in the LCAP. A reorganized and simplified set of actions and services emerged from this work. To make the LCAP more user-friendly, we continued to focus the LCAP on a few high-leverage areas rather than including everything being done in the district. Newly mandated areas of priority have been added at the school and district level.

We posted the draft of the LCAP on our website on June 2, 2026 The public was invited to submit comments related to the draft LCAP, including feedback about specific actions, services, and expenditures. The public was given the opportunity to comment on the plan at public hearings on the 2026-27 LCAP and district budget at the Board meeting on June 9, 2026. The Superintendent has responded in writing to questions from the public. The Board adopted the LCAP and district budget at their meeting on June 16, 2026.

Goals and Actions

Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Academic achievement is the primary purpose of school districts. This goal includes focus areas as measured by Goal 1 metrics along with a broad emphasis on equitable and positive outcomes for all students. We believe that all students can achieve and with the right supports and innovative curriculum we can engage students actively in their educations. We are committed to closing the achievement gap. An achievement gap is also an opportunity gap, which leads to an income gap, which leads to a gap in positive life outcomes, including a healthy lifespan. We believe that education is the antidote to poverty, and that our mission is to ensure that all students thrive as adults, both personally and through high-skill, high-wage employment.

Dashboard and Local Data Areas of Focus:
Our 2023-24 data showed we needed to focus on improving the performance of students with disabilities and low-income students. Local data (from NWEA MAP and class grades) from the 2023-24 school year shows those groups and English learners continue to need additional support. These trends continued on the 2024-25 Dashboard, and there were some notable improvements on the most recent Dashboard. Based on our data, our LCAP is focused on improving outcomes for all students, with special focus on students with disabilities at all school sites.

When looking at the grade data for our secondary students (grades 7-12) we also see some troubling trends, especially for students in the 9th grade. Studies show that transitional periods (i.e., when a student goes from middle to high school) can be challenging for students. Nonetheless, we are committed to addressing the high number of students who do not successfully complete Algebra 1, World History, and English 1 on the first attempt. Unfortunately, success rates for students with disabilities in co-taught classes are not as we would hope.

Feedback from Community Partners:
Academics continue to be an area of focus for families, teachers, administrators and support staff. In focus groups, students often cited academics as an area of stress and the need to balance academic and social/family/athletic commitments. Although students reported

different areas of challenge, math, science and English were all top for students across the grade levels. Whereas electives and college and career (CTE) classes were often seen as highlights, including history, Automotive and Medical Science. When students with disabilities were interviewed, both math and writing were considered the most challenging for elementary students and they would like more art. Students had suggestions to help improve their performance, including getting help from teachers, getting help and staying up-to-date on homework, and having fewer subs or having more "trained" subs.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	State Priorities 2A, 2B: implementation of academic and ELD content and performance standards as adopted by the State Board and Dashboard Local Indicator Implementation of State Academic Content Standards Data Source: 2023-24 Teacher Survey	Data from 2023-24 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. English Language Arts: 4.44 ELD: 3.99 Math: 4.31 Science: 3.55 History-Social Science: 3.72	Data from 2024-25 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. English Language Arts: 4.57 ELD: 4.16 Math: 4.52 Science: 3.90 History-Social Science: 3.89	Data from Q4 of the 2025-26 LCAP 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. English Language Arts: 4.27 ELD: 3.81 Math: 3.98 Science: 3.70 History-Social Science: 3.85	2026-27 School Year Implementation of all academic core standards = or above 4.0.	English Language Arts: -.17 ELD: -0.18 Math: -0.33 Science: +0.15 History-Social Science: +0.13
1.2	State Priority 4 Statewide assessments in English Language Arts and the Dashboard State Academic Indicator	Data from Fall 2023 Dashboard (2022-23 data): Color: Orange	Data from Fall 2024 Dashboard (2023-24 data): Color: Orange 12.8 points below average with a	Data from Fall 2025 Dashboard (2024-25 data): Color: Yellow 7.1 points below average with an	2026-27 School Year All students at or above standard with all student	Color: Orange -> Yellow Points Below Average: -0.6 Point Decline/Increase: +17.5

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	English Language Arts (grades 3-8 and 11) Data Source: Fall 2023 CA Dashboard	7.7 points below average with a decline of 11.7 points Red: Students with Disabilities Orange: African American English Learners Hispanic Socioeconomically Disadvantaged For comparison, State data is 13.6 points below standard. For a deeper understanding of this baseline data, percentages have been included. 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%	decline of 5.2 points Red: Students with Disabilities Orange: African American English Learners Hispanic Two or More Races Socioeconomically Disadvantaged For comparison, State data is 13.2 points below standard. For a deeper understanding of this baseline data, percentages have been included. Percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards (from Aeries Analytics CAASPP data 2023-24):	increase of 5.8 points Red: N/A Orange: English Learners Long-Term English Learners Students with Disabilities For comparison, State data is 8.1 points below standard. For a deeper understanding of this baseline data, percentages have been included. Percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards (from Aeries Analytics CAASPP data 2024-25): All Students: 47.3%	groups in yellow, blue, or green.	Red: -Students with Disabilities Orange: -African American -Hispanic +Long-Term English Learners State Data Below Standard Comparison: -5.5 Percent of Students meeting or exceeding Standards All Students: -0.6% Grades 3-6: -2.9% Grades 7-8: -1.3% Grade 11: +10.9% Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard No Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Grade 11: 48.4% Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard 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	All Students: 46.8% Grades 3-6: 44.9% Grades 7-8: 47.7% Grade 11: 52.8% Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard Students with Disabilities (SWD) District-wide: 101.2 points below standard Cambridge: 98.4 points below standard Scandia: 63.1 points below standard Golden West: 119.8 points below standard	Grades 3-6: 42.9% Grades 7-8: 50.7% Grade 11: 59.3% Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard None		
1.3	State Priority 8 English Language Arts local measure NWEA MAP winter ELA growth scores, taken in Jan-March 2024 in grades 2-12	NWEA MAP Reading score Winter 2023-24: Students scoring average, above or high average on growth: All students: 63.8% English Learners: 18.1%	NWEA MAP Reading score Winter 2024-25: Students scoring average, above or high average on growth:	NWEA MAP Reading score Winter 2025-26: Students scoring average, above or high average on growth:	2026-27 School Year 74% of all students to score average, above or high ELA growth and focus groups (EL and SWD) to increase by 20% of current	Students scoring average, above or high average on growth: All students: +7.0% English Learners: +4.7% SWD: +2.1%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Data Source: NWEA MAP ELA Scores	SWD: 29%	All students: 61.5% English Learners: 16.3% SWD: 26.1%	All students: 70.8% English Learners: 22.8% SWD: 31.1%	level (to 22% for EL and 35% for SWD)	
1.4	Metric 3 State Priority 4 Statewide assessments in mathematics and the Dashboard State Academic Indicator Mathematics (grades 3-8 and 11) Data Source: Fall 2023 CA Dashboard	Data from Fall 2023 Dashboard (2022-23 data): Color: Orange 39.7 points below average with a decline of 1.1 points, which the CDE defines as maintained status. Red: 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):	Data from Fall 2024 Dashboard (2023-24 data): Color: Orange 44.4 points below average with a decline of 4.7 points, which the CDE defines as declined status. Red: Students with Disabilities Orange: African American English Learners Hispanic Two or More Races Socioeconomically Disadvantaged White For comparison, State data is 47.6 points below standard.	Data from Fall 2025 Dashboard (2024-25 data): Color: Orange 41.9 points below average which a decline of 2.5 points, which the CDE defines as maintained status. Red: Students with Disabilities Orange: English Learners Hispanic Long-Term English Learners Two or More Races Socioeconomically Disadvantaged For comparison, State data is 42.4 points below standard.	2026-27 School Year All students at or above standard with all student groups in yellow, blue, or green.	Color: Orange +4.7 points below average with a decline of +3.6 points, which the CDE defines as declined status. Red: No Change Orange: -African American +English Learners +Hispanic +Long-Term English Learners -White Percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards (from Aeries Analytics CAASPP data): All Students: -0.8% Grades 3-6: -1.4% Grades 7-8: +0.2% Grade 11: -2.1%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		All Students: 35.7% Grades 3-6: 37.5%% Grades 7-8: 36.4% Grade 11: 28.5% Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard 1. Students with Disabilities (SWD) District-wide: 118 points below standard Golden West: 152.9points below standard	Percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards (from Aeries Analytics CAASPP data 2022-23): All Students: 33.9% Grades 3-6: 36.3% Grades 7-8: 33.9% Grade 11: 25.8% Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard 1. Students with Disabilities (SWD) District-wide: 120.2 points below standard Cambridge: 112.4 points below standard	Percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards (from Aeries Analytics CAASPP data 2024-25): All Students: 34.9% Grades 3-6: 36.1% Grades 7-8: 36.6% Grade 11: 26.4% Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard 1. Students with Disabilities (SWD) District-wide: 117.3 points below standard Cambridge: 120.5 points below standard Center: 112 points below standard Foxboro: 101.6 points below standard		Students with areas of focus (Red) on Dashboard 1. Students with Disabilities (SWD) District-wide: -0.7 points below standard Cambridge: +120.5 points below standard Center: +112 points below standard Foxboro: +101.6 points below standard Golden West: -152.9 points below standard
1.5	State Priority 8 Math local measure	NWEA MAP Math score Winter 2023-24:	NWEA MAP Math Score Winter 2024-25:	NWEA MAP Math Score Winter 2025-26:	2026-27 School Year	Students scoring average, above or

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	NWEA MAP math growth scores, taken in Jan-March 2024 in grades 2-12 Data Source: NWEA MAP Math Scores	Students scoring average, above or high average on growth: All students: 61.8% SWD: 28.8%	Students scoring average, above or high average on growth: All students: 62.9% SWD: 25.6%	Students scoring average, above or high average on growth: All students: 67.8% SWD: 30.2%	72% of all students to score average, above or high ELA growth and focus groups (SWD) to increase by 20% of current level (35% for SWD)	high average on growth: All students: +6.0% SWD: +1.4%
1.6	State Priority 4 Statewide assessments in Science (California Science Test CAST) in grades 5, 8, and high school Data Source: CAST 2022-23	CAST 2022-23 All Students who met or exceeded standards: 37.22%	CAST 2023-24 All Students who met or exceeded standards: 33.1%	CAST 2024-25 All Students who met or exceeded standards: 46.7%	2026-27 School Year 50% of all students will meet or exceed standards.	All Students who met or exceeded standards: +9.48%
1.7	State Priority 4E 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 Source: Fall 2023 CA Dashboard	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. For comparison, 48.7% of English Learners in the state made	Data from Fall 2024 Dashboard (2023-24 data): Color: Orange 43.5% making progress, an decrease of 9.6% This is defined as English Learners who increase ELPI levels as measured on the annual ELPAC test.	Data from Fall 2025 Dashboard (2024-25 data): Color: Blue 55.1% making progress, an increase of 11.6% This is defined as English Learners who increase ELPI levels as measured on the annual ELPAC test.	2026-27 School Year 60% of all English Learners making progress or maintaining the highest EL level, 4. Dashboard performance level green or blue.	Color: Green -> Blue +1.9% making progress This is defined as English Learners who increase ELPI levels as measured on the annual ELPAC test. For comparison, there was a (-2.3%) drop in the number of English Learners in the

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		progress in the same period.	For comparison, 45.7% of English Learners in the state made progress in the same period.	For comparison, 46.4% of English Learners in the state made progress in the same period.		state who made progress.
1.8	State Priority 4F English Learner reclassification rate From DataQuest: RFEP (reclassified) divided by the sum of EL (English learners) and RFEP Data Source: 2022-23 DataQuest	Reclassifcation rates for 2022-23 (DataQuest) 67.1% For comparison the reclassification rates for the state for this period is 45.5%.	Reclassifcation rates for 2023-24 (DataQuest) 67.0% For comparison the reclassification rates for the state for this period is 46.2%.	Reclassifcation rates for 2024-25 (DataQuest) 64.0% For comparison the reclassification rates for the state for this period is 45.2%.	2026-27 School Year Reclassification rate above the state average or above 75%.	Reclassifcation rates for 2023-24 (DataQuest) -3.1% For comparison the reclassification rates for the state for this period is -0.3%.
1.9	English Learner LTEL status Long-Term English Learner (LTEL) is an EL student to which all of the following apply: (1) is enrolled on Census Day (the first Wednesday in October) in grades 6 to 12, inclusive; and (2) has been enrolled in a U.S. school for six or more years; and (3) has remained at the same English language proficiency level for two or more consecutive prior years, or has	2022-23 LTEL Percentages (DataQuest) LTEL: 6.1% of all English Learners EL in year 4-5 who are "at-risk" of LTEL status: 4.8% EL in year 4+ who are not "at-risk" or LTEL status: 3.8% For comparison, 11.1% of ELs are LTEL status.	2023-24 LTEL Percentages (DataQuest) LTEL: 5.7% of all English Learners EL in year 4-5 who are "at-risk" of LTEL status: 4.4% EL in year 4+ who are not "at-risk" or LTEL status: 3.2% For comparison, 10.6% of ELs in the state are LTEL status.	2024-25 LTEL Percentages (DataQuest) LTEL: 3.1% of all English Learners EL in year 4-5 who are "at-risk" of LTEL status: 5.1% EL in year 4+ who are not "at-risk" or LTEL status: 4.7% For comparison, 10.4% of ELs in the state are LTEL status.	2026-27 School Year Maintain LTEL rate below the state average or below 4% of English Learners.	2024-25 LTEL Percentages (DataQuest) LTEL: -3% of all English Learners EL in year 4-5 who are "at-risk" of LTEL status: +0.3% EL in year 4+ who are not "at-risk" or LTEL status: +0.9% For comparison, (-0.7%) of ELs in the

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	regressed to a lower English language proficiency level, as determined by the ELPAC. LTEL percentage: From DataQuest, LTEL divided by the sum of all EL students Data Source: 2022-23 DataQuest					state are LTEL status.
1.10	State Priority 4 and 4D College/Career Indicator College/Career Indicator from California School Dashboard Data Source: 2023 CA Dashboard Students who met UC/CSU Requirements and a CTE Pathway	College/Career Indicator: 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 due to Covid-19, which make year-over-year progress data unavailable in 2022-23.	College/Career Indicator: Data from the 2024 Dashboard (2023-24 data) Status: Orange 42.9% prepared Red: Students with Disabilities Orange: African American Two or More Races Yellow: Filipino	College/Career Indicator: Data from the 2025 Dashboard (2024-25 data) Status: Green 48.8% prepared Red: Students with Disabilities Orange: N/A Yellow: African American Filipino Two or More Races	College/Career Indicator: 2026-27 School Year 55% of all students to be prepared, (or yellow or higher status when data presentation changes) and focus groups (TEC, socioeconomically disadvantaged) to increase to 10% prepared. CSU Requirements and CTE Pathway Completion:	College/Career Indicator: Data from the 2024 Dashboard (2023-24 data) Status: Medium/Yellow -> Green +3.8% prepared Red/Very Low: No Change Orange/Low: -African American -Hispanic Yellow/Medium: +African American +Filipino

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Very low: Students with Disabilities Low: African American Hispanic Medium: White Socioeconomically Disadvantaged 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 CSU Requirements and CTE Pathway Completion: All: 4.5% African American: 4.8% Hispanic: 2.4% Whiter: 2.6%	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged For comparison, State data reports 45.3% of students prepared CSU Requirements and CTE Pathway Completion: All: 9.09% African American: 0.0% Hispanic: 11.11% White: 5.71% Students with Disabilities: 0.0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 13.16%	White For comparison, State data reports 51.7% of students prepared CSU Requirements and CTE Pathway Completion: All: 9.09% African American: 0.0% Hispanic: 11.11% White: 5.71% Students with Disabilities: 0.0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 13.16%	All: 7.1% African American: 6.8% Hispanic: 5.9% White: 7.2% Students with Disabilities: 2.0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 4.8%	+Two or More Races - Socioeconomically Disadvantaged For comparison, State data reports +7.8% of students prepared CSU Requirements and CTE Pathway Completion: All: +4.59% African American: -4.8% Hispanic: +8.51% White: +3.11% Students with Disabilities: +0.0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: +9.96%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Students with Disabilities: 0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 3.2%				
1.11	State Priority 8 College Going Rate From DataQuest, the percentage of high school completers who enroll in college. These students must successfully complete the required courses to enroll and apply. Data is obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse and reported to DataQuest annually. Data Source: 2020-21 DataQuest	College going rate for 2020-21 (most recent DataQuest data) TEC: 14.5% Vanden: 70.7% TUSD: 63.4% For comparison the college going rate for the same period is 63.8%.	College going rate for 2021-22 (most recent DataQuest data) TEC: 14.3% Vanden: 73.3% TUSD: 66.1% For comparison the college going rate for the same period in the state is 63.6%.	College going rate for 2022-23 (most recent DataQuest data) TEC: 15.4% Vanden: 76.1% TUSD: 68.5% For comparison the college going rate for the same period in the state is 67.2%.	2026-27 School Year College going rate will exceed the state average or 70%. TEC students will have a college going rate of 20%.	College going rate for 2022-23 (most recent DataQuest data) TEC: +0.9% Vanden: +5.4% TUSD: +5.1% For comparison the college going rate for the same period in the state is (+3.4%.from baseline, TUSD is +1.3% above state average)
1.12	State Priority 4B College Readiness (A-G rate) The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the UC or CSU	Aeries Analytics data June 2023 (2022-23 data) All 12th graders: 50.4% African American: 33.9% Hispanic 39.6% White 48.9%	Aeries Analytics data June 2024 (2023-24 data) All 12th graders: 50.1% African American: 21.6% Hispanic 46.0%	Aeries Analytics data June 2025 (2024-25 data) All 12th graders: 48.9% African American: 40.7% Hispanic 55.2%	2026-27 School Year Increase all student groups by 10%.	Aeries Analytics data June 2025 (2024-25 data) All 12th graders: -1.5% African American: +6.8% Hispanic +15.6%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	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 more that 65 students or areas of focus for Academic metrics on the Dashboard (Red), TEC, SWD, SED Data Source: June 2023 Aeries Analytics	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 51.8% of students meeting A-G eligibility.	White 50.6% Students with Disabilities: 0.0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 36.1% TEC: All students: 0.0% Vanden: All students: 50.3% For comparison, the state data represents 51.5% of students meeting A-G eligibility.	White 44.4% Students with Disabilities: 8.6% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 44.0% TEC: All students: 0.0% Vanden: All students: 49.5% For comparison, the state data represents 48.9% of students meeting A-G eligibility.		White -4.5% Students with Disabilities: +8.6% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: +2.1% TEC: All students: 0.0% Vanden: All students: -2.1% For comparison, the state data represents -2.9% of students meeting A-G eligibility.
1.13	State Priority 4C 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	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 Completed at Least One CTE Pathway 2023: 8.7%	2024-25 (predicted completers as of April 16, 2025) Seniors completing CTE Pathways All pathways: 67 Marketing (244) = 8 Patient Care (198) = 29 Production / Managerial Arts (113) = 27	2025-26 (predicted completers as of March 23, 2026) Seniors completing CTE Pathways All pathways: 72 Marketing (244) = 10 Patient Care (198) = 27 Production / Managerial Arts (113) = 23	2026-27 School Year Increase the number of CTE completers by 50% (at least 60 students in any pathway).	2025-26 (predicted completers as of April 16, 2025) Seniors completing CTE Pathways All pathways: +31 Marketing (244) = +10 Patient Care (198) = +4 Production / Managerial Arts (113) = +23 Automotive = -4

