SSFUSD Strategic Plan Targets (by Strategic Priority and Year)

Board Approved on September 10, 2026

Strategic Priority #1: Exceptional Instruction								
Type	Measure of Success	23-24 Actual	24-25 Actual	25-26 Old Target	25-26 Actual	26-27 Proposed	27-28 Proposed	28-29 Proposed
Student Outcomes *(overall + for focus student groups*)*	% proficient / advanced on 3rd, 8th & 11th grade ELA (1.1)	52%	51%	n/a - new	51%	55%	59%	63%
	% proficient / advanced on 3rd, 8th & 11th grade Math (1.2)	37%	40%	n/a - new	37%	42%	46%	51%
	% of graduates eligible for UC / CSU (1.3)	51%	49%	59%	50%	53%	57%	62%
	% of English language learners who are reclassified each year (1.4)	13%	12%	n/a - new	12%	13%	13%	13%
Student Experience	% of students who use our Portrait of a Graduate competencies to self-assess their learning and development (1.5)	n/a	n/a	Baseline Year	48%	51%	54%	57%
	% of high school students who report understanding their options after high school (1.6)	84%	n/a	85%	77%	83%	89%	90%
	% of high school students who report feeling prepared for success after high school (1.7)	70%	n/a	75%	75%	81%	87%	95%
Educator Experience	% of educators who report that they have the support and resources they need to be successful (1.8)	n/a	n/a	Baseline Year	84%	89%	92%	95%
	% of classroom observations that reflect instruction aligned with our instructional vision (1.9)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Baseline Year	TBD	TBD
	% of educators who use common rubrics or scoring criteria to ensure all students are engaged in complex, rigorous work (1.10)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Baseline Year	TBD	TBD

** Focus student groups include English learners, students with disabilities, African American / Black, Latinx, and Pacific Islander students*

Data Sources and Definitions: ***Note - All data rounded up to nearest % (unless below 10%)***

- **1.1 ELA Proficiency (3rd, 8th & 11th Grade):** EOY State Summative Assessment (CAASPP) https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/
- **1.2 Math Proficiency (3rd, 8th & 11th Grade):** EOY State Summative Assessment (CAASPP) https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/
- **1.3 UC / CSU Eligibility:** Graduates meeting UC / CSU requirements as % of eligible cohort of students, as reported to CDE (see report here)
- **1.4 English Learner Reclassification:** CDE Dataquest reporting
- **1.5 Portrait of a Graduate Self-Assessment:** CHKS data. Weighted average of 5th, 7th, 9th, 11th, and other secondary student responses (Agree + Strongly Agree) to custom question Z2.1 ("I use our Portrait of a Graduate skills to check my learning and growth. How much do you agree with this statement?"). See methodology and calculations here: Belonging Data Calculations
- **1.6 Awareness of Post-Secondary Options:** SY2023-24 baseline data from an internal October 2023 student survey (results here). No data in SY2024-25. Question added to CHKS as of SY2025-26
- **1.7 Preparedness for Post-Secondary Success:** SY2023-24 baseline data from an internal October 2023 student survey (results here). No data in SY2024-25. Question added to CHKS as of SY2025-26
- **1.8 Educator Support:** CA School Staff Survey (CSSS), % agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement "I have the support and resources I need to be successful." Question added to CHKS as of SY2025-26
- **1.9 Alignment with Instructional Vision:** Measured based on results of learning walks starting in SY2026-27. Definition of "aligned with our instructional vision" = classrooms that reflect mostly 3s & 4s on learning walk tool
- **1.10 Rubric Use:** Measured based on results of learning walks starting in SY2026-27

Strategic Priority #2: Engaged Students							
Measure of Success	23-24 Actual	24-25 Actual	25-26 Old Target	25-26 Actual	26-27 Proposed	27-28 Proposed	28-29 Proposed
% of students who report feeling a sense of connectedness (2.1)	n/a	51%	63%	63%	66%	69%	72%
% of students who report having opportunities for meaningful participation at school (2.2)	n/a	30%	36%	36%	39%	42%	45%
% of students who report having a caring adult at school (2.3)	n/a	63%	76%	64%	70%	73%	76%
% of students who report having educators who believe in their ability to succeed (2.4)	n/a	n/a	n/a - new	71%	74%	77%	80%
% of students who report feeling safe at school (2.5)	n/a	59%	74%	70%	73%	77%	80%
% of students who are chronically absent (2.6)	19%	18%	14%	18%	16%	14%	13%
> % chronic absenteeism for multilingual learners (2.6.1)	*21%*	*19%*	*18%*	*23%*	*18%*	*15%*	*12%*
> % chronic absenteeism for African American students (2.6.3)	*22%*	*26%*	*25%*	*31%*	*25%*	*20%*	*16%*
> % chronic absenteeism for Pacific Islander students (2.6.5)	*26%*	*31%*	*30%*	*38%*	*30%*	*24%*	*19%*
% average daily attendance (ADA) (2.7)	93%	94%	95%	94%	95%	95%	95%
> % ADA for multilingual learners (2.7.1)	*92%*	*92%*	*94%*	*93%*	*93%*	*94%*	*95%*
> % ADA for African American students (2.7.2)	*92%*	*91%*	*93%*	*92%*	*92%*	*93%*	*94%*
> % ADA for Pacific Islander students (2.7.3)	*90%*	*91%*	*92%*	*91%*	*92%*	*93%*	*93%*
Suspension rates (2.8)	3.3%	2.6%	2.3%	2.7%	2.4%	2.1%	1.9%
> Suspension rates for multilingual learners (2.8.1)	*3.5%*	*2.8%*	*2.5%*	*3.5%*	*3.2%*	*2.8%*	*2.5%*
> Suspension rates for African American students (2.8.2)	*6.0%*	*11.4%*	*11.3%*	*11.2%*	*9.0%*	*7.2%*	*5.7%*
> Suspension rates for Pacific Islander students (2.8.3)	*5.8%*	*4.4%*	*4.0%*	*2.8%*	*2.5%*	*2.3%*	*2.0%*

