
LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Hanford Elementary School District
CDS Code: 16639170000000
School Year: 2026-27
LEA contact information:
Robert Heugly
Director of Program Development, Assessment, and Accountability
rheugly@hanfordesd.org
5595853600

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 Hanford Elementary 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 Hanford Elementary School District is $113,756,538, of which $82,070,807 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), $21,179,931 is other state funds, $6,596,801 is local funds, and $3,908,999 is federal funds. Of the $82,070,807 in LCFF Funds, $19,187,516 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 Hanford Elementary 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: Hanford Elementary School District plans to spend $108,871,868 for the 2026-27 school year. Of that amount, $22,167,866 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and $86,704,002 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:


General Fund budget expenditures not included in the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) primarily consist of routine operational and compliance-related costs that support the overall functioning of the district but are not directly aligned to specific LCAP goals, actions, or services. These expenditures include, but are not limited to, costs associated with basic operational services such as utilities, insurance, routine maintenance and facilities upkeep, transportation, and legally required contributions to pension liabilities (STRS/PERS) and other post-employment benefits.

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

In 2026-27, Hanford Elementary School District is projecting it will receive $19,187,516 based on the enrollment of foster youth, English learner, and low-income students. Hanford Elementary School District must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Hanford Elementary School District plans to spend $19,591,693, 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 Hanford Elementary 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 Hanford Elementary 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, Hanford Elementary School District's LCAP budgeted $20,087,466 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Hanford Elementary School District actually spent $19,175,533, for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2025-26.

The difference between the budgeted and actual expenditures of $911,933 had the following impact on Hanford Elementary School District’s ability to increase or improve services for high needs students:

In 2025–2026, the district spent less than originally planned on technology purchases that were intended to support actions and services for high-needs students. This difference occurred primarily because certain technology items—such as devices, software, or infrastructure upgrades—were delayed based on need. As a result, there was minimal impact on the overall services provided to students. The district was still able to maintain key supports—such as access to instructional technology, digital learning tools, and targeted academic programs.

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
Hanford Elementary School District	Robert Heugly Director of Program Development, Assessment, and Accountability	rheugly@hanfordesd.org 5595853600

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.

District & Students
The Hanford Elementary School District is located in Kings County in California's Central Valley. The district's enrollment in 2025-2026 was approximately 5,440. The district's percentage of foster youth, English learners, and low-income students is approximately 78%. The district has the following student groups: African American, Asian, Filipino, Hispanic, White, Two or More Races, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, English Learners, Long Term English Learners (LTELs), Students with Disabilities, Foster Youth, Homeless. The district participates in the National School Lunch Program Community Eligibility Provision, which means all students are provided with free breakfast and lunch.

Schools & Students:
The district is comprised of 12 schools (8 elementary schools, 1 magnet K-8 school, 2 junior high 7-8 schools, and one alternative school CDS) serving Transitional Kindergarten (TK) through 8th grade. The 12 schools with their enrollment and demographics numbers per CalPads are:
* Hamilton Elementary (Enrollment: 441 of which 13.38% are English Learners and 80.73% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)
* Jefferson Elementary (Magnet Dual Immersion K-8) (Enrollment: 510 of which 14.90% are English Learners and 47.45% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)
* Lee Richmond Elementary (Enrollment: 402 of which 24.88% are English Learners and 89.30% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)
* Lincoln Elementary (Enrollment: 377 of which 25.46% are English Learners and 92.57% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)

* Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary (Enrollment: 605 of which 16.53% are English Learners and 75.87% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)
* Monroe Elementary (Enrollment: 629 of which 7.79% are English Learners and 75.83% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)
* Roosevelt Elementary (Enrollment: 491 of which 29.33% are English Learners and 90.84% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)
* Joseph M. Simas Elementary (Enrollment: 512 of which 5.86% are English Learners and 56.84% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)
* Washington Elementary (Enrollment: 461 of which 11.71% are English Learners and 81.78% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)
* John F. Kennedy Jr. High (Enrollment: 501 of which 16.57% are English Learners and 86.73% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)
* Woodrow Wilson Jr. High (Enrollment: 513 of which 12.67% are English Learners and 73.68% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)
* Community Day School (Alternative School) (Enrollment: 4 of which 0% are English Learners and 100% are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students)

Community:
Based on Census.gov estimates of July 1, 2024, the community of Hanford had a population of 60,594. The racial makeup of Hanford was 46.6% White, 6.1% African American, 1.7% Native American, 4.2% Asian, 0.1% Pacific Islander, 22.7% from two or more races. Hispanic or Latino of any race were 51.4% and white alone, not Hispanic or Latino were 34.7%.

There were 19,518 households, with an average of 3.01 persons per household. The percent of persons under 5 years was 7.5%. The percent of persons under 18 years was 28.7%. The percent of persons 65 years and over was 13.3%. The amount of female persons was 48.7%.

Education based, 82.8% percent of persons age 25 years+ were a high school graduate or higher education level and 18.1% had a Bachelor's degree or higher.

The median household income in 2024 dollars was $76,461 with 14.5% of people below the poverty line.

HESD Serves Students and Community:
The Hanford Elementary School District serves these students by providing them with the academic, social, and leadership support necessary to become individuals who achieve academically, who respect basic cultural values, who demonstrate ethical behavior including respect for others, and who value personal integrity, responsibility, and accountability.

Equity Multiplier Funding
The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Equity Multiplier (Equity Multiplier) provides additional funding for allocation to school sites with prior year nonstability rates greater than 25 percent and prior year socioeconomically disadvantaged pupil rates greater than 70 percent. Pursuant to California Education Code (EC) 42238.024 Equity Multiplier funding is required to be used to provide evidence-based services

and supports for students at these school sites. LEAs are also required to document the efforts to improve outcomes for students at these school sites.

- The following schools are receiving Equity Multiplier Funding: Community Day School

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

Broad Educational Program (Goal 1)
One of the greatest successes of the HESD LCAP has been the district's efforts to provide students with a broad educational program. A continuing mandate, reiterated by educational partners in advisory committees, through surveys, and in student focus groups has been that a good education is focused on reading and math, but is also well-rounded, providing science, history, art, music, and physical education. Moreover, a well-rounded education includes opportunities to travel to museums and scientific exhibits, participate in outdoor education, and have access to modern technology.

In fulfilling this mandate from our educational partners, and to maintain and build upon our success in this area, the district has added credentialed teachers who specialize in art, music, and physical education. Students at all grade levels receive instruction in these subjects. All students have the opportunity to attend an academic study trip each year that is aligned with the content standards for their grade level. Every classroom is equipped with a Smartboard and is connected to the internet via a state-of-the-art wireless network. Students have access to a variety of apps and multimedia digital academic content. Every student in TK-1 is assigned and has access to an iPad. Every student in grades 2-8 is assigned and has access to a laptop computer, with students in grades 4-8 taking laptops home for homework and research.

Academic Achievement (Goal 2)
Students in HESD continue to make progress toward achieving proficiency on the State academic standards. On the 2023 school dashboard, All Students scored Orange and "Maintained" (increased by 1.1 points) in ELA (per CDE Data Quest: 44.77% proficient). On the 2023 school dashboard for Math, All Students scored Yellow and "Increased" (increased by 8.1) (per CDE Data Quest: 33.66% proficient). On the 2025 school dashboard, All Students scored Green and "Increased" (increased by 13.2 points) in ELA (per CDE Data Quest: 51.29% proficient). On the 2025 school dashboard for Math, All Students scored Yellow and "Increased" (increased by 7.8) (per CDE Data Quest: 40.40% proficient).

In comparing the scores of All students on the CAASPP assessment over the last several years, the percent of proficiency in ELA has grown from 39.22% in 2021 to 51.29% in 2025, and in Math, the percent of proficiency has grown from 25.74% in 2021 to 40.40% in 2025 (data from CDE Data Quest). The district will maintain and build on students' academic success by providing smaller class sizes, eliminating combination classes, and providing a robust summer and after-school instructional program going forward.

On the 2023 Dashboard, the EL Progress Indicator continues to be an area of success. When looking over the past several years, the percent of proficiency in Learning the English Language continues to hover right around 50%, with 2025 coming in at 47.8% and a "maintained" level, resulting in a large number of reclassifications.

The following reflects the district's Greatest Challenges from the California School Dashboard:

2023: ACADEMIC INDICATOR (Red & Orange on the CA Dashboard)
ELA: All Students: Orange (17.5 points below standard – Maintained +1.1 pts)
ELA: Foster Students: Orange (19.9 points below standard – Maintained -0.4 pts)
ELA: Hispanic Students: Orange (20.6 points below standard – Maintained +1.1 pts)
ELA: Two or More Races: Orange (5.8 points below standard – Declined 4.9 pts)
ELA: Students with Disabilities: Red (104.1 points below standard – Declined 6.2 pts)
Mathematics: Homeless Students: Orange (77.0 points below standard – Maintained -1.2 pts)
Mathematics: Students with Disabilities: Red (126.5 points below standard – Maintained +0.4 pts)

2024: ACADEMIC INDICATOR (Red & Orange on the CA Dashboard)
ELA: All Students: Orange (15.8 points below standard – Maintained +0.7 pts)
ELA: African American Students (AA): Orange (48.8 points below standard – Maintained +1.4 pts)
ELA: English Learners (EL): Orange (37.6 points below standard – Maintained -1.1 pts)
ELA: Long Term English Learners (LTEL): Red (80.6 points below standard – Declined 7.7 pts)
ELA: Socially Economically Disadvantaged Students (SED): Orange (27.3 points below standard – Maintained 0.9 pts)
ELA: Students with Disabilities (SWD): Red (104.6 points below standard – Maintained -0.5 pts)
ELA: Foster Students: Orange (44.7 points below standard – Declined 24.8 pts)
ELA: Homeless Students: Red (78.4 points below standard – Declined 31.6 pts)
ELA: Hispanic Students: Orange (20.1 points below standard – Maintained 0.5 pts)
Mathematics: African American Students (AA): Orange (81.7 points below standard – Declined 3.1 pts)
Mathematics: Long Term English Learners (LTEL): Red (113.8 points below standard – Maintained +2.7 pts)
Mathematics: Students with Disabilities (SWD): Orange (117.4 points below standard – Increased 9.1 pts)
Mathematics: Homeless Students: Red (98.3 points below standard – Declined 21.3 pts)

2025: ACADEMIC INDICATOR (Red & Orange on the CA Dashboard)
ELA: Long Term English Learners (LTEL): Red (83.8 points below standard – Declined 3.3 pts)
ELA: Students with Disabilities (SWD): Orange (87.0 points below standard – Increased 17.6 pts)
ELA: Foster Students: Orange (69.0 points below standard – Declined 24.3 pts)
Mathematics: Long Term English Learners (LTEL): Red (125.3 points below standard – Declined 11.4 pts)
Mathematics: Students with Disabilities (SWD): Red (115.4 points below standard – Maintained 2.0 pts)
Mathematics: Foster Students: Red (111.5 points below standard – Declined 43.4 pts)
Science: Long Term English Learners (LTEL): Red (33.8 pts – Declined 2.0 pts)
Science: Homeless Students: Orange (41.3 pts – Maintained 1.2 pts)

2023: CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM RATE (Red & Orange on the CA Dashboard)
None

2024: CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM RATE (Red & Orange on the CA Dashboard)
Foster Students: Red (23.5% chronically absent – Increased 5.9%)
Homeless Students: Orange (34.1% chronically absent – Declined 2.7%)

2025: CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM RATE (Red & Orange on the CA Dashboard)
African American Students (AA): Red (21.4% chronically absent – Increased 5.2%)
English Learners (EL): Orange (10.4% chronically absent – Maintained 0.3%)
Students with Disabilities (SWD): Orange (22.6% chronically absent – Declined 1.0%)
Foster Students: Red (31.9% chronically absent – Increased 8.5%)
Asian Students: Orange (13.0% chronically absent – Increased 10.9%)
Filipino Students: Orange (8.2% chronically absent – Increased 2.6%)

2023: SUSPENSION RATE (Red & Orange on the CA Dashboard)
All Students: Orange (5.4% suspension rate – Increased 1.0%)
African American Students (AA): Red (11.6% suspension rate – Increased 2.5%)
English Learner Students (EL): Orange (4.6% suspension rate – Maintained 0.0%)
Socially Economically Disadvantaged Students (SED): Red (6.1% suspension rate – Increased 1.1%)
Students with Disabilities (SWD): Red (6.3% suspension rate – Maintained -0.1%)
Foster Students: Red (8.2% suspension rate – Increased 3.7%)
Homeless Students: Orange (7.9% suspension rate – Declined 1.5%)
Hispanic Students: Orange (5.1% suspension rate – Increased 1.0%)
White Students: Orange (5.4% suspension rate – Increased 1.2%)
Two or More Races (TOM): Orange (6.0% suspension rate – Increased 1.5%)

2024: SUSPENSION RATE (Red & Orange on the CA Dashboard)
African American Students (AA): Orange (10.1% suspension rate – Declined 1.6%)
Students with Disabilities (SWD): Red (6.7% suspension rate – Increased 0.4%)
Foster Students: Red (15.7% suspension rate – Increased 7.4%)
Homeless Students: Red (8.9% suspension rate – Increased 1.1%)
Asian Students: Orange (2.0% suspension rate – Increased 2.0%)
Filipino Students: Orange (1.9% suspension rate – Increased 1.9%)

2025: SUSPENSION RATE (Red & Orange on the CA Dashboard)
Foster Students: Orange (12.2% suspension rate – Declined 3.4%)
White Students: Orange (4.5% suspension rate – Maintained -0.2%)

District Level
2023: The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2023

Dashboard are:
Priority Area 4 (ELA & Math Academics)
- Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA and Math

Priority Area 5 (Chronic Absenteeism)
- None

Priority Area 6 (Suspension Rate)
- African American (AA) student group (Red)
- Socially Economically Disadvantaged (SED) student group (Red)
- Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
- Foster student group (Red)

2024: The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2024 Dashboard are:
Priority Area 4 (ELA & Math Academics)
- Long-Term English Learners (LTEL) student group (Red) in ELA and Math
- Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA
- Homeless student group (Red) in ELA and Math

Priority Area 5 (Chronic Absenteeism)
- Foster student group (Red)

Priority Area 6 (Suspension Rate)
- Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
- Foster student group (Red)
- Homeless student group (Red)

2025: The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2025 Dashboard are:
Priority Area 4 (ELA, Math, & Science Academics)
- Long-Term English Learners (LTEL) student group (Red) in ELA, Math, and Science
- Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in Math
- Foster student group (Red) in Math

Priority Area 5 (Chronic Absenteeism)
- African American (AA) student group (Red)
- Foster student group (Red)

Priority Area 6 (Suspension Rate)

- None

School Level
2023: Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators along with any student group within that school that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2023 Dashboard are:
Priority Area 4 (ELA & Math Academics)
* Hamilton
 * English Learner (EL) student group (Red) in Math
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA and Math
* Monroe
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA
* Simas
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA and Math
* Kennedy
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA and Math
* Woodrow
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA and Math

Priority Area 5 (Chronic Absenteeism)
* Kennedy
 * White student group (Red)

Priority Area 6 (Suspension Rate)
* Hamilton
 * White student group (Red)
* Lincoln
 * African American (AA) student group (Red)
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
* Roosevelt
 * White student group (Red)
* Kennedy
 * Overall (All Students) (Red)
 * English Learners (EL) student group (Red)
 * Socially Economically Disadvantaged (SED) student group (Red)
 * Hispanic student group (Red)
* Woodrow
 * Socially Economically Disadvantaged (SED) student group (Red)
 * Hispanic student group (Red)

2024: Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators along with any student group within that school that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2024 Dashboard are:

Priority Area 4 (ELA & Math Academics)
* Hamilton
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA
  * English Learners (EL) student group (Red) in Math
* Monroe
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in Math
* Richmond
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in Math
* Roosevelt
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA and Math
* Simas
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA
* Kennedy
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
* Woodrow
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)

Priority Area 5 (Chronic Absenteeism)
* Monroe
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
* Kennedy
  * Homeless student group (Red)
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)

Priority Area 6 (Suspension Rate)
* Hamilton
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
* Lincoln
  * African American (AA) student group (Red)
* Monroe
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
* Simas
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
* Washington
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
* Kennedy
  * Homeless student group (Red)

* Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)

2025: Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators along with any student group within that school that received the lowest performance level on one or more state indicators on the 2025 Dashboard are:

Priority Area 4 (ELA, Math, & Science Academics)
* Simas
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in Math
* Kennedy
  * Long-Term English Learners (LTEL) student group (Red) in ELA, Math, and Science
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in Math
* Woodrow
  * Long-Term English Learners (LTEL) student group (Red) in ELA and Math
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in Math

Priority Area 5 (Chronic Absenteeism)
* King
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
* Roosevelt
  * White Students student group (Red)
* Simas
  * Overall Students student group (Red)
  * Socially Economically Disadvantaged (SED) student group (Red)
  * Hispanic Students student group (Red)

Priority Area 6 (Suspension Rate)
* Hamilton
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
* Richmond
  * White Students student group (Red)
* Roosevelt
  * White Students student group (Red)
* Simas
  * Socially Economically Disadvantaged (SED) student group (Red)
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
* Washington
  * White Students student group (Red)

Each of the needs identified above are discussed in detail below:
2025 Hanford Elementary School District was identified for Differentiated Assistance based on the Student group: Foster Youths (2024 was

Students with Disabilities, Foster, and Homeless). Foster Students were identified in priority area 4 (Pupil Achievement for Math-Red and ELA-Orange) and in priority area 5 (School Climate – Chronic Absenteeism). HESD will work closely with the Kings County Office of Education over the course of the year to improve these areas through a series of meetings scheduled over the year. There are multiple actions that will address this work specifically to decrease chronic absenteeism and increase academic support for Foster students including social-emotional support to provide students and families with what they need to be successful. Looking at the broad educational goals, the arts and extra-curricular activities will continue to support engagement for Foster students at all grade levels. This includes transportation support to ensure students can be involved and engaged. Measures have been taken to increase student and family engagement and increase school connectedness and safety for students and families in the identified student group.

ACADEMIC INDICATOR
Students' overall performance (the "All Students" group) scored in the Yellow category in Math on the 2025 California School Dashboard. The district will take the following steps to address this need:
Combination classes will be eliminated in grades 1-6 in all elementary schools.
Teachers will be provided with professional development and training designed to build their content knowledge and further develop their pedagogy.
Teachers will be provided with professional development and training designed to build their ability support English learners and Long-Term English Learners.
Up-to-date instructional materials will be provided to students in all content areas.
A robust summer instructional program will be implemented.

Safe Schools/Student Support (Goal 4)
The district’s suspension rate continues to be both an area of success and an area of challenges. The district's suspension rate is Geen (2025 CA School Dashboard), and the number of students suspended each year continued to fall until the COVID pandemic. From 2013 to 2019, the district’s suspension rate had decreased from 6.3% to 2.7%. This represents more than a fifty-percent reduction in the number of students suspended. This had been done without lowering the district's high standards for student behavior and citizenship.
Analysis of the district’s suspension rate through Dataquest shows the following:
Overall (All Students) Suspension Rates:
2013 (CDE Dataquest) 6.3%
2014 (CDE Dataquest) 5.0%
2015 (CDE Dataquest) 5.1%
2016 (CDE Dataquest) 4.3%
2017 (CDE Dataquest) 3.4%
2018 (CDE Dataquest) 3.1%
2019 (CDE Dataquest) 2.8%
2020 (CDE Dataquest) 2.9%
2021 (CDE Dataquest) 0.5% (School closures and extended periods of distance learning affected student suspensions and suspension rates in 2020-2021.)
2022 (CDE Dataquest) 4.5%
2023 (CDE Dataquest) 5.6%

2024 (CDE Dataquest) 4.5%
2025 (CDE Dataquest) 3.1%

2025 Dashboard data indicate that the past several years, starting with the COVID pandemic, have had a negative impact on student's social and emotional well-being, and suspension rates were trending upward from 2020 to 2023 but is correcting back down these past two years (per Data Quest in 2024, All Students 4.5% suspension rate HESD, County: 6.0%, State: 3.5% and in 2025 All Students 3.1% suspension rate HESD, County: 4.9%, State: 3.1%) following both county and state trends. The successful implementation of actions and services that support students' social and emotional well-being continues to mitigate the negative impact students have experienced over the past few years. There is a focus on continuing our pre-COVID trend of low suspension rates.

The district's chronic absenteeism rate is both an area of success and an area of need. During the 21-22 school year, when Chronic Absenteeism was once again monitored after the COVID pandemic put a halt to monitoring Chronic Absenteeism, the rate was 41.5%. In 22-23, the rate fell to 21.6% and fell again to 13.2% in 23-24, and once again fell in 24-25 to 11.9%, which is a great improvement, however, it still lags behind the 7.9% rate of 18-19 school year prior to COVID. The districts 24-25 chronic absenteeism rate of 11.9% is lower than both the County (15.6%) and the state of California overall rate of 19.5% for 24-25.

In order to maintain and build upon the district's previous successes in reducing suspension rates and reducing Chronic Absenteeism rate, students in Hanford Elementary are provided with an array of support services designed to reduce the barriers that can lead to absenteeism and discipline incidents or that otherwise stand in the way of learning. Schools are provided with nurses, counselors, and student specialists. To mitigate the impact of the COVID pandemic on students' social and emotional well-being, the district added additional school counselors in 2021-2022 and has continued through 25-26 and looks to continue to 26-27. Each elementary school now has a full-time counselor. Each junior high school has two full-time counselors. Learning directors at the elementary schools and vice principals at the junior high schools coordinate services to ensure that students who need services receive them. School resource officers provide an additional layer of safety.

Since the COVID pandemic, there has been significant rise in absenteeism when compared to pre-COVID times. Per CDE Data Quest HESD Chronic absenteeism for 2021-2022 rose to 41.0% compared to the County: 36.9% and the State: 30.8%, but has declined in 2024-2025 to 11.9% for all HESD students compared to the County 15.6% and the State: 19.5%. There is a need to continue re-establishing practices that had HESD Chronic Absenteeism rates lower during pre-COIVD times.

The following reflects the district's Greatest Challenges from the California School Dashboard:

2025 CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM INDICATOR (Red or Orange on the CA Dashboard)
African American Students (AA): Red at 21.4% (Increased 5.2%)
English Learners (EL): Orange at 10.4% (Maintained 0.3%)
Students with Disabilities (SWD): Orange at 22.6% (Declined 1.0%)
Foster Students: Red at 31.9% (Increased 8.5%)
Asian Students: Red at 13.0% (Increased 10.9%)
Filipino Students: Red at 8.2% (Increased 2.6%)

2025 SUSPENSION RATE INDICATOR (Red or Orange on the CA Dashboard)

Foster Students: Orange at 12.2% (Declined 3.4%)
White Students: Orange at 4.5% (Maintained -0.2%)

CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM INDICATOR
Even though our Overall group landed in the Yellow category on the 2025 California School Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Indicator, the rates are still above pre-COVID rates. In addition, six of the 13 student groups landed in the Orange or Red categories showing a need to be addressed. The district will take the following steps to address this need:

Implement an Assistant Superintendent of School Climate, Child Welfare, and Attendance. They will provide technical assistance to schools in the development of programs that improve school attendance and reduce chronic absenteeism, focusing on the attendance of high-needs student groups including Foster and Homeless students.

The Assistant Superintendent will monitor the implementation of school attendance-related actions at school sites; direct and deliver professional development to student support staff including Learning Directors, Counselors, Student Specialists, and Vice Principals; and monitor school attendance-related data across the district.

Provide each school with a learning director. Learning directors coordinate the services students receive including services and activities that support school attendance. Learning directors lead the development, implementation, and monitoring of attendance support activities at the school site.

Provide each junior high with two school counselors and provide the elementary schools with a counselor at each site. The school counselor provides counseling and guidance services that promote academic, career, personal, and social development as well as SEL (Social Emotional Learning) techniques. The school counselor serves as an advocate for high academic achievement and social development for all students through the provision of individual and schoolwide intervention strategies and counseling services. The school counselor provides personal and social counseling and interventions that promote positive interpersonal relationships and social skills including the importance of school attendance.