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Education programs; data from Aeries Data Source: Aeries Analytics		System Diagnostics / Systems & Repairs (221) = 3 Completed at Least One CTE Pathway 2024: 10.2%	System Diagnostics / Systems & Repairs (221) = 6 Business Management (182) = 7 Completed at Least One CTE Pathway 2025: 15.5%		Business Management = -9 System Diagnostics / Systems & Repairs (221) = +6 Video Production = -5 Completed at Least One CTE Pathway:+6.8%
1.14	State Priority 4G Access to a broad course of study described in §51210 and §51220 (a) to (i); programs developed and provided to unduplicated students . Percentage of 12th grade Vanden students who passed one or more AP tests with a 3 or higher during their high school career. Course Access: Advanced Placement Data Source: Aeries Analytics	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%	2023-24 All students = 25.97% Asian = 47.37% African American = 12.96% Filipino = 43.64% Hispanic = 26.92% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander = N/A Two or More Races (multi-racial) = 18.33% White = 23.86% higher**	2024-25 All students = 27.36% Asian = 57.14% African American = 12.35% Filipino = 46.03% Hispanic = 30.30% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander = N/A Two or More Races (multi-racial) = 20.29% White = 24.72% higher**	2026-27 School Year 33% or more for all students and listed student groups.	2023-24 All students = +13.37% Asian = +39.75% African American = +1.64% Filipino = +24.03% Hispanic = +20.05% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander = N/A Two or More Races (multi-racial) = +3.34% White = +12.48%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.15	State Priority 7 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 (students with disabilities). Course Access: Core English and Math courses Data Source: CDE Local Level Annual Performance Reports	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%	Data from CDE Local Level Annual Performance Report 2023-24; State Least Restrictive Environment Targets Percentage of students spending 80% or more of their day in general education classrooms 70.26%	Data from CDE Local Level Annual Performance Report 2024-25; State Least Restrictive Environment Targets Percentage of students spending 80% or more of their day in general education classrooms 71.89%	2026-27 School Year Meet or exceed the state Least Restrictive Environment targets each year.	Currently meeting outcome data. District is exceeding state target by 4.89%. Percentage of students spending 80% or more of their day in general education classrooms +1.21%
1.16	State Priority 7 Pupil outcomes in subject areas described in §51210 and §51220 (a) to (i) as applicable; programs developed and provided to unduplicated students; programs and services developed and provided to individuals with exceptional needs	NWEA MAP Spring 2023 (2022-23 data) (Students who have a reading score 199 or above) All students: 49.6% Special Ed: 29.4% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 43.2% African American: 32.6% Hispanic: 49.2% White: 53.5%	NWEA MAP Spring 2024 (2023-24 data) (Students who have a reading score 199 or above) All students: 46.1% Special Ed: 27.1% Socio-Economically	NWEA MAP Spring 2025 (2024-25 data) (Students who have a reading score 199 or above) All students: 40.7% Special Ed: 16.7% Socio-Economically	2026-27 School Year 65% of all students meeting standard in reading by 3rd grade. All subgroups increasing by 10%.	NWEA MAP Spring 2025 (2024-25 data) (Students who have a reading score 199 or above) All students: -8.9% Special Ed: -12.7% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: -7.8%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	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. Student groups who are an area of focus, due to being in the red or orange in academic Dashboard data are included. Data Source: Spring 2023 NWEA MAP data	EL: 7.1% Foster Youth: NA CAASPP 3rd grade ELA data 2023 (2022-23 data) All Students who met or exceeded standard: 43.2% Special Ed: 24.2% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 38.7% African American: 33.8% Hispanic: 44.2% White: 43.6% EL: 0.0% Foster Youth: NA	Disadvantaged: 40.6% African American: 18.6% Hispanic: 40.5% White: 54.5% EL: 5.0% Foster Youth: NA CAASPP 3rd grade ELA data 2024 (2023-24 data) All Students who met or exceeded standard: 38.9% Special Ed: 18.3% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 29.3% African American: 22.0% Hispanic: 28.5% White: 41.5% EL: 10.0% Foster Youth: NA	Disadvantaged: 35.4% African American: 32.6% Hispanic: 29.6% White: 56.4% EL: 0.0% Foster Youth: 0.0% CAASPP 3rd grade ELA data 2025 (2024-25 data) All Students who met or exceeded standard: 35.4% Special Ed: 9.5% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: 26.5% African American: 29.8% Hispanic: 27.8% White: 42.1% EL: 6.7% Foster Youth: NA		African American: -0.0% Hispanic: -19.6% White: +2.9% EL: -7.1% Foster Youth: NA -> 0.0% CAASPP 3rd grade ELA data 2025 (2024-25 data) All Students who met or exceeded standard: -7.8% Special Ed: -14.7% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: -12.2% African American: -4.0% Hispanic: -16.4% White: -1.5% EL: +6.7% Foster Youth: NA
1.17	State Priority 5 School attendance rates This data comes from Aeries Analytics. Data is not available for	Percentage of students with attendance of 95% or higher (Aeries Data as of 3/1/24) All students: 50.99%	Percentage of students with attendance of 95% or higher (Aeries Data as of 4/16/25)	Percentage of students with attendance of 95% or higher (Aeries Data as of 3/31/26)	2026-27 School Year We would like to return to pre-pandemic levels	Percentage of students with attendance of 95% or higher (Aeries Data as of 3/31/26)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	alternative education (TISP) schools because attendance is accounted in a different way. Student groups who are an area of focus, due to being in the red in academic Dashboard data are included. Data Source: Aeries Data	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%	All students: 58.0% Focus Student Groups (due to red Dashboard metrics for one or more school site): EL students: 52.8% Filipino students: 62.3% SED students: 53.3% SWD students: 52.0% White students: 56.1% Hispanic students: 50.4%	All students: 64.4% Focus Student Groups (due to red Dashboard metrics for one or more school site): Homeless: 48.6% African American: 65.4% EL Students: 65.2% SED students: 57.3% Hispanic: 57.4% White: 66.4% Two or More Races: 63.7% SWD students: 57.1%	with all students being above 79%. All focal subgroups will be yellow or above.	All students: +13.41% Focus Student Groups (due to red Dashboard metrics for one or more school site): EL students: +6.31% Filipino students: +???% SED students: +11.93% SWD students: +8.86% White students: +14.29% Hispanic students: +13.83%
1.18	State Priority 4H EAP English Language Arts	2023 (2022-23) Vanden CAASPP results from Aeries Analytics and CDE CAASPP website	2024 (2023-24) Vanden CAASPP results from Aeries	2025 (2024-25) Vanden CAASPP results from CDE CAASPP website	2026-27 School Year	2024 (2023-24) Vanden CAASPP results from Aeries

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	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 Aeries Analytics and CDE CAASPP website Data Source: Aeries Analytics	All Students = 21.3% African American = 8.7% Hispanic = 16.3% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED): 20.5% Two or More Races (multi-ethnic): 14.5% All Students (state wide): 20.7%	Analytics and CDE CAASPP website All Students = 19.74% African American = 11.90% Hispanic = 18.75% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED): 13.33% Two or More Races (multi-ethnic): 15.49% **All Students (state wide): 26.23%**	All Students = 28.53% African American = 14.04% Hispanic = 16.04% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED): 20.71% Two or More Races (multi-ethnic): 23.64% **All Students (state wide): 27.36%**	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.	Analytics and CDE CAASPP website All Students = +7.23% African American = +5.34% Hispanic = -0.26% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED): +0.21% Two or More Races (multi-ethnic): +9.14% **All Students (state wide): +6.66%**
1.19	State Priority 4H EAP Mathematics This information comes from the CAASPP website and Aeries Analytics. Vanden 11th grade students who score Level 4 (exceeds standards) on the state test are exempted from	2023 (2022-23) Vanden CAASPP results from Aeries Analytics and CDE CAASPP website All Students = 10.1% African American = 2.9% Hispanic = 1.0%	2024 (2023-24) Vanden CAASPP results from Aeries Analytics and CDE CAASPP website All Students = 8.19% African American = 0.0%	2025 (2024-25) Vanden CAASPP results from CDE CAASPP website All Students = 8.85% African American = 1.67% Hispanic = 4.17%	2026-27 School Year Vanden will exceed the state All Students percentage by 3% or more. 10% or more of students in listed groups will score	2025 (2024-25) Vanden CAASPP results from Aeries Analytics and CDE CAASPP website All Students = -1.25% African American = -1.23%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	placement testing by many colleges. Data Source: Aeries Analytics	Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED): 6.8% Two or More Races (multi-ethnic): 7.3% All Students (state wide): 17.1 %	Hispanic = 7.14% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED): 3.3% Two or More Races (multi-ethnic): 11.11% All Students (state wide): 12.29 %	Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED): 5.49% Two or More Races (multi-ethnic): 3.17% All Students (state wide): 14.22 %	at a Level 4 on the Math CAASPP.	Hispanic = +3.17% Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED): -3.5% Two or More Races (multi-ethnic): -4.13% All Students (state wide): -2.88%
1.20	State Priority 4 Student Achievement CAASPP ELA test scores for students with disabilities at Vanden Data Source: CDE CAASPP website	2023 (2022-23) CAASPP Data for ELA, students with disabilities at Vanden. Vanden students: Exceeded Standard: 3.9% Met Standard: 11.5% Nearly Met Standard: 23.1% Standard Not Met: 61.5% State students: Exceeded Standard: 5.2% Met Standard: 10.6%	2024 (2023-24) CAASPP Data for ELA, students with disabilities at Vanden. Vanden students: Exceeded Standard: 0.0% Met Standard: 0.0% Nearly Met Standard: 21.95% Standard Not Met: 78.05% State students: Exceeded Standard: 5.1%	2025 (2024-25) CAASPP Data for ELA, students with disabilities at Vanden. Vanden students: Exceeded Standard: 2.5% Met Standard: 25.0% Nearly Met Standard: 30.0% Standard Not Met: 42.5% State students: Exceeded Standard: 4.57%	2026-27 School Year Vanden students with disabilities will exceed state scores by 5% for students who meet or exceed standards.	2025 (2024-25) CAASPP Data for ELA, students with disabilities at Vanden. Vanden students: Exceeded Standard: -1.4% Met Standard: +13.5% Nearly Met Standard: +6.9% Standard Not Met: +19.0% State students: Exceeded Standard: -0.63

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Nearly Met Standard: 18.6% Standard Not Met: 65.7%	Met Standard: 10.7% Nearly Met Standard: 18.6% Standard Not Met: 65.6%	Met Standard: 13.88% Nearly Met Standard: 24.31% Standard Not Met: 57.25%		Met Standard: +3.28 Nearly Met Standard: +5.71 Standard Not Met: -8.45
1.21	State Priority 4 Student Achievement CAASPP Math test scores for students with disabilities at Vanden Data Source: CDE CAASPP website	2023 (2022-23) CAASPP Data for Math, students with disabilities at Vanden. Vanden students: Exceeded Standard: 0.0% Met Standard: 0.0% Nearly Met Standard: 8.0% Standard Not Met: 92.0% State students: Exceeded Standard: 5.0% Met Standard: 7.3% Nearly Met Standard: 15.0% Standard Not Met: 72.8%	2024 (2023-24) CAASPP Data for Math, students with disabilities at Vanden. Vanden students: Exceeded Standard: 0.0% Met Standard: 0.0% Nearly Met Standard: 2.78% Standard Not Met: 97.22% State students: Exceeded Standard: 5.16% Met Standard: 7.38% Nearly Met Standard: 15.34% Standard Not Met: 72.12%	2025 (2024-25) CAASPP Data for Math, students with disabilities at Vanden. Vanden students: Exceeded Standard: 0.0% Met Standard: 0.0% Nearly Met Standard: 15.0% Standard Not Met: 85.0% State students: Exceeded Standard: 2.28% Met Standard: 4.02% Nearly Met Standard: 9.82% Standard Not Met: 83.89%	2026-27 School Year Vanden students with disabilities will meet or exceed standards at the same rate as students state wide.	2025 (2024-25) CAASPP Data for Math, students with disabilities at Vanden. Vanden students: Exceeded Standard: 0.0% Met Standard: 0.0% Nearly Met Standard: +7.0% Standard Not Met: -7.0% State students: Exceeded Standard: -2.72% Met Standard: -3.28% Nearly Met Standard: -5.18% Standard Not Met: +11.09%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.22	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 Source: 2023 CA Dashboard	Data from 2023 (2022-23) Dashboard: Graduation Rate District-wide: Blue 98.7% Graduation 2.5% Increase All reporting subgroups are in blue.	Data from 2024 (2023-24) Dashboard: Graduation Rate District-wide: Blue 98.3% Graduation -0.3% Maintained Subgroups in blue: African American Filipino Hispanic Two or More Races Socioeconomically Disadvantaged White Orange: Students with Disabilities	Data from 2025 (2024-25) Dashboard: Graduation Rate District-wide: Blue 98.1% Graduation -0.2% Maintained Subgroups in blue: African American Filipino Hispanic Two or More Races Socioeconomically Disadvantaged White Yellow: Students with Disabilities	2026-27 School Year Maintain Blue status for all student groups.	Data from 2025 (2024-25) Dashboard: Graduation Rate District-wide: Blue -0.6% Graduation -2.7% Maintained Subgroups in blue: -Students with Disabilities Yellow: +Students with Disabilities

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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

A description of overall implementation, including any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions, and any relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.

1.1: Action implemented as written. Assessment results are used to create instructional groups for enrichment and/or intervention. Data are accessible to staff in a variety of ways, and used to make student-centered decisions.

1.2: Action implemented as written. Supplemental materials are available and used by staff to enhance English Leaner access.

1.3: Action implemented as written. WIN is in place at all elementary sites. Assistant Principals are key players is efforts to provide targeted support for students.

1.4: Action implemented as written. Math professional development centering on the instructional shifts called for in the CA Framework has been the focus, in addition to supplemental materials to enhance instruction.

1.5: Action implemented as written. Additional sections allotted at secondary schools to better meet students at their level. Professional development in integrated ELD strategies occurred throughout the year. The Director of Curriculum and Instruction provides ongoing direct support to the ELD program.

1.6 Action implemented as written. Outside the school day tutoring is available at all sites, and a secondary summer school is in place to remediate credits. New CTE pathway in Mechatronics implemented.

1.7: Action implemented as written. Targeted leadership training centered on student achievement provided to leaders. All schools provided an allotment for site specific PD, and the elementary program received additional math support.

1.8: Action implemented as written. Home to school transportation is a key action to meet the needs of low-income families, and is a highly utilized service.

1.9: Action implemented as written. All schools have active MTSS teams, supported by the Directors of Student Services and Curriculum and Instruction. Moreover, the county office is supporting us in enhancing these efforts through the DA process.

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.

No material difference between budgeted expenditures and estimated actuals.

A description of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal.

1.1: Assessments and data visualization allow for effective and ongoing monitoring of student achievement. Instructional groupings based on individual student needs are possible as a result. Students enrolled in elementary intervention groups show increased improvement on assessments which outpaces those of students not enrolled. Increase in CAASPP performance across schools and student groups.

1.2: Specialized supplemental materials allow for teachers to effectively differentiate instruction for students based on their needs.

1.3: Intervention during the instructional day based on student needs from specialists effectively impacts student learning as evidenced by improvement on norm referenced assessments. Assistant Principals, TOSAs, and SST Coordinators are essential to MTSS efforts, which drives Goal 1's focus to improve instructional quality and equity for all students. Students take advantage of offerings to accelerate credit recovery as evidences by the district's high graduation rate, increased CCI performance, and growth in ELA and Math scores.

1.4: The SCOE math coach has met with and trained math teachers throughout the year. During observations and walkthroughs evidence of impact on instruction has been noted by site and district leaders. Math steering committees formed for the elementary and middle school programs.

1.5: Additional sections to reduce class sizes and to provide more discreet instructional groupings allow for more targeted and individualized instruction based on student need.

1.6: After school tutoring and summer school provide needed support of students preparing to meet A-G college entrance requirements. Ongoing support of the CTE program has resulted in a new pathway for the 2025-26 school year. Graduation rates remain high, and there was an increase in students graduating college and career ready.

1.7: Site specific PD allows schools to be responsive to the unique needs presented in their contexts. Coaching for leaders centered on equity and supporting the instructional program results in administrators equipped to work with teachers to improve practices that benefit all learners.

1.8: 26.24% of our bus ridership are low-income students. Families report this is a critical service in order to get their students to school on time, safely, and ready to learn.

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

No planned changes.

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.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.1	Identify areas of need and monitor progress	Use NWEA MAP, ESGI, and other assessments to identify areas where intervention is needed; support staff with custom data tools to monitor student progress Create customizable data visualization tools for administrators, counselors and district leaders to more clearly identify the trends and patterns of student academic performance, attendance and behavioral outcomes.	$266,763.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Maintain digital tools, provide training for site administrators and customizable reports for counselors and teachers.		
1.2	Specialized, quality instructional materials	Provide evidence-based instructional materials to help unduplicated students reach academic standards and implement new supplementary elementary ELD materials. Support unduplicated students by providing supplementary print and digital reading and writing material for use at home to promote ELA skill acquisition and the equity initiative by using relevant high-interest resources and increasing the diversity of characters and authors represented in works read during English Language Arts instruction and in print and online library collections.	$75,220.00	Yes
1.3	MTSS and Intervention Support during the school day (defined costs)	This Action Item focuses on providing instruction and support tailored to students' individuals needs within the school day. Utilizing Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant funding, provide WIN (What I Need) Teams of Intervention Specialist to provide elementary intervention during the school day using evidence-based instructional materials to help unduplicated students reach academic standards. Classroom teachers in K-5th grade (depending on student need) provide scheduled WIN time daily. Provide Assistant Principals, Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs), and Student Success Team (SST) Coordinators at elementary schools to plan and monitor intervention, collect and analyze data to identify any unduplicated students not making adequate academic progress, support effective instruction, and analyze MTSS results for continuous improvement. MTSS teams meet weekly to discuss student referrals and determine interventions. These interventions are monitored, and data is collected. These teams also meet with district leaders to discuss the data specifically related to unduplicated students. Accelerate high school credit recovery with online courses and in-person instruction to help unduplicated students graduate on time.	$2,679,703.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Improve the achievement of unduplicated students by providing support during the school day, using combinations of in-person and online instruction. With additional opportunities to remediate classes using online programs, unduplicated students and students with disabilities who often have fewer elective opportunities, due to required support or ELD classes, can remediate classes and continue to take elective or CTE classes, which is shown to increase engagement and likelihood of completing CTE pathways. Provide increased intervention for TEC students to meet graduation and college and career goals by increasing the number of courses offered in person. LREBG Funds: $309,904 (Eligibility Codes B and E)		
1.4	Resources and supports to improve math academic performance.	Improve the achievement of unduplicated middle school Math 7 and Math 8 students by reducing class size to allow more teacher time for individual and small group differentiated instruction; provide instructional support through math focused professional development. Improve math achievement for unduplicated students with instruction and practice through the Khan Academy MAP Accelerator and Delta Math intervention tool; provide experiences in coding and robotics for math skill application. Improve math instruction with professional development in math instructional strategies. Additional training to support the implementation of new textbooks.	$192,237.00	Yes
1.5	Resources and supports to improve ELA / ELD academic performance.	Accelerate English learner proficiency with English Language Development (ELD) instruction and support English learners with ELD Instructional Assistants at Golden West and Vanden. Although TUSD is required to have an ELD class at both schools, we are providing additional sections to support and differentiate for our students. These additional sections allow for more targeted support and additional classroom ELD instruction for our newcomers and learners in the earliest stages of English language	$304,078.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		development. We are also contracting with an educational consultant who will be providing specialized, additional training to address the needs of LTEL students. Provide support for new ELD materials, monitoring and support plans for site principals and Intervention Specialists by the Director of Curriculum and Instruction. Provide ELA and ELD training for staff on integrated ELD and language acquisition strategies for all students. Provide training on the ELA Framework using $47,000 LREBG Funds. (Eligibility Code B, vi.)		
1.6	Outside the school day resources to increase students' readiness for next grade and college and career.	Increase the percentage of students completing the A-G college entrance requirements by identifying and removing systemic barriers, providing instruction about the path to college and career, improving academic support for unduplicated students taking A-G courses through the implementation of 9th grade Guidance classes that provide tutoring, monitoring student progress, and funding Advanced Placement (AP) tests for low-income students, English learners, and foster youth. Update Career Technical Education pathways to better reflect student interests and needs. Improve the achievement of unduplicated students by providing academic support before and after school in tutoring. Provide summer school opportunities to meet graduation requirements, get on track for A-G eligibility and prepare for classes that consistently restrict students' A-G eligibility (world language and math).	$106,914.00	Yes
1.7	Support staff learning.	Provide coaching and training for administrators to improve student outcomes by Educational Services staff and outside consultants.	$304,807.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Improve Special Education instruction through professional development in the implementation of evidence-based multisensory reading and math strategies for teachers and paraeducators; co-teaching strategies; and effective specialized academic instruction in Special Education settings. Provide professional development for teachers and other staff to enhance and improve tier 1 first instruction. Partner with outside consultants as needed for specialized training.		
1.8	Home to school transportation	Improve student attendance by providing no-cost home to school transportation for low-income students.	$1,046,290.00	Yes
1.9	MTSS interventions during the school day (percentage of increased services)	This Action Item focuses on providing instruction and support tailored to students' individuals needs within the school day. Provide WIN (What I Need) team intervention groups. Classroom teachers in K-5th grade and some 6th grade classes (depending on student need) provide scheduled WIN time daily. Currently 45% of our students are unduplicated, which means that all of our elementary teachers need to provide this intervention. It would be impractical and potentially stigmatizing to remove nearly half of each class for additional services; therefore, to provide WIN time teachers team and switch students to provide leveled support. This only works when all grade level teachers collaborate. Additional supports are also provided for some of our highest need general education students by dedicated intervention staff (their salaries are identified in action 1.3). This action focuses on the additional services provided by classroom teachers. Classroom teachers and school staff (including the school social workers, student support specialists, principal and assistant principals) also hold weekly MTSS team meetings to determine how students are progressing and if they need to make adjustments to intervention services. These teams meet during the duty day and target their discussions on unduplicated students. Specialty support staff (TOSAs, APs) salaries are	$0.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		included in action 1.3. This action addresses the time by other staff as part of their workday. These teams collect and analyze data to identify any unduplicated students not making adequate academic progress, support effective instruction, and analyze MTSS results for continuous improvement. MTSS teams meet weekly to discuss student referrals and determine interventions. These interventions are monitored, and data is collected. These teams also meet with district leaders to discuss the data specifically related to unduplicated students. At the alternative education high school, TEC, students receive weekly "guidance" tutorials on classroom progress and removing barriers to meet instructional goals, including graduating on time. Staff meets weekly to train and discuss these lessons. The topics are driven by needs of high need and unduplicated students.		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Promote student well-being and a positive school culture and climate by delivering effective socioemotional supports and behavioral interventions that create engaging and safe learning environments for all.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

We established this goal based on the understanding that student social and emotional well-being serves as a cornerstone for academic success. Embracing a 'whole child' approach, we prioritize fostering secure, enduring relationships that nurture academic, physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development. Research consistently underscores the effectiveness of this relationship-centered approach in enhancing achievement across diverse circumstances. Recognizing that every child requires a foundation of health, safety, engagement, support, and challenge, we remain steadfast in our commitment to this holistic approach.