Data Sources and Definitions: ***Note - All data rounded up to nearest % (unless below 10%)***

- **2.1 Student Connectedness:** California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS). Elementary Source (Question # 15). Secondary Source (Question #31). Weighted average of ES / MS / HS. See calculations here: Belonging Data Calculations.
- **2.2 Meaningful Student Participation:** California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS). Elementary Source (Question # 31). Secondary Source (Question 58). Weighted average of ES / MS / HS. See calculations here: Belonging Data Calculations.
- **2.3 Student Relationships with Caring Adults:** California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS). Elementary Source (Question # 28). Secondary Source (Question #47). Weighted average of ES / MS / HS. See calculations here: Belonging Data Calculations.
- **2.4 Student Academic Belonging:** California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS). Elementary Source (Question # 39). Secondary Source (Question #54). Weighted average of ES / MS / HS. See calculations here: Belonging Data Calculations.
- **2.5 Student Perceptions of Safety:** California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS). Elementary Source (Question # 75). Secondary Source (Question #117). Weighted average of ES / MS / HS. See calculations here: Belonging Data Calculations.
- **2.6 Chronic Absenteeism:** Infinite Campus (student information system). 2029 target = 1% reduction overall; in absenteeism for each group
- **2.7 Average Daily Attendance (ADA):** Infinite Campus (student information system). 2029 target = 0.10% increase in ADA for each group
- **2.8 Student Suspensions:** Infinite Campus (student information system). 2029 target = 10% decrease in suspensions for each group

Strategic Priority #3: Purposeful Partnerships							
Measure of Success	23-24 Actual	24-25 Actual	25-26 Old Target	25-26 Actual	26-27 Proposed	27-28 Proposed	28-29 Proposed
% of families who report feeling welcome to participate in school (3.1)	n/a	43%	53%	48%	52%	57%	62%
% of families who report that school staff take their concerns seriously (3.2)	n/a	85%	90%	42%	47%	52%	57%
% of families who report that teachers communicate with them about what students are expected to learn in class (3.3)	n/a	91%	95%	50%	55%	60%	65%
% of families who report receiving advice and resources from school staff to support their children's social and emotional needs (3.4)	n/a	74%	84%	87%	90%	93%	96%

Data Sources and Definitions: ***Note - All data rounded up to nearest % (unless below 10%)***

- **3.1 Welcoming Environment for Families:** CA School Parent Survey (CSPS), which is the parent version of the CHKS
- **3.2 Staff Responsiveness to Family Concerns:** CA School Parent Survey (CSPS)
- **3.3 Communication with Families about Student Learning:** CA School Parent Survey (CSPS)
- **3.4 Social-Emotional Supports for Families:** CA School Parent Survey (CSPS)

Strategic Priority #4: Empowered Educators							
Measure of Success	23-24 Actual	24-25 Actual	25-26 Old Target	25-26 Actual	26-27 Proposed	27-28 Proposed	28-29 Proposed
% of SSFUSD staff who report feeling engaged (4.1)	n/a	n/a	Baseline Year	86% (n=224)	75% (n=700)	80% (n=800)	85% (n=900)
% of SSFUSD staff who reflect the diversity of our community (4.2)	n/a	n/a	Baseline Year	**CalPADS Self-Reported Race / Ethnicity of Staff:** *(as of August 2026)* Ethnicity: Hispanic / Latino of any race = 24% Non Hispanic / Latino of any race = 74% Decline to State = 2.5% Race: African American = 3.3% American Indian or Alaskan = 2.7% Asian = 17% Declined to State = 13% Filipino = 16% Hawaiian / Pacific Islander = 0.6% Multiple = 2.4% White = 45% *Reported descriptively via CalPADS; no quotas / targets; monitored descriptively*			
% of open school-based teacher positions filled by the last day of school annually (4.3)	n/a	42%	45%	88%	88%	89%	90%
% of open school-based teacher positions filled by the first day of school annually (4.4)	n/a	89%	70%	94%	95%	95%	95%