Provide each elementary school site with a student specialist and each junior high school with a vice principal. The primary purpose of the student specialist and vice principal is to provide students and their families with behavior and attendance support. Student specialists and vice principals work directly with students who have attendance challenges. Student specialists work with elementary students and their families. Vice principals work with junior high students and their families. The student specialist and vice principal function as personal advocates and as intermediaries in seeking to reduce or eliminate barriers to school attendance.

Maintain two social workers. The social workers provide direct services to students and their families and connects families with resources in the community that are intended to reduce the barriers that prevent students from attending school every day.

Analysis of the district’s Suspension Rate through Dataquest shows the following:
Overall (All Students) Suspension Rates:
2013 (CDE Dataquest) 6.3%
2014 (CDE Dataquest) 5.0%

2015 (CDE Dataquest) 5.1%
2016 (CDE Dataquest) 4.3%
2017 (CDE Dataquest) 3.4%
2018 (CDE Dataquest) 3.1%
2019 (CDE Dataquest) 2.8%
2020 (CDE Dataquest) 2.9%
2021 (CDE Dataquest) 0.5% (School closures and extended periods of distance learning affected student suspensions and suspension rates in 2020-2021.)
2022 (CDE Dataquest) 4.5%
2023 (CDE Dataquest) 5.6%
2024 (CDE Dataquest) 4.5%
2025 (CDE Dataquest) 2.9%

While the district has reduced its suspension rates by more than 50% from 2013, the reduction of student suspensions continues to be a priority for Hanford Elementary after seeing an increase following the COVID pandemic. The following steps will be taken to continue to reduce the numbers of students being suspended with a focus on student groups with high or increasing suspension rates:

Implement an Assistant Superintendent of School Climate, Child Welfare, and Attendance. They will provide technical assistance to schools in the development of programs that improve school climate, reduce discipline incidents, and increase attendance; monitor the implementation of school climate actions at school sites; direct and deliver professional development to student support staff including Learning Directors, Counselors, Student Specialists, and Vice Principals; monitor school climate-related data across the district. They will serve as the district's homeless and foster youth liaison.

Provide each school with a learning director. Learning directors coordinate the services students receive including behavior interventions for at-risk students. Learning directors lead the development, implementation, and monitoring of behavior support plans and behavior contracts at the school sites.

Provide each elementary school with a school counselor and provide the junior high schools with two counselors. The school counselor provides counseling and guidance services that promote academic, career, personal, and social development. The school counselor serves as an advocate for high academic achievement and social development for all students through the provision of individual and schoolwide intervention strategies and counseling services. The school counselor provides personal and social counseling and interventions that promote positive interpersonal relationships and social skills.

Provide each elementary school site with a student specialist and each junior high school with a vice principal. The primary purpose of the student specialist and vice principal is to provide students and their families with behavior and attendance support. Student specialists and vice principals work directly with students who have behavior challenges. Student specialists work with elementary students and their families. Vice principals work with junior high students and their families. The student specialist and vice principal function as personal advocates and as intermediaries in seeking prevention of discipline incidents and in seeking solutions to problems that get in the way of learning and personal growth.

Well Maintained Campuses (Goal 4)
Well-maintained school campuses are an important factor in student safety and engagement. The physical state of the school sites in Hanford Elementary continues to be an area of success. Despite the fact that some schools are more than fifty years old, all schools received a score of “Exemplary” on the Facilities Inspection Tool for 2025. This score indicates the highest level of repair, operational readiness, and attractiveness.

To maintain and build upon this success, deferred maintenance will continue to be a priority for HESD.

Parent involvement (Goal 5, SP 3)
Parents in Hanford Elementary have multiple opportunities to receive information on their child’s progress, participate in educational and social activities, and have their voices heard in decisions about the district’s programs and services for students. The district’s parent/teacher conference attendance rate is 100% (2025). On the district’s surveys, parents overwhelmingly agree that there are opportunities to become involved in school activities, that they receive information about their child’s progress, and that they have opportunities to provide input into the school’s programs.

To maintain and build upon this success, the district will continue to upgrade technology tools to facilitate outreach and communication with families, a parent outreach center will provide parents with resources and training that will help them support their children in school, educational partner groups will continue to provide input and recommendations on the district's programs and services. The district upgraded its online parent communication tools in 2021-2022, which has gotten positive praise from families. HESD is transitioning to a new SIS platform in 2026-2027 to better support both school and parent needs.

LEARNING RECOVERY AND EMERGENCY BLOCK GRANT
Hanford Elementary School District has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2026-2027 school year. LREBG funded actions can be found in Goal 4, Actions 1 and 2. LREBG funded actions will be implemented at all schools.

The Hanford Elementary School District’s needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2025 CA Dashboard related to Suspension rates and Chronic Absenteeism. A review of state and local data indicates a significantly high suspension rate for Foster students at 12.2% compared to All Students at 2.9%. In addition, for Chronic Absenteeism, Students with Disabilities (SWD), Foster, and Homeless student groups were at 22.6%, 31.9%, and 23.7% respectively, which is significantly higher when compared to All Students (12.8%). Based on this, Goal 4, Metric 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 along with Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 directly address the health and wellness needs in addition to the social and emotional needs that go well beyond what all students need. Counselors, Social Workers, SPED Teachers, Psychologists, and School nurses provide accessible counseling and crisis intervention to support students in building resilience, developing coping strategies, and managing the emotional toll of their circumstances. These actions align to the allowable uses of funds in the area of integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, such as provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupils needs (EC Section 32526(c)(2)(c). This is evidenced by:

- Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf)

- Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf)
- The Link Between School Attendance and Good Health (https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AAP_policy_statement_chronic_absence_2019_.pdf)

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

The student groups that qualified the district for Differentiated Assistance based on the state indicators on the 2023 Dashboard are:

Priority Area 4 (ELA & Math Academics)
* Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA and Math
  * ELA: Students with Disabilities: Red (104.1 points below standard – Declined 6.2 pts)
  * Mathematics: Students with Disabilities: Red (126.5 points below standard – Maintained +0.4 pts)

Priority Area 5 (Chronic Absenteeism)
* None

Priority Area 6 (Suspension Rate)
* Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red)
  * Students with Disabilities (SWD): Red (6.3% suspension rate – Maintained -0.1%)

2023-24: Hanford Elementary School District was identified for Differentiated Assistance based on the Student group: Students with Disabilities (SWD). SWD was identified in priority area 4 (Pupil Achievement for ELA and Math) in priority area 6 (School Climate - Suspension). HESD will work closely with the Kings County Office of Education over the course of the year to improve our Suspension Rate through a series of meetings scheduled over the year. There are multiple actions that will address this work specifically to decrease suspension rates and increase the academic support for SWD including social-emotional support to provide students and families with what they need to be successful. Looking at the broad educational goals, the arts and extra-curricular activities will continue to support engagement for SWD at all grade levels. This includes transportation support to ensure students can be involved and engaged. Measures have been taken to increase student and family engagement and increase school connectedness and safety for students and families in the identified student group.

In beginning the DA work with the County in 23-24, the DA committee created a Working Theory of Improvement that involved four key points:
* What will be improved?
  * We will improve math achievement for AA students
* How Much?
  * By 15.16% as measured by 2024 CAASPP scores (21-22: 13.42%, 22-23: 24.84%)
* By When?

* June 2024
* For Whom?
* African American students

After working through the data and AIM Statement was created:
* Increase overall CAASPP scores in Mathematics for AA students by 15.16% by June 2024.

The next question what how do we know our changes are or will be improvements?
* State Assessments: There are significant achievement gaps between AA students and all student as well as other student groups. Current reality in November of 2023 was that AA students scored 13.42% proficient on the 21-22 CAASPP Math assessment and 24.84% proficient on the 22-23 CAASPP Math assessment. The district and DA team will monitor student data by student group, know them by name (including strengths and needs), target and prioritize for interventions, follow-up at Instructional Cabinet meetings, Curriculum Committee, and TAG (Technology Advisory Group). Building a stronger home to school connection with AA parents by providing early education resources (Kinder Counts, First and Forward). Personally inviting AA parents to Math Facts Parent Academy for grades 3-4.

The student groups that qualified the district for Differentiated Assistance based on the state indicators on the 2024 Dashboard are:

Priority Area 4 (ELA & Math Academics)
* Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA and (Orange) in Math
* ELA: Students with Disabilities: Red (104.6 points below standard – Declined 0.5 pts)
* Mathematics: Students with Disabilities: Orange (117.4 points below standard – Increased 9.1 pts)
* Homeless student group (Red) in ELA and Math
* ELA: Homeless: Red (78.4 points below standard – Declined 31.6 pts)
* Mathematics: Homeless: Red (98.3 points below standard – Declined 21.3 pts)

Priority Area 5 (Chronic Absenteeism)
* Foster student group (Red): 23.5% Chronically Absent (Increased 5.9%)

Priority Area 6 (Suspension Rate)
* Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group: Red: (6.7% suspension rate – Increased 0.4%)
* Foster student group: Red: (15.7% suspension rate – Increased 7.4%)
* Homeless student group: Red: (8.9% suspension rate – Increased 1.1%)

2024-25: Hanford Elementary School District was identified for Differentiated Assistance based on the Student group: Students with Disabilities (SWD), Foster, and Homeless. SWD and Homeless were identified in priority area 4 (Pupil Achievement for ELA and Math) and in priority area 6 (School Climate - Suspension), while Foster were identified in priority area 5 (School Climate – Chronic Absenteeism) and in priority area 6 (School Climate – Suspension). HESD will work closely with the Kings County Office of Education over the course of the year to improve these areas through a series of meetings scheduled over the year. There are multiple actions that will address this work specifically to decrease suspension & chronic absenteeism and increase academic support for SWD, Foster, and Homeless students including social-emotional support to provide students and families with what they need to be successful. Looking at the broad educational goals, the arts and extra-curricular activities will continue to support engagement for SWD, Foster, and Homeless students at all grade levels.

This includes transportation support to ensure students can be involved and engaged. Measures have been taken to increase student and family engagement and increase school connectedness and safety for students and families in the identified student group.

In January 2024, after the CA Dashboard was publicized and updated Differentiated Assistance criteria was known, Hanford Elementary School District qualified for the student group Students with Disabilities (SWD), scoring Red on the CA Dashboard in ELA and Math (Priority 4) and also in Suspension Rate (Priority 6). Starting January 2024 the DA team focused on SWD.

DA Meeting #1
* Evidence for Improvement (EFI) Model
* District Investigation of Data looking at CA Dashboard data, creating an investigation question, looking at root causes, and creating change ideas.
* Aim Statement and Change Ideas information

DA Meeting #2
* Analysis of District Data
* Worked through the process of creating an Aim Statement and Change Ideas
 * What will be improved?
 * Suspension rates will decline from Aug – Nov compared to previous year
 * How Much?
 * Down to 15% (239 students)
 * By When?
 * December 2024
 * For Whom?
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD)
 * Indicators?
 * Local Suspension Rate Data

DA Meeting #3
* Analysis of District Data
* Worked through the process of creating an Aim Statement and Change Ideas
 * What will be improved?
 * Benchmark
* Admin planning to set achievement goals (by student group and students)
* Speech language being the focus
* Bring back Speech and Language data in comparison to all SPED
 * How Much?
 * Data Points
* SLI, Speech, IEP yes, IEP no (common definitions)
* Grade cohorts (ex. Grade 3 to grade 4)
* 5% by cohort

* By When?
* December 2024 (October Assessment)
* For Whom?
* Students with Disabilities (SWD)
* Indicators?
* Local Math data

DA Meeting #4
* Update the Analysis of District Data, local and Dashboard data
* Worked through the process and updated the Aim Statement and Change Ideas
* What will be improved?
* Dashboard & Local data will be improved
* Suspension rates will decline
* How Much?
* 6.3% maintained – we are 5.39% at this point in the year
* Goals will be set up during the next year
* By When?
* June 2025
* For Whom?
* Students with Disabilities (SWD)
* Indicators?
* Dashboard: Academics and Suspension Rates
* Local Data for Progress Monitoring: Synergy (Suspension Rates)
* Local Assessments (Academics)
* Aim Statement?
* Possible Aim Statement: Suspension rates through Synergy will be improve by _____. Academic performance as measured by local assessment data by _____ (how much). (Aim Statement will be set at the next meeting)
* Change Idea?
* Student support team implementation
* Expectations
* Meeting Times
* Work
* Suspension
* Evaluation of approval and systems (tier….steps)
* Deep dives with team members

During the April 2024 meeting an Aim Statement was established:

- Math: We will increase our Benchmark 1 scores by 5% for students with Disabilities in the fall semester
- ELA: We will increase our Benchmark 1 scores by 5% for students with Disabilities in the fall semester
- Suspensions: We will decrease our suspension rates by 15% (Goal of 239) in the fall semester.

Some of the big ideas to consider were:

- Admin planning to set achievement goals by student group and students.
- Speech and language students may be the focus.
- We will bring back Speech and language data in comparison to all SWD.
- We will bring back baseline data to compare with Fall 2024 data.

The next steps set during the meeting with KCOE were:

- Begin discussions around the supports, strategies, and focused student groups that would be included in your change idea for students with disabilities.
- Begin thinking about qualitative metrics that would provide more information on the effectiveness of the potential change idea.

During the 2024-2025 school year, the process of the DA work continued with the county office.

AIM STATEMENT
* We will decrease our suspension days by 15% (goal of decreasing from 525 to 446) in January 2025.
HEART AIM STATEMENTS (which will lead to……..)
* Create a sense of belonging to help meet expectations
* Focus on improving student conduct while keeping students present and learning
* Decrease in Aggressive student's behavior
* Finding other ways to support students through difficult situations so they are still provided with the opportunity to learn
* Students are at school so there’s no interruption in learning
* More students in class contributing and learning
* To increase the amount of time students are in class, less time out of class not learning, not belonging to the class community
* Students receive adequate supports therefore reducing/preventing suspension
* Less suspensions equals better climate and culture for all
PRIMARY DRIVERS (this will impact…….)
* Organizational Awareness
* Capacity and Support
* Procedural Safeguards
CHANGE IDEAS (If I do…….)
* Data analysis PD
* Site based data chats and staff meetings
* Communicate awareness and urgency
* SPED specific PD for teachers (coaching)
* Coaching for SDC teachers
* Special Ed Aide training
* Call SPED Director for consultation
* BIP, SST, 504 in student information system

Data Driven Dialogue
* Prediction: By establishing protocols for suspension incidents, administrators can explore alternative methods and interventions for

addressing student behavior.
* Local Data Observations: When suspension incidents occur, site administrators foster autonomy by applying consistent disciplinary actions based on previous or similar cases.
* Growth: Consider developing post-intervention guidelines that outline the process following a student's suspension and what the reintegration into the classroom looks like.
* Inferences: Suspensions can serve as a reset, offering the team an opportunity to regroup and create new strategies and supports for the student.
* Future Actions: Continue providing training, support, and coaching for special education teachers and support staff to ensure ongoing development.

This will be an ongoing process, determined by the state's Differentiated Assistance qualifications.

At the end of 2024-2025, HESD met the DA Goal of reducing suspension days by 15%. HESD reduced suspension days by 49%, from 1006 days in 2023-2024, down to 582 days for 2024-2025 for all students.

Based on our local data, suspension rates for:

- All students suspension rate declined from 4.46% in 23-24 down to 3.05% in 24-25.
- SWD suspension rate declined from 8.05% in 23-24 down to 6.27% in 24-25
- Homeless suspension rates declined from 7.20% in 23-24 down to 5.13% in 24-25
- Foster suspension rates declined from 14.81% in 23-24 down to 10.53% in 24-25

2025-26: Hanford Elementary School District was identified for Differentiated Assistance based on the Student group: Foster Youth. Foster Youth were identified in priority area 4 (Pupil Achievement for Math) and in priority area 5 (Pupil Engagement – Chronic Absenteeism). HESD will work closely with the Kings County Office of Education over the course of the year to improve these areas through a series of meetings scheduled over the year. There are multiple actions that will address this work specifically to decrease chronic absenteeism and increase academic support for Foster students including social-emotional support to provide students and families with what they need to be successful. Looking at the broad educational goals, the arts and extra-curricular activities will continue to support engagement for Foster students at all grade levels. This includes transportation support to ensure students can be involved and engaged. Measures have been taken to increase student and family engagement and increase school connectedness and safety for students and families in the identified student group.

In November 2025, after the CA Dashboard was publicized and updated Differentiated Assistance criteria was known, Hanford Elementary School District qualified for the student group Foster Student student group, scoring Red on the CA Dashboard in Math (and Orange in ELA) (Priority 4) and also in Red Chronic Absenteeism Rate (Priority 5). Starting December 2025, the DA team focused on Foster Youth.

DA Meeting #1 (9/2/25)
* Updated Driver Diagram with the AIM statement of "We will decrease our suspension days by 15% (Goal of decreasing from 525 to 446) in June of 2025.
* Through the Driver Diagram

* HESD primary drivers are:
* Organization Awareness
* Capacity and Support
* Procedural Safeguards
* HESD change ideas are:
* Data Analysis PD
* Site Based Data Chas and Staff Meetings
* Communicate Awareness/Urgency
* SPED specific PD for Teachers (Coaching)
* Coaching for SDC Teachers
* Special Ed Aide Training
* Student re-integration and Intervention
* Call Cruz for consultation
* BIP, SST, 504 in student information system
* Strategic Roadmap (Focus on Priority 6 – Conditions and School Climate)
* Problem Statement: Suspension for SWD increased from the previous year (2022 to 2023 Dashboard) and increased for SWD, Homeless, and Foster students (2023 to 2024 Dashboard).
* Metric: Fall 2024 Dashboard-Suspensions
* SWD-Red Status: 6.7%
* Homeless-Red Status: 8.9%
* Forster-Red Status: 15.7%
*Aim Statement: We will decrease our suspension days by 15% (Goal of decreasing from 525 to 446 in June 2025
* Strategic Priority
* Chosen Driver: Capacity and Support
* Identified Change Ideas
* SPED Specific PD for Teachers
* Coaching for SDC teachers
* Special Ed aide training
* Student Re-Integration and Intervention
* Tasks:
* MTSS Rollout 25-26
* Continue with SPED suspension process
* Secured Angela Beyer for August 7th PD for Teachers and Admin

DA Meeting #2 (12/10/2025)
* Analysis of new Dashboard data which showed HESD qualified for DA for 25-26 for only one student group, Foster Students in Priority 4 (Math Red and ELA Orange) and Priority 5 (Chronic Absenteeism Red). Based on this new information, the Strategic Roadmap was updated.
* Strategic Roadmap - MATH (Focus on Priority 4 – Student Achievement)
* Problem Statement: In Math, SWD, Students Experiencing Homelessness and Foster Youth are performing below grade level standards (DFS). (2025 Dashboard)

* Metric: Fall 2025 Dashboard-English Language Arts
* SWD- RED Status: -115.4 DFS
* Homeless- YELLOW Status: -67.7 DFS
* Foster Youth- RED Status: -111.5 DFS
*Aim Statement: By June 2026, we will decrease the DFS gap in Math by 3 points (-67.7 to -64.7) for Students Experiencing Homelessness, by 3 points (-111.5 to -108.5) for Foster Youth, and by 3 points (-115.4 to -112.4) for Students with Disabilities.
* Strategic Priority
* Chosen Driver: HESD Targeted Assistance
* Identified Change Ideas
* Coaching Cycles (Standards-Based Driven)
* Tasks for District Leadership:
* District Assessment Edits
* Instructional Cabinet Data Digs
* Parent resources to support students at home. (Resources online by grade and specific area)
* Coaching Cycles
* Analytical data Lessons
* Tasks for Site Leadership:
* Identified schools 5th & 6th Grade - 2 cycles in math
* 3rd-6th Grade teachers attend 2 data meetings
* Ongoing Monitoring
* Continuous Data Monitoring
* Regularly monitoring how students entered and how they are performing on local assessments
* Principals sharing data and clearly defining expectations and strategies
* Tasks for Frontline:
* Parent academies K-1
* Guided data dig
* Resources
* Engage in reteach and reassess for identified standards and students
* Teachers get:
* Lesson/ Unit planning
* Resources/ Units
* In class modeling
* Feedback
* Coaching
* PAC
* DELAC
* Strategic Roadmap – English Language Arts (Focus on Priority 4 – Student Achievement)
* Problem Statement: In ELA, SWD, Students Experiencing Homelessness and Foster Youth are performing below grade level standards (DFS). (2025 Dashboard)
* Metric: Fall 2025 Dashboard-English Language Arts

* SWD- ORANGE Status: -87 DFS
* Homeless- YELLOW Status: -39.7 DFS
* Foster Youth- ORANGE Status: -69 DFS
*Aim Statement: By June 2026, we will decrease the DFS gap in ELA by 3 points (-39.7 to -36.7) for Students Experiencing Homelessness, by 3 points (-69 to -66) for Foster Youth, and by 3 points (-87 to -84) for Students with Disabilities.
* Strategic Priority
* Chosen Driver: HESD Targeted Assistance
* Identified Change Ideas
* Coaching Cycles (Standards-Based Driven)
* Tasks for District Leadership:
* Instructional Cabinet Data Digs
* PD and district focus on guided reading (Bonnie & Heather)
* Targeted Assistance Coaching
* Modified Assessments
* Coaching Cycles
* Analytical data Lessons
* Tasks for Site Leadership:
* Identified schools 5th & 6th Grade - 2 cycles in ELA
* 3rd-6th Grade teachers attend 2 data meetings
* Ongoing Monitoring
* Continuous Data Monitoring
* Regularly monitoring how students entered and how they are performing on local assessments
* Principals sharing data and clearly defining expectations and strategies
* Tasks for Frontline:
* Buy-In for Targeted Assistance-seeing progress
* Guided data dig
* Resources
* Engaged in reteach and reassess for identified standards and students
* Teachers get:
* Lesson/ Unit planning
* Resources/ Units
* In class modeling
* Feedback
* Coaching
* PAC
* DELAC
Strategy Roadmaps- English Language Arts and Mathematics
* Data-Driven Instruction & Monitoring
* Ongoing and continuous monitoring of student entry data and performance on local assessments, including guided data digs and regular data meetings.

* Principals and district teams analyze and share data to define expectations, identify standards for reteach, and monitor progress for targeted assistance.
* Targeted Coaching & Instructional Support
* Coaching cycles in Mathematics and English Language Arts (focused on specific grade levels), including in-class modeling, feedback, lesson/unit planning, and guided reading Professional Development.
* Teachers receive resources, assessments to meet students' needs, analytical lessons, and support to reteach and reassess identified standards and students.
* Family Engagement & Stakeholder Support
* Parent academies and grade-level, content-specific online resources provide families with information and tools to support student learning at home.
* Collaboration and communication with PAC (Parent Advisory Council) and DELAC (District English Learner Advisory Committee) to strengthen community partnerships, share progress, and align district priorities.

Next Steps:
* Review the meeting newsletter, resources/handouts, and share any feedback or updates as needed.
* Review the Strategy Roadmaps for ELA and Math with your educational partners.
* Communicate your Updated Aim Statements with your educational partners:
 * We will decrease the Distance From Standard (DFS) gap in English Language Arts by 3 points for Students Experiencing Homelessness from -39.7 to -36.7, by 3 points for Foster Youth from -69 to -66, and by 3 points for Students With Disabilities from -87 to -84.
 * We will decrease the Distance from Standard (DFS) gap in Mathematics by 3 points for Students Experiencing Homelessness from -67.7 to -64.7, by 3 points for Foster Youth from -111.5 to -108.5, by 3 points for Students With Disabilities from -115.4 to -112.4.
 * We will decrease the Suspension Days Count by 2% from 582 to 570 days.

DA Meeting #3 (4/28/2026)
* We discussed the action plan and continued our work with the strategy roadmap for ELA and Math that we created at our DA Meeting in December. An analysis from the team was done comparing our last few recent assessments and looking at Foster, Homeless, and SWD scores compared to All Students. The HESD went over the Coaching Cycles that are taking place with our TA (Technical Assistant) schools. We then revisited our ELA and Math Roadmaps created in our last meeting and analyzed the information for any changes. No changes to the roadmap were made.