The enduring effects of pandemic-related isolation and social stresses continue to manifest in students. Thus, maintaining a focus on this aspect remains imperative. Additionally, the TUSD Board, in conjunction with robust community involvement recently created a new Strategic Plan. This plan identifies safety and socio-emotional wellness as the top two priorities of the district.

Data supports this focus as our students continue to report high levels of chronic sadness (Elem: 17%; Middle School: 30%; Vanden: 29% and TEC: 24%). Although students at all grade levels report high expectations from adults at school, and generally high scores for feeling physically safe at school, there has been a sustained drop in school connection; this includes all student groups, even elementary students who traditionally report high levels of school connection.

Focus group and survey data supports a focus on socio-emotional supports, as it is the top single subject that teachers requested PD on this year. They also identified a need for peer collaboration, trauma informed practices and de-escalation training. Our labor partners shared this desire for increased training.

Additionally, we have some areas of focus based on the CA Dashboard that we believe are related to positive student culture and climate:

Attendance:
Cambridge: English Learners
Foxboro: African American students
Golden West: Socioeconomically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and white students

Suspensions:
District-wide: Long-term English Learners
Cambridge: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
Golden West: Students with Disabilities
TEC: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	State Priority 5 School attendance rates This data comes from Aeries Analytics. Data is not available for alternative education (TISP) schools because attendance is accounted in a different way. Student groups who are an area of focus, due to being in the red or orange in academic Dashboard data are included. Data Source: Aeries Analytics	Percentage of students with attendance of 95% or higher (Aeries Data as of 3/1/24) 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%	Percentage of students with attendance of 95% or higher (Aeries Data as of 4/16/25) Percentage of students with attendance of 95% or higher (Aeries Data as of 3/1/24) All students: 58.0% Focus Student Groups (due to red Dashboard metrics for one or more school site): EL students: 52.8% Filipino students: 62.3%	Percentage of students with attendance of 95% or higher (Aeries Data as of 5/20/26) All students: 66.90% Focus Student Groups (due to red Dashboard metrics for one or more school site): Homeless: 45.0% African American: 64.8% EL Students: 64.0% Filipino students: 69.30%:	2026-27 School Year We would like to return to pre-pandemic levels with all students being above 79%. All focal subgroups will be yellow or above.	All Students: 15.91% EL students: 17.51% Filipino students: 7.49% SED students: 14.43% SWD students: 11.06% White students: 15.59% Hispanic students: 15.73%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Hispanic students: 43.57%	SED students: 53.3% SWD students: 52.0% White students: 56.1% Hispanic students: 50.4%	SED students: 59.8% Hispanic: 59.3% White: 67.7% Two or More Races: 67.2% SWD students: 59.3%		
2.2	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 Source: 2023 CA Dashboard	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.	Data from 2024 (2023-24) Dashboard: Chronic Absenteeism District-wide: Yellow 13.1% Chronically Absent For comparison, the state rate is 18.6% chronically absent.	Data from 2025 (2024-25) Dashboard: Chronic Absenteeism District-wide: Orange 13.4% Chronically Absent For comparison, the state rate is 17.1%	2026-27 School Year District overall and all student groups in yellow, blue, or green. Overall chronic absenteeism rate is below 5% (pre-pandemic level).	Districtwide: Declined by 3.7% Statewide: Declined by 7.2%
2.3	State Priority 5E Dashboard State Graduation Rate Indicator	Data from 2023 (2022-23) Dashboard: Graduation Rate District-wide: Blue	Data from 2024 (2023-24) Dashboard: Graduation Rate	Data from 2025 (2024-25) Dashboard: Graduation Rate	2026-27 School Year	0.6% Decrease

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Graduation data comes from the Dashboard Graduation Rate Indicator, which uses the four-year cohort graduation rate. Data Source: 2023 CA Dashboard	98.7% Graduation 2.5% Increase All reporting subgroups are in blue.	District-wide: Blue 98.3% Graduation 0.4% Decrease All reporting subgroups are in blue, except for Students with Disabilities (Orange)	District-wide: Blue 98.1% Graduation 0.2% Maintained All reporting subgroups are in blue, except for Students with Disabilities (Yellow)	Maintain Blue status for all student groups.	All subgroups not including Students with Disabilities: Maintained Blue on Dashboard Students with Disabilities: from Blue to Yellow on Dashboard
2.4	State Priority 5C Middle school dropout rates Dropout data from DataQuest One-Year Adjusted Dropout Rate CALPADS reports. Data Source: DataQuest	Data is from 2022-23. Middle School Dropouts: 0	Data is from 2023-24. Middle School Dropouts: 0	Data is from 2024-25. Middle School Dropouts: 0	2026-27 School Year Zero dropouts.	0
2.5	State Priority 5D High school dropout rates Dropout data comes from DataQuest Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Outcome. Data Source: DataQuest & CALPADS 15.1 Cohort Outcome Report	Data is from 2022-23. 5 Dropouts This is a rate of 1.11%. For comparison the state dropout rate is 10.9%.	Data is from 2023-24. 2 Dropouts, 1 GED Completer 2 drop outs out of 473 students in cohort = 0.4% For comparison the state dropout rate is 8.9%.	Data is from 2024-25. 1 Dropout, 1 GED Completer 1 drop outs out of 473 students in cohort = 0.21% For comparison the state dropout rate is 8.0%.	2026-27 School Year Zero dropouts.	4 Fewer Dropouts Drop Percentage Rate: declined 0.90%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.6	State Priority 6A Suspension rate and Dashboard State 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. Data Source: 2022-23 CA Dashboard	Data from 2022-23 Dashboard: 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%.	Data from 2023-24 Dashboard: Suspension Rate: 3.6% Yellow Unduplicated students made up 66.05% of the suspensions. Percentage of students with one suspension: 63.72%. Percentage of students with two or more suspensions: 36.28% For comparison, the state suspension rate is 3.2%	Data from 2024-25 Dashboard: Suspension Rate: 2.4% Green Unduplicated students made up 64.53% of the suspensions. Percentage of students with one suspension: 76.85%. Percentage of students with two or more suspensions: 23.15% For comparison, the state suspension rate is 2.9%	2026-27 School Year All student groups to be in yellow, green or blue and the suspension level to below the state suspension rate.	Decline 1.5% No student groups in red. Percentage of Suspensions for Unduplicated Students: Increase 3.53% Percentage of Suspended Students with One Suspension: Increased by 10.05% Percentage of Students with two ore more suspensions: Decreased by 10.05% State Suspension Rate: Decline by 0.9%
2.7	State Priority 6B Expulsion rate Data Source: DataQuest.	2022-23 data: 0 expulsions	2023-24 data: 2 expulsions	2024-25 data: 2 expulsions	2026-27 School Year Zero expulsions.	2 Expulsion Increase
2.8	State Priority 6C	Percent of students responding in	Percent of students responding in	Percent of students responding in	2026-27 School Year	School Connection: Elem: 8%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	School climate survey data and Dashboard Local Indicator School Climate (Positive metrics to increase) School climate and mental health data come from an annual survey and the school climate Local Indicator Report. Data Source: CA Dashboard Local Indicator Report	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: 1319 TEC: 61 Total Responses: 3584 Indicators to increase (agree/strongly agree) School Connection: Elem: 59% GW: 40% VHS: 41% TEC: 35% Caring adults: Elem:78% GW: 48% VHS: 55% TEC: 82% High expectations:	affirmative in these areas. NOTE: District adopted California Healthy Kids Survey over locally generated survey in 2024-25. (E = elementary, GW = Golden West; VHS = Vanden, TEC = Travis Education Center, alternative education) Data from December 2024. Elementary 5th Grade: responses: 330 GW 7th Grade responses: 135 VHS 9th and 11th Grade responses: 598 TEC 11th Grade responses: 54 Total Responses: 1,117 Indicators: Percentage of	affirmative in these areas. NOTE: District adopted California Healthy Kids Survey over locally generated survey in 2024-25. (E = elementary, GW = Golden West; VHS = Vanden, TEC = Travis Education Center, alternative education) Data from February 2026. Elementary 5th Grade: responses: 208 GW 7th Grade responses: 311 VHS 9th and 11th Grade responses: 636 TEC 11th Grade responses: 43 Total Responses: 1,198 Indicators: Percentage of	Indicators to increase annually. Increase each indicator by 10%, or to 90% or above.	GW: 11% VHS: 13% TEC: 27% Caring adults: Elem:-14% GW: 14% VHS: 5% TEC: -16% High expectations: Elem: 10% GW: 9% VHS: 14% TEC: 14% Feel safe at school: Elem: 8% GW: 6% VHS: 14% TEC: -2% place to go w/problems: Elem: % GW: % VHS: % TEC: %

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Elem: 70% GW: 58% VHS: 58% TEC: 67% Feel safe at school: Elem: 65% GW: 43% VHS: 48% TEC: 69% place to go w/problems: Elem: 78% GW: 53% VHS: 56% TEC: 76 %	Students who agree/strongly agree with each indicator. School Connection: Elem: 63% GW: 50% VHS: 50% TEC: 58% Caring adults: Elem:60% GW: 58% VHS: 55% TEC: 71% High expectations: Elem: 74% GW: 73% VHS: 68% TEC: 76% Feel safe at school: Elem: 65% GW: 43% VHS: 56% TEC: 73% place to go w/problems: Elem: 60% GW: 58% VHS: 57% TEC: 73%	Students who agree/strongly agree with each indicator. School Connection: Elem: 67% GW: 51% VHS: 54% TEC: 62% Caring adults: Elem: 64% GW: 62% VHS: 60% TEC: 66% High expectations: Elem: 80% GW: 67% VHS: 72% TEC: 81% Feel safe at school: Elem: 73% GW: 49% VHS: 62% TEC: 67% place to go w/problems: Elem: % GW: % VHS: % TEC: %		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.9	State Priority 6C School climate survey data and Dashboard Local Indicator School Climate (Negative metrics to decrease) School climate and mental health data come from an annual survey and the school climate Local Indicator Report. Data Source: CA Dashboard Local Indicator Report	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: 1319 TEC: 61 Total Responses: 3584 Indicators to decrease (agree/strongly agree) Bullying/ Harassment: Elem: 26% GW: 14% VHS: 10% TEC: 10% Chronic Sadness: Elem: 31% GW: 24% VHS: 31%	Percent of students responding in affirmative in these areas. NOTE: District adopted California Healthy Kids Survey over locally generated survey in 2024-25. (E = elementary, GW = Golden West; VHS = Vanden, TEC = Travis Education Center, alternative education) Data from December 2024 Elementary 5th Grade: responses: 330 GW 7th Grade responses: 135 VHS 9th and 11th Grade responses: 598 TEC 1 responses: 54 Total Responses: 1,117	Percent of students responding in affirmative in these areas. NOTE: District adopted California Healthy Kids Survey over locally generated survey in 2024-25. (E = elementary, GW = Golden West; VHS = Vanden, TEC = Travis Education Center, alternative education) Data from February 2026. Elementary 5th Grade: responses: 208 GW 7th Grade responses: 311 VHS 9th and 11th Grade responses: 636 TEC 11th Grade responses: 43	2026-27 School Year Decrease harassment and bullying by 2% per year, use mental health data to make decisions about socio-emotional support. It is important to monitor chronic sadness and suicidal ideation over time as indicators of student socio-emotional well-being, but performance targets are not appropriate for this type of metric. We will continue to monitor our data to see improvement and compare to state-wide data for norming.	Bullying/ Harassment: Elem: 8% GW: 31% VHS: 19% TEC: 7% Chronic Sadness: Elem: -7% GW: 4% VHS: 1% TEC: 18% Suicidal Ideation Elem: Excluded from this question GW: 11% VHS: 6% TEC: 18%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		TEC: 22% Suicidal Ideation Elem: Excluded from this question GW: 8% VHS: 7% TEC: 8%	Indicators: Percentage of Students who agree/strongly agree with each indicator. Bullying/ Harassment: Elem: 40% GW: 49% VHS: 26% TEC: 15% Chronic Sadness: Elem: 17% GW: 30% VHS: 29% TEC: 24% Suicidal Ideation Elem: Excluded from this question GW: 19% VHS: 11% TEC: 9%	Total Responses: 1,198 Indicators: Percentage of Students who agree/strongly agree with each indicator. Bullying/ Harassment: Elem: 34% GW: 45% VHS: 29% TEC: 17% Chronic Sadness: Elem: 24% GW: 28% VHS: 32% TEC: 40% Suicidal Ideation Elem: Excluded from this question GW: 19% VHS: 13% TEC: 16%		
2.10	Wellness Center Usage Data is collected locally at school sites on the usage of our Wellness Centers by grade,	Wellness Center data (in local Tableau Dashboard, as of 3/1/24) Total Visits:	Wellness Center data (in local Tableau Dashboard, as of 4/15/25)	Wellness Center data (in local Tableau Dashboard, as of 4/30/26)	2026-27 School Year This metric is meant to measure continued usage,	increase by 2,525 Visits

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	gender and student group. Data Source: School Site Reporting	1,562 Unique students: 547 Unduplicated students: 56.3%	Total Visits: 2,977 Unique students: 751 Unduplicated students: 56.32%	Total Visits: 4,087 Unique students: 914 Unduplicated students: 55.36%	especially for our unduplicated students. We do not have a goal to increase usage, as it's driven by student need. We do want to continue to monitor usage to ensure that services are reaching the highest need students and students at all schools and grade levels.	
2.11	Community survey data: Safe school environment Annually TUSD administers a community survey to all parents and guardians, results are identified by school site. Parents are asked if they consider their child's school safe. Data Source: 2023-24 Local Community Data	2023-24 Local Community Data Percentage of respondents who indicated they "agree or strongly agree" with the statement my child's school is safe: All schools: 76.7% Cambridge: 68% Center: 70% Foxboro: 80% Scandia: 81% Travis: 86% Golden West: 57% TEC: 100% Vanden: 72%	2024-25 Local Community Data Percentage of respondents who indicated they "agree or strongly agree" with the statement my child's school is safe: All schools: 85.8% Cambridge: 83.7% Center: 86.5% Foxboro: 91.8% Scandia: 92.3% Travis: 90.0%	2025-26 Local Community Data Percentage of respondents who indicated they "agree or strongly agree" with the statement my child's school is safe: All schools: 84.6% Cambridge: 85.3% Center: 88.5% Foxboro: 90.7% Scandia: 92.1% Travis: 88.4%	2026-27 School Year All schools will be increase by 10% or until they have reached 90%.	All Schools: 7.9% Cambridge: 17.3% Center: 18.5% Foxboro: 10.7% Scandia: 11.1% Travis: 2.4% Golden West: 6.2% TEC: -5.3% Vanden: 15.8%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			Golden West: 73.0% TEC: 100% Vanden: 81.2%	Golden West: 63.2% TEC: 94.7% Vanden: 87.8%		

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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

A description of overall implementation, including any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions, and any relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.

2.1: Action implemented as written. Staff hired in accordance with plan and implemented services as described.

2.2: Action implemented as written. Tier 2 social-emotional wellness services delivered by social workers and in wellness centers.

2.3: Action implemented as written. PBIS systems, support, and professional learning in place at all sites. CA-ISP training occurred throughout the year as scheduled. Use of SWIS in place at all sites.

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.

There were no material differences between budgeted and estimated actual expenditures.

A description of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal.

2.1: Evidence of effectiveness includes implementation of Playworks strategies and activities at all elementary sites. WEB, Link Crew, and Anchored 4 Life programs in place and serving students across the district. There was a reduction in suspensions for targeted student groups, and the suspension rate is now 1.2% lower than when these actions and services began. Graduation rates remain highest in the region and high for all student groups.

2.2: Over the course of this action student attendance rates continue to improve, and our Chronic Absenteeism rate, as measured on the CA School Dashboard, is well below county and state averages.

2.3: Each school site has received 6 sessions of CA-ISP training. PBIS is in place at all school sites, and a number have earned distinction awards from the state. Suspension data continue to trend downward. Wellness Centers are open at each site and have been visited over 3,000 times by over 750 students. SWIS data is utilized weekly at school sites to monitor current PBIS structures and to implement appropriate actions based on trends.

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

Historically, Travis Unified has used a local survey to gauge student sentiment around safety, well-being, and school connectedness, among other areas. While a fine survey, beginning in the 2025 LCAP and beyond, the district will use the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) as it is a norm-referenced, industry standard survey of students. By using this survey, we will be able to gather more reliable information about our students, have access to a more robust reporting system, and be able to compare our results with other districts across the state. Metrics for 2.2 and 2.6 have been simplified based on educational partners feedback.

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.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.1	Improve school climate	Ensure a safe and productive environment using support systems to maintain calm classrooms and create positive connections to school. Promote safe and inclusive play in elementary schools to help students stay active and to provide practice with valuable social and emotional life skills, including use of Playworks model. Enhance 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. Improve 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. Improve attendance and school climate through administrative support to address chronic absenteeism in the secondary school. LRBG: $195,884 (LREBG Allowability Code C)	$1,172,208.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.2	Improve Socio-emotional Wellness	Provide services for students with Tier 2 needs to improve the socio-emotional wellness of students, particularly students with high needs and limited resources. Continue to provide School Social Workers and Social Work interns for unduplicated students needing socio-emotional support. Provide Wellness Centers at all schools to help students regulate emotions so they can focus on learning. Provide 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. Facilitate trainings and meetings at school sites for School Social Workers, Social Work Interns, and Wellness Center implementation teams by the Director of Student services.	$345,069.00	Yes
2.3	Strengthen Staff Skills and Systems: Professional Development and System refinement	Refine 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 district-wide facilitation among schools and community partners provided by the Director of Student Services. Provide support for school sites in PBIS implementation process facilitation. Provide on-going training and support in concert with state and county partners on PBIS implementation, including implementation of CA-Inegrated Supports Project (CA-ISP), which includes training on culturally relevant strategies and trauma informed practices. Provide data collection tools specifically designed to aggregate data related to student behavior to assist staff decision making and system development.	$66,354.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	Strengthen open and meaningful communication throughout the community, particularly partnering with parents and guardians in their child's education.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Open transparent communication and authentic partnership with families are key for schools to succeed. We honor the role of families and the community in the educational process, and we recognize that schools that want to fully serve their students benefit from the active participation and support of their community. Staff and family surveys, along with the messages of the Board, continually highlight the pivotal role that families have in the work of education. Families regularly have favorable opinions of our schools, with most families rating their overall recommendation of their school at 8 out of 10. However, there are some areas of focus where families describe less positive experiences; these areas are items of focus for all staff, both classified and certificated alike. From survey data, families were overall positive for family involvement. An area of growth for all schools except TEC, is post high school planning and options.