Data Sources and Definitions: ***Note - All data rounded up to nearest % (unless below 10%)***

- **4.1 SSFUSD Staff Engagement:** % of staff who respond favorably (i.e., select "Agree" or "Strongly Agree") to the Gallup Q[12] Employee Engagement Survey Items in our California School Staff Survey (CSSS). Baseline calculated as % of certificated staff responding favorably to these questions on the SY25-26 CSSS (n = 224). See calculations here: Staff Engagement Data Calculations. Starting in SY26-27, our goal is to increase the % of district and site-based staff (total staff = ~1,100) who respond favorably to these staff engagement questions
- **4.2 SSFUSD Staff Diversity:** Voluntary, self-identified staff demographic data sourced from California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CalPADS) aligned to our Human Resources Information System (HRIS) records. We aim to assess the effectiveness of our recruitment,

talent sourcing, screening, and workplace retention strategies by descriptively monitoring voluntary, self-identified staff demographic composition over time in alignment with state CalPADS reporting standards. In compliance with California Proposition 209 and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the District is unequivocally committed to equal employment opportunity and merit-based hiring practices. The District does not utilize demographic hiring quotas, preferences, or set-asides. Demographic data is monitored descriptively to verify that systemic outreach and talent sourcing efforts generate broad, inclusive, and qualified applicant pools

- **4.3 Open School-Based Teacher Positions Filled by Last Day of School:** Open school-based teacher positions filled by the last day of school, per HR Team Hiring & Retention Report analysis; does not include Adult Education positions
- **4.4 School-Based Teacher Positions Filled by Start of School:** % of open school-based teacher positions filled by the first day of school, per HR Team Hiring & Retention Report analysis; does not include Adult Education positions
- **Note for metrics 4.3-4.4 (Measurement Timeline):** The percentage of positions filled is measured during the academic year in which the recruitment occurs. For example, during SY2026-27, the district will recruit with the goal of having 88% of open SY2027-28 school-based teacher positions filled by the last day of the SY2026-27 school year. Consistent with prior years of analysis, Adult Education positions are excluded
- **Notes for metrics 4.3-4.4 (Position Scope):** Includes classroom-based general education and special education teacher-of-record roles, including part-time interventionist positions. It excludes specialized itinerant special education roles (e.g., Deaf / Hard of Hearing or Adapted Physical Education teachers), counselor / social worker roles, and special categorically-funded roles (e.g., part-time positions funded via Prop 28 arts funding)

Strategic Priority #5: Equity-Centered Systems							
Measure of Success	23-24 Actual	24-25 Actual	25-26 Old Target	25-26 Actual	26-27 Proposed	27-28 Proposed	28-29 Proposed
% of principals who agree that annual planning, staffing, and budgeting processes and decisions were transparent and equitable (5.1)	n/a	n/a	Baseline Year	100% (n=7)	100% (n=15)	100% (n=15)	100% (n=15)
% of school staffing allocations that align with the district's equity-based staffing guidelines (5.2)	n/a	n/a	Baseline Year	86%	100%	100%	100%
% of school and district leaders who use Open Architects to guide improvement efforts (5.3)	n/a	n/a	n/a - new	80% (n=15)	100% (n=25+)	100% (n=25+)	100% (n=25+)
% of teachers who agree that district-provided technology meets students' needs (5.4)	n/a	n/a	Baseline Year	75%	80%	85%	90%

Data Sources and Definitions: ***Note - All data rounded up to nearest % (unless below 10%)***

- **5.1 Transparency & Equity of Annual Planning Process:** % agree or strongly agree on internal survey, administered to principals / site leaders during last Ops Meeting of the school year (annually in May), that "the annual planning, staffing, and budgeting process was transparent, and decisions were equitable and aligned with district priorities"
- **5.2 Staffing Allocations:** % of school-based staffing allocations that meet or exceed district guidelines, per analysis comparing actual staffing vs. actual enrollment by school (including by grade for elementary) (annually in Oct, after CBEDs enrollment #s are final). See methodology here: 5.2 Staffing Allocations Metric details
- **5.3 Progress Monitoring Systems:** % of site and district leaders who demonstrate effective use of our Open Architects Data Dashboard to assess and guide improvement efforts, per internal survey, administered to site leaders during Quarterly Stepbacks (annually). Baseline taken during August 2026 Principal Ops meeting: % of respondents who indicated that, in SY25-26, they used OpenArchitects “Sometimes” or “Often” to review student data and monitor progress
- **5.4 Technology for Learning:** Custom question (Question # Z2.16) in CSSS (staff survey). Aggregate of respondents who selected “Agree” or “Strongly agree”