Next the team reviewed the LCAP Alignment Matrix and how our AIM Statements were aligned to specific LCAP Goals, Actions, and practices. It was determined that:
* Goal 1, along with Actions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 all contribute to SWD, Foster, and Homeless students receiving a broad educational experience that they probably would not have had otherwise, helping to connect their school learning to real experiences outside of school.

* Goal 2, along with Actions 2.3 and 2.4, all contribute to SWD, Foster, Homeless students being provided with specialized educational components that are specifically designed to provide increased support for struggling students.
* Goal 3, along with Actions 3.1 and 3.2, all contribute to SWD, Foster, and Homeless students receiving stronger instructional support from teachers who receive specialized professional development targeting data analysis and next steps. Teachers' weekly collaborations allow teachers and admin to take a deep dive into student work and plan instruction according to students' needs.

Lastly, the team reviewed the LCAP Reflection: Technical Assistance section along with CDE requirements and LCAP directions to ensure compliance. After a thorough investigation, it was determined that this section reflected all technical assistance the district is receiving from the county involving the Differentiated Assistance process.

Next Steps to continue:

- Review the meeting newsletter, resources/handouts, and share any feedback or updates as needed.
- Review the Strategy Roadmaps for ELA and Math.
- Communicate your Updated Aim Statements with your educational partners:

o We will decrease the Distance From Standard (DFS) gap in English Language Arts by 3 points for Students Experiencing Homelessness from -39.7 to -36.7, by 3 points for Foster Youth from -69 to -66, and by 3 points for Students With Disabilities from -87 to -84.
o We will decrease the Distance from Standard (DFS) gap in Mathematics by 3 points for Students Experiencing Homelessness from -67.7 to -64.7, by 3 points for Foster Youth from -111.5 to -108.5, by 3 points for Students With Disabilities from -115.4 to -112.4.
o We will decrease the Suspension Days Count by 2% from 582 to 570 days.

This will be an ongoing process, determined by the state's Differentiated Assistance qualifications.
In 2026-2027, at our next Analytical Partnership Meeting, we plan to:

- Review Progress and Outcomes on 2025 AIM Statements
- Continue our work with the Strategy Roadmap for ELA and Math
- Review Action Plan
- Review 2026 CA Dashboard Results and Heat Maps
- Review DA Eligiblity Chart
- Create updated 2026 Aim Statements

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.

N/A

Support for Identified Schools

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

N/A

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

N/A

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
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 supports 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. Below is a list of the Educational Partner groups consulted with who provided input into the development of the LCAP and budgets. PARENTS and COMMUNITY Members * Parent Advisory Committee (including parents or legal guardians of currently enrolled students with disabilities in the school district) * District English Learner Advisory Committee (including parents or legal guardians of currently enrolled students with disabilities in the school district) * School Site English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) / School Site Council (SSC) * HESD LCAP Parent Survey	PARENTS and COMMUNITY Members: PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE The district's Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) met regularly throughout the school year. Each school site council elected a parent for the district PAC. The PAC met six times during the school year (two training sessions and four regular meetings). The PAC is comprised of the Superintendent, the Director of Program Development, Assessment, & Accountability; the Director of Special Services; the District Parent Liaison, a parent member from each school site, and a student from each of the two Junior High Schools. The purpose of the PAC is to engage parents in the LCAP review and planning process, to elicit their input into the district's LCAP, including the Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG) and Equity Multiplier funding, and to provide them with the opportunity to voice priorities for their students. Information regarding the state priorities, the district's goals, the purposes of the supplemental and concentration funding, and programs and services for Unduplicated Pupils, were all presented to parents. The PAC reviewed information and data showing the district's performance in relation to the metrics that are part of each of the state's priorities. The PAC reviewed drafts of the LCAP throughout the school year providing input and advice as the plan was reviewed and developed, including the Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG) and the Equity Multiplier funds that Community Day School is receiving. Parent Advisory Committee met on:

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	• 10/28/2025 PAC Training Session #1 • 11/18/2025 PAC Training Session #2 • 12/9/2025 PAC Meeting #1 • 2/3/2026 PAC Meeting #2 • 3/17/2026 PAC Meeting #3 • 5/12/2026 PAC Meeting #4 PARENTS and COMMUNITY Members: DISTRICT ENGLISH LEARNER ADVISORY COMMITTEE The LCAP is a standing item on the District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) agenda. (Note that the DELAC is comprised of parents of students who are English learners; community members with an interest in the achievement of ELs and the programs and services they receive; and district-level leadership.) At each DELAC meeting, members receive information and provide recommendations on the development and implementation of the LCAP, including the Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG) and Equity Multiplier funding. The DELAC reviews the achievement and progress of EL students in detail, including the California School Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator, the Academic Indicators in English Language Arts and Math, and the Suspension Rate and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators. The DELAC receives information on the district's reclassification procedures and rates, along with other data including data relating to the metrics that are part of the state's priorities. Members receive information and provide recommendations on programs and services for English learners. DELAC members review EL student achievement and provide recommendations as to how the district's programs, including programs within the LCAP, can be improved to increase the achievement of ELs, including the use of the Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant (LREBG) and Equity Multiplier funds. The DELAC met on: • 10/30/25 Training Session #1 • 11/20/25 Training Session #2 • 12/12/25 Meeting #1 • 2/5/26 Meeting #2 • 3/26/26 Meeting #3 • 5/14/26 Meeting #4

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	PARENTS and COMMUNITY Members: SCHOOL SITE ENGLISH LEARNER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ELAC) AND SCHOOL SITE COUNCIL (SSC) Members receive information and provide recommendations on programs and services for English learners. (Note that the ELAC is comprised of parents of students who are English learners; community members with an interest in the achievement of ELs and the programs and services they receive; and school site staff.) At each ELAC meeting, members receive information and provide recommendations on the development and implementation of EL programs and services as well as SPSA, including the Equity Multiplier funds that Community Day School is receiving. The ELAC reviews the achievement and progress of EL students in detail, including the California School Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator, the Academic Indicators in English Language Arts and Math, and the Suspension Rate and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators. The ELAC receives information on the district's/school's reclassification procedures and rates. ELAC members review EL student achievement and provide recommendations as to how the district's/school's programs, can be improved to increase the achievement of ELs. Each school meets at least 4 times each school year. The Equity Multiplier funds that Community Day School (CDS) receives are discussed during the Martin Luther King Jr. English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and School Site Council (SSC). Parents, teachers, and community members have the opportunity to provide input on CDS SPSA and budgets, including the Equity Multiplier funding. PARENTS and COMMUNITY Members: HESD LCAP PARENT SURVEY The survey was distributed to families on February 2, 2026 and remained open for three weeks. The HESD LCAP Parent survey was delivered to all parents/guardians of students in the district. On the survey, parents have the opportunity to voice their opinion on topics related to the district's goals and the state's priorities.

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	PARENTS and COMMUNITY Members: COMMUNITY * Posted the LCAP for public comment prior to public hearing [May 2026] * Held a public hearing to solicit the recommendations and comments of members of the public regarding the specific actions and expenditures proposed to be included in the LCAP [May 2026] * Adopted the LCAP and Budget at the board meeting and reported local indicator data as a non-consent item [June 2026] * Posted the adopted LCAP prominently on our district web page [June 2026]
STUDENTS * LCAP Student Focus Group * HESD LCAP Student Survey	STUDENTS: HESD LCAP STUDENT FOCUS EVENT March 2026 Every year, Hanford Elementary School District conducts an all-day event (on a Wednesday minimum day) where student representatives in grades 5-8 from each school come together in one location to work through parts of the LCAP and to provide their input on different topics. These topics include: * After-School/Summer Programs * Art * Band * Extracurriculars * Health Services * Human Resources * Libraries * Physical Education * Social Workers/Counselors * Study Trips STUDENTS: HESD LCAP STUDENT SURVEY March 2026 The HESD LCAP Student survey was delivered in March 2026 to all students in grades 5-8. On the survey, students voice their opinions on programs and services for Unduplicated Pupils.

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
TEACHERS: * HESD LCAP Teacher Survey * Curriculum Committee * ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee) * SSC (School Site Council)	TEACHERS: HESD LCAP TEACHER SURVEY The HESD LCAP teacher survey was delivered to all teaching staff in March 2026, including itinerant teachers. On the survey, teachers voice their opinions on programs and services for Unduplicated Pupils. TEACHERS: CURRICULUM COMMITTEE The Curriculum Committee is comprised of one teacher representative from each school in the district (11 sites), one Special Education Teacher, a Co-chair teacher representing HETA (Hanford Elementary Teachers Association), Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development, ELA/Social Studies Curriculum Specialist, Math/Science Curriculum Specialist, Director of Categorical Programs, a Principal, a Elementary Learning Director, and a Junior High Learning Director. The Curriculum Committee provides a method by which district administrators and HETA representatives work together to improve instruction in the district. Following are some of the key elements of the Committee: * Advise the district in defining educational objectives * Advise the district in the design of curriculum * Advise the district in selecting state-adopted instructional materials * Advise the district in planning district assessments * Advise the district regarding district sponsored professional development The Curriculum Committee met on: • September 29, 2025 • October 27, 2025 • November 17, 2025 • January 26, 2026 • February 23, 2026 • March 23, 2026 • April 20, 2026 • May 18, 2026 TEACHER MEMBERS: SCHOOL SITE ENGLISH LEARNER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ELAC) AND SCHOOL SITE COUNCIL (SSC) Teacher members receive information and provide recommendations

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	on programs and services for unduplicated students including English learners. At each ELAC/SSC meeting, members receive information and provide recommendations on the development and implementation of programs and services as well as each schools SPSA, including the Equity Multiplier funds that Community Day School is receiving. The ELAC/SSC reviews the achievement and progress of students in detail, including the California School Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator, the Academic Indicators in English Language Arts and Math, and the Suspension Rate and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators. The ELAC/SSC receives information on the district's/school's reclassification procedures and rates. ELAC/SSC members review student achievement and provide recommendations as to how the district's/school's programs, can be improved to increase the achievement of students. Each school meets at least 4 times each school year. The Equity Multiplier funds that Community Day School (CDS) receives are discussed during the Martin Luther King Jr. English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and School Site Council (SSC). Teachers, parents, and community members have the opportunity to provide input on CDS school plan and budgets, including the Equity Multiplier funding. LCAP Goal 6 (Equity Multiplier Focus Goal) was developed in response to parents of DELAC and PAC, teachers, administration, and staff recommendations to have a counselor on campus (Action 6.1).
PRINCIPALS and ADMINISTRATORS * Instructional Cabinet INSTRUCTIONAL CABINET * Special Education Local Plan Area Administrator (SELPA) * ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee) * SSC (School Site Council)	PRINCIPALS and ADMINISTRATORS: INSTRUCTIONAL CABINET Instructional Cabinet was held on: 7/29/2025 (Management Team Meeting) 9/3/2025 (including site visits prior to Instructional Cabinet) 10/1/2025 (including site visits prior to Instructional Cabinet) 11/12/2025 (including data meeting prior to Instructional Cabinet) 12/3/2025 (including MTSS meeting) 2/4/2026 (including MTSS meeting) 3/4/2026 (including Budget meeting) 6/11/2025 (including MTSS meeting)

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	The district's Instructional Cabinet met throughout the school year. At these meetings, administrators including Principals, Learning Directors, district office managers, and Curriculum Specialists conducted analysis of student achievement and performance in absenteeism and suspension rates, using this analysis to assess the needs of students across the district, including the Equity Multiplier funds that Community Day School is receiving. The instructional cabinet provided administrators with the opportunity to give input into the LCAP, including programs and services for Unduplicated Pupils based on analysis of students' academic and social/emotional needs. LCAP Goal 6 (Equity Multiplier Focus Goal) was developed in response to parents of DELAC and PAC, teachers, administration, and staff recommendations to have a counselor on campus (Action 6.1). SELPA: SELPA Meeting March 20, 2026 Met with the SELPA administrator and the district Special education team to determine specific actions for students with disabilities (SWDs) are included in the LCAP. At this meeting, the group conducted an analysis to identify areas of challenges, root causes, and specific needs of student achievement, chronic absenteeism, and suspension rates for students with disabilities. Using this analysis to assess the needs of students with disabilities across the district, the SELPA made recommendations for programs and services in the district that support students with disabilities. Some of the areas discussed were collaboration time. HESD has a SPED & General Education cross collaboration scheduled on the district Collaboration calendar, where the two teams discuss academic and behavior strategies. Content Connectors were also discussed. HESD had a focus this year on Legal Foundations for SPED teachers and will shift to Instructional content focus for the next school year.
BARGAINING UNITS and OTHER PERSONNEL * Hanford Elementary Teachers Association (HETA) * California School Employee's Association (CSEA)	BARGAINING UNITS and OTHER PERSONNEL The LCAP is a regular agenda item at the district's meet-and-consult sessions with the certificated and classified collective bargaining units. These groups have provided input into the district's services

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	and programs and on how to prioritize these programs and services. Hanford Elementary Teachers Association (HETA) meet-and-consult is held on the first Monday of each month. California School Employees' Association (CSEA) meet and consult is held on the third Monday of each month. LCAP Goal 6 (Equity Multiplier Focus Goal) was developed in response to parents of DELAC and PAC, teachers, administration, and staff recommendations to have a counselor on campus (Action 6.1).
EQUITY MULTIPLIER FUNDS School Receiving Funds: Community Day School (CDS)	The Equity Multiplier funds that Community Day School (CDS) receives are discussed during the Martin Luther King Jr. English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and School Site Council (SSC). They are also discussed during the PAC and DELAC meetings to gather parent input (See above for PAC/DELAC). Teachers, parents, and community members have the opportunity to provide input on CDS school plan and budgets, including the Equity Multiplier funding. Members receive information and provide recommendations on programs and services. The SSC reviews the achievement and progress of students in detail, including the California School Dashboard, the Academic Indicators in English Language Arts and Math, and the Suspension Rate and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators. The members review student achievement and provide recommendations as to how the district's/school's programs, can be improved to increase the achievement of the students and student groups. The School Site Council for CDS met on: • October 6, 2025 • January 26, 2026 • March 2, 2026 • May 11, 2026

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

The Parent Advisory Committee and the District Instructional Cabinet recommend the Expected Outcomes below for all students and all student groups. The District English Learner Advisory recommends the Expected Outcomes below for the English Learner student group. The SELPA recommends the Expected Outcomes below for the Students with Disabilities Student group. These expected outcomes, based on educational partner input, will be the district’s Expected Outcomes for the achievement and performance on the California School Dashboard State Indicators (ELA, Math, Chronic Absenteeism, Suspension Rate).

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS: For Baseline & Expected Outcome see below in Goal 2 (Measuring and Reporting Results)

MATHEMATICS: For Baseline & Expected Outcome see below in Goal 2 (Measuring and Reporting Results)

CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM: For Baseline & Expected Outcome see below in Goal 4 (Measuring and Reporting Results)

SUSPENSION RATES: For Baseline & Expected Outcome see below in Goal 4 (Measuring and Reporting Results)

PARENTS, COMMUNITY: PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
Recommendations (State Indicators)
The Parent Advisory Committee provided specific recommendations for the district's Expected Outcomes for all students, and for each student student group, in each of the State Indicators (ELA, math, chronic absenteeism, suspension rates), including the Equity Multiplier funds that Community Day School is receiving. (See details in the next section below).

2025-2026 School Year Recommendations
12/9/2025 PAC Meeting #1

- The PAC recommends that the board approve BP6020 Parent Involvement
- The PAC recommends that the district continue to ensure that all students have the required instructional materials (See Action 2.3).
- The PAC recommends looking into a teaching pathway club for those students interested in becoming a teacher later in life.
- The PAC recommends looking at how to incorporate more after school programs at the junior high (See Action 1.6 & ELOP Funds).
- The PAC recommends having a Career Day, and College/Vocational Day at school sites.

2/3/2026 PAC Meeting #2

- Keeping action 2.1 – Eliminate Combination Classes/Reduce Class Sizes (See Action 2.1).
- Continue to focus on science curriculum and teaching strategies in the classroom.
- Look at creating electives/intro classes to various "tracks" such as a business track, medical track, Science track, etc., similar to what the high school has, to tie the Junior High to the High School.

3/17/2026 PAC Meeting #3

- The committee recommended looking into events at schools (and district wide) that help create connections among different families within the school and district.
- The committee recommended looking at the transportation needs of Homeless and Foster Youths, and utilizing Kart Bus, and seeing if there is a way HESD could have a van that goes around and pick up students in need that were not able to ride the bus.
- The committee recommended sharing with the schools their thoughts about school & family connectedness (See Action 5.2), which includes:
- Monthly awards and Trimester Awards where students can earn a trip through behavior and or attendance
- One day School site events such as Rally Fridays to excite students to come to school on Fridays, after school Carnival, after school cook off like a salsa competition.

- Month long activities, such as Olympics (like Woodrow does in October) or intramurals
- District wide event, like a carnival at one place for all families in the district
- The committee recommended using the same proposed suspension rate Expected Outcomes for 2024-2025 through 2026-2027 school years.

5/12/2026 PAC Meeting #4

- Approve the changes to the School Family Compact (School Site Councils will approve this during SSC meeting #1 next school year).
- The committee recommends that the HESD Board of Trustees approve the 2024-2025 to 2026-2027 (Year 2) Local Control Accountability Plan

PARENTS, COMMUNITY: DISTRICT ENGLISH LEARNER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DELAC)
The District English Learner Advisory Committee provided specific recommendations for the district's Expected Outcomes for English learners in each of the State Indicators (ELA, math, chronic absenteeism, suspension rates). (See details in the next section below).

2025-2026 School Year
12/12/25 DELAC Meeting #1

- DELAC recommends that the board approve BP6020 Parent Involvement
- DELAC recommends that the district continue to ensure that all students have the required instructional materials (See Action 2.3).
- DELAC recommends that the board approve continued use of Programs and Services for English Learners (See Action 2.5 & 2.6).
- DELAC recommends looking at incorporating more after school programs at the junior highs (ELOP Funds).
- DELAC recommends looking at having more Reading Challenges/Competitions throughout the school year (See Action 1.2).
- DELAC recommends having more incentives for academics and attendance throughout the school year (See Action 4.1).

2/5/25 DELAC Meeting #2

- Recommendations were given to encourage more parent participation (See Action 5.2):

o Parent meetings with school staff of students who are not progressing to support the home-school connection and learning.
o Monthly parent workshops to enhance social and ethical education for their children.
o Workshop regarding discipline and consequence to enhance academic learning.

- To hold a workshop for parents, especially for third graders, to help prepare their children for their first time taking the State Test.
- Facilitate a program for the Jr. High students such as vocational learning skills, mentoring, or apprentice, and/or work experience.

3/26/26 DELAC Meeting #3

- Parent Academies:

o Continue with Kinder Counts and First and Forward & Parenting Workshops (See Action 2.5).
o Look to expand training offered for second and third-grade parents, especially since third grade students take state assessments for the first time.

- Explore after-school reading opportunities for students, possibly in an interactive manner, especially for at-risk students (ELOP Funds).
- Offer parents and students classes on self-esteem, self-regulation, values, ethics and morals.
- Continue to offer tutoring for EL students (See Actions 2.6 & 2.6)
- Continue to support school sites to network and plan student incentive programs and activities including providing teachers/administrators with professional development that helps to increase student engagement and student academic discussions in the classroom (See Action 3.1 & 3.2).
- Provide CPR training for staff supervising lunch and yard duty personnel (See Action 4.2).

PARENTS and COMMUNITY Members: SCHOOL SITE ENGLISH LEARNER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ELAC) and School Site Council (SSC), including MLK & CDS (School Receiving Equity Multiplier Funds) SSC/ELAC
Members receive information and provide recommendations on programs and services for English learners. (Note that the ELAC is comprised of parents of students who are English learners; community members with an interest in the achievement of ELs and the programs and services they receive; and school site staff.) At each ELAC meeting, members receive information and provide recommendations on the development and implementation of EL programs and services as well as SPSA, including the Equity Multiplier funds that Community Day School is receiving. The ELAC reviews the achievement and progress of EL students in detail, including the California School Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator, the Academic Indicators in English language arts and math, the Suspension Rate and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators. The ELAC receives information on the district's/school's reclassification procedures and rates. ELAC members review EL student achievement and provide recommendations as to how the district's/school's programs, can be improved to increase the achievement of ELs. Each school meets at least 4 times each school year.

2025-2026 School Year - Synopsis of the feedback received from the School Site ELAC/SSC meetings, including MLK & CDS (School Receiving Equity Multiplier Funds) SSC/ELAC. Input is from both EO and EL parents.

A parent stated when she was in school, they would have a country that represented their class and learned about their country to compete against other classes. LD stated those ideas are tied to learning and would be just fine. She also talked about how we had Multicultural Day put on by the former counselor, and doing something similar would be a nice parent involvement activity.

Parent stated parents may need some tips to help them get their kids out the door. Our focus is on the student, but parents also need some support to help with attendance. A parent suggested giving parents an incentive that goes to both the student and the parent, like a gift card. LD stated that maybe a type of luncheon/activity similar to our student of the month celebration, but for attendance.

Parent commented about the organization of activities and volunteer opportunities; she suggested improved organization and stated parents are willing to donate and support the preparation process.

Parent commented on the new Jog-A-Thon encouragement posters and how she liked this idea. Principal said it was an idea shared by another site.

One parent shared she had two kids that attended another school and she enjoyed all the parent involvement nights so parents can get to know each other. Another parent shared her parents enjoy coming to school and hope parent nights continue. A teacher shared the parent activities have changed the culture of the school because we get to know the parents on a different level.

Parents all shared they loved the paint night and any activities where they can meet families from the school.

A parent shared that having parent events to teach parents about grade level math practices might be useful parent involvement event. A parent mentioned having videos to show parents how to teach math concepts would be useful. Fochetti noted that the district has how-to math videos for parents on the public website. Principal also shared that having the school counselor present on social emotional learning topics would be helpful for families.

Principal shared that she enjoyed the formal presentations during Back to School Night but missed a part of the presentation due to traveling from work to the school and checking her students out of READY. A parent suggested moving the start time to a later time to accommodate working families. Parent shared that she too feels like more parents would be available to come if the event started later.

Parents suggested for site admin to visit the Hanford Learning Center and/or First Five to recruit bilingual families for our dual-immersion program.

A parent asked about parent workshops and what they entail. LD explained about the topics and format of these workshops for parents. A parent said she really enjoyed our paint night we had before Winter Break. Teacher said she enjoyed activities for parents and students like paint night where families can come together and have fun with the teachers.

A parent asked, “What if students who are reclassified begin to struggle?” LD shared that we have an ongoing EL Monitoring log. We look at how the students are doing throughout the year with district assessments and determine if they are performing how they should and we celebrate them, or if they are not performing to expectations and we meet with the student, teacher, or parent.

A parent shared that her daughter was in the after school On Stage Club that is putting on the production of Aladdin. She shared that her daughter got one of the lead roles and is playing Aladdin and is enjoying it.

A parent shared she appreciates all the activities during the month of March because kids are excited and it increases motivation. Teacher shared that she likes the activities during the month of National Reading Month in March. She likes how students can participate in book walks on Wednesday’s recess to have a chance to win a brand-new book.

A parent’s child, suggested that for a reward day, students should earn a Snow Cone party instead of popcorn and a movie.

Teacher shared that as there is always room for improvement, perhaps we can offer classes to some of our students to learn how to control and regulate their emotional intelligence as a preventative measure before suspensions. A parent suggested a designated nap time for our young students so they can recharge and not be so triggered.

A parent asked about the school newsletter. LD shared all school information goes out on Parent Square but that we could look at putting

together a newsletter.

A parent suggested partnerships/visits to the Boys and Girls club and the relevancy of serving our students in their neighborhoods.

- LCAP Goal 6 (Equity Multiplier Focus Goal) was developed in response to parents of ELAC & SSC, teachers, students, and staff recommendation of having a counselor on campus (Action 6.1).

PARENTS and COMMUNITY Members: HESD LCAP PARENT SURVEY
Parents responded to a variety of questions related to their level of satisfaction with their students' education, parent communication and involvement, school safety, and instructional programs. Survey responses indicate that parents are overwhelmingly satisfied in all of these areas.