The California Department of Education (CDE) has also developed a self-reflection tool to monitor progress in this area and encourages it's inclusion in LCAPs. Although this fact did not influence our motivation to add this goal area, it did influence the metrics that we are including, as they align with the CDE local indicators reflection tool. To make the questions more relevant to families, Likert scale questions used common language of "strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree" instead of CDE self-reflection tool language: exploration through full implementation and sustainability" Staff were also asked these questions, using the CDE language, information from both are included below to give a fuller understanding of our progress on these areas.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Parent Education Program Participation Participation is measured by either in	Attendees to Parent Education Program as of 3/1/2024 611	Attendees to Parent Education Program as of 2/1/2025		2026-27 School Year	Increase by 2,620

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	person attendees to District sponsored educational events or online attendees/views of our online content.		3,231		1000 attendees or view of events annually	
3.2	Community Informational Events (excluding Board meetings) at school sites	Parent Engagement and community events as of April 30, 2024 399	Parent Engagement and community events as of April 30, 226		2026-27 School Year Maintain over 390 events with each school holding many diverse events for families and community members.	Decrease by 173
3.3	Launchpad Logins Data Source: Launchpad	Logins as of April 30, 2024 642,000	Logins as of April 16, 2025 729,321	Logins as of April 30, 2026 790,673	2026-27 School Year 750,000 logins	Increase by 148,673 log ins.
3.4	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%) Data Source: Aeries Analytics	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%	Parent Portal Access 2024-25, logins as of April 16, 2025 All Schools: 76% Cambridge: 55% Center: 56% Foxboro: 52% Scandia: 63% Travis: 65% Golden West: 100% Vanden: 81% TEC: 100%	Parent Portal Access 2025-26, logins as of March 25, 2026 All Schools: 73% Cambridge: 58% Center: 55% Foxboro: 60% Scandia: 71% Travis: 66% Golden West: 84% Vanden: 90% TEC: 100%	2026-27 School Year All sites to be above 75% parent portal access.	All Schools: 0% Cambridge: -2% Center: 0% Foxboro: 4% Scandia: 10% Travis: 4% Golden West: -14% Vanden: 4% TEC: 0%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.5	Family Survey Responses Rates Data Source: 23-24: Select Survey Data Report 24-25: Survey Monkey Data	2023-24 Family LCAP Survey responses 657	2024-25 Family LCAP Survey responses 524	2025-26 Family LCAP Survey responses 494	2026-27 School Year Have 1000 or more responses to the Family LCAP Survey.	163 Fewer Responses
3.6	Family satisfaction with family and community offerings Local community survey is conducted annually. Data Source: 23-24: Select Survey Data Report 24-25: Survey Monkey Data	2023-24 Family LCAP Survey responses Percentage of respondents answering "satisfied or very satisfied" to prompt on satisfaction with offerings for families. 72%	2024-25 Family LCAP Survey responses Percentage of respondents answering "satisfied or very satisfied" to prompt on satisfaction with offerings for families. 61%	2025-26 Family LCAP Survey responses Percentage of respondents answering "satisfied or very satisfied" to prompt on satisfaction with offerings for families. 92%	2026-27 School Year Increase satisfaction to 80% or higher.	Increase by 20%
3.7	Family satisfaction with family and community communication Local community survey is conducted annually. Data Source: 23-24: Select Survey Data Report 24-25: Survey Monkey Data	2023-24 Family LCAP Survey responses Percentage of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that the schools have communication that is "easy to access and understand". 89.3%	2024-25 Family LCAP Survey responses Percentage of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that the schools have communication that is "easy to access and understand".	2025-26 Family LCAP Survey responses Percentage of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that the schools have communication that is "easy to access and understand".	2026-27 School Year 90% "easy to access or understand" for all school sites and district-wide.	Increase by 6.2%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			94.5%	95.5%		
3.8	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 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. 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.	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	4-Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP survey Q 17, 18, 19, 24, 26, 28 ; Family survey Q 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 27 2024-25 LCAP Survey	4-Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP survey Q 17, 18, 19, 24, 26, 28 ; Family survey Q 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 27 2025-26 LCAP Survey	2026-27 School Year 5 - Full implementation and Sustainability	No Change: Fully Implementation

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	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. Data Source: LCAP Survey Q 17, 18, 19, 24, 26, 28; Family Survey Q 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 27					
3.9	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. State Practice 6. Rate the LEA's progress in providing families with information and resources to support	4- Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP staff survey Q 20, 21, 22, 29; Family Survey 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26 2023-24 LCAP Surveys	4- Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP staff survey Q 20, 21, 22, 29; Family Survey 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26 2024-25 LCAP Surveys	4- Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP staff survey Q 20, 21, 22, 29; Family Survey 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26 2025-26 LCAP Surveys	2026-27 School Year 5 - Full implementation and Sustainability	No Change- Full Implementation

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	student learning and development in the home.? 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.? 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.? Data Source: LCAP staff survey Q 20, 21, 22, 29; LCAP Family Survey Q 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26					
3.10	State Priority 3A, 3B, 3C, and Dashboard Local Indicator Section 3: Seeking input for decision-making State Practice 9. Rate the LEA's progress in building the capacity of	4- Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP Family Survey: 31, 32, 33, 2023-24 LCAP Surveys	4- Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP Family Survey: 31, 32, 33, 2024-25 LCAP Surveys	4- Full Implementation Data Source: LCAP Family Survey: 31, 32, 33, 2025-26 LCAP Surveys	2026-27 School Year 5 - Full implementation and Sustainability	No Change: Full Implementation

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	and supporting principals and staff to effectively engage families in advisory groups and with decision-making.? 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.? 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 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					

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	engagement activities at school and district levels. Data Source: LCAP Family Survey 31, 32, 33					

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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

A description of overall implementation, including any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions, and any relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.

3.1: The work of the equity action team has been picked up by other standing groups, namely the Continuous and Improvement Monitoring (CIM) teams, the Administrator Academy team, CA-ISP trainings, PBIS teams, and MTSS teams. Additionally, training from social workers and behaviorists around trauma informed practices, cultural responsiveness, and de-escalation techniques are ongoing.

3.2: District and school committees are in place as written in the action. These include School Site Councils, PTAs, DELAC, Superintendent's Parent Advisory, among others.

3.3: Action implemented as written. Actions such as Parent Square, improved web services, and communication software are in place as planned.

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.

There were not material differences.

A description of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal.

3.1: Actions have resulted in improved outcomes for students targeted for disproportionate data. For example, African-American students with disabilities saw a drop in suspension rates after focused work from the CIM teams. Individual school sites have created action plans to address a problem of practice identified through data analysis during Administrator Academy training. CA-ISP sessions have focused on equitable, culturally relevant practices to ensure all students attend school in a welcoming, culturally responsive setting.

3.3: Suspension data continues its downward trend. There is evidence of improved satisfaction with home to school communication as reported in family surveys.

3.4: Parent participation in Parent University activities remains strong. Family nights at schools remain well-attended and positively received per family surveys.

3.5: Training classified staff to create more welcoming, culturally relevant experiences for a our community remains a priority with our labor and community partners.

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

No planned changes.

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.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.1	Equity Team	Focus the work of the Equity Action Team, school leaders and community members on closing the achievement gap experienced by some student groups, including unduplicated students and students with special needs. This team has been in existence for the past 4 years and is in a transition. Part of the work of this group will be to determine the next steps forward to continue the work of closing the opportunity gap for our students.	$0.00	Yes
3.2	Family involvement in decision-making	Continue to involve the families of our students in decision-making through participation on district and school committees.	$0.00	No
3.3	Communication, family support, and involvement at school	Continue to focus on family communication and support by broadcasting Board meetings; expanding the use of surveys; using multi-lingual electronic communication systems (including translation systems); using results of the LCAP family survey to shape improvements at schools; providing a bilingual family liaison and translation/interpretation services; providing our parent-requested single sign-on service; continuing to support volunteer, PTA/PTO/Booster, and other parent involvement at schools; and making volunteer opportunities available through our CERVIS web-accessible platform. Create new website with increased functionality for families, specifically military connected and transfer families.	$131,069.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.4	Parent University and student/family involvement events	Provide parent education with a focus on the needs of families of unduplicated students through a Parent University that provides in-person and online sessions for families, including parenting classes, family nights at school, and sessions about supporting children's success in school and preparing for college and post-secondary education. This includes partnership with outside organizations and specialists to respond to needs generated by families.	$33,085.00	Yes
3.5	Provide welcoming environment	Provide staff training, support and systems to create welcoming, helpful environments for families. Work with pivotal support staff to create an inclusive, welcoming environment where all families and community members feel welcomed with clear, positive communication.	$25,000.00	Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
4	Provide basic services to meet the needs of all students, providing safe environments for learning, appropriate materials and qualified staff.	Maintenance of Progress Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Basic services are essential for fostering academic achievement. In alignment with State Priority 1, which focuses on Basic Services and Conditions at Schools, we have established a maintenance goal in our LCAP. This goal addresses the Williams Act requirements, ensuring all students have equal access to instructional materials, qualified teachers, and safe learning environments. It informs our educational partners about our efforts in teacher assignments, textbook adequacy, facility maintenance priorities, and the integration of new textbooks and technology. Additionally, our LCAP emphasizes a robust new teacher induction program designed to elevate the performance of students with high needs and narrow the achievement gap.

Additionally, the Board has identified facilities maintenance and overall safety as key areas of focus. Student safety and security (as related to physical setting) were the top priority of the new TUSD Strategic Plan and the District has spent considerable time and community feedback into a new Facilities Master Plan.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.1	State Priority 1A and Dashboard Local Indicator Basic Services Teacher assignments Teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject areas and for	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%	TAMO data on the 2024 CA Dashboard local indicator (reporting year 2022-22 Total Teaching FTE: 251.3 Clear (% of teaching FTE): 90.7%	TAMO data on the 2025 CA Dashboard local indicator (reporting year 2022-22 Total Teaching FTE: 256.3 Clear (% of teaching FTE): 88.7%	2026-27 School Year Remain above the statewide average for Clear teachers (as reported by TAMO on the CA Dashboard)	0 for all Measures

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	the students they are teaching (Williams Act) Data Source: CA Dashboard Local Indicator	Comparison to statewide average: Above For more recent data: 2023-24 data from Human Resources (as of CBEDs Day, Oct. 2023) Misassignment of teachers of English learners: 0 Total teacher misassignments: 0 Vacant teacher positions: 5	Comparison to statewide average: Above For more recent data: 2023-24 data from Human Resources (as of CBEDs Day, Oct. 2024) Misassignment of teachers of English learners: 0 Total teacher misassignments: 3 Vacant teacher positions: 2	Comparison to statewide average: Above For more recent data: 2023-24 data from Human Resources (as of CBEDs Day, Oct. 2025) Misassignment of teachers of English learners: 0 Total teacher misassignments: 4 Vacant teacher positions: 3		
4.2	State Priority 1B and Dashboard Local Indicator Basic Services Instructional materials Every student has sufficient access to standards-aligned instructional materials (Williams Act) Data Source: CA Dashboard Local Indicator	2023-24 Data Percent of students with required instructional materials: 100%	2024-25 Data: Percent of students with required instructional materials: 100%	2025-26 Data: Percent of students with required instructional materials: 100%	2026-27 School Year Maintain 100% of students having required instructional materials.	0

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.3	State Priority 1C and Dashboard Local Indicator Basic Services Facilities maintenance School facilities are maintained in good repair (Williams Act) Data Source: Williams Act Report Data, Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT)	2023-24 data Percent of schools rated good exemplary overall on the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT): 100%	2024-25 data Percent of schools rated good / exemplary overall on the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT): 100%	2025-26 data Percent of schools rated good / exemplary overall on the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT): 100%	2026-27 School Year Maintain 100% of schools rated good or exemplary overall on the FIT.	0
4.4	New Teacher Professional Development New teachers were given surveys after completing specific trainings for new teachers. Data Source: 2023 New Teacher Summer Institute	2023-24 Data from 2023 New Teacher Summer Institute Number of new teachers attending: 16 Survey data of efficacy of training, percentages of agree and strongly agree: "good use of my time": 87.6% "gained new information helpful to my new job": 100%	2024-25 Data from 2024 New Teacher Summer Institute Number of new teachers attending: 17 Survey data of efficacy of training, percentages of agree and strongly agree: "good use of my time": 94.1% "gained new information helpful to my new job": 100%	2025-26 Data from 2025 New Teacher Summer Institute Number of new teachers attending: 12 Survey data of efficacy of training, percentages of agree and strongly agree: "good use of my time": 91.6% "gained new information helpful to my new job": 100%	2026-27 School Year New teachers rate training as helpful and gaining helpful information at a rate of 90% or higher.	decrease by 4 participant(s) 'good use of my time": Increase by 4.0% "gained new information helpful to my new job": Maintained 100%

Goal Analysis [2025-26]

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

A description of overall implementation, including any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions, and any relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.

4.1: Action implemented as written.

4.2: Action implemented as written. Induction program supported for new teachers, and professional learning specifically tailored to new teachers to the district occurred summer 2024.

4.3: Action implemented as written. All students have necessary textbooks and district is fully compliant with Williams Settlement.

4.4: Action implemented as written. Supplemental materials purchased for accelration.

4.5: Action implemented as written. Technology purchases aligned with LCAP goals, strategic plan, and student and staff needs.

4.6: Action implemented as written. Classroom furniture for expansion of TK purchased, and purchases to ensure safe facilities for students and staff made as needed and/or as part of district facilities plan.

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.

No material differences between budgeted and estimated actual expenditures.

A description of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal.

4.1: Travis Unified continues to enjoy a Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcome (TAMO) that is superior to neighboring districts and the state.

4.2: A total of 19 new teachers were mentored this year through direct support from TUSD. The work focused on meeting the needs of all students, with focused sessions on working with targeted students groups. As referenced above, TUSD's TAMO remains high, due in part to efforts to retain highly qualitied teachers through support as they begin their careers.

4.3: 100% of students have standards aligned materials as reported through Williams monitoring.

4.4: Supplemental materials are used to identify and serve those students identified as GATE.

4.5: Educational technology has been purchases to reflect student and staff needs. As reported on the TUSD Strategic Plan, all technology is up to date, functional, and secure.

4..6: Maintaining safe facilities is a high priority for the district. Numerous projects are ongoing to modernize and improve facilities. New furniture and equipment has been purchased for the expanded TK progam.

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

No changes planned.

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.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
4.1	Teachers assigned appropriately	Recruit and retain qualified, credentialed staff.	$0.00	No
4.2	New teacher training and support	Provide new teachers with support, induction and specially designed professional development to meet the unique needs of new teachers.	$128,808.00	Yes
4.3	Instructional Materials	Provide standards aligned, evidence-based materials and textbooks for all students.	$968,290.00	No
4.4	Acceleration materials	Provide schools with materials and resources to identify students' needs and differentiate instruction. Provide supplementary instructional materials to support acceleration of unduplicated students toward grade level standards.	$20,000.00	Yes
4.5	Educational Technology	Provide technology to support learning and staff need. Focus on accessibility, security, and integration to create quality user experiences.	$200,000.00	No
4.6	Facilities maintenance and development	Maintain safe environments for students. Provide facilities and furniture for new transitional kindergarten students.	$2,546,868.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing

Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students [2026-27]

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant
$$5,604,730	$0

Required Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the LCAP Year

Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year	LCFF Carryover — Percentage	LCFF Carryover — Dollar	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year
8.860%	1.312%	$773,404.39	10.172%

The Budgeted Expenditures for Actions identified as Contributing may be found in the Contributing Actions Table.

Required Descriptions

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

For each action being provided to an entire LEA or school, provide an explanation of (1) the unique identified need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) for whom the action is principally directed, (2) how the action is designed to address the identified need(s) and why it is being provided on an LEA or schoolwide basis, and (3) the metric(s) used to measure the effectiveness of the action in improving outcomes for the unduplicated student group(s).

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.1	**Action:** Identify areas of need and monitor progress **Need:** Our 2023-24 data showed we needed to focus on improving the performance of students with disabilities and low-income students. Local data (from NWEA MAP and class grades) from the 2023-24 school year shows those groups and English learners continue to need additional support. Based on our Dashboard	To determine student need, it is necessary to have multiple benchmark assessments, which need to be given district-wide to identify overall and site-specific areas of growth. These assessments are a critical element in our efforts to plan appropriate instruction for unduplicated students and to monitor their progress. We use ESGI assessments in TK-1 and with struggling students in grade 2 to monitor the acquisition of basic skills, including letter and	1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 1.21 Since this action has a broad scope with intended impacts on many areas of student academic outcomes, metrics related

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	data, our LCAP is focused on improving outcomes for all students, with special focus on students with disabilities at all school sites, and in particular: Cambridge, Scandia, Golden West and SED students at TEC. **Scope:** LEA-wide	number recognition and letter sounds. Our early primary teachers selected ESGI because it provides valid, reliable information about student progress. Results are used to place struggling students into groups for the instruction they need to move forward. NWEA MAP assessments and reports on student academic growth in reading and math provide our teachers with accurate, actionable evidence to help target instruction for each student or group of students. Our teachers use the data to place struggling students into groups for targeted instruction. We also use data aggregated by student group to monitor the progress, of low-income, foster, and English learner students as part of our process where we consider which LCAP actions and services are effective in meeting the needs of unduplicated students. We consider whether actions and services and should be continued or modified, and which are ineffective and should be discontinued. We expanded this program to our secondary schools in 2022, and it has proved helpful to identify specific skills student need assistance with, especially incoming 9th graders. NWEA publishes research on the validity and reliability of these assessments and on best practices in their use. We have also found that creating custom data visualization tools increases the likelihood that they will be used more regularly and by more people. For example, after creating a tool in Tableau, high school counselors and Guidance class teachers were able to more easily look at their data for students disaggregated by subgroup	to multiple subject areas are included.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		to more quickly see trends and respond appropriately.	
1.2	**Action:** Specialized, quality instructional materials **Need:** Student, especially TK-3 have struggled with writing skills post Covid -19. Staff report decreased ability to identify and write letters. Additionally, students with disabilities have struggled on ELA, particularly at Cambridge and Scandia. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Students in low-income families are less likely to have access to a variety of print and electronic reading material at home. We developed this action to meet the need of low-income students to have access to more print material and expanded selections in online libraries at home. Research indicates that time spent on independent reading outside school is a strong predictor of reading success. Time spent reading improves critical thinking, vocabulary development, and knowledge of the world. What we are providing is of high interest and attractive, encouraging reading. We believe this will be particularly helpful for our students with disabilities.	1.2, 1.3, 1.16
1.3	**Action:** MTSS and Intervention Support during the school day (defined costs) **Need:** District-wide our CAASPP scores decreased significantly since Covid-19; this decrease was felt particularly acutely by our students with disabilities, who have no students meeting or exceeding standards in math in the 11th grade. Additionally, ELA scores across the grade levels, have declined. While there has been improvement in all student groups, achievement and opportunity gaps remain. Additionally we have the following groups as targeted due to the "red" status on the CA Dashboard (2022-23):	We have data showing our WIN (What I Need) Team elementary academic intervention program effectively meets the needs of unduplicated students. The focus is on ensuring students reach grade-level standards. Prior to the pandemic, we found that unduplicated students grew 0.37 standard deviations in English Language Arts as measured by NWEA MAP Reading when working with an Intervention Specialist. African American students gained 0.62 of a standard deviation: gap-closing solid growth. Teachers, staff and administrators identify this service as effective in surveys. There is observational data showing Intervention Specialists use evidence-based reading interventions with exemplary fidelity, leading to observable student growth and increased academic confidence. Following the Covid	1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12, 1.13, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 1.21,1.22 Since this action has a broad scope with intended impacts on many areas of student academic outcomes, metrics related to multiple subject areas are included.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	District-wide: Students with disabilities Cambridge: Students with disabilities (ELA only) Scandia: Students with disabilities (ELA only) Golden West: Students with disabilities (ELA and math) TEC: Socio-economically disadvantaged (CCI- due in large part to ELA and math scores and limited CTE options) For Technical Assistance, this need is echoed with a focus on Students with disabilities in ELA, math and CCI (Differentiated Assistance, targeted level 2). After a districtwide needs assessment for the Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant program, it was determined that there was a high need to support ELA and math instruction for student groups in the elementary setting. Funds from LREBG will be utilized under this action to increase and enhance services aligned with identified needs. **Scope:** LEA-wide	pandemic, we continued the WIN program, but due to subbing shortages and inability to fill all Intervention Specialist positions, the program was not used with fidelity. Now that all positions are filled and we have regained a full student group, we have begun to see growth which approximates that from prior to the pandemic. We have data showing elementary MTSS is effective. Still, we need to continually increase its effectiveness for unduplicated students, which requires collating and analyzing data to share with teachers, supporting the development and scheduling of intervention groups, monitoring student progress, and adjusting instruction as needed. In order to accomplish this work, part of the day of our Assistant Principals will be devoted to MTSS support, and we have TOSAs who will spend part of the day providing intervention instruction and the other part supporting the MTSS process in schools without an Assistant Principal. In addition, teachers will act as Student Success Team (SST) Coordinators to set up parent meetings with the school's team to explore why a student is not successful and to create a plan to help the student get back on track. Many unduplicated students face barriers to graduation, including unstable housing, food insecurity, and language barriers. Our online and in-person credit recovery program, designed to provide accessibility for students facing these barriers, has yielded strong results as evidenced by graduation rates for unduplicated students. Our low-income students' graduation rate was 98.3% in 2024, well above the state average. We do not	

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		have evidence that Cyber High fills in knowledge and skill gaps in unduplicated students, such as closing gaps in math performance. Still, it is an effective tool in general credit recovery. For our all students, College and Career Indicators were an area of focus (orange on Dashboard). At TEC, staff, indicate that although we have Cyber High classes, which are successful for remediation, in person classes are more effective, especially for classes that have more emphasis on written communication (as classroom teachers offer more practice and frequent feedback). 59.7% of TEC students are unduplicated and graduate at high rates (89.6%).	
1.4	**Action:** Resources and supports to improve math academic performance. **Need:** Our 2023-24 data showed we needed to focus on improving the performance of students with disabilities and low-income students. Local data (from NWEA MAP and class grades) from the 2023-24 school year shows those groups and English learners continue to need additional support. Based on our Dashboard data, our LCAP is focused on improving outcomes for all students, with special focus on students with disabilities at these school sites: Cambridge, Scandia, Golden West and SED students at TEC. CAASPP scores parallel the needs identified in our local NWEA MAP test, especially for our unduplicated students. Only 3% of English	Intervention Tools: Our aim is to enhance math proficiency among our unduplicated group. Our observation indicates that many students within this demographic exhibit skill gaps, which may vary from one student to another, necessitating a personalized approach. To address this, we leverage the Khan Academy MAP Accelerator, a tool that utilizes NWEA MAP math scores to tailor learning pathways for students in grades 3-8. These pathways encompass a range of instructional resources such as lessons, videos, and practice problems, targeting the specific concepts and skills required for each student's progression in mathematics. Research conducted by the Albertson Family Foundation underscores the impact, revealing that students completing 60% or more of their grade-level math practice through Khan Academy	1.4, 1.5, 1.19, 1.21

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Learners met math standards on CAASPP (2022-23). For our students with disabilities with the most profound intellectual challenges who take the CA Alt CAASPP exam, no students met standard with 70% scoring at the lowest level. **Scope:** LEA-wide	achieved growth 1.8 times higher than expected on the MAP math assessment. Tier 1 Instructional supports: class size and coaching We want to enhance the learning environment for unduplicated students by reducing class sizes, recognizing that many of these students have gaps in mastering crucial concepts and skills pivotal for their future math education. There were promising signs that reducing class sizes for Math 7 and Math 8 had a positive impact. For instance, prior to the pandemic low-income students and English learners at Golden West progressed from the orange to yellow category on the CAASPP math test, indicating the effectiveness of this initiative for targeted groups. Additionally, the MAP Conditional Growth Index (CGI) exceeded one standard deviation above the national average achieved by other schools that year. However, we must exercise caution in interpreting these results due to a drop in math scores at Golden West in 2024. Interestingly, there was an increase in the performance of African American and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students. We continue to monitor the effectiveness of this action, especially when paired with other initiatives to improve outcomes. The data suggests that Tier I intervention remains the primary focus. It's widely acknowledged that if more than 15-20% of students require higher-tier intervention, efforts should prioritize Tier I core	