ACTION: PARENTS and COMMUNITY Members: DELAC & PAC

- The District will continue and expand, Parent Workshops (Parent Education Nights) including homework help that will look to include how-to links to videos and/or instructions that break down math steps and How-To's for current and upcoming skills including a monthly/quarterly math how-to guide for parents to help their child at home. (Action 1.1, 1.6, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 5.2)
- The district will continue to provide academic support for English learners (Action 2.5, 2.6).
- The district will continue to support teachers new to the profession with a New Teacher Induction Program (Action 3.3).
- The district will continue to provide social and emotional support for students (Action 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4).
- The district will look to continue to provide supports for students including nurses, counselors, social workers, student specialists, and vice principals (Action 4.2)
- The district will look into parent education and assistance for online parent communication platforms (Actions 5.1, 5.2).

- LCAP Goal 6 (Equity Multiplier Focus Goal) was developed in response to parents of DELAC and PAC, teachers, students, and staff recommendation to have a counselor on campus (Action 6.1).

STUDENTS: LCAP STUDENT FOCUS GROUP/ HESD LCAP STUDENT SURVEY
Students recommended that the district maintain the programs and services under each of the district's six LCAP goals at their current levels, with an emphasis on Art, Music, Physical Education, study trips, and other enrichment activities. The students recommend expanding these activities as funding permits. The students also recommend maintaining services and programs that support physical and social/emotional

well-being. The LCAP Student Focus Group provided the following specific recommendations all captured on poster board and summarized below:

2025-2026 School Year (March 11, 2026)
During the Student LCAP event, the theme was Student Voice, where students provided input to each facilitator who captured the students input on poster board. Below is a summary of what was captured on the poster board for each topic:

Art Program: (Action 1.5)
The 'More Of' section reveals several broad themes in student preferences:

- 3D & Tactile/Hands-On Work: The single most requested category. Students strongly want to work in three dimensions — clay, pottery, sculpture, play dough, 3D projects, origami. This reflects a desire for hands-on, tactile, sensory learning beyond flat paper.
- Student Agency & Choice: 'Student choice,' 'free draw,' and 'free choice' appear with checkmarks, revealing that students want more autonomy in what they create.
- More Instructional Time: Students explicitly want art more frequently and for longer sessions. The increase from 1x to 2x/month is appreciated but may not yet feel sufficient.
- Expanded Materials: Students want exposure to a wider range of materials — oil pastels, paint pens, chalk, collage materials — suggesting the current palette feels limited.
- Community & Social Art: Gallery walks, art nights, murals, and graffiti art suggest students want art to extend beyond the classroom into shared, public, or community experiences.
- Technique & Art Education: Color theory, shading, and studying famous artists show that students also value structured skill-building alongside creative freedom.
- Cultural & Specialty Art: Masks, mixed media, abstract, historical art — students want exposure to diverse art traditions and styles.
- 1 Teacher Per Campus: A notable logistical request — students value a consistent, dedicated art teacher at each school site.

The 'New Ideas' quadrant is the longest section, revealing students' creative and forward-thinking vision for the program. Items fall into several categories:

- Digital Art — strong support for integrating technology into the curriculum
- 3-D pens — a hands-on tech tool bridging physical and digital creation
- 3D printers — desire for cutting-edge fabrication technology
- Animation — interest in motion and time-based art
- Clothing design / shoes — fashion design as a creative outlet
- Wood carving — traditional craft skill
- Toothpicks / engineering — STEAM cross-disciplinary art
- Recycled art — sustainability-focused creativity
- Paper mache — classic sculptural medium
- Stained glass — specialty craft art
- Art gallery at school — students want to see their work displayed professionally
- Outside lessons — very strong support for learning outdoors
- Field trips for art — visits to galleries, museums, or art spaces
- Art contests (Beg/Int levels) — structured competition as motivation

- Partner projects — collaborative, social art-making
- Canvas art — painting on professional-grade surfaces rather than paper
- Tie dye — popular, colorful, hands-on textile art
- Sketch books — personal, ongoing creative journals
- Sponge art — experimental technique
- Shrinky dinks / stickers / modeling clay — tactile, fun, craft-focused
- Art classroom (dedicated space) — suggests students may not currently have a dedicated art room
- Art contests for beginners and intermediate levels — desire for inclusive competition

The breadth of 'New Ideas' shows students have thought deeply about what a richer, more varied art program could look like, ranging from technology integration to community engagement to dedicated physical space.

The 'Less Of' section is notably focused on materials and structural complaints rather than specific activities:

- Traditional/basic mediums: Crayon, color pencil, and watercolor are listed as 'less of,' which may suggest these are overused or feel too elementary for students. This does NOT necessarily mean students dislike these mediums — rather, they may want more variety alongside them.
- Direct draw: Students want less teacher-directed, prescriptive drawing assignments, reinforcing the strong desire for choice and creative freedom seen in the 'More Of' section.
- Poor quality/broken materials: 'Broken oil pastels' and 'broken materials' appear as specific complaints. This points to a resource/supply issue — students notice and are frustrated by worn or insufficient materials.
- Shared materials: Students explicitly request individual materials rather than shared class sets. This may relate to hygiene, availability, or fairness concerns.
- Art on paper: The desire for less 'art on paper' directly mirrors the desire for more 3D, tactile, and canvas-based work seen in the 'More Of' section.

Key Insight: The 'Less Of' section is not a rejection of art fundamentals, but a call for better resources, more variety, and greater student ownership of the creative process.

School Counselors and Social Workers: (Action 4.1, 4.2)

The 'More Of' section captures student and Educational Partner requests for increased frequency, visibility, and variety in services already offered. These are not new ideas but amplifications of what already exists.

- More individual sessions — students want more 1:1 face time with counselors
- Meet with ALL new students — proactive outreach to ensure no student falls through the cracks
- More follow-up meetings — continuity of care after an initial session
- Attentive / time — students want counselors to be present and unhurried
- Peer mediations — structured conflict resolution between students
- Train peer counselors — students supporting students
- Assembly with support staff — so students know who their counselors are and what they do
- Class introductions — bringing counselors into classrooms to build familiarity and trust
- Class presentations (trimester) — structured curriculum-based mental health content
- Games — using play and interactive methods to teach social-emotional skills

- Read-alouds about emotions — literacy-integrated social-emotional learning
- Boundaries — explicit instruction on healthy personal and relational boundaries

The 'More Of' responses indicate that students appreciate what they have but feel access is limited — whether by time, visibility, or frequency. The desire for assemblies and class introductions suggests that many students may not know who their counselor is or what services are available. This represents a significant opportunity for proactive communication and visibility campaigns.

The 'New Ideas' section is the most generative portion of the poster. It captures original suggestions from students and educational partners for programs, tools, and spaces that do not currently exist or are underdeveloped. This section represents a powerful look at unmet student need.

- Walk-ins — on-demand access without appointments
- Mailbox for self-referral — low-barrier anonymous method for students to request help
- After school counseling — expanding availability beyond school hours
- Less wait times to see the counselor — reducing barriers to timely support
- Better locations — making counseling spaces more accessible and visible
- Available during breaks — extending windows of access throughout the school day
- Email communication — digital outreach as an access pathway
- Art therapy — creative modalities for emotional expression
- Stress management — targeted instruction in stress reduction techniques
- Breathing exercises — somatic and mindfulness-based coping tools
- More coping skills — broad request for evidence-based personal regulation strategies
- More groups so more students can participate — scaling peer support
- Monthly activities — regular, predictable touchpoints for all students
- Q & A to learn more — student-led inquiry into mental health topics
- Therapists at school — clinical-level support on campus
- PREVENTION – talk about mental health — proactive, universal mental health literacy
- Teach about crisis — preparing students to recognize and respond to mental health crises
- Share information that helps students — distribution of psychoeducational materials
- Vent box — an anonymous outlet for students to express frustrations or concerns
- Quiet rooms — designated spaces for emotional regulation and de-escalation
- Wellness Room — a dedicated room for student mental health and self-care
- Provide tools and fidgets — sensory tools for regulation and focus
- Help with bullying more — expanded anti-bullying intervention and prevention

Staffing: (Action 3,1, 3.3)
The qualities a teacher should have can be grouped into five thematic clusters:
A. Interpersonal & Relational Skills

- Interact with children | Patience
- Being a role model | Kindness | Fairness
- Trustworthy, warm smile

- Good listener
- Comforting, helpful, passionate
- Compassion

Students clearly prioritize emotional intelligence and relational warmth above nearly everything else. The repeated emphasis on patience, kindness, fairness, and compassion signals that students value feeling seen and respected.

B. Professional Competency

- Knowledgeable | Having degree credential
- More teaching skills
- Able to provide weekly recaps

Students value professional credentials and teaching ability, but these appear lower on the list, suggesting they are seen as baseline expectations rather than differentiating qualities.

C. Safety & Awareness

- Safety skills | Understanding
- First aid skills
- Be alert, aware, know the rules

Students have a notable concern for physical safety and rule awareness, reflected in multiple entries. This may indicate past experiences with unsafe situations or a general desire for greater vigilance from staff.

D. Adaptability & Inclusion

- Adapt to different learning styles
- Softer tone

The inclusion of 'adapt to different learning styles' shows remarkable awareness of learning diversity. 'Softer tone' reflects a desire for communication that feels respectful, not harsh or authoritative.

E. Communication & Accountability

- Able to provide weekly recaps

This highly specific request shows students want structure, transparency, and consistent communication from staff about what is happening in their learning environment.

Libraries: (Action 1.2)

The ‘More Of’ section of the poster reflects high community investment in improving library services:

- Incentivized reading contests and engaging library activities — reinforce the desire for fun, motivating programming.
- Updated and current collections — multiple items call for newer books, updated non-fiction (with a specific note about sports), current book series, more YA options at the elementary level, graphic novels, and expanded level collections.
- Consistent library helpers and seasonal/themed decor — suggest interest in a well-staffed, welcoming, visually dynamic space.
- Book fairs at every school — indicates a perceived inequity in access to book purchasing opportunities across campus sites.
- Reading competitions and book hospital helpers — collaborative, student-led programming ideas.
- Lofi music — a modern, ambient atmosphere element that supports focused reading.

Takeaway: Collection currency and breadth is the dominant concern. Programming variety and atmosphere are secondary but closely related priorities.

The ‘New Ideas’ section reflects creative, forward-thinking proposals that could significantly enhance the library experience:

- Seating options and upper-grade differentiated seating — flexible seating is a high-priority, low-cost transformation.
- Chapter book read alouds for upper grades — builds community around shared reading experiences for older students.
- Student book recommendations — elevates student voice and peer influence in reading choices.
- Reading coaching/tutoring — transforms the library into a learning support hub.
- Book making workshops and drawing contests based on fictional characters — connects literacy with creativity and hands-on making.
- Recess/lunch study center — expands library access beyond scheduled class visits.
- Longer check-out periods — reduces logistical pressure and trusts students with materials.
- Book buddies — cross-grade mentorship through shared reading.
- Board games and book clubs — social, community-building activities that extend reading culture.
- Fun Fridays — a recurring, branded programming slot to generate anticipation and excitement.

Takeaway: There is rich appetite for a library that serves as a creative, social, and academic hub — far beyond a simple book-lending space.

The ‘Less Of’ section highlights friction areas that diminish the library experience:

- Missing materials — loss of library items creates barriers to access and frustration.
- Old/outdated books — directly reinforces the 'More Of' calls for updated collections.
- Loud library / lack of noise control — the current environment may not be conducive to focused reading or study.
- Pressures of reading programs — suggests that current AR or similar programs may feel coercive or stressful for some students.

Takeaway: The physical environment and the emotional climate of library programming need attention. Students and/or staff feel some current structures are counterproductive to genuine reading engagement.

Music Program: (Action 1.5)
The ‘More Of’ section indicates high student enthusiasm and specific desires for program expansion. Key themes include:

- Performance opportunities: Students want solo/duet performances at concerts, jazz band performances, and simply more performances overall. This suggests students are motivated to showcase their work publicly.
- Frequency: Students want band to meet every day instead of 2x per week — a strong signal of genuine interest and desire for deeper engagement.
- Variety: Requests for new instruments, storage, and a wider variety of music suggest students want a richer, more exploratory musical experience.
- Logistics: Repair kits for instruments shows practical thinking and student investment in program infrastructure.
- Elementary-specific additions: Longer class sessions (over 30 min) and more instrument options were noted specifically for elementary students, suggesting differentiated needs across grade levels.

Implication: Students are enthusiastic and want more time, more variety, more performance. These are hallmarks of a program students genuinely value.

The ‘New Ideas’ sections consisted of spanning logistics, programming, and community engagement:

- Uniforms for concerts (Elem.): Elementary students want a sense of identity and belonging through matching concert attire.

- Dedicated practice rooms: Students recognize the need for appropriate spaces — not the cafeteria — for serious practice. This reflects growing musical maturity.
- School visits: The idea to visit other schools to observe performances is an excellent peer-learning strategy that builds community and musical inspiration.
- After-school band: Students want band time beyond school hours, further confirming high motivation.
- 1-on-1 lessons: Time-scheduled individual instruction would support students who want personalized advancement.
- G4 in band: Suggests interest in integrating band into the G4 grade level, potentially expanding the program's reach.
- Singing/Choir: Interest in vocal music alongside instrumental — could signal a desire for a broader performing arts program.
- After-school club / instrument procession: A creative, community-building idea that blends performance with school culture events.

Implication: Students are thinking beyond the classroom. Many of these ideas require minimal resources but significant scheduling creativity.

The ‘Less Of’ section, there were four items noted:

- Instrument balance: The humorous note about 'More Tubas / Saxes' crossed out and replaced points to a real concern about too many loud or dominating instruments. Students want better balance across sections.
- Volume and disruption: The qualifier 'too loud, obnoxious' highlights that noise management is a real issue affecting the quality of the ensemble experience.
- Assessment anxiety: The note that 'Assessments are scary' is a significant finding. This suggests that formal evaluations may be creating stress rather than supporting growth, potentially affecting student confidence and enjoyment.

Implication: Leadership should review assessment formats to reduce anxiety. Consider low-stakes or formative alternatives. Additionally, ensemble balance should be addressed in instrument assignment processes.

Academic Study Trips: (Action 1.4)
Section Analysis: More Of
This is the most densely populated section of the poster, indicating strong community consensus around several key themes:
1. Frequency & Duration
   - Requests for more trips and longer trips appear multiple times
   - A desire for more frequent outings throughout the school year
   - More independent time for students during trips
2. Nature, Animals & Outdoor Experiences
   - Trips involving animals and beach trips are heavily requested
   - Zoo trips mentioned explicitly with frequency
   - Gold Country and outdoor/environmental themes echo through multiple entries
3. STEM & Educational Enrichment
   - Science-focused locations (Science-Plus Studios, museums in San Jose) are highlighted
   - Engineering & science destinations called out specifically
   - Aquarium and Fossil Museum point to natural science interest
4. History & Culture
   - History-based museums, Historical places, and Fossil Museum noted
   - Suggests a desire for curriculum-aligned cultural enrichment

5. Logistics & Comfort
- Charter buses with choice of seating is a notable practical request
- Better food / more food mentioned multiple times — student comfort matters
- Better movies on buses reflects attention to the travel experience itself

Poll students — a request for more student voice in trip planning

Section Analysis: New Ideas
The New Ideas section is expansive and diverse, reflecting creative and ambitious thinking. Ideas cluster into several categories:
Entertainment & Theme Parks
- Disney, Six Flags, Universal Studios — popular culture destinations with strong student appeal
- Water parks received multiple tally marks

Academic & Career Enrichment
- College visits — forward-looking, aspirational academic exposure
- Sci-Con (Science Convention / overnight trip)
- Carnegie — likely Carnegie Science Center or Carnegie Museum
- Art museums — cultural enrichment

Outdoor & Adventure
- Camping and nature trips — hands-on environmental learning
- Mountains
- Fishing & hiking
- Alcatraz — history meets adventure
- Experiences on boats

Cultural & Historical
- Missions — California history tie-in
- Cultural sites
- Santa Monica — coastal California experience

Logistics & Program Enhancements
- Class shirts for safety — practical and builds group identity
- Cameras to take pictures — student documentation and memory-making
- Alternative eating experiences — expanding beyond standard meal options
- Private tours — more personalized and educational experiences
- Cross grade level trips — building community across age groups
- Fair with intro brochures — better preparation and context
- Train trips — novel transportation experience

Cross-Cutting Themes & Recommendations
Based on the full poster, five major themes emerge:
1. Go Further, Go Bigger: The community strongly rejects local/familiar trips in favor of more distant, memorable destinations.
2. Increase Frequency: Both "More Of" and "New Ideas" suggest demand for more than one trip per year.
3. STEM + Nature is a Priority: Science centers, animals, outdoor environments, and hands-on activities appear repeatedly across sections.
4. Student Voice Matters: The request to "poll students" and the variety of student-centric ideas show that participants want more ownership

over trip planning.
5. Comfort & Experience Quality: From food to bus movies to class shirts, participants care about the full trip experience, not just the destination.

Section Analysis: Less Of
This section is smaller but meaningful. It identifies destinations the community wants to phase out or reduce:

- Burris Park — received the highest number of tally marks, indicating clear and repeated dissatisfaction
- "Fresno" trips — written in large red letters, signaling strong sentiment against trips to Fresno generally
- "Local places" — also tallied multiple times; community wants destinations that feel more special and further afield
- Storybook Garden — seen as too juvenile or repetitive

Key Insight: The community is clearly fatigued by close-to-home, familiar destinations. There is a strong desire for trips that feel like genuine adventures—further away, more novel, and more memorable.

Health Services: (Action 4.2)
5a. Staffing & Human Resources (High Priority)
Two of the ten items directly address staffing: 'More nursing staff' and 'Male nurses.' This dual request is significant:

- 'More nursing staff' points to a workload and capacity problem — students may experience long wait times or insufficient attention.
- 'Male nurses' signals a desire for gender-diverse representation, which can improve comfort and accessibility for all students, particularly male students who may be reluctant to seek health services.

5b. Physical Environment & Comfort
Three items focus on the physical health office space: warm lighting/decorations, a privacy curtain, and fidgets for busy times. Together, these suggest the current space may feel clinical, impersonal, or lacking in privacy. A warmer, more inviting environment can reduce student anxiety and increase health-seeking behavior.
5c. Supply & Resources
Requests for stocked medications (Tylenol, Ibuprofen), high-quality first aid products, hygiene classes/products, and more snack options reflect resource constraints. Stocking common OTC medications is a practical ask that could reduce the frequency of parent call-outs and keep students in school longer.
5d. Student Relationship & Time
'More time with students in the health office' is a qualitative, relationship-focused request. This suggests students value the nurse-student connection and feel current interactions are rushed. This has implications for student trust, early intervention, and mental health screening.

After School READY Program and Summer Program: (Action 1.6, 2.2)
MORE OF: What Educational Partners Want Expanded
With 21 distinct requests, this is the largest quadrant, signaling deep enthusiasm for program growth. Inputs can be grouped into five thematic clusters:
Theme A: Physical Activity & Sports

- Outdoor Games
- Recess / Breaks

- Sports Club (Volleyball, Soccer, Football, Basketball, Baseball)
- Karate
- Water / Field Days / Color Runs / Water Slides
- Dancing

Physical activity is the single largest theme in the "More Of" quadrant. Combined with the "Less Of" request to reduce indoor time, it is clear that educational partners want the program to prioritize movement, fresh air, and sport. Six of 21 items relate directly to physical activity.

Theme B: Special Events & Celebrations

- Parties / Cooking
- READY Olympics
- Glow Parties
- Carnivals
- Rallies / Events
- Trips to San Francisco

Community celebrations and special events rank as a second major interest area. These events build school culture, create memorable experiences, and give students something to look forward to. The specific mention of San Francisco trips suggests interest in field-trip style learning beyond the campus.

Theme C: Creative Arts

- Art - Tie Dye
- Drama
- Band / Concerts
- Dancing

Creative and performing arts appear both in the current offerings (OnStage Theater) and the "More Of" column, indicating that arts programming resonates strongly with the community and should be diversified.

Theme D: Academic Support

- Tutoring
- Science
- Blooket (educational gaming platform)

Some respondents want more structured academic support alongside the enrichment activities. The inclusion of Blooket reflects a desire to integrate technology and gamification into learning.

Theme E: Logistics & Operations

- Second Snack / Snack Time (repeated emphasis)
- Larger Capacity
- Advertising

Operational concerns appear here, most notably a request for larger program capacity. This implies demand exceeds current enrollment limits and is a significant operational finding. Advertising suggests some Educational Partners feel the program is not well-known enough in the broader community.

NEW IDEAS: Innovative Proposals from the Community
Twenty new ideas were submitted, demonstrating exceptional creative engagement from Educational Partners. These span a wide range of interests and can be grouped as follows:

STEM & Technical Skills
- Mechanics / Engineering
- Coding Clubs
- Woodshop
- Headset Mics (AV/tech operation)

STEM-related new ideas are notable and reflect broader educational trends. Coding clubs and engineering activities would align the program with 21st-century workforce preparation.

Fitness & Alternative Sports
- Pilates Club
- Horseback Riding
- Hikes / Water Activities
- Cheer Club
- Jiu-Jitsu Club
- Cross Club

An impressive variety of physical activity ideas extends beyond traditional sports. Pilates and Jiu-Jitsu suggest interest in mind-body disciplines. Horseback riding is an aspirational, high-cost idea but signals strong community ambition.

Arts & Crafts
- Gardening
- Crochet Club
- Gaming Club

Hands-on creative pursuits appear among new ideas. Gardening in particular connects to science education, nutrition, and environmental stewardship. Crochet/fiber arts are having a cultural resurgence and would be an accessible, low-cost offering.

Academic & Performing Arts
- Different Classes
- Afterschool Band
- Competitions
- Voting for Next OnStage
- Library Help

Educational Partners want more academic variety and student voice. Voting for OnStage productions is a low-cost, high-impact way to increase student ownership of the program. Afterschool Band would extend music education for students who may not have it during the school day.

Field Experiences

- Overnight Trips - Disney World, Camping, Amusement Park
- Separate Classrooms

Overnight trips represent significant resource and logistical investment but indicate Educational Partners envision ELOP as more than a daily after-school program. This could be explored as an annual highlight event rather than a routine offering.

LESS OF: Areas to Reduce or Eliminate

The "Less Of" quadrant has the fewest entries, which can be interpreted positively: educational partners are largely satisfied with the program and do not want to remove much. However, the three items raised are meaningful:

- Burris Park - A specific location that respondents want to visit less frequently
- Forced Activities - Students and families want more choice and agency in participation
- Indoor Time - Corroborates the strong desire for outdoor and physical programming

Analysis

The "Forced Activities" request is particularly important from a program design standpoint. Research in after-school programming consistently shows that student autonomy and choice improve engagement and retention. If students feel activities are mandatory rather than self-selected, participation quality suffers. Program leaders should examine whether the current club or activity structure allows meaningful opt-in choice.

The Burris Park concern may relate to safety, transportation time, limited amenities, or simple fatigue with the location. Gathering more specific feedback on this would be advisable before reducing visits entirely.

ACTION: STUDENTS: LCAP STUDENT FOCUS GROUP

Each of the posters with student input has been shared with the corresponding departments, including Nurses, Social Workers, Art Teachers, Music Teachers, Librarians, Human Recourses, and our READY/After-School coordinator. These have also been shared with District and School leaders to work through and make appropriate changes for the coming school year.

- LCAP Goal 6 (Equity Multiplier Focus Goal) was developed in response to parents, teachers, students, and staff recommendation to have a counselor on campus (Action 6.1).

PRINCIPALS, ADMINISTRATION: INSTRUCTIONAL CABINET/ HESD LCAP ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

The district’s administrators provided specific recommendations for the district’s Expected Outcomes for all students, and for each student student group, in each of the State Indicators (ELA, math, chronic absenteeism, suspension rates), including the Equity Multiplier funds that Community Day School is receiving. (See details in the next section below). Instructional Cabinet recommended that the district maintain the programs and services for Unduplicated Pupils under each of the district's five LCAP goals at their current levels.

- LCAP Goal 6 (Equity Multiplier Focus Goal) was developed in response to district leadership input from the district administration and school site administration to have a counselor on campus (Action 6.1). District and School site administration, analyzing data, has shown that student responses to counselors have been positive and have been effective in reducing chronic absenteeism.

SELPA: SELPA Meeting (March 20, 2026)
SELPA provided specific recommendations for the district's Expected Outcomes for students with disabilities in each of the State Indicators (ELA, math, chronic absenteeism, suspension rates). The SELPA Administrator and the HESD administration conducted an analysis to identify areas of challenges, root causes, and specific needs of student achievement, chronic absenteeism, and suspension rates for students with disabilities. Using this analysis to assess the needs of students with disabilities across the district, the SELPA made recommendations for programs and services in the district that support students with disabilities including working with the California Content Connectors in helping with developing appropriate IEP goals.

TEACHERS: HESD LCAP TEACHER SURVEY
The district's teachers recommended that the district maintain the programs and services for Unduplicated Pupils under each of the district's five LCAP goals at their current levels.

BARGAINING UNITS, OTHER PERSONNEL
Bargaining units recommended:
* Action 1.4: Look into College Trips for Junior High, 7th grade to local Junior College an 8th grade to local State College like Fresno State.
* Action 1.6: Look into more after-school programs such as a mentoring program where Junior High student mentor elementary students; Service in the Community such as volunteering at Kings SPCA, KCAO, "retirement" homes, Story Book Garden, etc.
* Action 2.5/2.6: Look at possibly having an EL Instructional aide at both Junior High Schools.
* Action 4.2: Look at utilizing counselors to create groups on Wednesday on various topics such as Behavior Management, Drug Awareness, etc.

ACTIONS: TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, ADMINISTRATORS, BARGAINING UNITS, AND OTHER SCHOOL PERSONNEL
* Programs and services for Unduplicated pupils under each of the district's five LCAP goals will be maintained at current levels or expanded. (See goals 1-6)

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	Students will receive a broad educational program that includes English language arts, mathematics, science, history, visual and performing arts, and physical education.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The district developed this goal as our educational partner groups support the idea that a good education is focused on reading and math, but is also well-rounded, providing science, history, art, music, and physical education. Moreover, the district's educational partners believe in a well-rounded education for students that includes these areas of study and that also provides opportunities to travel to museums and scientific exhibits, participate in outdoor education, and to have access to modern technology. A broad educational program is one of the State's identified priorities (Priority 7).

The district has developed this goal:
* Because we have a large number of students from low-income families, and students from low-income families sometimes lack the resources to experience the types of enrichment activities, such as music, art, and physical education, that have been shown to increase academic achievement; there is a need to provide students with an educational program that includes these areas of study. Moreover, 100% of parents agree/strongly agree that: "In addition to ELA and Mathematics, it is important for my child to have instruction in science, history, art, music, and physical education (2026 HESD Parent Survey).
* Because we have a large number of students from low-income families, and students from low-income families sometimes lack the resources to experience activities that have been shown to increase their interest and engagement in school such as travel to museums, zoos, and parks such as Yosemite or Sequoia; there is a need to provide students with academic study trips. Moreover, 99% of parents agree/strongly agree that "It is important for my child to attend academic study trips that are aligned with classroom instruction including travel to museums, zoos, state and national parks (2026 HESD Parent Survey).

The district developed this goal because it is committed to the academic achievement of all students, especially those who are low-income, English learners, and foster youth.

The district developed this goal:
* Because data from the 2025 California School Dashboard Academic Indicator places Hanford Elementary in the Green category in ELA and Yellow category in Math. In ELA, three of the eleven student student groups are in the Orange or Red category. In Math, three of the eleven

student groups are in the Orange or Red category. This grouping, along with numerous student groups performing at levels equal to or below the district overall, indicates a need to provide support to all student groups of high-needs students. There is a need to provide high-needs students with instructional supports, including increasing staffing levels in grades 1-6 to reduce class size and/or eliminate combination classes (thereby providing these students with more individualized time and attention from the teacher), and to provide summer educational programs giving these students additional hours of instructional time.

*Because English learners performed at the Yellow (18.2 points below standard) level in ELA and also at the Yellow (44.1 points below standard) in Math both below that of All Students (per 2025 CA Dashboard), this indicates that there is a need to provide students who are English learners with language support in all academic areas and to provide these students with English language development instruction (instruction in learning the English language). There is an additional need to provide classroom teachers with leadership, training, and support in implementing effective integrated and designated English language development instruction.

The metrics under this goal will measure the extent to which increased student achievement has been delivered. The actions provide students with the programs, services, and materials that will lead to increased achievement. On the 2025 CA Dashboard, even though ELs scored 18.2 points below standard in ELA and 44.1 points in Math, ELs did “increase” their scores by 19.5 points in ELA and 15.8 points in Math over the previous year, indicating progress, but still a need.

The metrics below will measure the extent to which we deliver a broad educational program to our students. The actions are the individual components of the broad educational program that will be provided to students, for example, art, music, physical education, technology resources etc.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	Priority 2A: Implementation of State Standards addresses: A. The implementation of state board adopted academic content and performance standards for all students, which are: a. English Language Arts – Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts	The District received a score of "Met" on the 2023 CA School Dashboard: Implementation of Academic Standards Local Indicator. (A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard: Implementation of Academic Standards Local Indicator shows	The District received a score of "Met" on the 2024 CA School Dashboard: Implementation of Academic Standards Local Indicator. (A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard:	The District received a score of "Met" on the 2025 CA School Dashboard: Implementation of Academic Standards Local Indicator. (A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard:	Priority 2A: The District will receive a score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard Implementation of Academic Standards Local Indicator. Priority 2B: The District English Learner Progress	A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard was both the baseline and Year 1 Outcome (Same). Priority 2B: The difference in English Learner Progress was 15.0% points lower in Year 2 from

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	b. Mathematics – Common Core State Standards for Mathematics c. English Language Development d. Career Technical Education e. Health Education Content Standards f. History-Social Science g. Model School Library Standards h. Physical Education Model Content Standards i. Next Generation Science Standards j. Visual and Performing Arts k. World Language; Priority 2B: How the programs and services will enable English learners to access the CCSS and the ELD standards for purposes of gaining academic content knowledge and English language proficiency. Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by:	that the district has met all of the metrics (a-k) under Priority 2.) Priority 2B: English Learner Progress was Blue at 62.8% making progress towards English Language Proficiency on the 2023 CA School Dashboard. Goal 2: "All students will make progress toward proficiency on the state-adopted standards and English learners will make progress learning the English language" addresses English Learner programs. Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 44.77% SWD: 11.14% SED: 40.46% EL: 20.41% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 5.00% Asian: 65.52% African American: 34.15% Hispanic: 42.87%	Implementation of Academic Standards Local Indicator shows that the district has met all of the metrics (a-k) under Priority 2.) Priority 2B: English Learner Progress was Orange at 48.2% making progress towards English Language Proficiency on the 2024 CA School Dashboard. Goal 2: "All students will make progress toward proficiency on the state-adopted standards and English learners will make progress learning the English language" addresses English Learner programs. Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024	Implementation of Academic Standards Local Indicator shows that the district has met all of the metrics (a-k) under Priority 2.) Priority 2B: English Learner Progress was Yellow at 47.8% making progress towards English Language Proficiency on the 2025 CA School Dashboard. Goal 2: "All students will make progress toward proficiency on the state-adopted standards and English learners will make progress learning the English language" addresses English Learner programs. Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025	will be at least 50% on the CA School Dashboard. Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest - Proposed Target) Overall: 54.00% SWD: 21.00% SED: 50.00% EL: 30.00% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 16.00% Asian: 71.00% African American: 44.00% Hispanic: 52.00% White: 64.00% Two or More: 64.00% Homeless: 41.00% Foster: 48.00% English Language Arts (per 2026 CA Dashboard): Overall: 6.4 points Below EL: 26.5 points Below SED: 18.2 points	baseline. Priority 4: The Difference between Baseline and Year 2 of Students Scoring Proficient on the CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: +6.52% SWD: +4.88% SED: +6.37% EL: -1.06% LTEL (Long-Term EL): +1.35% Asian: +8.56% African American: +8.37% Hispanic: +7.26% White: +1.60% Two or More: +1.26% Homeless: +4.24% Foster: -7.79% English Language Arts Difference (per CA Dashboard): Overall: +13.80 EL: +18.30 SED: +14.80 SWD: +17.10 Homeless: +7.10 African American: +19.50

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	CAASPP Data: ELA & Math	White: 57.11% Two or More: 54.47% Homeless: 31.06% Foster: 36.36% English Language Arts (per 2023 CA Dashboard): Overall: 16.4 points Below (Orange) EL: 36.5 points Below (Yellow) SED: 28.2 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 104.1 points Below (Red) Homeless: 46.8 points Below (Yellow) African American: 50.2 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 20.6 points Below (Orange) Two or More: 5.8 points Below (Orange) White: 14.9 points Above (Green) Foster: 19.9 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 53.1 points Below (No Color) Asian: 26.0 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 61.0 points Above (No Color) Schools within the	CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 45.10% SWD: 12.44% SED: 41.14% EL: 16.08% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 3.45% Asian: 75.86% African American: 31.12% Hispanic: 42.96% White: 57.99% Two or More: 55.83% Homeless: 25.00% Foster: 13.33% English Language Arts (per 2024 CA Dashboard): Overall: 15.8 points Below (Orange) EL: 37.6 points Below (Orange) SED: 27.3 points Below (Orange) SWD: 104.6 points Below (Red) Homeless: 78.4 points Below (Red) African American: 48.8 points Below (Orange) Hispanic: 20.1 points Below	CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 51.29% SWD: 16.10% SED: 46.83% EL: 19.35% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% Asian: 74.08% African American: 42.52% Hispanic: 50.13% White: 58.71% Two or More: 55.73% Homeless: 35.30% Foster: 28.57% English Language Arts (per 2025 CA Dashboard): Overall: 2.6 points Below (Green) EL: 18.2 points Below (Yellow) SED: 13.4 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 87.0 points Below (Orange) Homeless: 39.7 points Below (Yellow) African American: 30.7 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 5.2 points Below	Below SWD: 80.1 points Below Homeless: 36.8 points Below African American: 40.2 points Below Hispanic: 10.6 points Below Two or More: 5.0 points Above White: 24.9 points Above Foster: 9.9 points Below American Indian: 43.0 points Below Asian: 35.0 points Above Filipino: 70.0 points Above Schools that had Red Indicators in 2023 ELA • Hamilton: SWD: 90 points below • Monroe: SWD: 75 points below • Simas: SWD: 60	Hispanic: +15.40 Two or More: -2.40 White: +1.00 Foster: -49.10 American Indian: -43.50 Asian: +28.90 Filipino: -1.20 The Difference between Baseline and Year 2 of schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA Academics on the Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: +7.50 • Monroe: SWD: +18.00 • Simas: SWD: +7.20 • Kennedy: SWD: +24.00 • Woodrow: SWD: +12.50

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA Academics on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 115.7 points below (Red) • Monroe: SWD: 100 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 82.7 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 132.4 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 124.9 points below (Red)	(Orange) Two or More: 6.9 points Above (Green) White: 9.4 points Above (Yellow) Foster: 44.7 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 100.3 points Below (No Color) Asian: 59.8 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 56.8 points Above (No Color) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in the baseline column on Priority 4: ELA Academics, Now scored at these levels on the 2024 Dashboard: • Hamilton: SWD: 139.3 points below (Red)	(Yellow) Two or More: 8.2 points Above (Yellow) White: 15.9 points Above (Green) Foster: 69.0 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 96.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 54.9 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 59.8 points Above (Blue) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA Academics on the 2023 Dashboard, 2025 Dashboard scores are: • Hamilton: SWD: 108.20 points below (Orange) • Monroe: SWD:	points below • Kennedy: SWD: 90 points below • Woodrow: SWD: 90 points below Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 43.00% SWD: 18.00% SED: 39.00% EL: 22.00% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 15.00% Asian: 57.00% African American: 33.00% Hispanic: 41.00% White: 56.00% Two or More: 56.00% Homeless: 29.00% Foster: 48.00% Mathematics (per 2026 CA	The Difference between Baseline and Year 2 of Students Scoring Proficient on the CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: +6.74% SWD: +3.77% SED: +6.99% English Learners: +3.77% LTEL (Long-Term EL): +2.78% Asian: +11.25% African American: -0.34% Hispanic: +7.44% White: +5.46% Two or More: +2.42% Homeless: +0.58% Foster: -29.69% Mathematics Difference (per CA Dashboard): Overall: +15.40 EL: +21.80 SED: +16.90 SWD: +11.10 Homeless: +9.3 African American: +11.50 Hispanic: +15.70

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 33.66% SWD: 8.60% SED: 29.12% English Learners: 12.50% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 3.57% Asian: 51.72% African American: 23.78% Hispanic: 31.32% White: 46.33% Two or More: 46.43% Homeless: 19.42% Foster: 36.36% Mathematics (per 2023 CA Dashboard): Overall: 45.8 points Below (Yellow) EL: 65.9 points Below (Yellow) SED: 57.6 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 126.5 points Below (Red) Homeless: 77.0 points Below (Orange) African American: 78.7 points Below (Yellow)	• Monroe: SWD: 90.8 points below (Orange) • Simas: SWD: 101.8 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 126.2 points below (Orange) • Woodrow: SWD: 132.5 points below (Red) As informational, schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA Academics on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD:	82.00 points below (Orange) • Simas: SWD: 75.50 points below (Orange) • Kennedy: SWD: 108.40 points below (Orange) • Woodrow: SWD: 112.40 points below (Orange) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA Academics on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: LTEL: 87.2 points	Dashboard): Overall: 35.8 points Below EL: 55.9 points Below SED: 47.6 points Below SWD: 90.0 points Below Homeless: 67.0 points Below African American: 68.7 points Below Hispanic: 39.9 points Below Two or More: 13.6 points Below White: 8.4 points Below Foster: 63.0 points Below American Indian: 60.0 points Below Asian: 17.0 points Above Filipino: 17.0 points Above Schools that had Red Indicators in 2023 Math • Hamilton: EL: 75 points below	Two or More: +19.00 White: +12.90 Foster: -38.50 American Indian: -15.30 Asian: +18.00 Filipino: -1.90 The Difference between Baseline and Year 2 of schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority 4: Math Academics on the Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: +34.80 • Hamilton: SWD: +34.30 • Simas: SWD: +7.80 • Kennedy: SWD: 0.00 • Woodrow: SWD: +12.50

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Hispanic: 49.9 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 23.6 points Below (Yellow) White: 18.4 points Below (Green) Foster: 73.0 points Below (Yellow) American Indian: 70.3 points Below (No Color) Asian: 7.1 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 7.2 points Above (No Color) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math Academics on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) • Hamilton: SWD: 157.0 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 116.3 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 174.9 points below (Red)	139.3 points below (Red) • Roosevelt: SWD: 109.0 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 101.8 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 85.7 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 132.5 points below (Red) Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest)	below (Red) • Woodrow: LTEL: 85.4 points below (Red) Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 40.40% SWD: 12.37% SED: 36.11% English Learners: 16.27% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% Asian: 62.97% African American: 23.44% Hispanic: 38.76% White: 51.79% Two or More: 48.85% Homeless: 20.00% Foster: 6.67% Mathematics (per 2025 CA	• Hamilton: SWD: 90 points below • Simas: SWD: 90 points below • Kennedy: SWD: 90 points below • Woodrow: SWD: 90 points below	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		• Woodrow: SWD: 144 points below (Red)	Overall: 37.67% SWD: 13.62% SED: 34.43% English Learners: 13.69% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 1.72% Asian: 55.17% African American: 21.71% Hispanic: 35.57% White: 51.85% Two or More: 48.34% Homeless: 16.30% Foster: 6.67% Mathematics (per 2024 CA Dashboard): Overall: 38.2 points Below (Yellow) EL: 59.9 points Below (Yellow) SED: 49.5 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 117.4 points Below (Orange) Homeless: 98.3 points Below (Red) African American: 81.7 points Below (Orange) Hispanic: 42.6 points Below (Yellow)	Dashboard): Overall:30.4 points Below (Yellow) EL: 44.1 points Below (Yellow) SED: 40.7 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 1115.4 points Below (Red) Homeless: 67.7 points Below (Yellow) African American: 67.2 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 34.2 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 4.6 points Below (Green) White: 5.5 points Below (Green) Foster: 111.5 points Below (Red) American Indian: 85.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 25.1 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 5.3 points Above (Green) Schools within the district that		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			Two or More: 14.8 points Below (Green) White: 8.58 points Below (Green) Foster: 68.2 points Below (Yellow) American Indian: 67.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 31.5 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 7.1 points Above (No Color) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in the baseline column on Priority 4: Math Academics, Now scored at these levels on the 2024 Dashboard: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) • Hamilton: SWD: 145.7 points	received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math Academics on the 2023 Dashboard, 2025 Dashboard scores are: • Hamilton: EL: 62.6 points below (Yellow) • Hamilton: SWD: 122.7 points below (Orange) • Simas: SWD: 108.5 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 174.9 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 131.5 points		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			below (Orange) • Simas: SWD: 98.2 points below (Orange) • Kennedy: SWD: 166.3 points below (Orange) • Woodrow: SWD: 115.1 points below (Orange) As Informational, schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math Academics on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red)	below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math Academics on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SWD: 108.5 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 134.7 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 174.9 points below (Red) • Woodrow: LTEL: 125.6 points below (Red)		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			• Monroe: SWD: 102.6 points below (Red) • Richmond: SWD: 125.4 points below (Red) • Roosevelt: SWD: 140.5 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 129.0 points below (Red)	• Woodrow: SWD: 131.5 points below (Red)		
1.2	Priority 7: Course Access addresses the extent to which pupils have access to and are enrolled in: A. A broad course of study including courses described under Sections 51210 and 51220(a)-(i), as applicable; B. Programs and services developed and	The District received a score of "Met" on the 2023 CA School Dashboard: Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator. (A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard: Implementation of Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator shows that the	The District received a score of "Met" on the 2024 CA School Dashboard: Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator. (A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard: Implementation of	The District received a score of "Met" on the 2025 CA School Dashboard: Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator. (A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard: Implementation of	The District will receive a score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator. Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met)	The District received a score of "Met" in both the baseline and Year 2 on Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator. (A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard: Implementation of

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	provided to unduplicated pupils C. Programs and services developed and provided to individuals with exceptional needs. Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by: CAASPP Data: ELA & Math	district has met all of the metrics (A, B, C) under Priority 2.) Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 44.77% SWD: 11.14% SED: 40.46% EL: 20.41% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 5.00% Asian: 65.52% African American: 34.15% Hispanic: 42.87% White: 57.11% Two or More: 54.47% Homeless: 31.06% Foster: 36.36% English Language Arts (per 2023 CA Dashboard): Overall: 16.4 points Below (Orange) EL: 36.5 points Below (Yellow) SED: 28.2 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 104.1 points Below (Red)	Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator shows that the district has met all of the metrics (A, B, C) under Priority 2.) Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 45.10% SWD: 12.44% SED: 41.14% EL: 16.08% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 3.45% Asian: 75.86% African American: 31.12% Hispanic: 42.96% White: 57.99% Two or More: 55.83% Homeless: 25.00% Foster: 13.33% English Language Arts (per 2024 CA Dashboard):	Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator shows that the district has met all of the metrics (A, B, C) under Priority 2.) Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 51.29% SWD: 16.10% SED: 46.83% EL: 19.35% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% Asian: 74.08% African American: 42.52% Hispanic: 50.13% White: 58.71% Two or More: 55.73% Homeless: 35.30% Foster: 28.57% English Language Arts (per 2025 CA Dashboard):	on the 2026 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest - Proposed Target) Overall: 54.00% SWD: 21.00% SED: 50.00% EL: 30.00% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 16.00% Asian: 71.00% African American: 44.00% Hispanic: 52.00% White: 64.00% Two or More: 64.00% Homeless: 41.00% Foster: 48.00% English Language Arts (per 2026 CA Dashboard): Overall: 6.4 points Below EL: 26.5 points Below SED: 18.2 points Below SWD: 80.1 points Below Homeless: 36.8 points Below African American: 40.2 points Below Hispanic: 10.6 points Below	Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator shows that the district has met all of the metrics (A, B, C) under Priority 2.) Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient - Difference from baseline in ELA: Overall: +6.52% SWD: +4.88% SED: +6.37% EL: -1.06% LTEL (Long-Term EL): +1.35% Asian: +8.56% African American: +8.37% Hispanic: +7.26% White: +1.60% Two or More: +1.26% Homeless: +4.24% Foster: -7.79% English Language Arts Difference (per CA Dashboard): Overall: +13.80 EL: +18.30

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Homeless: 46.8 points Below (Yellow) African American: 50.2 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 20.6 points Below (Orange) Two or More: 5.8 points Below (Orange) White: 14.9 points Above (Green) Foster: 19.9 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 53.1 points Below (No Color) Asian: 26.0 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 61.0 points Above (No Color)	Overall: 15.8 points Below (Orange) EL: 37.6 points Below (Orange) SED: 27.3 points Below (Orange) SWD: 104.6 points Below (Red) Homeless: 78.4 points Below (Red) African American: 48.8 points Below (Orange) Hispanic: 20.1 points Below (Orange) Two or More: 6.9 points Above (Green) White: 9.4 points Above (Yellow) Foster: 44.7 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 100.3 points Below (No Color) Asian: 59.8 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 56.8 points Above (No Color)	Overall: 2.6 points Below (Green) EL: 18.2 points Below (Yellow) SED: 13.4 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 87.0 points Below (Orange) Homeless: 39.7 points Below (Yellow) African American: 30.7 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 5.2 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 8.2 points Above (Yellow) White: 15.9 points Above (Green) Foster: 69.0 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 96.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 54.9 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 59.8 points Above (Blue)	Two or More: 5.0 points Above White: 24.9 points Above Foster: 9.9 points Below American Indian: 43.0 points Below Asian: 35.0 points Above Filipino: 70.0 points Above	SED: +14.80 SWD: +17.10 Homeless: +7.10 African American: +19.50 Hispanic: +15.40 Two or More: -2.40 White: +1.00 Foster: -49.10 American Indian: -43.50 Asian: +28.90 Filipino: -1.20
1.3	Priority 7: Course Access addresses the extent to which pupils	Students (including with exceptional needs) received instruction in art, music, and physical	Students (including with exceptional needs) received instruction in art,	Students (including with exceptional needs) received instruction in art,	Students will receive instruction in art, music, and PE, and participate	Students (including with exceptional needs) received instruction in art,