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		instruction, which encompasses daily classroom lessons benefiting all students.	
1.6	**Action:** Outside the school day resources to increase students' readiness for next grade and college and career. **Need:** Student academic metrics for unduplicated students are in red or orange for most school sites for ELA and Math. With additional pressures on requirements during the school day for elementary students, including recess minutes, digital citizenship and arts education (a local priority to increase in the next year), in school intervention will not suffice to meet the needs of all students, especially those with higher needs including unduplicated students. Additionally we have the following groups as targeted due to the "red" status on the CA Dashboard (2022-23): District-wide: Students with disabilities Cambridge: Students with disabilities (ELA only) Scandia: Students with disabilities (ELA only) Golden West: Students with disabilities (ELA and math) TEC: Socio-economically disadvantaged (CCI-due in large part to ELA and math scores and limited CTE options) For Technical Assistance, this need is echoed with a focus on Students with disabilities in	Tutoring is experiencing a resurgence in popularity, supported by a wealth of high-quality research studies highlighting its efficacy and pinpointing the critical elements for successful implementation. A comprehensive and accessible meta-analysis of such research is conducted by the Annenberg Institute at Brown University. Their findings underscore the significance of intensity, often referred to as 'high-dosage tutoring,' advocating for a frequency of at least three 30-minute sessions per week within the school day, utilizing small groups with a tutor-to-student ratio of 1:4 or lower to facilitate individualized attention. Kraft and Falken from Brown University advocate for models where students engage with the same tutor as part of their regular class routine, proposing tutoring sessions three to five times per week. These recommendations are corroborated by WestEd, the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) West, which stresses the importance of tutor training. Given this information, we are designing our tutoring programs to be available at least 3 days per week for secondary students (who do not have built in intervention periods such as the WIN program available for elementary students). Elementary tutoring is meant to supplement the in-school tutoring available during WIN time. Tutoring is frequently identified by both parents and students in surveys and focus groups as a preferred way to get additional support for in-class instruction.	1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 1.8, 1.10, 1.15, 1.20, 1.21 Additionally, growth may be seen in these areas: 1.6, 1.9, 1.12, 1.16, 1.18, 1.19,

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	ELA, math and CCI (Differentiated Assistance, targeted level 2). **Scope:** LEA-wide	At the secondary level, we know that students with higher academic needs (and requirements) such as students with disabilities and English Learners often have less time in their schedules to remediate courses or take additional electives, such as CTE classes. This can mean that if they need to remediate a class, it puts them behind for graduation, A-G attainment and CTE completion; summer school and online remediation options can address this.	
1.7	**Action:** Support staff learning. **Need:** We have a number of new staff and administrators who have joined our district, and the teaching profession, in the last 3 years. Seven of our 16 site administrators are new to our district in the last three years and we have approximately 30 teachers in year 1 or 2 of their teaching careers. These staff members need support to implement effective instructional strategies and lead instructional innovation. Staff have identified the need to focus on first best instruction as a critical next step to improving outcomes for all students, and in particular those in targeted student groups and students with disabilities. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Administrators and teachers regularly request additional professional development in our annual surveys and cite the efficacy of evidence-based PD. Linda Darling-Hammond identified essential components of effective professional development in a study conducted by the Learning Policy Institute. The report highlighted seven critical elements: content focus, active learning, collaborative efforts, model use and demonstration, coaching and expert support, opportunities for feedback and reflection, and an emphasis on sustained duration. Our professional development programs encompass both training and coaching components. We have documented the success of our training through improved student outcomes. Additionally, we observe the significant contributions of trained Instructional Assistants within our WIN Team intervention program. These team members consistently implement evidence-based curricula with accuracy and foster supportive, constructive relationships with students. Data tracking student progress supports these findings.	1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 1.21 Since this action has a broad scope with intended impacts on many areas of student academic and engagement outcomes, metrics related to multiple subject areas are included.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.8	**Action:** Home to school transportation **Need:** Research consistently supports the link between academic performance and regular school attendance. Travis has traditionally experienced a high rate of attendance, but following the Covid pandemic, we have struggled to return to these high levels. Until this year, our elementary schools all scored in the lowest tier in attendance rates, and this is has continued for many of our unduplicated student groups, specifically English Learners and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. CA Dashboard areas of focus for attendance: Cambridge: English Learners and Filipino students Foxboro: English Learners Golden West: Socioeconomically disadvantaged, SWD, white and Hispanic students **Scope:** LEA-wide	Research has consistently shown the positive correlation between attendance and students' academic outcomes. This is bolstered by the emphasis on attendance as a CDE State Priority (5) and Dashboard metric. Following Covid-19, the chronic absenteeism rate has increased dramatically, from 4.3% in 2018-19 (the last full year before Covid-19) to 17% this year. Some of our unduplicated students face barriers related to family transportation to school. Cost of transportation is also an additional barrier for our low-income students. In looking at the attendance rates for unduplicated students and comparing the attendance rates for those who use home to school transportation and those who do not, there is an increase of 2% in daily attendance for those using district provided transportation. This transportation has been provided at no cost to eligible low-income students. In 2022-23, the overall number (and rate) of students using no-cost home to school transportation increased due to new, easier to complete, online forms that were deployed in the fall of 2022.	1.17 and indirectly: 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 1.21
2.1	**Action:** Improve school climate **Need:** We established this objective because the social and emotional well-being of students is essential for their attendance, positive behavior and ultimately academic	We adhere to a "whole child" philosophy that emphasizes stable, enduring relationships that nurture academic, physical, cognitive, social, and emotional growth. Studies indicate that this approach, centered on relationships, significantly enhances performance across all children, regardless of their backgrounds.	2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 2.11

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	achievement. It's crucial for every child to feel healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged. The lingering impacts of pandemic-related isolation and social stress on students underscore the continuing importance of this focus. This is also highlighted in our district-wide initiatives, such as our Strategic Plan, which prioritized student safety and socio-emotional wellness as the top two priorities. Our Dashboard data also necessitates the focus on this area. Like schools nation-wide, our chronic absenteeism and daily attendance rates dipped during the pandemic and have not fully rebounded. Also, fitting the patterns seen across the country, students struggled with the return to in person classes and behavior suffered. Student survey data also reflects this as more students identify feeling disconnected to school and peers. Of specific focus are areas of red on the CA Dashboard, Climate (Suspensions): District-wide: Pacific Islander and Homeless students Center: all students, students with disabilities, socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED), multi-racial (2 or more races) Vanden: white students Engagement (attendance):	Our additional staff will be providing targeted supports for unduplicated students for the above described strategies, such as check in, check out, WEB/Link Crew activities and individual meetings. Data on specific strategies (Playworks and CICO); Multiple studies provide evidence that Playworks is effective. Massey et. al. found the Playworks recess observational tool was effective. The RAND Corporation found Playworks to be an effective socio-emotional learning intervention for unduplicated (low-income) students in their large study of social and emotional learning interventions completed in 2017 under the Every Student Succeeds Act. Our robust implementation for the last two years is showing the benefits, particularly in reduced student interpersonal conflict during recess. Teachers report that students come into class ready to learn instead of angry and frustrated about something that happened at recess. This supports continued, district-wide implementation. We analyzed Tier II supports for unduplicated students and selected CICO. Some of our unduplicated students struggle with executive functioning, behavior, and academic stamina, and a coach can provide them with daily check-ins and ongoing personalized support and encouragement. A review of research by Laging et al. on the effectiveness of Check-in Check-out found that it is an effective Tier 2 intervention for problem behaviors.	

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Cambridge: English Learners, Filipino students Foxboro: English Learners Golden West: all students, socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED), students with disabilities (SWD), white, Hispanic students Travis unified continues to focus on climate (suspension) data for students with disabilities, although our data no longer shows disproportionality in this area, we are continuing to monitor our work in this area as part of the Differentiated Assistance (DA) and Compliance and Improvement Monitoring (CIM) process. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Of specific focus are areas of red on the CA Dashboard, which we believe will benefit from these individualized services: Climate: Suspensions: District-wide: Long-term English Learners Cambridge: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Golden West: Students with Disabilities TEC: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Engagement: Attendance: Cambridge: English Learners Foxboro: African American students Golden West: Socioeconomically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and white students	
2.2	**Action:** Improve Socio-emotional Wellness **Need:** Student data continues to show high levels of chronic sadness and (in older student groups) suicidal ideation. Although these metrics have been improving and are not out of line with data state-wide, they continue to be an area of concern. Additionally, we have a continued need to increase attendance rates, especially for our	Some of our unduplicated students face socio-emotional or mental health barriers to school success. To provide higher-tier support to these students in our MTSS system, we have a team of social workers. We have also added a social worker intern program to increase capacity to serve mental health needs exacerbated by the pandemic. Navigating the mental health care system can be complex, and Care Solace experts work with families to understand their needs and health insurance to create a good match. Their network is large, and they have expertise and capacity to support families who need help	2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10 We believe that socio-emotional wellness contributes to many areas of student experience, academics, attendance and behavior. With this in mind, we included multiple metrics that may be positively impacted by this goal.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	unduplicated students (particularly English Learners and Socioeconomically disadvantaged) and positive connection to school and trusted adults are both identified as motivators to improve this. **Scope:** LEA-wide	navigating Medicaid, having no insurance, or having trouble finding mental health care within their health insurance network of providers. In addition, they can support families who speak languages other than English. The Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory provides a summary of the research of the effectiveness of school social workers on student outcomes. Studies cited indicate that school social workers increase graduation rates. They are also effective providers of mental health services and improve the fidelity of implementation of programs designed to improve behavior. A study by Early and Vonk found that school social workers were effective in helping students learn problem-solving skills and improve relationships with peers. All schools district-wide face these same issues and will benefit from these evidence-supported interventions.	
2.3	**Action:** Strengthen Staff Skills and Systems: Professional Development and System refinement **Need:** The needs for staff and system development are the same as those identified in Actions 2.1 and 2.2. Student socio-emotional wellness is a high priority for our Board, staff and families and our data supports continued growth in this area. Attendance, suspensions and student climate data all have opportunities to improve, and we believe that staff and systems	We believe that developing our staff is the most controllable, effective way to address the socioemotional needs of our students as a whole. Especially the needs of our unduplicated students who have may have unique needs in addition to those of all students. With this in mind, we are focusing on evidence-based systems with built in monitoring and evaluation processes, such as the work with CA-ISP. Numerous studies, as referenced by John Hattie in his work Visible Learning, shows the strong impact that well-prepared, thoughtful and well-trained teachers can have on student outcomes and experiences.	2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9 We believe that socio-emotional wellness contributes to many areas of student experience, academics, attendance and behavior. With this in mind, we included multiple metrics that may be positively impacted by this goal.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	development (to maximize the efforts of staff) will make the largest impact. Specifically, we have the following areas of focus, which will be directly impacted by staff and systems development: Climate (Suspensions): District-wide: Pacific Islander and Homeless students Center: all students, students with disabilities, socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED), multi-racial (2 or more races) Vanden: white students Engagement (attendance): Cambridge: English Learners, Filipino students Foxboro: English Learners Golden West: all students, socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED), students with disabilities (SWD), white, Hispanic students Travis unified continues to focus on climate (suspension) data for students with disabilities, although our data no longer shows disproportionality in this area, we are continuing to monitor our work in this area as part of the Differentiated Assistance (DA) and Compliance and Improvement Monitoring (CIM) process. **Scope:** LEA-wide	We acknowledge that for a system to be successful, it needs to be implemented with fidelity, monitored and evaluated consistantly and refined to meet student needs. We know that the best way to do this is by training all staff and providing software and protocols for monitoring and adjustment. Working with CA-ISP, and West Ed, during this implementation will help with this and having the same training and systems district-wide will strengthen the system and make perpetuation more likely.	

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
3.1	**Action:** Equity Team **Need:** We continue to experience gaps in the achievement and outcomes for our students. For example, our data around suspensions is disproportionate for African American and Hispanic students and students with disabilities, district-wide. This is contrasted by having red Dashboard data for white students at our high school. Test scores also demonstrate disparate outcomes with African American students, English Learners and students with disabilities scoring lower than peers. Staff and current members of the Equity Action Team continue to express interest in continuing this as an area of focus. **Scope:** LEA-wide	We believe that issues of equity must be addressed at both a site and district level for greatest impact. We believe that by bringing community members, staff, students and administrators together to examine data, choose focus goals and take action, we will be best situated to make changes that impact students.	3.8, 3.9, 3.10
3.3	**Action:** Communication, family support, and involvement at school **Need:** During the pandemic, we saw an increase in online communication and involvement by families; however, that has decreased in the last two years, and we are revisiting this area of focus. We continue to have families use single sign on and online tools to monitor grades, but we have seen a drop off in	Parent survey data shows consistent value of parent communication. Families appreciate efforts in this area, such as phone calls home and frequent communication from staff. They also cite this as an area that could be improved, especially when students are struggling. Additionally, English Learner parents, in focus groups and ELAC meetings, mention not knowing some procedures and rules. Although there are slight variations in data about communication by school site, the overall trend is that this is very important and a continued area of growth.	3.3,3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	meeting and engagement activities that are available only online; this includes a decrease in survey results. Additionally, when we met with Travis AirForce Base representatives, the website and communication systems were identified as key for families transferring into Travis and specifically requested changes in this area. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Additionally, the use of single sign on (Launchpad) has been beneficial for students, and we want to continue it. Last year we had over 915,977 student sign-ons, and we are on track to have that amount again this year. Although all students use this tool, we know that unduplicated students often face more significant barriers in using technology.	
3.4	**Action:** Parent University and student/family involvement events **Need:** Our family survey data indicates a need for enhanced parent education programs. Parents have expressed a desire for sessions focused on understanding test scores, exploring post-secondary pathways, and strategies to support their children's academic success. Additionally, there is a demand for guidance on navigating college admissions and finances, as well as parenting children with emotional or behavioral challenges. **Scope:** LEA-wide	The California Department of Education's 2014 Family Engagement Framework highlights the effectiveness of support for learning at home and strong school-home communication, as detailed in the research summary on page 39 of the framework. We hope to build on this evidence-based approach by continuing to offer parent education, both in person and online, to help meet families' needs.	3.1, 3.2, 3.6, 3.9
3.5	**Action:** Provide welcoming environment	We believe that our staff are dedicated professionals who want to create welcoming, helpful environments for families. However, we	3.8

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Need: Community and staff data (from surveys and focus groups) generally rate our schools as welcoming places that they "would recommend" to others. However, there some areas that could be improved. For example, only half of families agree or strongly agree that they a are "greeted warmly and promptly" when calling or visiting Golden West. Increased staff training regarding helping families from diverse backgrounds, including multi-lingual families was also identified as a need in administrator data. **Scope:** LEA-wide	recognize that with staff taking on new roles and turn over in front office staff, who often provide the first impression for families, specific training to support them is necessary.	
4.2	**Action:** New teacher training and support **Need:** New teachers often come to teaching with extremely limited experience in classrooms. The CDE recognizes this and requires all new teachers to complete an induction program in order to continue teaching. Additionally, survey data of teachers early in their career, show that they want more support and training on serving English Learners, dealing with classroom management and creating routines and procedures. **Scope:**	We implemented specific training on supporting English learners for all new teachers last year and it was very well reviewed in administrator and new teacher participant exit surveys. More generally, induction programs are shown to increase the performance and test scores of students in those teachers' classes (according to a meta-analysis of such programs by Ingersoll and Strong in "The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers: A Critical Review of the Research".	4.1, 4.4

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	LEA-wide		
4.4	**Action:** Acceleration materials **Need:** Our Intervention Specialists use a variety of specialized instructional materials in reading and math, and we needed to purchase additional materials because we focused our teams to better support our unduplicated students as we return to regular instruction -- specifically English Learners. We also increased access to high-interest, differentiated materials that students can access at home. Students in low-income families are less likely to have access to a variety of print and electronic reading material at home. We developed this action to meet the need of low-income students to have access to more print material and expanded selections in online libraries at home. **Scope:** LEA-wide	Research indicates that time spent on independent reading outside school is a strong predictor of reading success. Time spent reading improves critical thinking, vocabulary development, and knowledge of the world. What we are providing is of high interest and attractive, encouraging reading. Our new digital library also allows students looking for something to do at home to instantly check out a book from their school library to read. It also provides immediate access to research materials for students writing papers. We have also increased our identification of GATE students to move away from more subjective measures (such as parent and teacher evaluations) to NWEA MAP scores to reach more unduplicated students who may be less likely to be identified using more traditional methods.	1.2, 1.3, 1.16, 1.18

Limited Actions

For each action being solely provided to one or more unduplicated student group(s), provide an explanation of (1) the unique identified need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) being served, (2) how the action is designed to address the identified need(s), and (3) how the effectiveness of the action in improving outcomes for the unduplicated student group(s) will be measured.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
1.5	**Action:** Resources and supports to improve ELA / ELD academic performance. **Need:** Students, especially TK-3 have struggled with writing skills post COVID-19. Staff report decreased ability to identify and write letters. Additionally, students with disabilities have struggled on ELA district-wide, particularly at Cambridge and Scandia. Increased achievement on CAASPP scores indicates that this action is working, although needs clearly remain. Although not at a troubling percentage, we also believe that reducing the number of students who become Long-term English learner (LTEL) is important and could be mitigated by increased staff training on early intervention. As part of Compliance and Improvement Monitoring, we have been identified as needing to address the academic performance of our students with disabilities. The CIM group has created an area of focus of ELA and Tier 1 supports to address this. **Scope:**	ELD was designed to meet the needs of our English learners. Pre-pandemic, our efforts in serving English learners were effective. Performance on the Dashboard English Learner Indicator (ELPI) was High. The district outperformed the state on all metrics. Students rarely become Long Term English Learners (LTELs). Suspension and chronic absence rates are low for English learners, indicating engagement in school. English learners report that they enjoy ELD and find the teachers helpful. Staff rate ELD as effective. Parents of English learners said at DELAC that they appreciate our dependable delivery of ELD services and that the instruction is helping their children. However, we know that the pandemic had a differential negative effect on English learners, and attendance rates for this group has remained low following our return to in-person schooling, especially at Foxboro (Dashboard Red for EL students). We are continuing to contract with English Learner/Literacy expert Janelle Cameron to provide staff development related to English Learner needs and effective strategies to use in instruction. In staff surveys, this training ranks as one of the most effective in teachers' opinions and is requested to be expanded to all school sites moving forward. We anticipate that the focus on intentional language acquisition strategies will help not just English Learners, but all students in the field of ELA.	1.7, 1.8, 1.9 Additional metrics: 1.2, 1.3, 1.16

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Additionally, we have contracted with Janelle Cameron to design specific professional development to address the unique needs of our LTELs. We are also partnering with our SCOE team to train on the newly developed alternative reclassification criteria for EL students, as we have found that LTEL status is more prevalent with our ELs who are dual identified as EL and in need of special education services. These students do not qualify for the Alt. ELPAC, but still struggle with standardized tests, which we believe is impacting their ability to score a 4 on the ELPAC and be eligible for reclassification. Our CIM group has been very successful in the last three years addressing targeted issues, such as suspension, with a Tier 1 approach. We will continue to work with this team to improve first instruction across the district. The group, after looking at CAASPP ELA data for all school sites chose to focus on ELA first since it has the most cross-over with other core subjects, and they believe will positively impact performance in other subjects, such as math, science, and social studies as they require academic English proficiency.	
1.9	**Action:** MTSS interventions during the school day (percentage of increased services) **Need:** District-wide our CAASPP scores have decreased significantly since Covid-19; this decrease was felt particularly acutely by our students with disabilities, who have no	We have data showing our WIN (What I Need) Team elementary academic intervention program effectively meets the needs of unduplicated students. The focus is on ensuring students reach grade-level standards. Prior to the pandemic, we found that unduplicated students grew 0.37 standard deviations in English Language Arts as measured by NWEA MAP	1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12, 1.13, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 1.21,1.22 Since this action has a broad scope with intended impacts on many areas of student academic

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	students meeting or exceeding standards in math in the 11th grade. Additionally, ELA scores across the grade levels, have declined. For our TEC students, College and Career Indicators were an area of focus (red on Dashboard). **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Reading when working with an Intervention Specialist. African American students gained 0.62 of a standard deviation: gap-closing solid growth. Teachers, staff and administrators identify this service as effective in surveys. There is observational data showing Intervention Specialists use evidence-based reading interventions with exemplary fidelity, leading to observable student growth and increased academic confidence. Following the Covid pandemic, we continued the WIN program, but due to subbing shortages and inability to fill all Intervention Specialist positions, the program was not used with fidelity. Now that all positions are filled and we have regained a full student group, we anticipate pre-pandemic growth again. We have data showing elementary MTSS is effective. Still, we need to continually increase its effectiveness for unduplicated students, which requires collating and analyzing data to share with teachers, supporting the development and scheduling of intervention groups, monitoring student progress, and adjusting instruction as needed. In addition, teachers will act as Student Success Team (SST) Coordinators to set up parent meetings with the school's team to explore why a student is not successful and to create a plan to help the student get back on track. Families have also identified that interventions during the school day (when parents don't need to arrange for additional transportation) are more convenient. We know that the issues of after school transportation (when families may be	outcomes, metrics related to multiple subject areas are included.