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	have access to and are enrolled in: B. Programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated pupils California Education Code Section 42238.02(b) (1) For purposes of this section unduplicated pupil means a pupil enrolled in a school district or a charter school who is either classified as an English learner, eligible for a free or reduced-price meal, or is a foster youth. C. Programs and services developed and provided to individuals with exceptional needs.	education, and participate in these subjects as evidenced by the numbers of students in art and music along with the number of PE minutes students receive. All students received at least the required number of minutes of PE. Elementary Schools: Art: All Students received art Instruction. Music: 5th and 6th grade students self-select participation in band: 5th Grade: 270 6th Grade: 196 (Total 466) All students in 4th grade received music instruction. (The schools with the highest #s of low-income students were prioritized) (655 students) Junior High 244 students chose art.	music, and physical education, and participate in these subjects as evidenced by the numbers of students in art and music along with the number of PE minutes students receive. All students received at least the required number of minutes of PE. Elementary Schools: Art: All Students received art Instruction. Music: 5th and 6th grade students self-select participation in band: 5th Grade: For 2024-25: 277 6th Grade: For 2024-25: 261 (Total 538) All students in 4th grade received	music, and physical education, and participate in these subjects as evidenced by the numbers of students in art and music along with the number of PE minutes students receive. All students received at least the required number of minutes of PE. Elementary Schools: Art: All Students received art Instruction. Music: 5th and 6th grade students self-select participation in band: 5th Grade: For 2025-26: 335 6th Grade: For 2025-26: 169 (Total 504) All students in 4th grade received music instruction.	in these subjects as evidenced by the numbers of students in art and music along with the number of PE minutes students receive. All students will receive the required number of PE minutes. Elementary Schools: Art: All Students will receive art Instruction. Music: 5th and 6th-grade students will self-select participation in band: 5th Grade: 200 6th Grade: 175 All students in 4th grade received music instruction. (The schools with the highest #s of low-income students were prioritized) Junior High	music, and physical education, and participate in these subjects as evidenced by the numbers of students in art and music along with the number of PE minutes students receive. All students received at least the required number of minutes of PE (No difference). Elementary Schools: Art: All Students received art Instruction (No Difference). Music: 5th and 6th grade students self-select participation in band: 5th Grade: Difference: +65 6th Grade: Difference: -27 (Total: Difference: +38)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		312 students chose music.	music instruction. (The schools with the highest #s of low-income students were prioritized) (2024-25: 601 students) Junior High 2024-25: 221 students chose art. 2024-25: 258 students chose music.	(The schools with the highest #s of low-income students were prioritized) (2025-26: 642 students) Junior High 2025-26: 217 students chose art. 2025-26: 254 students chose music.	200 students will choose art. 200 students will choose music.	All students in 4th grade received music instruction, a difference of -13 students. Junior High Difference: -27 students chose art. Difference: -58 students chose music.
1.4	Priority 8: Pupil Outcomes addresses pupil outcomes, if available, for courses described	Students are enriched by art, music, and physical education, feel more engaged in school, and are motivated to achieve as a result of participating in these activities as evidence by survey results. % Agree/Strongly Agree: Physical education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school: 82% Participating in physical education motivates me	Students are enriched by art, music, and physical education, feel more engaged in school, and are motivated to achieve as a result of participating in these activities as evidence by survey results. % Agree/Strongly Agree: 2024-25 HESD Student Survey Physical education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school: 76%	Students are enriched by art, music, and physical education, feel more engaged in school, and are motivated to achieve as a result of participating in these activities as evidence by survey results. 25-26 Student Survey Results % Agree/Strongly Agree: 2025-26 HESD Student Survey Physical education activities enrich (improve) my	Students will be enriched by art, music, and physical education, feel more engaged in school, and are motivated to achieve as a result of participating in these activities as evidence by survey results. % Agree/Strongly Agree: Physical education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school: 70%	Students are enriched by art, music, and physical education, feel more engaged in school, and are motivated to achieve as a result of participating in these activities as evidence by survey results. % Agree/Strongly Agree: HESD Student Survey - Differences Physical education activities enrich (improve) my experience at

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		to come to school every day: 64% Participating in music enriches (improves) my experience at school: 91% Participating in music motivates me to come to school every day: 77% Learning about music will help me in the future: 80% Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school: 74% Participating in art motivates me to come to school every day: 66% Learning about art will help me in the future: 67%	Participating in physical education motivates me to come to school every day: 50% Participating in music enriches (improves) my experience at school: 86% Participating in band motivates me to come to school every day: 68% Learning about band will help me in the future: 60% Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school: 66% Participating in art motivates me to come to school every day: 58% Learning about art will help me in the future: 60%	experience at school: 74% Participating in physical education motivates me to come to school every day: 46% Participating in music enriches (improves) my experience at school: 86% Participating in band motivates me to come to school every day: 74% Learning about band will help me in the future: 80% Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school: 69% Participating in art motivates me to come to school every day: 63% Learning about art will help me in the future: 62%	Participating in physical education motivates me to come to school every day:70% Participating in music enriches (improves) my experience at school: 70% Participating in music motivates me to come to school every day: 70% Learning about music will help me in the future: 70% Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school: 70% Participating in art motivates me to come to school every day: 70% Learning about art will help me in the future: 70%	school: -8% difference Participating in physical education motivates me to come to school every day: -18% difference Participating in music enriches (improves) my experience at school: -5% difference Participating in music motivates me to come to school every day: -3% difference Learning about band will help me in the future: same difference Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school: -5% difference Participating in art motivates me to come to school every day: -3% difference

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
						Learning about art will help me in the future: -5% difference

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.

The actions under Goal #1 well were implemented overall during the 2025-2026 school year.

* Action 1.1: Supplies/Materials School Sites: Individual school sites were provided with funding to support the goals in the LCAP based on the percentages of unduplicated pupils at the site. Note that the goals in each school site's School Plan for Student Achievement are aligned with the district's LCAP goals. School sites documented the use of these funds in their School Plans for Student Achievement. School sites used these funds to purchase supplies and materials to support their LCAP-aligned school goals.
* Action 1.2: School Libraries: A Library Media Technician at each school site managed instructional and library materials and technology, and ensured libraries were open to serve students.
* Action 1.3: Technology: All students were provided with a computer device. Students in grades 2-8 have access to laptop computers and standards-aligned digital content. Students in grades TK-1 have access to an iPad and standards-aligned digital content. Students without internet connectivity at home were provided with a wifi hotspot. A team of technicians supported schools and students ensuring computers and networks were operating and supporting students.
* Action 1.4: Study Trips: The district and school sites were able to provide academic study trips to all students throughout 2025-2026 to help enhance each student's learning experience beyond the classroom.
* Action 1.5: Art, Music, PE: All students in the elementary schools received art instruction. Elementary students in grades five and six were able to choose music as an elective. Students in elementary schools received a minimum of 200 minutes of physical education every ten days. Students at the junior high schools received 400 minutes of physical education every 10 days. Students at the junior high schools had opportunities to select additional athletic electives. Credentialed PE, music, and art teachers provided educational activities to students at elementary and junior high schools.
* Action 1.6: The district's after-school program was implemented, however, with the continuation of ELOP (Extended Learning Opportunities Program), elementary after-school activities continue to be funded with ELOP instead of the LCAP. The Junior High after-school activities continue to be funded through the LCAP.

CHALLENGES
Technology continues to be both a success and a challenge. One challenge is remaining current with technological advances to ensure all 5,500 plus student devices remain up-to-date with both software systems as well as student-appropriate filters. Our vast technology

department is consistently ensuring updates are rolled out to both student and staff devices. Students' lack of internet connectivity in their homes is a challenge in which HESD provides hotspots to families to help alleviate that barrier to their learning. Updating and maintaining these hotspots remains a challenge.

SUCCESSES
One of the greatest successes of the HESD LCAP has been the district's efforts to provide students with a broad educational program. A continuing mandate, reiterated by educational partners in advisory committees, through surveys, and in student focus groups has been that a good education is focused on reading and math, but is also well-rounded, providing science, history, art, music, and physical education. Moreover, a well-rounded education includes opportunities to travel to museums and scientific exhibits, to participate in concerts and sporting events, and to have access to modern technology. In fulfilling this mandate from our educational partners, and to maintain and build upon our success in this area, the district has added credentialed teachers who specialize in art, music, and physical education. Students at all grade levels receive instruction in these subjects. All students have the opportunity to attend an academic study trip that is aligned with the content standards for their grade level. Every classroom is equipped with a Smartboard and is connected to the internet via a state-of-the-art wireless network. Students have access to a variety of apps and multimedia digital academic content. Students in TK-1 have access to an iPad. Students in grades 2-8 have access to a laptop computer, with students in grades 4-8 taking laptops home for homework and research.

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.

Goal #1 Overall: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Goal #1 was more than a 10% difference, with the biggest difference being in action 1.3 for technology as the need for student device replacement ended up not being as big as planned. The estimated actual expenditures were less than the budgeted expenditures, mainly due to action 1.3.
* Action 1.1: Supplies/Materials School Sites: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Action 1.1 was more than a 10% difference. School sites ended up purchasing less than budgeted for supplies and materials.
* Action 1.2: School Libraries: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.
* Action 1.3: Technology: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Action 1.3 was more than a 10% difference. There was not a need to update as much of the technology as originally thought and all students maintained a one-to-one ratio of device to student.
* Action 1.4: Study Trips: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.
* Action 1.5: Art, Music, PE: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.
* Action 1.6: After School Program: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Action 1.6 was more than a 10% difference, which was due to most after-school expenditures being run through ELOP, and less than planned having to be run through the LCFF.

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

The actions under Goal #1 exhibited some degree of effectiveness in delivering a broad educational program to the district's students.

* Action 1.1 was effective with school sites are providing supplies and materials that supported the programs and services in the LCAP including art, music, physical education.
* Action 1.2 was effective with school libraries being supported with staff, books, periodicals, and technology including electronic books. School libraries serve as the check-out/check in point for student technology including laptops and iPads. Libraries serve as the initial point of contact for troubleshooting technology/repairing devices.
* Action 1.3 was effective with classrooms being maintained with updated technology such as Smartboards and Desktops/Laptops, as well as online assessment programs such as Illuminate to enhance the delivery of instruction and the delivery and analysis of assessments. The visual instructional components (ie: Smartboards) help visual learners, such as EL students. These technology investments are to help close the achievement gap of EL, Foster youth, and low-income students by making instruction more engaging and assessments more informative for adjusting instruction.
* Action 1.4 was effective with students in each grade level attending at least one study trip that is aligned with content standards for their grade.
* Action 1.5 was effective with students being provided arts, music, and physical education opportunities.
* Action 1.6 was effective with students in grades 7-8 having the opportunity to participate in an after-school enrichment.

A total of 4 metrics was included in Goal 1, for which all the data and disaggregated data points are provided in the detail above. For the purpose of this summary, we have included highlights from the related metrics:

The district received a score of "Met" on the Implementation of Academic Standards Local Indicator on the CA Dashboard. From our most recent CAASPP results (2025) in English Language Arts (51.29%) and Mathematics (40.40%), HESD has outperformed our county scores in both ELA (46.37%) and Math (31.99%), and also outscored the proficiency level of the state in ELA (48.82%) and Math (37.30%).

Students received instruction in art, music, and physical education, and participated in these subjects:
Elementary Schools:
* Art: All Students received art Instruction.
* 504 students in 5th and 6th-grade participated in band.
* All students in 4th grade received music instruction. (The schools with the highest numbers of low-income students were prioritized) (642 students)
* All students received the required number of physical education minutes. Junior High Schools:
* 217 students chose art
* 254 students chose music
* All students received the required number of physical education minutes.

Data from the HESD student survey show that students overwhelmingly feel that they are enriched by participating in these activities, that these activities improve their school experience, and that participating in these activities will benefit them in the future. Data from the HESD parent survey show that parents overwhelmingly believe that a broad educational program is important for their students.

The district's English Learning Progress did dip from 62.8% in 2023, which was the highest since tracking started, to 47.8% in 2025. In looking further back, the English Learner Progress indicator shows growth from 41.09% in 2019 (pre-covid) to 47.8% in 2025. The reason for the high percentage in 2023, is due to the lack of reclassifications during the pandemic and lack of state testing in the years prior. 2023 then

became more of a catch-up year with reclassification, thus in 2025, after reclassifying a large number of students in 2023, the scores ELP score dropped back down to more of a historical norm.

Other highlights include:

ELA
Almost every student groups scored a higher proficiency level in 2025 compared to 2023 (CDE DataQuest)
* Overall increased 6.52%
* Students with Disabilities increased 4.88%
* Socially Economically Disadvantaged students increased 6.37%
* Long Term English Learners increased 1.35%
* Asian students increased 8.56%
* African American Students increased 8.37%
* Hispanic students increased 7.26%
* White students increased 1.60%
* Two or More Races increased 1.26%
* Homeless students increased 4.24%

Math
Almost every student group scored a higher proficiency level in 2025 compared to 2023 (CDE DataQuest)
* Overall increased 6.74%
* Students with Disabilities increased 3.77%
* Socially Economically Disadvantaged students increased 6.99%
* English Learners increased 3.77%
* Long Term English Learners increased 2.78%
* Asian students increased 11.25%
* Hispanic students increased 7.44%
* White students increased 5.46%
* Two or More Races increased 2.42%
* Homeless students increased 0.58%

* The percentage of students scoring proficient on the ELPAC continues to remain high at 52.98% scoring Level 3 or 4 compared to 2021: 50.77% (CDE DataQuest).

Actions to support English Learner's acquisition of the English Language seem to have mixed results. From the most recent CA Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator as proficiency levels improved from 41.09% in 2019 (pre-covid) to 47.8% in 2025. ELA CAASPP scores also show an increase of 12.07% from 2021 to 2025. Math CAASPP scores also show an increase of 14.66% from 2021 to 2025. English Learners, however, did not show the same improvements from the prior years in in ELA (21-22 at 25.03% to 24-25 at 19.35%), and therefore additional training may be needed in Integrated ELD supports in all content area classes. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum (English Learners), provided leadership and monitoring of the district's integrated and designated ELD programs. The Assistant

Superintendent of Curriculum provided leadership that ensured all EL students received instructional support throughout the school day (integrated ELD) and specific instruction in learning the English language (designated ELD) each day. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum worked with school site principals and learning directors ensuring that implementation of integrated and designated ELD was in place and that teaching staff received professional development in ELD instruction. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum develops, implements, supervises, and monitors all activities at the district and school level that support English learners. A learning director at each school site, provided leadership and monitoring of ELD instruction at the school site level. Learning directors ensure that both integrated and designated ELD are in place and are effective. Learning directors provide leadership and support to teaching staff in identifying EL students requiring interventions. Learning directors monitor the implementation of interventions at their sites. Learning directors, working with the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, assess the ELD professional development needs of their individual school sites, and, working together, implement professional development that is targeted to individual school sites' needs. Successes in Implementation Hanford Elementary School District implemented services leading students to proficiency on the state-adopted standards. Classrooms were staffed so that no students in grades 1-6 were in a combination class. All students in Hanford Elementary who are English learners received language support across all academic subjects. English learners also received specific instruction in learning the English language.

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.

* Action 1.1 Supplies/Materials School Sites: The Budget decreased slightly as school sites are working on maintaining students' school connectedness with programs and services that support the goals in the LCAP based on the percentages of unduplicated pupils at the site. School sites use these funds to purchase supplies and materials to support their LCAP-aligned school goals.
* Action 1.2 Library Media Technicians continue to remain funded at a full-time level to continue to provide increased/improved services for students. The budget increased slightly for employees for step and column increases.
* Action 1.3 With additional grant funding, some student technology were funded outside the LCAP using additional grant funding, resulting in a reduction in the budget for 26-27. For personnel, annual salary schedule increases for employees (step & column) increased the amount of funding required to support the personnel side of this action, which the non-personnel side of this action is being decreased in funding due to a decline in enrollment, so the need of less technology devices.
* Action 1.4 Increases in entrance fees and transportation costs require additional funding for study trips.
* Action 1.5 With the addition of ELOP and the district meeting all the elementary requirements, ELOP funds will be used to Junior High After School athletics, resulting in a reduction of budget in the LCAP. Also with the addition of Prop 28 funds, the district reduced the LCAP budget for 1.5.
* Action 1.6 The after-school program for elementary grades will continue to expand going forward, however, the funding for elementary grades will continue to flow through the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELOP). With meeting state requirements, HESD was able to fund Junior High afterschool activities through ELOP, keeping the funding through the LCAP at a minimum.

Note: Budgeted expenditure amounts may change going forward due to salary differences or price changes on goods. Unless otherwise noted, such changes are not material and are not the result of changes to our programs.

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	Supplies/Materials School Sites	School sites are provided with supplies and materials that support the programs and services in the LCAP including art, music, physical education. This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red)	$164,234.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		
1.2	School Libraries	School libraries are open during school hours and are supported with staff, books, periodicals, and technology including electronic books. School libraries serve as the check-out/check in point for student technology including laptops and iPads. Libraries serve as the initial point of contact for troubleshooting technology/repairing devices. Library Media Technician aide for each school site Destiny library information system This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math	$992,854.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		
1.3	Technology	Classrooms will continue to maintain updated technology such as Smartboards and Desktops/Laptops, as well as online assessment programs such as Illuminate to enhance the delivery of instruction and the delivery and analysis of assessments. The visual instructional components (ie: Smartboards) help visual learners, such as EL students. These technology investments are to help close the achievement gap of EL, Foster youth, and low-income students by making instruction more engaging and assessments more informative for adjusting instruction. Students in grades 2-8 have access to laptop computers and standards-aligned digital content, which is supplemental to the hard copy textbook/workbook curriculum required. Students in grades TK-1 have access to an iPad and standards-aligned digital content, which is supplemental to the hard copy textbook/workbook curriculum required.	$2,206,471.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Classroom Technology Laptop for each student grades 2-8. iPad for each student in TK, K, 1 Computer Technicians Tech Engineers Standards-aligned digital content/subscriptions This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red)		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		
1.4	Study Trips	Students in each grade level attend a study trip that is aligned with content standards for their grade. Entrance fees Transportation This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA	$390,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		
1.5	Art, Music, PE	Art, music, and PE instruction is supported with staff, supplies, and materials. Art Teachers Art Supplies Music Teachers Music Supplies/Equipment/Instruments PE Teachers PE Supplies After School Athletics and Youth Development Personnel After School Athletics and Youth Development Supplies This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are:	$2,093,538.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		• No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		
1.6	After School Program	Students in grades 7-8 will have the opportunity to participate in an after-school enrichment. After School Staff Supplies and materials This action addresses the following Red Indicators:	$200.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Junior High Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA at the Junior High Schools Junior High Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math at the Junior High Schools District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Junior High Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA at the Junior High Schools Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math at the Junior High Schools District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA at the Junior High Schools		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math at the Junior High Schools		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	All students will make progress toward proficiency on the state-adopted standards and English learners will make progress learning the English language.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The district developed this goal because it is committed to the academic achievement of all students, especially those who are low-income, English learners, and foster youth.

The district developed this goal:
* Because data from the 2025 California School Dashboard Academic Indicator places Hanford Elementary in the Green category in ELA and Yellow category in Math. In ELA, three of the eleven student student groups are in the Orange or Red category. In Math, three of the eleven student groups are in the Orange or Red category. This grouping, along with numerous student groups performing at levels equal to or below the district overall, indicates a need to provide support to all student groups of high-needs students. There is a need to provide high-needs students with instructional supports, including increasing staffing levels in grades 1-6 to reduce class size and/or eliminate combination classes (thereby providing these students with more individualized time and attention from the teacher), and to provide summer educational programs giving these students additional hours of instructional time.

*Because English learners performed at the Yellow (18.2 points below standard) level in ELA and also at the Yellow (44.1 points below standard) in Math both below that of All Students (per 2025 CA Dashboard), this indicates that there is a need to provide students who are English learners with language support in all academic areas and to provide these students with English language development instruction (instruction in learning the English language). There is an additional need to provide classroom teachers with leadership, training, and support in implementing effective integrated and designated English language development instruction.

The metrics under this goal will measure the extent to which increased student achievement has been delivered. The actions provide students with the programs, services, and materials that will lead to increased achievement. On the 2025 CA Dashboard, even though ELs scored 18.2 points below standard in ELA and 44.1 points in Math, ELs did “increase” their scores by 19.5 points in ELA and 15.8 points in Math over the previous year, indicating progress, but still a need.

Differentiated Assistance
2025-26: Hanford Elementary School District was identified for Differentiated Assistance based on the Student group: Foster Youth. Foster Youth were identified in priority area 4 (Pupil Achievement for ELA) and in priority area 5 (Pupil Engagement – Chronic Absenteeism). HESD

will work closely with the Kings County Office of Education over the course of the year to improve these areas through a series of meetings scheduled over the year. There are multiple actions that will address this work specifically to decrease chronic absenteeism and increase academic support for Foster students including social-emotional support to provide students and families with what they need to be successful. Looking at the broad educational goals, the arts and extra-curricular activities will continue to support engagement for Foster students at all grade levels. This includes transportation support to ensure students can be involved and engaged. Measures have been taken to increase student and family engagement and increase school connectedness and safety for students and families in the identified student group.

In November 2025, after the CA Dashboard was publicized and updated Differentiated Assistance criteria was known, Hanford Elementary School District qualified for the student group Foster Student student group, scoring Red on the CA Dashboard in ELA (and Orange in Math) (Priority 4) and also in Red Chronic Absenteeism Rate (Priority 5). Starting January 2026, the DA team focused on Foster Youth.

CAASPP Lowest Performing Groups (Priority 4, Academics)
District
The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on ELA and/or Math academic indicator on the 2025 Dashboard are:

Priority Area 4 (ELA, Math, & Science Academics)
* Long-Term English Learners (LTEL) student group (Red) in ELA, Math, & Science
* ELA: 83.8 points below standard (Declined 3.3 pts)
* Math: 125.3 points below standard (Declined 11.4 pts)
* Science: 33.8 points (Declined 2.0 pts)
* Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in Math
* Math: 115.4 points below standard (Maintained 2.0 pts)
* Foster student group (Red) in Math
* Math: 111.5 points below standard (Declined 43.4 pts)

School Level
Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on the ELA and/or Math academic indicators on the 2025 Dashboard are:

Priority Area 4 (ELA & Math Academics)
* Simas
* Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in ELA
* ELA: 108.5 points below standard (Declined 10.3 pts)
* Kennedy
* Long-Term English Learners (LTEL) student group (Red) in ELA, Math, & Science
* ELA: 87.2 points below standard (Maintained -1.5 pts)
* Math: 134.7 points below standard (Declined 5.7 pts)

* Science: 30.7 points (Declined 4.2 pts)
* Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in Math
* Math: 174.9 points below standard (Declined 8.7 pts)
* Woodrow
* Long-Term English Learners (LTEL) student group (Red) in ELA & Math
* ELA: 85.4 points below standard (Declined 10.2 pts)
* Math: 125.6 points below standard (Declined 39.8 pts)
* Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red) in Math
* Math: 131.5 points below standard (Declined 16.5 pts)

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by: A: Statewide Assessments CAASPP Data: ELA	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 44.77% SWD: 11.14% SED: 40.46% EL: 20.41% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 5.00% Asian: 65.52% African American: 34.15% Hispanic: 42.87% White: 57.11% Two or More: 54.47% Homeless: 31.06% Foster: 36.36% English Language Arts (per 2023 CA Dashboard): Overall: 16.4 points	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 45.10% SWD: 12.44% SED: 41.14% EL: 16.08% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 3.45% Asian: 75.86% African American: 31.12% Hispanic: 42.96% White: 57.99% Two or More: 55.83% Homeless: 25.00% Foster: 13.33% English Language	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 51.29% SWD: 16.10% SED: 46.83% EL: 19.35% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% Asian: 74.08% African American: 42.52% Hispanic: 50.13% White: 58.71% Two or More: 55.73% Homeless: 35.30% Foster: 28.57% English Language	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest - Proposed Target) Overall: 54.00% SWD: 21.00% SED: 50.00% EL: 30.00% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 16.00% Asian: 71.00% African American: 44.00% Hispanic: 52.00% White: 64.00% Two or More: 64.00% Homeless: 41.00% Foster 48.00%	The Difference between Baseline and Year 2 of Students Scoring Proficient on the CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: +6.52% SWD: +4.88% SED: +6.37% EL: -1.06% LTEL (Long-Term EL): +1.35% Asian: +8.56% African American: +8.37% Hispanic: +7.26% White: +1.60% Two or More: +1.26% Homeless: +4.24% Foster: -7.79% English Language

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Below (Orange) EL: 36.5 points Below (Yellow) SED: 28.2 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 104.1 points Below (Red) Homeless: 46.8 points Below (Yellow) African American: 50.2 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 20.6 points Below (Orange) Two or More: 5.8 points Below (Orange) White: 14.9 points Above (Green) Foster: 19.9 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 53.1 points Below (No Color) Asian: 26.0 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 61.0 points Above (No Color) District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority Area 4: ELA academic indicator on the 2023 Dashboard are: * Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Arts (per 2024 CA Dashboard): Overall: 15.8 points Below (Orange) EL: 37.6 points Below (Orange) SED: 27.3 points Below (Orange) SWD: 104.6 points Below (Red) Homeless: 78.4 points Below (Red) African American: 48.8 points Below (Orange) Hispanic: 20.1 points Below (Orange) Two or More: 6.9 points Above (Green) White: 9.4 points Above (Yellow) Foster: 44.7 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 100.3 points Below (No Color) Asian: 59.8 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 56.8 points Above (No Color) District The student	Arts (per 2025 CA Dashboard): Overall: 2.6 points Below (Green) EL: 18.2 points Below (Yellow) SED: 13.4 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 87.0 points Below (Orange) Homeless: 39.7 points Below (Yellow) African American: 30.7 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 5.2 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 8.2 points Above (Yellow) White: 15.9 points Above (Green) Foster: 69.0 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 96.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 54.9 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 59.8 points Above (Blue) District The student	English Language Arts (per 2026 CA Dashboard): Overall: 6.4 points Below EL: 26.5 points Below SED: 18.2 points Below SWD: 80.1 points Below Homeless: 36.8 points Below African American: 40.2 points Below Hispanic: 10.6 points Below Two or More: 5.0 points Above White: 24.9 points Above Foster: 9.9 points Below American Indian: 43.0 points Below Asian: 35.0 points Above Filipino: 70.0 points Above District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level	Arts Difference (per CA Dashboard): Overall: +13.80 EL: +18.30 SED: +14.80 SWD: +17.10 Homeless: +7.10 African American: +19.50 Hispanic: +15.40 Two or More: -2.40 White: +1.00 Foster: -49.10 American Indian: -43.50 Asian: +28.90 Filipino: -1.20 District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in 2023 on Priority Area 4: ELA academic indicator: Difference from Baseline: * Students with Disabilities (SWD)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		subgroup (Red) in ELA: 104.1 points below standard (Declined 6.2 pts) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Academics on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 115.7 points below (Red) • Monroe: SWD: 100 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 82.7 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 132.4 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 124.9 points below (Red)	groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) back in 2023 on Priority Area 4: ELA academic indicator, Now scored these levels on the 2024 Dashboard: * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Red) in ELA: 104.6 points below standard (Maintained -0.5 pts) AS Informational: District Level The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority Area 4 ELA academic indicator on the 2024 Dashboard are: * Long Term English Learners (LTEL) subgroup (Red) in ELA: 80.6	groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority Area 4 ELA Academics on the 2023 Dashboard, 2025 Dashboard scores are: * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Orange) in ELA: 87.0 points below standard (Increased 17.6 pts) The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority Area 4 ELA academic indicator on the 2025 Dashboard are: * Long Term English Learners (LTEL) subgroup (Red) in ELA: 83.8 points below standard (Declined 3.3 pts)	(Red) on Priority Area 4 ELA academic indicator on the 2023 Dashboard are: * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup in ELA: 80.1 points below standard Schools that had Red Indicators in 2023 • Hamilton: SWD: 90 points below • Monroe: SWD: 75 points below • Simas: SWD: 60 points below • Kennedy: SWD: 90 points below • Woodrow: SWD: 90 points below	subgroup: +17.10 pts difference The Difference between Baseline and Year 2 of schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA Academics on the Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: +7.50 • Monroe: SWD: +18.00 • Simas: SWD: +7.20

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			points below standard (Declined 7.7 pts) * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Red) in ELA: 104.6 points below standard (Maintained -0.5 pts) * Homeless subgroup (Red) in ELA: 78.4 points below standard (Declined 31.6 pts) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in the baseline column on Priority 4: ELA Academics, Now scored at these levels on the 2024 Dashboard: • Hamilton: SWD: 139.3 points below (Red) • Monroe: SWD: 90.8	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA Academics on the 2023 Dashboard, 2025 Dashboard scores are: • Hamilton: SWD: 108.20 points below (Orange) • Monroe: SWD: 82.00 points below (Orange) • Simas: SWD: 75.50 points below (Orange) • Kennedy: SWD: 108.40 points below (Orange)		• Kennedy: SWD: +24.00 • Woodrow: SWD: +12.50

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			points below (Orange) • Simas: SWD: 101.8 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 126.2 points below (Orange) • Woodrow: SWD: 132.5 points below (Red) As Informational, schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Academics on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 139.3 points below	• Woodrow: SWD: 112.40 points below (Orange) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA Academics on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: LTEL: 87.2 points below (Red) • Woodrow: LTEL: 85.4 points below (Red)		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			(Red) • Roosevelt: SWD: 109.0 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 101.8 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 85.7 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 132.5 points below (Red)			
2.2	Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by: A: Statewide Assessments CAASPP Data: Math	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 33.66% SWD: 8.60% SED: 29.12% EL: 12.50% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 3.57%	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 37.67% SWD: 13.62% SED: 34.43% English Learners:	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 40.40% SWD: 12.37% SED: 36.11% English Learners:	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 43.00% SWD: 18.00% SED: 39.00% EL: 22.00%	The Difference between Baseline and Year 2 of Students Scoring Proficient on the CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: +6.74% SWD: +3.77% SED: +6.99% English Learners:

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Asian: 51.72% African American: 23.78% Hispanic: 31.32% White: 46.33% Two or More: 46.43% Homeless: 19.42% Foster: 36.36% Mathematics (per 2023 CA Dashboard): Overall: 45.8 points Below (Yellow) EL: 65.9 points Below (Yellow) SED: 57.6 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 126.5 points Below (Red) Homeless: 77.0 points Below (Orange) African American: 78.7 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 49.9 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 23.6 points Below (Yellow) White: 18.4 points Below (Green) Foster: 73.0 points Below (Yellow) American Indian: 70.3 points Below (No Color) Asian: 7.1 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 7.2 points Above (No Color)	13.69% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 1.72% Asian: 55.17% African American: 21.71% Hispanic: 35.57% White: 51.85% Two or More: 48.34% Homeless: 16.30% Foster: 6.67% Mathematics (per 2024 CA Dashboard): Overall: 38.2 points Below (Yellow) EL: 59.9 points Below (Yellow) SED: 49.5 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 117.4 points Below (Orange) Homeless: 98.3 points Below (Red) African American: 81.7 points Below (Orange) Hispanic: 42.6 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 14.8 points Below (Green) White: 8.58 points	16.27% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% Asian: 62.97% African American: 23.44% Hispanic: 38.76% White: 51.79% Two or More: 48.85% Homeless: 20.00% Foster: 6.67% Mathematics (per 2025 CA Dashboard): Overall:30.4 points Below (Yellow) EL: 44.1 points Below (Yellow) SED: 40.7 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 1115.4 points Below (Red) Homeless: 67.7 points Below (Yellow) African American: 67.2 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 34.2 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 4.6 points Below (Green)	L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 15.00% Asian: 57.00% African American: 33.00% Hispanic: 41.00% White: 56.00% Two or More: 56.00% Homeless: 29.00% Foster 48.00% Mathematics (per 2026 CA Dashboard): Overall: 35.8 points Below EL: 55.9 points Below SED: 47.6 points Below SWD: 90.0 points Below Homeless: 67.0 points Below African American: 68.7 points Below Hispanic: 39.9 points Below Two or More: 13.6 points Below White: 8.4 points Below Foster: 63.0 points Below American Indian: 60.0 points Below	+3.77% LTEL (Long-Term EL): +2.78% Asian: +11.25% African American: -0.34% Hispanic: +7.44% White: +5.46% Two or More: +2.42% Homeless: +0.58% Foster: -29.69% Mathematics Difference (per CA Dashboard): Overall: +15.40 EL: +21.80 SED: +16.90 SWD: +11.10 Homeless: +9.3 African American: +11.50 Hispanic: +15.70 Two or More: +19.00 White: +12.90 Foster: -38.50 American Indian: -15.30 Asian: +18.00 Filipino: -1.90 District The student groups within the district that

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority Area 4 Math academic indicator on the 2023 Dashboard are: * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Red) in Math: 126.5 points below standard (Maintained 0.4 pts) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Academics on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) • Hamilton: SWD: 157.0 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 116.3 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 174.9	Below (Green) Foster: 68.2 points Below (Yellow) American Indian: 67.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 31.5 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 7.1 points Above (No Color) District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) back in 2023 on Priority 4: Math Academics, Now scored these levels on the 2024 Dashboard: * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Orange) in Math: 117.4 points below standard (Increase 9.1 pts) AS Informational: District Level The student groups within the district that	White: 5.5 points Below (Green) Foster: 111.5 points Below (Red) American Indian: 85.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 25.1 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 5.3 points Above (Green) District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority Area 4 Math Academics on the 2023 Dashboard, 2025 Dashboard scores are: * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Red) in Math: 115.4 points below standard (Maintained 2.0 pts) The student groups within the district that	Asian: 17.0 points Above Filipino: 17.0 points Above District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority Area 4 Math academic indicator on the 2023 Dashboard are: * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup in Math: 90.0 points below standard Schools that had Red Indicators in 2023 • Hamilton: EL: 75 points below • Hamilton: SWD: 90 points below • Simas: SWD: 90	received the lowest performance level (Red) in 2023 on Priority Area 4: Math academic indicator: Difference from Baseline: * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup: +11.10 pts difference The Difference between Baseline and Year 2 of schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority 4: Math Academics on the Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: +34.80 • Hamilton: SWD: +34.30 • Simas: SWD: +7.80

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 144 points below (Red)	received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority Area 4 Math academic indicator on the 2024 Dashboard are: * Long Term English Learners (LTEL) subgroup (Red) in Math: 113.8 points below standard (Maintained 2.7 pts) * Homeless subgroup (Red) in Math: 98.3 points below standard (Declined 21.3 pts) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in the baseline column on Priority 4: Math Academics, Now scored at these levels on the 2024 Dashboard: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points	received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority Area 4 Math academic indicator on the 2025 Dashboard are: * Long Term English Learners (LTEL) subgroup (Red) in Math: 125.3 points below standard (Declined 11.4 pts) * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Red) in Math: 115.4 points below standard (Maintained 2.0 pts) * Foster subgroup (Red) in Math: 111.5 points below standard (Declined 43.4 pts) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math Academics on the 2023	points below • Kennedy: SWD: 90 points below • Woodrow: SWD: 90 points below	• Kennedy: SWD: 0.00 • Woodrow: SWD: +12.50

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			below (Red) • Hamilton: SWD: 145.7 points below (Orange) • Simas: SWD: 98.2 points below (Orange) • Kennedy: SWD: 166.3 points below (Orange) • Woodrow: SWD: 115.1 points below (Orange) As Informational, schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Academics on the 2024 Dashboard are:	Dashboard, 2025 Dashboard scores are: • Hamilton: EL: 62.6 points below (Yellow) • Hamilton: SWD: 122.7 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 108.5 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 174.9 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 131.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			• Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) • Monroe: SWD: 102.6 points below (Red) • Richmond: SWD: 125.4 points below (Red) • Roosevelt: SWD: 140.5 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 129.0 points below (Red)	performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math Academics on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SWD: 108.5 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 134.7 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 174.9 points below (Red) • Woodrow: LTEL: 125.6 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 131.5 points below (Red)		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.3	Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by: A: Statewide Assessments CAST Data	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAST (per Data Quest) Overall: 24.33% SWD: 3.15% SED: 20.25% EL: 4.58% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 0.00% African American: 13.33% Hispanic: 22.24% White: 39.10% Two or More: 37.93% Homeless: 25.00%	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024 CAST (per Data Quest) Overall: 23.25% SWD: 5.04% SED: 19.27% EL: 1.62% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 0.00% African American: 4.76% Hispanic: 18.67% White: 27.45% Two or More: 14.29% Homeless: 15.00%	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025 CAST (per Data Quest) Overall: 25.98% SWD: 8.75% SED: 21.81% EL: 1.79% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 0.00% African American: 6.82% Hispanic: 24.00% White: 37.73% Two or More: 39.54% Homeless: 7.69% For Information Only District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) on Priority Area 4: CAST Academics on the 2025 Dashboard scores are: * Long Term English Learners (LTEL) subgroup	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAST (per Data Quest) Overall: 35.00% SWD: 13.00% SED: 30.00% EL: 14.00% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 10.00% African American: 23.00% Hispanic: 32.00% White: 49.00% Two or More: 47.00% Homeless: 35.00%	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the CAST: Difference from Baseline Overall: +1.65% SWD: +5.60% SED: +1.56% EL: -2.79% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 0.00% African American: -6.51% Hispanic: +1.76% White: -0.37% Two or More: +1.61% Homeless: -17.31%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
				(Red): 33.8 points (Declined 2.0 pts) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: CAST Academics on the 2025 Dashboard scores are: • Kennedy: Long Term English Learners (LTEL) subgroup (Red): 30.7 points (Declined 4.2 pts)		
2.4	Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by all of the following, as applicable: E. The percentage of English learner pupils who make progress toward English proficiency as measured by the English Learner	English Learner Progress was Blue at 62.8% making progress towards English Language Proficiency on the 2023 CA School Dashboard.	English Learner Progress was Orange at 48.2% making progress towards English Language Proficiency on the 2024 CA School Dashboard.	English Learner Progress was Yellow at 47.8% making progress towards English Language Proficiency on the 2025 CA School Dashboard.	High 55.5% making progress towards English language proficiency	The difference in English Learner Progress was -15.00% points lower in Year 2 from baseline.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	Progress CA Dashboard score					
2.5	Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by all of the following, as applicable: E. The percentage of English learner pupils who make progress toward English proficiency as measured by the Summative ELPAC (CDE DataQuest)	23.77% making progress towards English language proficiency (22-23 CDE DataQuest)	16.82% making progress towards English language proficiency (23-24 CDE DataQuest)	15.29% making progress towards English language proficiency (24-25 CDE DataQuest)	Percentage of EL Students Scoring Proficient on the Summative ELPAC: 20%	The difference in EL students making progress towards English language proficiency from Baseline: -8.48%
2.6	Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by all of the following, as applicable: A. LTEL Achievement as measured by State Assessment per Data Quest E. The English learner reclassification rate	A: Percentage of EL Students, including LTELs Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP Assessments(per Data Quest): ELA: ELs: 20.41% proficient LTEL (Long-Term EL): 5:00% proficient Math: ELs: 12.50% proficient LTEL (Long-Term EL): 3.57% proficient E: The English learner reclassification rate: 17% (2022-2023: 205 reclassified out of 1412 EL students)	A: Percentage of EL Students, including LTELs Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024 CAASPP Assessments (per Data Quest): ELA: ELs: 16.08% proficient LTEL (Long-Term EL): 3.45% proficient Math: ELs: 13.69% proficient LTEL (Long-Term EL): 1.72% proficient	A: Percentage of EL Students, including LTELs Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025 CAASPP Assessments (per Data Quest): ELA: ELs: 19.35% proficient LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% proficient Math: ELs: 16.27% proficient LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% proficient	A: Percentage of EL Students, including LTELs Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP Assessments(per Data Quest): ELA: English Learner: 30.00% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 16.00% Math: ELs: 22.00% proficient LTEL (Long-Term EL): 15.00% proficient E: The English learner	A: Difference in Percentage of EL Students, including LTELs Scoring Proficient on the 2024 CAASPP Assessments difference from baseline: ELA: ELs: -1.06% LTEL (Long-Term EL): +1.35% Math: ELs: +3.77% LTEL (Long-Term EL): +2.78% E: The difference in English learner reclassification rate from baseline:

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			E: The English learner reclassification rate: 24% (2023-2024: 316 reclassified out of 1331 EL students)	E: The English learner reclassification rate: 13% (2024-2025: 135 reclassified out of 1046 EL students)	reclassification rate: 15%	-4% (-70 EL students)
2.7	Priority 1: Basic Services addresses the degree to which: B. Pupils in the school district have sufficient access to the standards-aligned instructional materials	All students had State Board of Education approved, Common Core standards-aligned instructional materials in all classrooms as evidenced by the annual HESD Board of Trustees Sufficiency of Instructional Materials resolution that was adopted on 9/27/23.	All students had State Board of Education approved, Common Core standards-aligned instructional materials in all classrooms as evidenced by the annual HESD Board of Trustees Sufficiency of Instructional Materials resolution that was adopted on 9/11/24.	All students had State Board of Education approved, Common Core standards-aligned instructional materials in all classrooms as evidenced by the annual HESD Board of Trustees Sufficiency of Instructional Materials resolution that was adopted on 9/10/25.	All students will have State Board of Education approved, Common Core standards-aligned instructional materials in all classrooms as evidenced by the annual HESD Board of Trustees Sufficiency of Instructional Materials resolution.	No Difference: All students had State Board of Education approved, Common Core standards-aligned instructional materials in all classrooms both in baseline year and year 2.

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.

The actions and services under Goal 2 were well implemented overall, with overall students maintaining similar proficiency levels in ELA and making progress toward proficiency in math on the state-adopted standards with 47.8% of EL students who are English learners making progress learning English.

* Action 2.1: The district did not have any combination classes for in-person instruction in grades 1-6 in 2025-2026.

* Action 2.2: The district expanded its summer programs and looks to continue to expand during the summers moving forward. Note: Elementary summer programs continue to be funded through the Extended Learning Opportunities Program (ELOP) while the Junior High Schools' 7th and 8th-grade summer programs continue to be funded through the LCAP.
* Action 2.3: The district ensured all students had sufficient instructional materials. There were no new instructional materials adoptions in 2025-2026. The district maintained existing instructional materials and continued to fund instructional digital subscriptions/content through the LCAP.
* Action 2.4: The district provided integrated and designated ELD to all EL students.

CHALLENGES
Our absenteeism rate remains high compared to pre-covid, even though it has decreased over the last few years. With students absent and not in their seats in a classroom, there is a challenge keeping students up to date with day-to-day lessons and standards. In addition to student absenteeism, staff absenteeism continued to remain higher than pre-COVID years, which also had an impact on student learning.

SUCCESSES
Students in HESD continue to make progress toward achieving proficiency on the State academic standards. Based on the 2025 CA Dashboard, 'All Students' in Math scored at the Yellow level and increased in Proficiency level from 25.74% in 2021 to 40.40% in 2025 and increased 6.74% from 2023. In looking at Math CAASPP scores per CDE Dataquest, a few student groups had nice increases in proficiency levels for Math in 2024 compared to the previous year:
* SWD: 2023 = 8.60% proficient compared to 2025 = 12.37% proficient
* Low¬-Income: 2023 = 29.12% proficient compared to 2025 = 36.11% proficient
* EL: 2023 = 12.50% proficient compared to 2025 = 16.27% proficient

In ELA, based on the 2024 CA Dashboard, 'All Students' scored at the Green level and increased in Proficiency level from 39.22% in 2021 to 51.29% in 2025 and increased 6.52% from 2023. In looking at ELA CAASPP scores per CDE Dataquest, a couple of student groups had nice increases in proficiency levels for ELA in 2024 compared to the previous year:
* SWD: 2023 = 11.14% proficient compared to 2025 = 16.02% proficient

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.

Goal #2 Overall: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Goal #1 was less than a 10% difference. The estimated actual expenditures were slightly more than the budgeted expenditures, mainly due to Action 2.4 and 2.6, which is described below.
* Action 2.1: Eliminate Combination Classes /Reduce Class Sizes: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.
* Action 2.2: Summer Program: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.
* Action 2.3: Supplemental Instructional Materials: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Action 2.3 was more than 10% difference. The cost of instructional materials came in lower than budgeted. Students still maintained a one-to-one of instructional materials.

* Action 2.4: School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Action 2.4 was more than a 10% difference. The district placed a higher priority on supporting our lowest-performing student groups beyond the original plan its own internal Targeted Assistant program and professional development.
* Action 2.5: Supplemental Support for Designated and Integrated ELD for English Learners: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.
* Action 2.6: Supplemental Support for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs): The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Action 2.6 was more than 10% difference. The expenditures for our planned support of our Long-Term English Learners were about $6,000 more than budgeted.

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

The actions under Goal #2 exhibited some degree of effectiveness in students making progress toward proficiency on the state-adopted standards and English learners learning the English language.

* Action 2.1 was effective with classroom staffing levels being maintained or increased to eliminate combination classes in grades K-6 and to lower class sizes in grades 4-8.
* Action 2.2 was effective with students at the district's junior high schools supported with summer program that included both academics and enrichment.
* Action 2.3 was effective with providing low-income students, foster youth, and English learners with up to date/upgraded supplemental instructional materials that provided specialized lessons, materials, and technology components which were specifically designed to provide increased support for English learners and struggling students, even though English Learner growth was mixed as seen in the above metrics.
* Action 2.4 was effective with school sites allocations being prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard, even though the student groups growth was mixed as seen in the above metrics.
* Action 2.5 was effective with full implementation of designated and integrated ELD being supported with staff, supplies, and materials, even though English Learner growth was mixed as seen in the above metrics.
* Action 2.6 was effective with full implementation of designated and integrated ELD being supported with staff, supplies, and materials, even though English Learner growth was mixed as seen in the above metrics.

A total of 7 metrics was included in Goal 2, for which all the data and disaggregated data points are provided in the detail above. For the purpose of this summary, we have included highlights from the related metrics:

From the district most recent CAASPP results (2025) in English Language Arts (51.29%) and Mathematics (40.40%), HESD has outperformed our county scores in both ELA (46.37%) and Math (31.99%), and also outscored the proficiency levels of the state in both ELA (48.82%) and Math (37.30). During the pandemic of 2020-21 and 2021-22, not many students were being reclassified due to distance learning and the absence of Dashboard data. In 2022-23 and 2023-24 Hanford Elementary School district reclassified the most students the district has ever reclassified. Due to this, some EL scores were inflated in the 2022 & 2023 ELA CAASPP data since students who may have been reclassified were being reported still as ELs. For 2024-25 & 2025-26 school years, reclassification was back to normal which was also reflected in the EL data. Comparing EL data from 2019 (pre-covid) to 2025, EL students have shown progress from 15.17% proficient to

19.35% proficient in ELA. The English Learner Progress indicator reflected this as well with growth from 41.09% in 2019 (pre-covid) to 47.80% in 2025. Math CAASPP scores for English Learners also show an increase of 7.32% from 2021 to 2025.

The actions under Goal 2 continue to be effective by providing instructional supports including increasing staffing levels, reduction of class sizes, and the elimination of combination classes.

Other highlights include:

ELA
Almost every student groups scored a higher proficiency level in 2025 compared to 2023 (CDE DataQuest)
* Overall increased 6.52%
* Students with Disabilities increased 4.88%
* Socially Economically Disadvantaged students increased 6.37%
* Long Term English Learners increased 1.35%
* Asian students increased 8.56%
* African American Students increased 8.37%
* Hispanic students increased 7.26%
* White students increased 1.60%
* Two or More Races increased 1.26%
* Homeless students increased 4.24%

Math
Almost every student group scored a higher proficiency level in 2025 compared to 2023 (CDE DataQuest)
* Overall increased 6.74%
* Students with Disabilities increased 3.77%
* Socially Economically Disadvantaged students increased 6.99%
* English Learners increased 3.77%
* Long Term English Learners increased 2.78%
* Asian students increased 11.25%
* Hispanic students increased 7.44%
* White students increased 5.46%
* Two or More Races increased 2.42%
* Homeless students increased 0.58%

* The percentage of students scoring proficient on the ELPAC continues to remain high at 52.98% scoring Level 3 or 4 compared to 2021: 50.77% (CDE DataQuest).

Actions to support English Learner's acquisition of the English Language seem to have mixed results. From the most recent CA Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator as proficiency levels improved from 41.09% in 2019 (pre-covid) to 47.8% in 2025. ELA CAASPP scores also show an increase of 12.07% from 2021 to 2025. Math CAASPP scores also show an increase of 14.66% from 2021 to 2025. English

Learners, however, did not show the same improvements from the prior years in in ELA (21-22 at 25.03% to 24-25 at 19.35%), and therefore additional training may be needed in Integrated ELD supports in all content area classes. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum (English Learners), provided leadership and monitoring of the district's integrated and designated ELD programs. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum provided leadership that ensured all EL students received instructional support throughout the school day (integrated ELD) and specific instruction in learning the English language (designated ELD) each day. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum worked with school site principals and learning directors ensuring that implementation of integrated and designated ELD was in place and that teaching staff received professional development in ELD instruction. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum develops, implements, supervises, and monitors all activities at the district and school level that support English learners. A learning director at each school site, provided leadership and monitoring of ELD instruction at the school site level. Learning directors ensure that both integrated and designated ELD are in place and are effective. Learning directors provide leadership and support to teaching staff in identifying EL students requiring interventions. Learning directors monitor the implementation of interventions at their sites. Learning directors, working with the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, assess the ELD professional development needs of their individual school sites, and, working together, implement professional development that is targeted to individual school sites' needs. Successes in Implementation Hanford Elementary School District implemented services leading students to proficiency on the state-adopted standards. Classrooms were staffed so that no students in grades 1-6 were in a combination class. All students in Hanford Elementary who are English learners received language support across all academic subjects. English learners also received specific instruction in learning the English language.