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
		working) is a larger hurdle for low-income families. Additionally, last year's DELAC families also identified a desire for increased services during the school day. For our TEC students, College and Career Indicators were an area of focus (red on Dashboard). Staff, including the principal, report that increased access to post high school planning and academic goal achievement are necessary to address this. Unduplicated students are more likely to be first generation college-goers and may lack additional support at home on academic attainment. Staff have identified key skills and character traits (such as grit) to help students stay motivated and successful. This has proven successful with consistently high graduation rates, even with student groups who are traditionally underserved (such as our unduplicated students).	

For any limited action contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement that is associated with a Planned Percentage of Improved Services in the Contributing Summary Table rather than an expenditure of LCFF funds, describe the methodology that was used to determine the contribution of the action towards the proportional percentage, as applicable.

We added four instructional assistants to each school team to allow more students to be served. Annenberg research indicates that 50 hours of this intensive support during the school year increases achievement equivalent to an additional 3-15 months of school, which is gap-closing growth. To reach 50 hours would take 20 weeks of 30-minute daily intervention instruction. Instructional aides allow for more students to reach this critical level of intervention. This intervention is scheduled into the daily schedule of classroom teachers and provided for students in K-5 and some students in grade 6 based on student needs.

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

A description of the plan for how the additional concentration grant add-on funding identified above will be used to increase the number of staff providing direct services to students at schools that have a high concentration (above 55 percent) of foster youth, English learners, and low-income students, as applicable.

Not Applicable

Staff-to-student ratios by type of school and concentration of unduplicated students	Schools with a student concentration of 55 percent or less	Schools with a student concentration of greater than 55 percent
Staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students	NA	NA
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	NA	NA

2026-27 Total Planned Expenditures Table

LCAP Year	1. Projected LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Input Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)
Totals	$63,258,673	$5,604,730	8.860%	1.312%	10.172%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$5,902,747.00	$4,067,946.00	$0.00	$642,070.00	$10,612,763.00	$5,145,145.00	$5,467,618.00

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
1	1.1	Identify areas of need and monitor progress	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$139,895.00	$126,868.00	$266,763.00				$266,763.00	
1	1.2	Specialized, quality instructional materials	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Cambridge, Center, Foxboro, Scandia, Travis TK-6	Ongoing	$0.00	$75,220.00	$75,220.00				$75,220.00	
1	1.3	MTSS and Intervention Support during the school day (defined costs)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$2,609,942.00	$69,761.00	$2,005,609.00	$309,904.00		$364,190.00	$2,679,703.00	
1	1.4	Resources and supports to improve math academic performance.	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$168,037.00	$24,200.00	$192,237.00				$192,237.00	
1	1.5	Resources and supports to improve ELA / ELD academic performance.	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	Ongoing	$269,578.00	$34,500.00	$128,889.00	$47,000.00		$128,189.00	$304,078.00	
1	1.6	Outside the school day resources to increase students' readiness for next grade and college and career.	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$106,640.00	$274.00	$89,274.00			$17,640.00	$106,914.00	
1	1.7	Support staff learning.	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$198,040.00	$106,767.00	$288,307.00			$16,500.00	$304,807.00	
1	1.8	Home to school transportation	Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$1,046,290.00	$1,046,290.00				$1,046,290.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
1	1.9	MTSS interventions during the school day (percentage of increased services)	Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Cambridge, Center, Foxboro, Scandia, Travis, Travis Education Center K-5; 10-12	Ongoing	$0.00	$0.00			$0.00		$0.00	1.265%
2	2.1	Improve school climate	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$1,088,324.00	$83,884.00	$860,773.00	$195,884.00		$115,551.00	$1,172,208.00	
2	2.2	Improve Socio-emotional Wellness	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$324,669.00	$20,400.00	$345,069.00				$345,069.00	
2	2.3	Strengthen Staff Skills and Systems: Professional Development and System refinement	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$55,154.00	$11,200.00	$66,354.00				$66,354.00	
3	3.1	Equity Team	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
3	3.2	Family involvement in decision-making	All	No			All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
3	3.3	Communication, family support, and involvement at school	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$91,565.00	$39,504.00	$131,069.00				$131,069.00	
3	3.4	Parent University and student/family involvement events	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$23,493.00	$9,592.00	$33,085.00				$33,085.00	
3	3.5	Provide welcoming environment	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$25,000.00	$25,000.00				$25,000.00	
4	4.1	Teachers assigned appropriately	All	No			All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$0.00			$0.00		$0.00	
4	4.2	New teacher training and support	English Learners	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	All Schools	Ongoing	$69,808.00	$59,000.00	$128,808.00				$128,808.00	
4	4.3	Instructional Materials	All	No			All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$968,290.00		$968,290.00			$968,290.00	
4	4.4	Acceleration materials	English Learners Foster Youth	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth	All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$20,000.00	$20,000.00				$20,000.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
			Low Income			Low Income										
4	**4.5**	Educational Technology	All	No			All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$200,000.00	$200,000.00				$200,000.00	
4	**4.6**	Facilities maintenance and development	All	No			All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$2,546,868.00		$2,546,868.00			$2,546,868.00	

2026-27 Contributing Actions Table

1. Projected LCFF Base Grant	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)	Totals by Type	Total LCFF Funds
$63,258,673	$5,604,730	8.860%	1.312%	10.172%	$5,702,747.00	1.265%	10.280 %	**Total:**	$5,702,747.00
								LEA-wide Total:	$5,573,858.00
								Limited Total:	$128,889.00
								Schoolwide Total:	$0.00

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
1	**1.1**	Identify areas of need and monitor progress	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$266,763.00	
1	**1.2**	Specialized, quality instructional materials	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Cambridge, Center, Foxboro, Scandia, Travis TK-6	$75,220.00	
1	**1.3**	MTSS and Intervention Support during the school day (defined costs)	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$2,005,609.00	
1	**1.4**	Resources and supports to improve math academic performance.	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$192,237.00	
1	**1.5**	Resources and supports to improve ELA / ELD academic performance.	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$128,889.00	
1	**1.6**	Outside the school day resources to increase students' readiness for next	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$89,274.00	

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
		grade and college and career.						
1	1.7	Support staff learning.	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$288,307.00	
1	1.8	Home to school transportation	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,046,290.00	
1	1.9	MTSS interventions during the school day (percentage of increased services)	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Cambridge, Center, Foxboro, Scandia, Travis, Travis Education Center K-5; 10-12		1.265%
2	2.1	Improve school climate	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$860,773.00	
2	2.2	Improve Socio-emotional Wellness	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$345,069.00	
2	2.3	Strengthen Staff Skills and Systems: Professional Development and System refinement	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$66,354.00	
3	3.1	Equity Team	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$0.00	
3	3.3	Communication, family support, and involvement at school	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$131,069.00	
3	3.4	Parent University and student/family involvement events	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$33,085.00	
3	3.5	Provide welcoming environment	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$25,000.00	
4	4.2	New teacher training and support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	All Schools	$128,808.00	
4	4.4	Acceleration materials	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth	All Schools	$20,000.00	

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
					Low Income			

2025-26 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$10,332,816.00	$9,586,946.00

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
1	**1.1**	Identify areas of need and monitor progress	Yes	$254,474.00	241178
1	**1.2**	Specialized, quality instructional materials	Yes	$54,529.00	80034
1	**1.3**	MTSS and Intervention Support during the school day (defined costs)	Yes	$2,461,279.00	2667277
1	**1.4**	Resources and supports to improve math academic performance.	Yes	$182,044.00	170801
1	**1.5**	Resources and supports to improve ELA / ELD academic performance.	Yes	$256,034.00	250547
1	**1.6**	Outside the school day resources to increase students' readiness for next grade and college and career.	Yes	$228,387.00	185443
1	**1.7**	Support staff learning.	Yes	$264,444.00	131065
1	**1.8**	Home to school transportation	Yes	$993,513.00	993513
1	**1.9**	MTSS interventions during the school day (percentage of increased services)	Yes	$0.00	
2	**2.1**	Improve school climate	Yes	$949,743.00	906971
2	**2.2**	Improve Socio-emotional Wellness	Yes	$335,316.00	331244

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributed to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures (Input Total Funds)
2	2.3	Strengthen Staff Skills and Systems: Professional Development and System refinement	Yes	$167,346.00	145450
3	3.1	Equity Team	Yes	$10,000.00	0
3	3.2	Family involvement in decision-making	No	$0.00	
3	3.3	Communication, family support, and involvement at school	Yes	$168,197.00	154299
3	3.4	Parent University and student/family involvement events	Yes	$16,440.00	6578
3	3.5	Provide welcoming environment	Yes	$25,000.00	0
4	4.1	Teachers assigned appropriately	No	$0.00	
4	4.2	New teacher training and support	Yes	$132,797.00	111651
4	4.3	Instructional Materials	No	$988,273.00	453848
4	4.4	Acceleration materials	Yes	$20,000.00	4400
4	4.5	Educational Technology	No	$200,000.00	200000
4	4.6	Facilities maintenance and development	No	$2,625,000.00	2552647

2025-26 Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

6. Estimated LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)	7. Total Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)	5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)	8. Total Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (%)	Difference Between Planned and Estimated Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)
$5,405,566	$5,589,715.00	$5,445,465.00	$144,250.00	1.265%	0.000%	-1.265%

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
1	1.1	Identify areas of need and monitor progress	Yes	$254,474.00	$241,178		
1	1.2	Specialized, quality instructional materials	Yes	$54,529.00	$74,101		
1	1.3	MTSS and Intervention Support during the school day (defined costs)	Yes	$2,164,041.00	$2,330,591		
1	1.4	Resources and supports to improve math academic performance.	Yes	$173,044.00	$160,958		
1	1.5	Resources and supports to improve ELA / ELD academic performance.	Yes	$122,916.00	$133,438		
1	1.6	Outside the school day resources to increase students' readiness for next grade and college and career.	Yes	$110,228.00	$25,000		
1	1.7	Support staff learning.	Yes	$207,944.00	$113,129		
1	1.8	Home to school transportation	Yes	$993,513.00	$993,513		
1	1.9	MTSS interventions during the school day (percentage of increased services)	Yes			1.265%	
2	2.1	Improve school climate	Yes	$886,727.00	$776,986		

Last Year's Goal #	Last Year's Action #	Prior Action/Service Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Input LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services	Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Input Percentage)
2	2.2	Improve Socio-emotional Wellness	Yes	$335,316.00	$331,244		
2	2.3	Strengthen Staff Skills and Systems: Professional Development and System refinement	Yes	$129,146.00	$142,250		
3	3.1	Equity Team	Yes	$10,000.00	0		
3	3.3	Communication, family support, and involvement at school	Yes	$131,397.00	$116,499		
3	3.4	Parent University and student/family involvement events	Yes	$16,440.00	$6,578		
3	3.5	Provide welcoming environment	Yes				
4	4.2	New teacher training and support	Yes				
4	4.4	Acceleration materials	Yes				

2025-26 LCFF Carryover Table

9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Percentage from Prior Year)	10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 + Carryover %)	7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)	11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)	12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)	13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)
$58,935,028	$5,405,566	1.380	10.552%	$5,445,465.00	0.000%	9.240%	$773,404.39	1.312%

Local Control and Accountability Plan Instructions

Plan Summary

Engaging Educational Partners

Goals and Actions

Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students

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.

Introduction and Instructions

The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) requires local educational agencies (LEAs) to engage their local educational partners in an annual planning process to evaluate their progress within eight state priority areas encompassing all statutory metrics (COEs have 10 state priorities). LEAs document the results of this planning process in the LCAP using the template adopted by the State Board of Education.

The LCAP development process serves three distinct, but related functions:

- **Comprehensive Strategic Planning:** The process of developing and annually updating the LCAP supports comprehensive strategic planning, particularly to address and reduce disparities in opportunities and outcomes between student groups indicated by the California School Dashboard (California Education Code [EC] Section 52064[e][1]). Strategic planning that is comprehensive connects budgetary decisions to teaching and learning performance data. LEAs should continually evaluate the hard choices they make about the use of limited resources to meet student and community needs to ensure opportunities and outcomes are improved for all students.

- **Meaningful Engagement of Educational Partners:** The LCAP development process should result in an LCAP that reflects decisions made through meaningful engagement (EC Section 52064[e][1]). Local educational partners possess valuable perspectives and insights about an LEA's programs and services. Effective strategic planning will incorporate these perspectives and insights in order to identify potential goals and actions to be included in the LCAP.

- **Accountability and Compliance:** The LCAP serves an important accountability function because the nature of some LCAP template sections require LEAs to show that they have complied with various requirements specified in the LCFF statutes and regulations, most notably:

    - Demonstrating that LEAs are increasing or improving services for foster youth, English learners, including long-term English learners, and low-income students in proportion to the amount of additional funding those students generate under LCFF (EC Section 52064[b][4-6]).

    - Establishing goals, supported by actions and related expenditures, that address the statutory priority areas and statutory metrics (EC sections 52064[b][1] and [2]).

        - **NOTE:** As specified in EC Section 62064(b)(1), the LCAP must provide a description of the annual goals, for all pupils and each subgroup of pupils identified pursuant to EC Section 52052, to be achieved for each of the state priorities. Beginning in 2023–24, EC

Section 52052 identifies long-term English learners as a separate and distinct pupil subgroup with a numerical significance at 15 students.

- Annually reviewing and updating the LCAP to reflect progress toward the goals (EC Section 52064[b][7]).
- Ensuring that all increases attributable to supplemental and concentration grant calculations, including concentration grant add-on funding and/or LCFF carryover, are reflected in the LCAP (EC sections 52064[b][6], [8], and [11]).

The LCAP template, like each LEA's final adopted LCAP, is a document, not a process. LEAs must use the template to memorialize the outcome of their LCAP development process, which must: (a) reflect comprehensive strategic planning, particularly to address and reduce disparities in opportunities and outcomes between student groups indicated by the California School Dashboard (Dashboard), (b) through meaningful engagement with educational partners that (c) meets legal requirements, as reflected in the final adopted LCAP. The sections included within the LCAP template do not and cannot reflect the full development process, just as the LCAP template itself is not intended as a tool for engaging educational partners.

If a county superintendent of schools has jurisdiction over a single school district, the county board of education and the governing board of the school district may adopt and file for review and approval a single LCAP consistent with the requirements in EC sections 52060, 52062, 52066, 52068, and 52070. The LCAP must clearly articulate to which entity's budget (school district or county superintendent of schools) all budgeted and actual expenditures are aligned.

The revised LCAP template for the 2024–25, 2025–26, and 2026–27 school years reflects statutory changes made through Senate Bill 114 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 48, Statutes of 2023 and Senate Bill 153, Chapter 38, Statues of 2024.

At its most basic, the adopted LCAP should attempt to distill not just what the LEA is doing for students in transitional kindergarten through grade twelve (TK–12), but also allow educational partners to understand why, and whether those strategies are leading to improved opportunities and outcomes for students. LEAs are strongly encouraged to use language and a level of detail in their adopted LCAPs intended to be meaningful and accessible for the LEA's diverse educational partners and the broader public.

In developing and finalizing the LCAP for adoption, LEAs are encouraged to keep the following overarching frame at the forefront of the strategic planning and educational partner engagement functions:

> Given present performance across the state priorities and on indicators in the Dashboard, how is the LEA using its budgetary resources to respond to TK–12 student and community needs, and address any performance gaps, including by meeting its obligation to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, and low-income students?

LEAs are encouraged to focus on a set of metrics and actions which, based on research, experience, and input gathered from educational partners, the LEA believes will have the biggest impact on behalf of its TK–12 students.

These instructions address the requirements for each section of the LCAP but may include information about effective practices when developing the LCAP and completing the LCAP document. Additionally, the beginning of each template section includes information emphasizing the purpose that section serves.

Plan Summary

Purpose

A well-developed Plan Summary section provides a meaningful context for the LCAP. This section provides information about an LEA's community as well as relevant information about student needs and performance. In order to present a meaningful context for the rest of the LCAP, the content of this section should be clearly and meaningfully related to the content included throughout each subsequent section of the LCAP.

Requirements and Instructions

General Information

A description of the LEA, its schools, and its students in grades transitional kindergarten–12, as applicable to the LEA. LEAs may also provide information about their strategic plan, vision, etc.

Briefly describe the LEA, its schools, and its students in grades TK–12, as applicable to the LEA.

- For example, information about an LEA in terms of geography, enrollment, employment, the number and size of specific schools, recent community challenges, and other such information the LEA may wish to include can enable a reader to more fully understand the LEA's LCAP.
- LEAs may also provide information about their strategic plan, vision, etc.
- As part of this response, identify all schools within the LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funding.

Reflections: Annual Performance

A reflection on annual performance based on a review of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) and local data.

Reflect on the LEA's annual performance on the Dashboard and local data. This may include both successes and challenges identified by the LEA during the development process.

LEAs are encouraged to highlight how they are addressing the identified needs of student groups, and/or schools within the LCAP as part of this response.

As part of this response, the LEA must identify the following, which will remain unchanged during the three-year LCAP cycle:

- Any school within the LEA that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2023 Dashboard;
- Any student group within the LEA that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2023 Dashboard; and/or
- Any student group within a school within the LEA that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2023 Dashboard.

EC Section 52064.4 requires that an LEA that has unexpended Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG) funds must include one or more actions funded with LREBG funds within the 2026-27, 2026-27 and 2027-28 LCAPs, as applicable to the LEA. To implement the requirements of *EC* Section 52064.4, all LEAs must do the following:

- For the 2025–26, 2026–27, and 2027–28 LCAP years, identify whether or not the LEA has unexpended LREBG funds for the applicable LCAP year.
    - If the LEA has unexpended LREBG funds the LEA must provide the following:
        - The goal and action number for each action that will be funded, either in whole or in part, with LREBG funds; and
        - An explanation of the rationale for selecting each action funded with LREBG funds. This explanation must include:
            - An explanation of how the action is aligned with the allowable uses of funds identified in *EC* Section 32526(c)(2); and
            - An explanation of how the action is expected to address the area(s) of need of students and schools identified in the needs assessment required by *EC* Section 32526(d).
                - For information related to the allowable uses of funds and the required needs assessment, please see the Program Information tab on the LREBG Program Information web page.
            - Actions may be grouped together for purposes of these explanations.
            - The LEA may provide these explanations as part of the action description rather than as part of the Reflections: Annual Performance.
    - If the LEA does not have unexpended LREBG funds, the LEA is not required to conduct the needs assessment required by *EC* Section 32627(d), to provide the information identified above or to include actions funded with LREBG funds within the 2026-27, 2026-27 and 2027-28 LCAPs.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

As applicable, a summary of the work underway as part of technical assistance.

Annually identify the reason(s) the LEA is eligible for or has requested technical assistance consistent with EC sections 47607.3, 52071, 52071.5, 52072, or 52072.5, and provide a summary of the work underway as part of receiving technical assistance. The most common form of this technical assistance is frequently referred to as Differentiated Assistance, however this also includes LEAs that have requested technical assistance from their COE.

- If the LEA is not eligible for or receiving technical assistance, the LEA may respond to this prompt as “Not Applicable.”

Comprehensive Support and Improvement
An LEA with a school or schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) under the Every Student Succeeds Act must respond to the following prompts:

Schools Identified

A list of the schools in the LEA that are eligible for comprehensive support and improvement.

- Identify the schools within the LEA that have been identified for CSI.

Support for Identified Schools

A description of how the LEA has or will support its eligible schools in developing comprehensive support and improvement plans.

- Describe how the LEA has or will support the identified schools in developing CSI plans that included a school-level needs assessment, evidence-based interventions, and the identification of any resource inequities to be addressed through the implementation of the CSI plan.

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

A description of how the LEA will monitor and evaluate the plan to support student and school improvement.

- Describe how the LEA will monitor and evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the CSI plan to support student and school improvement.

Engaging Educational Partners

Purpose

Significant and purposeful engagement of parents, students, educators, and other educational partners, including those representing the student groups identified by LCFF, is critical to the development of the LCAP and the budget process. Consistent with statute, such engagement should support comprehensive strategic planning, particularly to address and reduce disparities in opportunities and outcomes between student groups indicated by the Dashboard, accountability, and improvement across the state priorities and locally identified priorities (EC Section 52064[e][1]). Engagement of educational partners is an ongoing, annual process.

This section is designed to reflect how the engagement of educational partners influenced the decisions reflected in the adopted LCAP. The goal is to allow educational partners that participated in the LCAP development process and the broader public to understand how the LEA engaged educational partners and the impact of that engagement. LEAs are encouraged to keep this goal in the forefront when completing this section.

Requirements

Requirements

School districts and COEs: *EC* Section 52060(g) and *EC* Section 52066(g) specify the educational partners that must be consulted when developing the LCAP:

- Teachers,

- Principals,
- Administrators,
- Other school personnel,
- Local bargaining units of the LEA,
- Parents, and
- Students

A school district or COE receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also consult with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for each applicable school.

Before adopting the LCAP, school districts and COEs must share it with the applicable committees, as identified below under Requirements and Instructions. The superintendent is required by statute to respond in writing to the comments received from these committees. School districts and COEs must also consult with the special education local plan area administrator(s) when developing the LCAP.

Charter schools: *EC* Section 47606.5(d) requires that the following educational partners be consulted with when developing the LCAP:

- Teachers,
- Principals,
- Administrators,
- Other school personnel,
- Parents, and
- Students

A charter school receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also consult with educational partners at the school generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for the school.

The LCAP should also be shared with, and LEAs should request input from, schoolsite-level advisory groups, as applicable (e.g., schoolsite councils, English Learner Advisory Councils, student advisory groups, etc.), to facilitate alignment between schoolsite and district-level goals. Information and resources that support effective engagement, define student consultation, and provide the requirements for advisory group composition, can be found under Resources on the CDE's LCAP webpage.

Before the governing board/body of an LEA considers the adoption of the LCAP, the LEA must meet the following legal requirements:

- For school districts, see *Education Code* Section 52062;
    - **Note:** Charter schools using the LCAP as the School Plan for Student Achievement must meet the requirements of *EC* Section 52062(a).
- For COEs, see *Education Code* Section 52068; and
- For charter schools, see *Education Code* Section 47606.5.

- **NOTE:** As a reminder, the superintendent of a school district or COE must respond, in writing, to comments received by the applicable committees identified in the *Education Code* sections listed above. This includes the parent advisory committee and may include the English learner parent advisory committee and, as of July 1, 2024, the student advisory committee, as applicable.

Instructions

Respond to the prompts as follows:

A summary of the process used to engage educational partners in the development of the LCAP.

School districts and county offices of education must, at a minimum, consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, local bargaining units, parents, and students in the development of the LCAP.

Charter schools must, at a minimum, consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, parents, and students in the development of the LCAP.

An LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also consult with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for each applicable school.

Complete the table as follows:

Educational Partners

Identify the applicable educational partner(s) or group(s) that were engaged in the development of the LCAP.

Process for Engagement

Describe the engagement process used by the LEA to involve the identified educational partner(s) in the development of the LCAP. At a minimum, the LEA must describe how it met its obligation to consult with all statutorily required educational partners, as applicable to the type of LEA.

- A sufficient response to this prompt must include general information about the timeline of the process and meetings or other engagement strategies with educational partners. A response may also include information about an LEA's philosophical approach to engaging its educational partners.

- An LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funds must also include a summary of how it consulted with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds in the development of the LCAP, specifically, in the development of the required focus goal for each applicable school.

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

Describe any goals, metrics, actions, or budgeted expenditures in the LCAP that were influenced by or developed in response to the educational partner feedback.

- A sufficient response to this prompt will provide educational partners and the public with clear, specific information about how the engagement process influenced the development of the LCAP. This may include a description of how the LEA prioritized requests of educational partners within the context of the budgetary resources available or otherwise prioritized areas of focus within the LCAP.

- An LEA receiving Equity Multiplier funds must include a description of how the consultation with educational partners at schools generating Equity Multiplier funds influenced the development of the adopted LCAP.

- For the purposes of this prompt, this may also include, but is not necessarily limited to:
    - Inclusion of a goal or decision to pursue a Focus Goal (as described below)
    - Inclusion of metrics other than the statutorily required metrics
    - Determination of the target outcome on one or more metrics
    - Inclusion of performance by one or more student groups in the Measuring and Reporting Results subsection
    - Inclusion of action(s) or a group of actions
    - Elimination of action(s) or group of actions
    - Changes to the level of proposed expenditures for one or more actions
    - Inclusion of action(s) as contributing to increased or improved services for unduplicated students
    - Analysis of effectiveness of the specific actions to achieve the goal
    - Analysis of material differences in expenditures
    - Analysis of changes made to a goal for the ensuing LCAP year based on the annual update process
    - Analysis of challenges or successes in the implementation of actions

Goals and Actions

Purpose

Well-developed goals will clearly communicate to educational partners what the LEA plans to accomplish, what the LEA plans to do in order to accomplish the goal, and how the LEA will know when it has accomplished the goal. A goal statement, associated metrics and expected outcomes, and the actions included in the goal must be in alignment. The explanation for why the LEA included a goal is an opportunity for LEAs to clearly communicate to educational partners and the public why, among the various strengths and areas for improvement highlighted by performance data and strategies and actions that could be pursued, the LEA decided to pursue this goal, and the related metrics, expected outcomes, actions, and expenditures.

A well-developed goal can be focused on the performance relative to a metric or metrics for all students, a specific student group(s), narrowing performance gaps, or implementing programs or strategies expected to impact outcomes. LEAs should assess the performance of their student groups when developing goals and the related actions to achieve such goals.

Requirements and Instructions

LEAs should prioritize the goals, specific actions, and related expenditures included within the LCAP within one or more state priorities. LEAs must consider performance on the state and local indicators, including their locally collected and reported data for the local indicators that are included in the Dashboard, in determining whether and how to prioritize its goals within the LCAP. As previously stated, strategic planning that

is comprehensive connects budgetary decisions to teaching and learning performance data. LEAs should continually evaluate the hard choices they make about the use of limited resources to meet student and community needs to ensure opportunities and outcomes are improved for all students, and to address and reduce disparities in opportunities and outcomes between student groups indicated by the Dashboard.

In order to support prioritization of goals, the LCAP template provides LEAs with the option of developing three different kinds of goals:

- Focus Goal: A Focus Goal is relatively more concentrated in scope and may focus on a fewer number of metrics to measure improvement. A Focus Goal statement will be time bound and make clear how the goal is to be measured.
    - All Equity Multiplier goals must be developed as focus goals. For additional information, see Required Focus Goal(s) for LEAs Receiving Equity Multiplier Funding below.
- Broad Goal: A Broad Goal is relatively less concentrated in its scope and may focus on improving performance across a wide range of metrics.
- Maintenance of Progress Goal: A Maintenance of Progress Goal includes actions that may be ongoing without significant changes and allows an LEA to track performance on any metrics not addressed in the other goals of the LCAP.

Requirement to Address the LCFF State Priorities

At a minimum, the LCAP must address all LCFF priorities and associated metrics articulated in *EC* sections 52060(d) and 52066(d), as applicable to the LEA. The *LCFF State Priorities Summary* provides a summary of *EC* sections 52060(d) and 52066(d) to aid in the development of the LCAP.

Respond to the following prompts, as applicable:

Focus Goal(s)

Description

The description provided for a Focus Goal must be specific, measurable, and time bound.

- An LEA develops a Focus Goal to address areas of need that may require or benefit from a more specific and data intensive approach.
- The Focus Goal can explicitly reference the metric(s) by which achievement of the goal will be measured and the time frame according to which the LEA expects to achieve the goal.

Type of Goal

Identify the type of goal being implemented as a Focus Goal.

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Identify each of the state priorities that this goal is intended to address.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

- An explanation must be based on Dashboard data or other locally collected data.
- LEAs must describe how the LEA identified this goal for focused attention, including relevant consultation with educational partners.
- LEAs are encouraged to promote transparency and understanding around the decision to pursue a focus goal.

Required Focus Goal(s) for LEAs Receiving Equity Multiplier Funding

Description

LEAs receiving Equity Multiplier funding must include one or more focus goals for each school generating Equity Multiplier funding. In addition to addressing the focus goal requirements described above, LEAs must adhere to the following requirements.

Focus goals for Equity Multiplier schoolsites must address the following:

(A) All student groups that have the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the Dashboard, and

(B) Any underlying issues in the credentialing, subject matter preparation, and retention of the school's educators, if applicable.

- Focus Goals for each and every Equity Multiplier schoolsite must identify specific metrics for each identified student group, as applicable.
- An LEA may create a single goal for multiple Equity Multiplier schoolsites if those schoolsites have the same student group(s) performing at the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the Dashboard or, experience similar issues in the credentialing, subject matter preparation, and retention of the school's educators.
    - When creating a single goal for multiple Equity Multiplier schoolsites, the goal must identify the student groups and the performance levels on the Dashboard that the Focus Goal is addressing; or,
    - The common issues the schoolsites are experiencing in credentialing, subject matter preparation, and retention of the school's educators, if applicable.

Type of Goal

Identify the type of goal being implemented as an Equity Multiplier Focus Goal.

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Identify each of the state priorities that this goal is intended to address.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

- An explanation must be based on Dashboard data or other locally collected data.
- LEAs must describe how the LEA identified this goal for focused attention, including relevant consultation with educational partners.
- LEAs are encouraged to promote transparency and understanding around the decision to pursue a focus goal.
- In addition to this information, the LEA must also identify:
    - The school or schools to which the goal applies

LEAs are encouraged to approach an Equity Multiplier goal from a wholistic standpoint, considering how the goal might maximize student outcomes through the use of LCFF and other funding in addition to Equity Multiplier funds.

- Equity Multiplier funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, funding provided to Equity Multiplier schoolsites for purposes of the LCFF, the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELO-P), the Literacy Coaches and Reading Specialists (LCRS) Grant Program, and/or the California Community Schools Partnership Program (CCSPP).
- This means that Equity Multiplier funds must not be used to replace funding that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement LEA-wide actions identified in the LCAP or that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement provisions of the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP.

Note: *EC* Section 42238.024(b)(1) requires that Equity Multiplier funds be used for the provision of evidence-based services and supports for students. Evidence-based services and supports are based on objective evidence that has informed the design of the service or support and/or guides the modification of those services and supports. Evidence-based supports and strategies are most commonly based on educational research and/or metrics of LEA, school, and/or student performance.

Broad Goal

Description

Describe what the LEA plans to achieve through the actions included in the goal.

- The description of a broad goal will be clearly aligned with the expected measurable outcomes included for the goal.

- The goal description organizes the actions and expected outcomes in a cohesive and consistent manner.
- A goal description is specific enough to be measurable in either quantitative or qualitative terms. A broad goal is not as specific as a focus goal. While it is specific enough to be measurable, there are many different metrics for measuring progress toward the goal.

Type of Goal

Identify the type of goal being implemented as a Broad Goal.

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Identify each of the state priorities that this goal is intended to address.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA developed this goal and how the actions and metrics grouped together will help achieve the goal.

Maintenance of Progress Goal

Description

Describe how the LEA intends to maintain the progress made in the LCFF State Priorities not addressed by the other goals in the LCAP.

- Use this type of goal to address the state priorities and applicable metrics not addressed within the other goals in the LCAP.
- The state priorities and metrics to be addressed in this section are those for which the LEA, in consultation with educational partners, has determined to maintain actions and monitor progress while focusing implementation efforts on the actions covered by other goals in the LCAP.

Type of Goal

Identify the type of goal being implemented as a Maintenance of Progress Goal.

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Identify each of the state priorities that this goal is intended to address.

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain how the actions will sustain the progress exemplified by the related metrics.

Measuring and Reporting Results:

For each LCAP year, identify the metric(s) that the LEA will use to track progress toward the expected outcomes.

- LEAs must identify metrics for specific student groups, as appropriate, including expected outcomes that address and reduce disparities in outcomes between student groups.

- The metrics may be quantitative or qualitative; but at minimum, an LEA's LCAP must include goals that are measured using all of the applicable metrics for the related state priorities, in each LCAP year, as applicable to the type of LEA.

- To the extent a state priority does not specify one or more metrics (e.g., implementation of state academic content and performance standards), the LEA must identify a metric to use within the LCAP. For these state priorities, LEAs are encouraged to use metrics based on or reported through the relevant local indicator self-reflection tools within the Dashboard.

- **Required metrics for LEA-wide actions:** For each action identified as 1) contributing towards the requirement to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, including long-term English learners, and low-income students and 2) being provided on an LEA-wide basis, the LEA must identify one or more metrics to monitor the effectiveness of the action and its budgeted expenditures.

    - These required metrics may be identified within the action description or the first prompt in the increased or improved services section, however the description must clearly identify the metric(s) being used to monitor the effectiveness of the action and the action(s) that the metric(s) apply to.

- **Required metrics for Equity Multiplier goals**: For each Equity Multiplier goal, the LEA must identify:

    - The specific metrics for each identified student group at each specific schoolsite, as applicable, to measure the progress toward the goal, and/or

    - The specific metrics used to measure progress in meeting the goal related to credentialing, subject matter preparation, or educator retention at each specific schoolsite.

- **Required metrics for actions supported by LREBG funds**: To implement the requirements of *EC* Section 52064.4, LEAs with unexpended LREBG funds must include at least one metric to monitor the impact of each action funded with LREBG funds included in the goal.

    - The metrics being used to monitor the impact of each action funded with LREBG funds are not required to be new metrics; they may be metrics that are already being used to measure progress towards goals and actions included in the LCAP.

Complete the table as follows:

Metric #

- Enter the metric number.

Metric

- Identify the standard of measure being used to determine progress towards the goal and/or to measure the effectiveness of one or more actions associated with the goal.

Baseline

- Enter the baseline when completing the LCAP for 2024–25.
    - Use the most recent data associated with the metric available at the time of adoption of the LCAP for the first year of the three-year plan. LEAs may use data as reported on the 2023 Dashboard for the baseline of a metric only if that data represents the most recent available data (e.g., high school graduation rate).
    - Using the most recent data available may involve reviewing data the LEA is preparing for submission to the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) or data that the LEA has recently submitted to CALPADS.
    - Indicate the school year to which the baseline data applies.
    - The baseline data must remain unchanged throughout the three-year LCAP.
        - This requirement is not intended to prevent LEAs from revising the baseline data if it is necessary to do so. For example, if an LEA identifies that its data collection practices for a particular metric are leading to inaccurate data and revises its practice to obtain accurate data, it would also be appropriate for the LEA to revise the baseline data to align with the more accurate data process and report its results using the accurate data.
        - If an LEA chooses to revise its baseline data, then, at a minimum, it must clearly identify the change as part of its response to the description of changes prompt in the Goal Analysis for the goal. LEAs are also strongly encouraged to involve their educational partners in the decision of whether or not to revise a baseline and to communicate the proposed change to their educational partners.
    - Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one- or two-year LCAP may identify a new baseline each year, as applicable.

Year 1 Outcome

- When completing the LCAP for 2025–26, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies.
    - Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one-year LCAP may provide the Year 1 Outcome when completing the LCAP for both 2025–26 and 2026–27 or may provide the Year 1 Outcome for 2025–26 and provide the Year 2 Outcome for 2026–27.

Year 2 Outcome

- When completing the LCAP for 2026–27, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies.

- Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one-year LCAP may identify the Year 2 Outcome as not applicable when completing the LCAP for 2026–27 or may provide the Year 2 Outcome for 2026–27.

Target for Year 3 Outcome

- When completing the first year of the LCAP, enter the target outcome for the relevant metric the LEA expects to achieve by the end of the three-year LCAP cycle.
    - Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one- or two-year LCAP may identify a Target for Year 1 or Target for Year 2, as applicable.

Current Difference from Baseline

- When completing the LCAP for 2025–26 and 2026–27, enter the current difference between the baseline and the yearly outcome, as applicable.
    - Note for Charter Schools: Charter schools developing a one- or two-year LCAP will identify the current difference between the baseline and the yearly outcome for Year 1 and/or the current difference between the baseline and the yearly outcome for Year 2, as applicable.

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

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2024–25** or when adding a new metric.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2024–25** or when adding a new metric.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2025–26**. Leave blank until then.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2026–27**. Leave blank until then.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2024–25** or when adding a new metric.	Enter information in this box when completing the LCAP for **2025–26** and **2026–27**. Leave blank until then.

Goal Analysis:

Enter the LCAP Year.

Using actual annual measurable outcome data, including data from the Dashboard, analyze whether the planned actions were effective towards achieving the goal. "Effective" means the degree to which the planned actions were successful in producing the target result. Respond to the prompts as instructed.

Note: When completing the 2024–25 LCAP, use the 2023–24 Local Control and Accountability Plan Annual Update template to complete the Goal Analysis and identify the Goal Analysis prompts in the 2024–25 LCAP as "Not Applicable."

A description of overall implementation, including any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions, and any relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.

- Describe the overall implementation of the actions to achieve the articulated goal, including relevant challenges and successes experienced with implementation.
    - Include a discussion of relevant challenges and successes experienced with the implementation process.
    - This discussion 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.

A description of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal.

- Describe the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions to date in making progress toward the goal. “Effectiveness” means the degree to which the actions were successful in producing the target result and “ineffectiveness” means that the actions did not produce any significant or targeted 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, target 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.

Actions:

Complete the table as follows. Add additional rows as necessary.

Action #

- Enter the action number.

Title

- Provide a short title for the action. This title will also appear in the action tables.

Description

- Provide a brief description of the action.
    - For actions that contribute to meeting the increased or improved services requirement, the LEA may include an explanation of how each action is principally directed towards and effective in meeting the LEA's goals for unduplicated students, as described in the instructions for the Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students section.
    - As previously noted, for each action identified as 1) contributing towards the requirement to increase or improve services for foster youth, English learners, including long-term English learners, and low-income students and 2) being provided on an LEA-wide basis, the LEA must identify one or more metrics to monitor the effectiveness of the action and its budgeted expenditures.
    - These required metrics may be identified within the action description or the first prompt in the increased or improved services section; however, the description must clearly identify the metric(s) being used to monitor the effectiveness of the action and the action(s) that the metric(s) apply to.

Total Funds

- Enter the total amount of expenditures associated with this action. Budgeted expenditures from specific fund sources will be provided in the action tables.

Contributing

- Indicate whether the action contributes to meeting the increased or improved services requirement as described in the Increased or Improved Services section using a “Y” for Yes or an “N” for No.
    - **Note:** for each such contributing action, the LEA will need to provide additional information in the Increased or Improved Services section to address the requirements in *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5 [5 *CCR*] Section 15496 in the Increased or Improved Services section of the LCAP.

***Actions for Foster Youth*:** School districts, COEs, and charter schools that have a numerically significant foster youth student subgroup are encouraged to include specific actions in the LCAP designed to meet needs specific to foster youth students.

Required Actions

For English Learners and Long-Term English Learners

- LEAs with 30 or more English learners and/or 15 or more long-term English learners must include specific actions in the LCAP related to, at a minimum:
    - Language acquisition programs, as defined in *EC* Section 306, provided to students, and
    - Professional development for teachers.
    - If an LEA has both 30 or more English learners and 15 or more long-term English learners, the LEA must include actions for both English learners and long-term English learners.

For Technical Assistance

- LEAs eligible for technical assistance pursuant to *EC* sections 47607.3, 52071, 52071.5, 52072, or 52072.5, must include specific actions within the LCAP related to its implementation of the work underway as part of technical assistance. The most common form of this technical assistance is frequently referred to as Differentiated Assistance.

For Lowest Performing Dashboard Indicators

- LEAs that have Red Dashboard indicators for (1) a school within the LEA, (2) a student group within the LEA, and/or (3) a student group within any school within the LEA must include one or more specific actions within the LCAP:
    - The specific action(s) must be directed towards the identified student group(s) and/or school(s) and must address the identified state indicator(s) for which the student group or school received the lowest performance level on the 2023 Dashboard. Each student group and/or school that receives the lowest performance level on the 2023 Dashboard must be addressed by one or more actions.
    - These required actions will be effective for the three-year LCAP cycle.

For LEAs With Unexpended LREBG Funds

- To implement the requirements of *EC* Section 52064.4, LEAs with unexpended LREBG funds must include one or more actions supported with LREBG funds within the 2025–26, 2026–27, and 2027–28 LCAPs, as applicable to the LEA. Actions funded with LREBG funds must remain in the LCAP until the LEA has expended the remainder of its LREBG funds, after which time the actions may be removed from the LCAP.
    - Prior to identifying the actions included in the LCAP the LEA is required to conduct a needs assessment pursuant to *EC* Section 32526(d). For information related to the required needs assessment please see the Program Information tab on the LREBG

Program Information web page. Additional information about the needs assessment and evidence-based resources for the LREBG may be found on the California Statewide System of Support LREBG Resources web page. The required LREBG needs assessment may be part of the LEAs regular needs assessment for the LCAP if it meets the requirements of *EC* Section 32627(d).

- School districts receiving technical assistance and COEs providing technical assistance are encouraged to use the technical assistance process to support the school district in conducting the required needs assessment, the selection of actions funded by the LREBG and/or the evaluation of implementation of the actions required as part of the LCAP annual update process.
- As a reminder, LREBG funds must be used to implement one or more of the purposes articulated in *EC* Section 32526(c)(2).
- LEAs with unexpended LREBG funds must include one or more actions supported by LREBG funds within the LCAP. For each action supported by LREBG funding the action description must:
  - Identify the action as an LREBG action;
  - Include an explanation of how research supports the selected action;
  - Identify the metric(s) being used to monitor the impact of the action; and
  - Identify the amount of LREBG funds being used to support the action.

Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students

Purpose

A well-written Increased or Improved Services section provides educational partners with a comprehensive description, within a single dedicated section, of how an LEA plans to increase or improve services for its unduplicated students as defined in *EC* Section 42238.02 in grades TK–12 as compared to all students in grades TK–12, as applicable, and how LEA-wide or schoolwide actions identified for this purpose meet regulatory requirements. Descriptions provided should include sufficient detail yet be sufficiently succinct to promote a broader understanding of educational partners to facilitate their ability to provide input. An LEA's description in this section must align with the actions included in the Goals and Actions section as contributing.

Please Note: For the purpose of meeting the Increased or Improved Services requirement and consistent with *EC* Section 42238.02, long-term English learners are included in the English learner student group.

Statutory Requirements

An LEA is required to demonstrate in its LCAP how it is increasing or improving services for its students who are foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income, collectively referred to as unduplicated students, as compared to the services provided to all students in proportion to the increase in funding it receives based on the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the LEA (*EC* Section 42238.07[a][1], *EC*

Section 52064[b][8][B]; 5 *CCR* Section 15496[a]). This proportionality percentage is also known as the "minimum proportionality percentage" or "MPP." The manner in which an LEA demonstrates it is meeting its MPP is two-fold: (1) through the expenditure of LCFF funds or through the identification of a Planned Percentage of Improved Services as documented in the Contributing Actions Table, and (2) through the explanations provided in the Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students section.

To improve services means to grow services in quality and to increase services means to grow services in quantity. Services are increased or improved by those actions in the LCAP that are identified in the Goals and Actions section as contributing to the increased or improved services requirement, whether they are provided across the entire LEA (LEA-wide action), provided to an entire school (Schoolwide action), or solely provided to one or more unduplicated student group(s) (Limited action).

Therefore, for *any* action contributing to meet the increased or improved services requirement, the LEA must include an explanation of:

- How the action is increasing or improving services for the unduplicated student group(s) (Identified Needs and Action Design), and
- How the action meets the LEA's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state and any local priority areas (Measurement of Effectiveness).

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

In addition to the above required explanations, LEAs must provide a justification for why an LEA-wide or Schoolwide action is being provided to all students and how the action is intended to improve outcomes for unduplicated student group(s) as compared to all students.

- Conclusory statements that a service will help achieve an expected outcome for the goal, without an explicit connection or further explanation as to how, are not sufficient.

- Further, simply stating that an LEA has a high enrollment percentage of a specific student group or groups does not meet the increased or improved services standard because enrolling students is not the same as serving students.

For School Districts Only

Actions provided on an **LEA-wide** basis at **school districts with an unduplicated pupil percentage of less than 55 percent** must also include a description of how the actions are the most effective use of the funds to meet the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state and any local priority areas. The description must provide the basis for this determination, including any alternatives considered, supporting research, experience, or educational theory.

Actions provided on a **Schoolwide** basis for **schools with less than 40 percent enrollment of unduplicated pupils** must also include a description of how these actions are the most effective use of the funds to meet the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state and any local priority areas. The description must provide the basis for this determination, including any alternatives considered, supporting research, experience, or educational theory.

Requirements and Instructions

Complete the tables as follows:

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants

- Specify the amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grant funds the LEA estimates it will receive in the coming year based on the number and concentration of foster youth, English learner, and low-income students. This amount includes the Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant.

Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant

- Specify the amount of additional LCFF concentration grant add-on funding, as described in *EC* Section 42238.02, that the LEA estimates it will receive in the coming year.

Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year

- Specify the estimated percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the LCAP year as calculated pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(7).

LCFF Carryover — Percentage

- Specify the LCFF Carryover — Percentage identified in the LCFF Carryover Table. If a carryover percentage is not identified in the LCFF Carryover Table, specify a percentage of zero (0.00%).

LCFF Carryover — Dollar

- Specify the LCFF Carryover — Dollar amount identified in the LCFF Carryover Table. If a carryover amount is not identified in the LCFF Carryover Table, specify an amount of zero ($0).

Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year

- Add the Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year and the Proportional LCFF Required Carryover Percentage and specify the percentage. This is the LEA's percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the LCAP year, as calculated pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(7).

Required Descriptions:

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

For each action being provided to an entire LEA or school, provide an explanation of (1) the unique identified need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) for whom the action is principally directed, (2) how the action is designed to address the identified need(s) and why it is being provided on an LEA or schoolwide basis, and (3) the metric(s) used to measure the effectiveness of the action in improving outcomes for the unduplicated student group(s).

If the LEA has provided this required description in the Action Descriptions, state as such within the table.

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

Provide an explanation of the unique identified need(s) of the LEA's unduplicated student group(s) for whom the action is principally directed.

An LEA demonstrates how an action is principally directed towards an unduplicated student group(s) when the LEA explains the need(s), condition(s), or circumstance(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) identified through a needs assessment and how the action addresses them. A meaningful needs assessment includes, at a minimum, analysis of applicable student achievement data and educational partner feedback.

How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis

Provide an explanation of how the action as designed will address the unique identified need(s) of the LEA's unduplicated student group(s) for whom the action is principally directed and the rationale for why the action is being provided on an LEA-wide or schoolwide basis.

- As stated above, conclusory statements that a service will help achieve an expected outcome for the goal, without an explicit connection or further explanation as to how, are not sufficient.
- Further, simply stating that an LEA has a high enrollment percentage of a specific student group or groups does not meet the increased or improved services standard because enrolling students is not the same as serving students.

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

Identify the metric(s) being used to measure the progress and effectiveness of the action(s).

Note for COEs and Charter Schools: In the case of COEs and charter schools, schoolwide and LEA-wide are considered to be synonymous.

Limited Actions

For each action being solely provided to one or more unduplicated student group(s), provide an explanation of (1) the unique identified need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) being served, (2) how the action is designed to address the identified need(s), and (3) how the effectiveness of the action in improving outcomes for the unduplicated student group(s) will be measured.

If the LEA has provided the required descriptions in the Action Descriptions, state as such.

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

Provide an explanation of the unique need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) being served identified through the LEA's needs assessment. A meaningful needs assessment includes, at a minimum, analysis of applicable student achievement data and educational partner feedback.

How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)

Provide an explanation of how the action is designed to address the unique identified need(s) of the unduplicated student group(s) being served.

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

Identify the metric(s) being used to measure the progress and effectiveness of the action(s).

For any limited action contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement that is associated with a Planned Percentage of Improved Services in the Contributing Summary Table rather than an expenditure of LCFF funds, describe the methodology that was used to determine the contribution of the action towards the proportional percentage, as applicable.

- For each action with an identified Planned Percentage of Improved Services, identify the goal and action number and describe the methodology that was used.

- When identifying a Planned Percentage of Improved Services, the LEA must describe the methodology that it used to determine the contribution of the action towards the proportional percentage. The percentage of improved services for an action corresponds to the amount of LCFF funding that the LEA estimates it would expend to implement the action if it were funded.

- For example, an LEA determines that there is a need to analyze data to ensure that instructional aides and expanded learning providers know what targeted supports to provide to students who are foster youth. The LEA could implement this action by hiring additional staff to collect and analyze data and to coordinate supports for students, which, based on the LEA's current pay scale, the LEA estimates would cost $165,000. Instead, the LEA chooses to utilize a portion of existing staff time to analyze data relating to students who are foster youth. This analysis will then be shared with site principals who will use the data to coordinate services provided by instructional assistants and expanded learning providers to target support to students. In this example, the LEA would divide the estimated cost of $165,000 by the amount of LCFF Funding identified in the Total Planned Expenditures Table and then convert the quotient to a percentage. This percentage is the Planned Percentage of Improved Services for the action.

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

A description of the plan for how the additional concentration grant add-on funding identified above will be used to increase the number of staff providing direct services to students at schools that have a high concentration (above 55 percent) of foster youth, English learners, and low-income students, as applicable.

An LEA that receives the additional concentration grant add-on described in *EC* Section 42238.02 is required to demonstrate how it is using these funds to increase the number of staff who provide direct services to students at schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent as compared to the number of staff who provide direct services to students at schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is equal to or less than 55 percent. The staff who provide direct services to students must be certificated staff and/or classified staff employed by the LEA; classified staff includes custodial staff.

Provide the following descriptions, as applicable to the LEA:

- An LEA that does not receive a concentration grant or the concentration grant add-on must indicate that a response to this prompt is not applicable.

- Identify the goal and action numbers of the actions in the LCAP that the LEA is implementing to meet the requirement to increase the number of staff who provide direct services to students at schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent.

- An LEA that does not have comparison schools from which to describe how it is using the concentration grant add-on funds, such as a single-school LEA or an LEA that only has schools with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, must describe how it is using the funds to increase the number of credentialed staff, classified staff, or both, including custodial staff, who provide direct services to students at selected schools and the criteria used to determine which schools require additional staffing support.

- In the event that an additional concentration grant add-on is not sufficient to increase staff providing direct services to students at a school with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, the LEA must describe how it is using the funds to retain staff providing direct services to students at a school with an enrollment of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent.

Complete the table as follows:

- Provide the staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students with a concentration of unduplicated students that is 55 percent or less and the staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, as applicable to the LEA.

    - The LEA may group its schools by grade span (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and High Schools), as applicable to the LEA.

    - The staff-to-student ratio must be based on the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff and the number of enrolled students as counted on the first Wednesday in October of each year.

- Provide the staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is 55 percent or less and the staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, as applicable to the LEA.

    - The LEA may group its schools by grade span (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and High Schools), as applicable to the LEA.

    - The staff-to-student ratio must be based on the number of FTE staff and the number of enrolled students as counted on the first Wednesday in October of each year.

Action Tables

Complete the Total Planned Expenditures Table for each action in the LCAP. The information entered into this table will automatically populate the other Action Tables. Information is only entered into the Total Planned Expenditures Table, the Annual Update Table, the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table, and the LCFF Carryover Table. The word “input” has been added to column headers to aid in identifying the column(s) where information will be entered. Information is not entered on the remaining Action tables.

The following tables are required to be included as part of the LCAP adopted by the local governing board or governing body:

- Table 1: Total Planned Expenditures Table (for the coming LCAP Year)
- Table 2: Contributing Actions Table (for the coming LCAP Year)
- Table 3: Annual Update Table (for the current LCAP Year)
- Table 4: Contributing Actions Annual Update Table (for the current LCAP Year)
- Table 5: LCFF Carryover Table (for the current LCAP Year)

Note: The coming LCAP Year is the year that is being planned for, while the current LCAP year is the current year of implementation. For example, when developing the 2024–25 LCAP, 2024–25 will be the coming LCAP Year and 2023–24 will be the current LCAP Year.

Total Planned Expenditures Table

In the Total Planned Expenditures Table, input the following information for each action in the LCAP for that applicable LCAP year:

- **LCAP Year**: Identify the applicable LCAP Year.
- **1. Projected LCFF Base Grant**: Provide the total amount estimated LCFF entitlement for the coming school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant program, the former Home-to-School Transportation program, and the Small School District Transportation program, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). Note that the LCFF Base Grant for purposes of the LCAP also includes the Necessary Small Schools and Economic Recovery Target allowances for school districts, and County Operations Grant for COEs.

  See *EC* sections 2574 (for COEs) and 42238.02 (for school districts and charter schools), as applicable, for LCFF entitlement calculations.
- **2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants:** Provide the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants estimated on the basis of the number and concentration of unduplicated students for the coming school year.
- **3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year:** This percentage will not be entered; it is calculated based on the Projected LCFF Base Grant and the Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). This is the percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the coming LCAP year.
- **LCFF Carryover — Percentage:** Specify the LCFF Carryover — Percentage identified in the LCFF Carryover Table from the prior LCAP year. If a carryover percentage is not identified in the LCFF Carryover Table, specify a percentage of zero (0.00%).
- **Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year:** This percentage will not be entered; it is calculated based on the Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year and the LCFF Carryover —

Percentage. ***This is the percentage by which the LEA must increase or improve services for unduplicated pupils as compared to the services provided to all students in the coming LCAP year.***

- **Goal #**: Enter the LCAP Goal number for the action.
- **Action #**: Enter the action's number as indicated in the LCAP Goal.
- **Action Title**: Provide a title of the action.
- **Student Group(s)**: Indicate the student group or groups who will be the primary beneficiary of the action by entering "All," or by entering a specific student group or groups.
- **Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?:** Type "Yes" if the action **is** included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement; OR, type "No" if the action is **not** included as contributing to meeting the increased or improved services requirement.
- If "Yes" is entered into the Contributing column, then complete the following columns:
    - **Scope**: The scope of an action may be LEA-wide (i.e., districtwide, countywide, or charterwide), schoolwide, or limited. An action that is LEA-wide in scope upgrades the entire educational program of the LEA. An action that is schoolwide in scope upgrades the entire educational program of a single school. An action that is limited in its scope is an action that serves only one or more unduplicated student groups.
    - **Unduplicated Student Group(s)**: Regardless of scope, contributing actions serve one or more unduplicated student groups. Indicate one or more unduplicated student groups for whom services are being increased or improved as compared to what all students receive.
    - **Location**: Identify the location where the action will be provided. If the action is provided to all schools within the LEA, the LEA must indicate "All Schools." If the action is provided to specific schools within the LEA or specific grade spans only, the LEA must enter "Specific Schools" or "Specific Grade Spans." Identify the individual school or a subset of schools or grade spans (e.g., all high schools or grades transitional kindergarten through grade five), as appropriate.
- **Time Span**: Enter "ongoing" if the action will be implemented for an indeterminate period of time. Otherwise, indicate the span of time for which the action will be implemented. For example, an LEA might enter "1 Year," or "2 Years," or "6 Months."
- **Total Personnel**: Enter the total amount of personnel expenditures utilized to implement this action.
- **Total Non-Personnel**: This amount will be automatically calculated based on information provided in the Total Personnel column and the Total Funds column.

- **LCFF Funds**: Enter the total amount of LCFF funds utilized to implement this action, if any. LCFF funds include all funds that make up an LEA's total LCFF target (i.e., base grant, grade span adjustment, supplemental grant, concentration grant, Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant, and Home-To-School Transportation).
    - **Note:** For an action to contribute towards meeting the increased or improved services requirement, it must include some measure of LCFF funding. The action may also include funding from other sources, however the extent to which an action contributes to meeting the increased or improved services requirement is based on the LCFF funding being used to implement the action.
- **Other State Funds**: Enter the total amount of Other State Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
    - **Note:** Equity Multiplier funds must be included in the "Other State Funds" category, not in the "LCFF Funds" category. As a reminder, Equity Multiplier funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, funding provided to Equity Multiplier schoolsites for purposes of the LCFF, the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP. This means that Equity Multiplier funds must not be used to replace funding that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement LEA-wide actions identified in the LEA's LCAP or that an Equity Multiplier schoolsite would otherwise receive to implement provisions of the ELO-P, the LCRS, and/or the CCSPP.
- **Local Funds**: Enter the total amount of Local Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
- **Federal Funds**: Enter the total amount of Federal Funds utilized to implement this action, if any.
- **Total Funds**: This amount is automatically calculated based on amounts entered in the previous four columns.
- **Planned Percentage of Improved Services**: For any action identified as contributing, being provided on a Limited basis to unduplicated students, and that does not have funding associated with the action, enter the planned quality improvement anticipated for the action as a percentage rounded to the nearest hundredth (0.00%). A limited action is an action that only serves foster youth, English learners, and/or low-income students.
    - As noted in the instructions for the Increased or Improved Services section, when identifying a Planned Percentage of Improved Services, the LEA must describe the methodology that it used to determine the contribution of the action towards the proportional percentage. The percentage of improved services for an action corresponds to the amount of LCFF funding that the LEA estimates it would expend to implement the action if it were funded.

      For example, an LEA determines that there is a need to analyze data to ensure that instructional aides and expanded learning providers know what targeted supports to provide to students who are foster youth. The LEA could implement this action by hiring additional staff to collect and analyze data and to coordinate supports for students, which, based on the LEA's current pay scale, the LEA estimates would cost $165,000. Instead, the LEA chooses to utilize a portion of existing staff time to analyze data relating to students who are foster youth. This analysis will then be shared with site principals who will use the data to coordinate services provided by instructional assistants and expanded learning providers to target support to students. In this example, the LEA would divide the estimated cost of $165,000 by the amount of LCFF Funding identified in the Data Entry Table and then convert the quotient to a percentage. This percentage is the Planned Percentage of Improved Services for the action.

Contributing Actions Table

As noted above, information will not be entered in the Contributing Actions Table; however, the 'Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?' column will need to be checked to ensure that only actions with a "Yes" are displaying. If actions with a "No" are displayed or if actions that are contributing are not displaying in the column, use the drop-down menu in the column header to filter only the "Yes" responses.

Annual Update Table

In the Annual Update Table, provide the following information for each action in the LCAP for the relevant LCAP year:

- **Estimated Actual Expenditures**: Enter the total estimated actual expenditures to implement this action, if any.

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

In the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table, check the 'Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?' column to ensure that only actions with a "Yes" are displaying. If actions with a "No" are displayed or if actions that are contributing are not displaying in the column, use the drop-down menu in the column header to filter only the "Yes" responses. Provide the following information for each contributing action in the LCAP for the relevant LCAP year:

- **6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants:** Provide the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants estimated based on the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the current school year.
- **Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions**: Enter the total estimated actual expenditure of LCFF funds used to implement this action, if any.
- **Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services:** For any action identified as contributing, being provided on a Limited basis only to unduplicated students, and that does not have funding associated with the action, enter the total estimated actual quality improvement anticipated for the action as a percentage rounded to the nearest hundredth (0.00%).
    - Building on the example provided above for calculating the Planned Percentage of Improved Services, the LEA in the example implements the action. As part of the annual update process, the LEA reviews implementation and student outcome data and determines that the action was implemented with fidelity and that outcomes for foster youth students improved. The LEA reviews the original estimated cost for the action and determines that had it hired additional staff to collect and analyze data and to coordinate supports for students that estimated actual cost would have been $169,500 due to a cost of living adjustment. The LEA would divide the estimated actual cost of $169,500 by the amount of LCFF Funding identified in the Data Entry Table and then convert the quotient to a percentage. This percentage is the Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services for the action.

LCFF Carryover Table

- **9. Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant**: Provide the total amount of estimated LCFF Target Entitlement for the current school year, excluding the supplemental and concentration grants and the add-ons for the Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant program,

the former Home-to-School Transportation program, and the Small School District Transportation program, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8). Note that the LCFF Base Grant for purposes of the LCAP also includes the Necessary Small Schools and Economic Recovery Target allowances for school districts, and County Operations Grant for COEs. See *EC* sections 2574 (for COEs) and 42238.02 (for school districts and charter schools), as applicable, for LCFF entitlement calculations.

- **10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year:** This percentage will not be entered. The percentage is calculated based on the amounts of the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9) and the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (6), pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 15496(a)(8), plus the LCFF Carryover – Percentage from the prior year. This is the percentage by which services for unduplicated pupils must be increased or improved as compared to the services provided to all students in the current LCAP year.

Calculations in the Action Tables

To reduce the duplication of effort of LEAs, the Action Tables include functionality such as pre-population of fields and cells based on the information provided in the Data Entry Table, the Annual Update Summary Table, and the Contributing Actions Table. For transparency, the functionality and calculations used are provided below.

Contributing Actions Table

- **4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)**
    - This amount is the total of the Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds) column.
- **5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services**
    - This percentage is the total of the Planned Percentage of Improved Services column.
- **Planned Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the coming school year (4 divided by 1, plus 5)**
    - This percentage is calculated by dividing the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4) by the Projected LCFF Base Grant (1), converting the quotient to a percentage, and adding it to the Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (5).

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

Pursuant to *EC* Section 42238.07(c)(2), if the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4) is less than the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and Concentration Grants (6), the LEA is required to calculate the difference between the Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (5) and the Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (7). If the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4) is equal to or greater than the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and Concentration Grants (6), the Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services will display “Not Required.”

- **6. Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and Concentration Grants**

- This is the total amount of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants the LEA estimates it will actually receive based on the number and concentration of unduplicated students in the current school year.

- **4. Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (LCFF Funds)**
  - This amount is the total of the Last Year's Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds).
- **7. Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions**
  - This amount is the total of the Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds).
- **Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (Subtract 7 from 4)**
  - This amount is the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (7) subtracted from the Total Planned Contributing Expenditures (4).
- **5. Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)**
  - This amount is the total of the Planned Percentage of Improved Services column.
- **8. Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (%)**
  - This amount is the total of the Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services column.
- **Difference Between Planned and Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (Subtract 5 from 8)**
  - This amount is the Total Planned Percentage of Improved Services (5) subtracted from the Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (8).

LCFF Carryover Table

- **10. Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Current School Year (6 divided by 9 plus Carryover %)**
  - This percentage is the Estimated Actual LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (6) divided by the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9) plus the LCFF Carryover – Percentage from the prior year.
- **11. Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (7 divided by 9, plus 8)**
  - This percentage is the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for Contributing Actions (7) divided by the LCFF Funding (9), then converting the quotient to a percentage and adding the Total Estimated Actual Percentage of Improved Services (8).
- **12. LCFF Carryover — Dollar Amount LCFF Carryover (Subtract 11 from 10 and multiply by 9)**

- If the Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (11) is less than the Estimated Actual Percentage to Increase or Improve Services (10), the LEA is required to carry over LCFF funds.

  The amount of LCFF funds is calculated by subtracting the Estimated Actual Percentage to Increase or Improve Services (11) from the Estimated Actual Percentage of Increased or Improved Services (10) and then multiplying by the Estimated Actual LCFF Base Grant (9). This amount is the amount of LCFF funds that is required to be carried over to the coming year.

- **13. LCFF Carryover — Percentage (12 divided by 9)**

  - This percentage is the unmet portion of the Percentage to Increase or Improve Services that the LEA must carry over into the coming LCAP year. The percentage is calculated by dividing the LCFF Carryover (12) by the LCFF Funding (9).

California Department of Education
November 2024