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.

* Action 2.1: Eliminate Combination Classes/Reduce Class Sizes: The budget was decreased as there were not as many additional teachers needed to eliminate combination classes and/or reduce class sizes.
* Action 2.2: Summer Program: The summer program for elementary grades will expand going forward, but will continue to be funded with the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELOP). This action is being discontinued for the 26-27 school as Junior High will after school programs will also be funded through ELOP.
* Action 2.3: Supplemental Instructional Materials: Additional instructional materials including materials supporting English language development along with digital subscriptions continue to be implemented. Funding was decreased based on declining enrollment and the need for less supplemental support materials.
* Action 2.4: School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard. An increase in funding and a change from Non-Contributing to Contributing for action 2.4 was implemented to help address our student groups in the red. In doing a needs assessment, we found that:
    - SWD is the lowest-performing group in the district by a wide margin — 1.55 (ELA) / 1.47 (Math) average achievement level, roughly a full level below All Students (2.46 / 2.26).
    - SED students make up 79% of all testers, so SED performance (2.34 / 2.15 average achievement levels) tracks close to the district average — but that average masks meaningful variation within the SED group.
    - 85% of all SWD are also SED, and about 15% of all SED testers score even lower than SWD as a whole (1.47 / 1.42 average achievement levels), making them the single most academically vulnerable slice of the SED population.

These dual-identified students face the economic barriers common to SED students (limited access to tutoring, enrichment, stable housing/routines that support learning) layered on top of disability related learning barriers (processing, pacing, and skill-gap challenges tied

to their IEPs). The result is a proficiency level for this dual-identified group that falls nearly a full point below the district average and below SED students overall. This issue is not and "SED students need support" and "SWD students need support" as two separate claims, it is one claim, that SED students' needs are most severe, especially the subset of SED students who also have a disability. This action is designed to reach that population without narrowing eligibility to benefit every SED student while being especially consequential for the 15% of SED students who are also SWD.

Looking at the 24-25 CAASPP assessment, All Students scored an average proficiency level of 2.46 in ELA and 2.26 in Math. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students (79% of all testers) scored 2.34 in ELA and 2.15 in Math, slightly below the district average. Students with Disabilities (SWD) (14% of all testers) scored substantially lower, at 1.55 in ELA and 1.47 in Math. Critically, 85% of the SWD testers are also SED. This dual-identified group scored 1.47 in ELA and 1.42 in Math, lower than SWD students overall and nearly a full proficiency level below SED students as a whole. This tells us that within the SED student group, students who also have a disability are experiencing the most significant barriers to proficiency, and that the SWD data is not describing a separate population's needs, it is describing the depth of need that exists inside the SED group itself.

This action is LEA-wide since SED students make up 79% of enrollment and are present in significant numbers at every school site. Because the action reaches every classroom, it is principally directed toward and effective for SED students specifically, while incidentally benefiting all students, which is the standard for an LEA-wide contributing action.
SED Student Group:

- CAASPP ELA Proficiency for SED: 24-25: 46.83% with a target of improving by 6% in 27-28
- CAASPP Math Proficiency for SED: 24-25: 21.81% with a target of improving by 6% in 27-28

Dual-Identified SED/SWD Student Group:

- CAASPP ELA Proficiency for SED/SWD: 24-25: 16.10% with a plan to monitor this dual-identified student group for growth over the next couple of years, looking for 3% growth each year.
- CAASPP ELA Proficiency for SED/SWD: 24-25: 8.75% with a plan to monitor this dual-identified student group for growth over the next couple of years, looking for 3% growth each year.

For these reasons, action 2.4 was changed to Contributing.
* Action 2.5: Supplemental Support for Designated and Integrated ELD for English Learners: Annual salary schedule increases for employees (step & column) increased the amount of funding required to support this action.
* Action 2.6: Supplemental Support for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs): The district will continue to fund supplemental support for LTELs based on needs of that population. With a decrease in the number of LTELs, the budget has decreased slightly.

In November 2025, after the CA Dashboard was publicized and updated Differentiated Assistance criteria was known, Hanford Elementary School District qualified for the student group Foster Student student group, scoring Red on the CA Dashboard in Math (and Orange in ELA) (Priority 4) and also in Red Chronic Absenteeism Rate (Priority 5). Starting December 2025, the DA team focused on Foster Youth. More information about the Differentiated Assistance work can be found in these sections above:

- Plan Summary: Reflections: Technical Assistance section
- Goal 2: An Explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal section

Note: Budgeted expenditure amounts may change going forward due to salary differences or price changes on goods. Unless otherwise

noted, such changes are not material and are not the result of changes to our programs.

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	Eliminate Combination Classes/Reduce Class Sizes	Classroom staffing levels will be maintained or increased to reduce or eliminate combination classes in grades K-6 and to lower class sizes in grades 4-8. Based on the Hanford Elementary Teachers Association (HETA) Collective Bargaining Agreement, grade-level staffing shall be based on the following teacher/pupil ratios and ceilings set forth below: Grade TK – Ratio: State Mandate Grades TK through 3rd – Ratio: 1:25, Ceiling: 1:25 (*The ratio and ceiling of 1:25 for Grades TK-3 is contingent upon the District's participation in the Class Size Reduction Program.) Grades 4 through 8 – Ratio: 1:30, Ceiling: 1:33 Based on the HETA Collective Bargaining Agreement, HESD is currently overstaffed with teachers to keep class sizes lower and to eliminate combination classes. If the funding were not available, there would be fewer teachers in HESD, class sizes would increase to close to max based on the HETA Collective Bargaining Agreement, and there would be combination classes through various schools and grade levels. This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA	$2,488,493.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		
2.2	Summer Program	Students at the district's junior high schools are supported with a summer program that includes both academics and enrichment. This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math	$0.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		
2.3	Supplemental Instructional Materials	Provide low-income students, foster youth, and English learners with up to date/upgraded supplemental instructional materials that provide specialized lessons, materials, and technology components that are specifically designed to provide increased support for English learners and	$195,805.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		struggling students. Instructional Materials (Books, textbooks) Teacher Resource Specialist This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		
2.4	School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard.	School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard. To address the low performing schools in a district and student group reds on the 2024 CA Dashboard (see “An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal”) and identified in the metrics appendix, including Students with Disabilities (SWD), Foster, and Homeless student groups (DA student groups), each school will take the following actions to address the student group(s): The LEA will provide schools with supplemental supplies, materials, books, and technology that support the programs and services in the LCAP targeting our lowest student groups. Students groups in these lowest performing groups will be prioritized for after school tutoring. Upgraded supplemental instructional materials provide specialized lessons, materials, and technology components that are specifically designed to provide additional (increased) supports for struggling students. Classroom teachers’ use of these upgraded materials in their instruction qualitatively improves the instruction. See Reflections: Technical Assistance section for details of the work underway for Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group from 24-25 and Foster Youth for 25-26 school years. This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • ELA: Students with Disabilities (SWD): 104.1 point below (Red) • Math: Students with Disabilities (SWD): 126.5 point below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 115.7 points below (Red)	$377,986.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		• Monroe: SWD: 100 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 82.7 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 132.4 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 124.9 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) • Hamilton: SWD: 157.0 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 116.3 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 174.9 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 144 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • ELA: Students with Disabilities (SWD): 104.1 point below (Red) • ELA: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 80.6 point below (Red) • ELA: Homeless: 78.4 point below (Red) • Math: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 113.8 point below (Red) • Math: Homeless: 98.3 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 139.3 points below (Red) • Roosevelt: SWD: 109.0 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 101.8 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 85.7 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 132.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) • Monroe: SWD: 102.6 points below (Red) • Richmond: SWD: 125.4 points below (Red) • Roosevelt: SWD: 140.5 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 129.0 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • ELA: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 83.8 points below (Red)		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		• Math: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 125.3 points below (Red) • Math: SWD: 115.4 points below (Red) • Math: Foster: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: LTEL: 87.2 points below (Red) • Woodrow: LTEL: 85.4 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SWD: 108.5 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 134.7 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 174.9 points below (Red) • Woodrow: LTEL: 125.6 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 131.5 points below (Red)		
2.5	Supplemental Support for Designated and Integrated ELD for English Learners	Designated and Integrated ELD are supported with staff, supplies, and materials. Designated ELD EL students are provided with consistent, effective, research-based designated English language development instruction that is carefully planned and explicitly taught; that includes opportunities to develop fluency through authentic oral and written practice; that includes activities with language beyond students' current level of proficiency; and that is specifically targeted to students' English proficiency levels. Students will receive ELD instruction at their English language development level during the ELD instructional block. Each school will implement a 30-minute block of time each day for English language development instruction. The district leadership team will monitor and provide technical assistance and professional development for the implementation of ELD at school sites. Students' ELD level will be appropriately and promptly identified. District level leadership team will provide school sites with professional development/technical assistance in developing deployment schedules so that all students are provided with ELD instruction at their ELD level.	$941,857.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Integrated ELD EL Students are supported across the school day in all content areas. English learners in Hanford Elementary are referred to as ELITE because being an English learner, knowing two languages and working toward becoming bilingual and biliterate, is considered an asset rather than a handicap. All content area instruction includes the intentional use of scaffolds to remove barriers to learning for English learners. Integrated ELD: • Includes intentional supports and scaffolds that happen by design • Is planned in advance as part of the lesson to eliminate barriers to learning • Often includes a preview or pre-teach to build background knowledge for the topic • May include small group • Provides connections to what students already know • Often includes hands on activity and discussion (with language supports as needed) • May include the use of charts and graphic organizers Director Prog. Dev., Assessment, Accountability (50%) 33% Learning Directors 50% Admin Secretary (PD ELs) EL Instructional Aide (Jr. High) Supplies Materials for Supplemental ELD Instruction This action addresses the following Red Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions for ELs: District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • None (only SWD) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • None (only SWD) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • None (only SWD, LTEL, and Homeless)		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No School site EL student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • None (only SWD, LTEL, and Foster) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No School site EL student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No School site EL student groups scored in the RED for Math		
2.6	Supplemental Support for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs)	Designated and Integrated ELD are supported with staff, supplies, and materials. Additional supplemental support for our LTEL population including special parent academies focused on at targeting LTELs including two Parent Academies: First and Forward and Kind Counts, both taught to Parents in Spanish and English. LTELs are targeted for EL interventions in special Designated ELD sessions including supplemental software students can work on during and after school. LTELs will continue to receive Designated ELD EL students are provided with consistent, effective, research-based designated English language development instruction that is carefully planned and explicitly taught; that includes opportunities to develop fluency through authentic oral and written practice; that includes activities with language beyond students' current level of proficiency; and that is specifically targeted to students' English proficiency levels. Students will receive ELD instruction at their English language development level during the ELD instructional block. Each school will implement a 30-minute block of time each day for English language development instruction. The district leadership team will monitor and provide technical assistance and	$22,071.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		professional development for the implementation of ELD at school sites. Students' ELD level will be appropriately and promptly identified. District level leadership team will provide school sites with professional development/technical assistance in developing deployment schedules so that all students are provided with ELD instruction at their ELD level. LTELs will continue to receive Integrated ELD EL Students are supported across the school day in all content areas. English learners in Hanford Elementary are referred to as ELITE because being an English learner, knowing two languages and working toward becoming bilingual and biliterate, is considered an asset rather than a handicap. All content area instruction includes the intentional use of scaffolds to remove barriers to learning for English learners. Integrated ELD: • Includes intentional supports and scaffolds that happen by design • Is planned in advance as part of the lesson to eliminate barriers to learning • Often includes a preview or pre-teach to build background knowledge for the topic • May include small group • Provides connections to what students already know • Often includes hands on activity and discussion (with language supports as needed) • May include the use of charts and graphic organizers Supplies Materials for Supplemental LTEL Instruction This action addressed the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions for ELs: District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • None (only SWD) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • None (only SWD) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		• ELA: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 80.6 points below (Red) • Math: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 113.8 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: LTEL: 85.7 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: LTEL: 129.0 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • ELA: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 83.8 points below (Red) • Math: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 125.3 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: LTEL: 87.2 points below (Red) • Woodrow: LTEL: 85.4 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: LTEL: 134.7 points below (Red) • Woodrow: LTEL: 125.6 points below (Red)		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	The district will support teachers and staff with professional development, training, and collaboration time.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The district developed this goal because students from low-income families, who are English learners, and who are foster youth have needs for exceptionally well-trained teachers that go beyond the needs of students who are more affluent, are proficient in English, and live with their families.

The district developed this goal:
* Because a teacher who is exceptionally well-trained has deep knowledge of the content areas for which he/she is responsible and is able to provide targeted individualized instruction (differentiated instruction) to struggling students (who are mostly unduplicated students).
* Because an exceptionally well-trained teacher is able to deliver specialized instruction to students who are English learners.
* Because data from the 2025 California School Dashboard indicate that low-income students, English learners, and foster youth performed below “All Students” in both ELA and Math.
* Because data from the 2025 California School Dashboard Academic Indicator places Hanford Elementary in the Green category in ELA and in the Yellow category in Math. In ELA, three of the eleven student student groups are in the Orange or Red category. In Math, three of the eleven student groups are in the Orange or Red categories. English learners performed at the Yellow level in ELA, at the Yellow level in Math, and performed lower than All Students.
*Because having teachers who are appropriately credentialed, well trained, who can provide expert pedagogy, and support their students who are English learners will lead to increased student achievement.
* There is a need to provide teachers with professional development and training designed to build their content knowledge and further develop their pedagogy.
* There is a need to provide teachers with professional development and training designed to build their ability to support English learners.
* There is a need to continue to provide up-to-date instructional materials to students in all content areas.
* There is a need to provide classroom teachers with leadership, training, and support in implementing effective integrated and designated English language development instruction.

The metrics under this goal will measure the extent to which all teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the pupils they are teaching, the extent to which the district's professional development programs support the training needs of teaching staff, and the extent to which teachers new to the profession are supported in their first two years of teaching.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Priority 1: Basic Services addresses the degree to which: A. Teachers in the LEA are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the pupils they are teaching	Based on 2023-2024 School Year 249 Teachers with Full Credentials (92.91%) 19 Teachers without Full Credentials (7.09%) 267 Teachers Assigned Appropriately (99.63%) 1 Teacher Misassigned (0.37%)	Based on 2024-2025 School Year 255 Teachers with Full Credentials (93.75%) 17 Teachers without Full Credentials (6.25%) 272 Teachers Assigned Appropriately (100%) 0 Teacher Misassigned (0%)	Based on 2025-2026 School Year 266 Teachers with Full Credentials (97.1%) 8 Teachers without Full Credentials (2.9%) 274 Teachers Assigned Appropriately (100%) 0 Teacher Misassigned (0%)	90% of teachers in the LEA will be fully credentialed. 95% of teachers in the LEA will be appropriately assigned in the subject area for the pupils they are teaching.	Difference of teachers with Full Credentials: 4.19% Difference of teachers without Full Credentials - 4.19% Difference of teachers Assigned Appropriately: 0.37% Difference of Teachers Misassigned: -1
3.2	Priority 1: Basic Services addresses the degree to which: A: HESD Teacher Survey	78% Agree/Strongly Agree: The three district-wide professional development days are an important resource that will lead to increased academic achievement.	2024-25 results were as: 82% Agree/Strongly Agree: The three district-wide professional development days are an important resource that will lead to increased academic achievement.	2025-26 results were as: 87% Agree/Strongly Agree: The three district-wide professional development days are an important resource that will lead to increased academic achievement.	80% will Agree/Strongly Agree: The three district-wide professional development days are an important resource that will lead to increased academic achievement.	The difference from baseline is +9% for the survey question: The three district-wide professional development days are an important resource that will lead to increased academic achievement.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.3	Priority 1: Basic Services addresses the degree to which: A. New Teacher Induction Completion Rates	100% of the teachers in year 2 of the district's induction program will complete the program.	100% of the teachers in year 2 of the district's induction program will complete the program.	100% of the teachers in year 2 of the district's induction program will complete the program.	100% of the teachers in year 2 of the district's induction program will complete the program.	No Difference in the percentage of teachers in year 2 of the district's induction program who will complete the program.
3.4	Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by CAASPP A: Statewide Assessments Data: ELA	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 44.77% SWD: 11.14% SED: 40.46% EL: 20.41% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 5.00% Asian: 65.52% African American: 34.15% Hispanic: 42.87% White: 57.11% Two or More: 54.47% Homeless: 31.06% Foster: 36.36% English Language Arts (per 2023 CA Dashboard): Overall: 16.4 points Below (Orange) EL: 36.5 points Below (Yellow) SED: 28.2 points Below (Yellow)	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 45.10% SWD: 12.44% SED: 41.14% EL: 16.08% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 3.45% Asian: 75.86% African American: 31.12% Hispanic: 42.96% White: 57.99% Two or More: 55.83% Homeless: 25.00% Foster: 13.33% English Language Arts (per 2024 CA Dashboard): Overall: 15.8 points Below (Orange)	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 51.29% SWD: 16.10% SED: 46.83% EL: 19.35% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% Asian: 74.08% African American: 42.52% Hispanic: 50.13% White: 58.71% Two or More: 55.73% Homeless: 35.30% Foster: 28.57% English Language Arts (per 2025 CA Dashboard): Overall: 2.6 points Below (Green) EL: 18.2 points Below (Yellow)	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest - Proposed Target) Overall: 54.00% SWD: 21.00% SED: 50.00% EL: 30.00% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 16.00% Asian: 71.00% African American: 44.00% Hispanic: 52.00% White: 64.00% Two or More: 64.00% Homeless: 41.00% Foster 48.00% English Language Arts (per 2026 CA Dashboard): Overall: 6.4 points Below	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient - Difference from baseline in ELA: Overall: +6.52% SWD: +4.88% SED: +6.37% EL: -1.06% LTEL (Long-Term EL): +1.35% Asian: +8.56% African American: +8.37% Hispanic: +7.26% White: +1.60% Two or More: +1.26% Homeless: +4.24% Foster: -7.79% English Language Arts Difference (per CA Dashboard): Overall: +13.80 EL: +18.30 SED: +14.80 SWD: +17.10 Homeless: +7.10

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		SWD: 104.1 points Below (Red) Homeless: 46.8 points Below (Yellow) African American: 50.2 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 20.6 points Below (Orange) Two or More: 5.8 points Below (Orange) White: 14.9 points Above (Green) Foster: 19.9 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 53.1 points Below (No Color) Asian: 26.0 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 61.0 points Above (No Color)	EL: 37.6 points Below (Orange) SED: 27.3 points Below (Orange) SWD: 104.6 points Below (Red) Homeless: 78.4 points Below (Red) African American: 48.8 points Below (Orange) Hispanic: 20.1 points Below (Orange) Two or More: 6.9 points Above (Green) White: 9.4 points Above (Yellow) Foster: 44.7 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 100.3 points Below (No Color) Asian: 59.8 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 56.8 points Above (No Color)	SED: 13.4 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 87.0 points Below (Orange) Homeless: 39.7 points Below (Yellow) African American: 30.7 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 5.2 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 8.2 points Above (Yellow) White: 15.9 points Above (Green) Foster: 69.0 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 96.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 54.9 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 59.8 points Above (Blue)	EL: 26.5 points Below SED: 18.2 points Below SWD: 80.1 points Below Homeless: 36.8 points Below African American: 40.2 points Below Hispanic: 10.6 points Below Two or More: 5.0 points Above White: 24.9 points Above Foster: 9.9 points Below American Indian: 43.0 points Below Asian: 35.0 points Above Filipino: 70.0 points Above	African American: +19.50 Hispanic: +15.40 Two or More: -2.40 White: +1.00 Foster: -49.10 American Indian: -43.50 Asian: +28.90 Filipino: -1.20
3.5	Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by CAASPP A: Statewide Assessments Data: Math	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 33.66% SWD: 8.60%	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest)	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest)	Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest)	The Difference between Baseline and Year 2 of Students Scoring Proficient on the CAASPP Math (per Data Quest)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		SED: 29.12% EL: 12.50% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 3.57% Asian: 51.72% African American: 23.78% Hispanic: 31.32% White: 46.33% Two or More: 46.43% Homeless: 19.42% Foster: 36.36% Mathematics (per 2023 CA Dashboard): Overall: 45.8 points Below (Yellow) EL: 65.9 points Below (Yellow) SED: 57.6 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 126.5 points Below (Red) Homeless: 77.0 points Below (Orange) African American: 78.7 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 49.9 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 23.6 points Below (Yellow) White: 18.4 points Below (Green) Foster: 73.0 points Below (Yellow) American Indian: 70.3 points Below (No Color)	Overall: 37.67% SWD: 13.62% SED: 34.43% English Learners: 13.69% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 1.72% Asian: 55.17% African American: 21.71% Hispanic: 35.57% White: 51.85% Two or More: 48.34% Homeless: 16.30% Foster: 6.67% Mathematics (per 2024 CA Dashboard): Overall: 38.2 points Below (Yellow) EL: 59.9 points Below (Yellow) SED: 49.5 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 117.4 points Below (Orange) Homeless: 98.3 points Below (Red) African American: 81.7 points Below (Orange) Hispanic: 42.6 points Below (Yellow)	Overall: 40.40% SWD: 12.37% SED: 36.11% English Learners: 16.27% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% Asian: 62.97% African American: 23.44% Hispanic: 38.76% White: 51.79% Two or More: 48.85% Homeless: 20.00% Foster: 6.67% Mathematics (per 2025 CA Dashboard): Overall:30.4 points Below (Yellow) EL: 44.1 points Below (Yellow) SED: 40.7 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 1115.4 points Below (Red) Homeless: 67.7 points Below (Yellow) African American: 67.2 points Below (Yellow)	Overall: 43.00% SWD: 18.00% SED: 39.00% EL: 22.00% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 15.00% Asian: 57.00% African American: 33.00% Hispanic: 41.00% White: 56.00% Two or More: 56.00% Homeless: 29.00% Foster 48.00% Mathematics (per 2026 CA Dashboard): Overall: 35.8 points Below EL: 55.9 points Below SED: 47.6 points Below SWD: 90.0 points Below Homeless: 67.0 points Below African American: 68.7 points Below Hispanic: 39.9 points Below Two or More: 13.6 points Below White: 8.4 points Below	Overall: +6.74% SWD: +3.77% SED: +6.99% English Learners: +3.77% LTEL (Long-Term EL): +2.78% Asian: +11.25% African American: -0.34% Hispanic: +7.44% White: +5.46% Two or More: +2.42% Homeless: +0.58% Foster: -29.69% Mathematics Difference (per CA Dashboard): Overall: +15.40 EL: +21.80 SED: +16.90 SWD: +11.10 Homeless: +9.3 African American: +11.50 Hispanic: +15.70 Two or More: +19.00 White: +12.90 Foster: -38.50 American Indian: -15.30 Asian: +18.00 Filipino: -1.90

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Asian: 7.1 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 7.2 points Above (No Color)	Two or More: 14.8 points Below (Green) White: 8.58 points Below (Green) Foster: 68.2 points Below (Yellow) American Indian: 67.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 31.5 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 7.1 points Above (No Color)	Hispanic: 34.2 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 4.6 points Below (Green) White: 5.5 points Below (Green) Foster: 111.5 points Below (Red) American Indian: 85.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 25.1 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 5.3 points Above (Green)	Foster: 63.0 points Below American Indian: 60.0 points Below Asian: 17.0 points Above Filipino: 17.0 points Above	

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.

The actions and services under Goal #3 were well implemented overall and led to the hiring, support, and retention of qualified teachers, support staff, and administrators.

* Action 3.1: Teacher Professional Development: Learning directors provided school-site based professional development and support for teachers. The district conducted three teacher professional development days in 2024-2025.
* Action 3.2: Teacher Collaboration Time: Teachers were provided with collaboration time each Wednesday.
* Action 3.3: New Teacher Induction: The induction program served new teachers throughout the 2024-2025 school year.

CHALLENGES
New teacher induction was a challenge with recent changes made by the state in regards to testing, qualifications, and credentialing. Our induction team has done a great job supporting new teachers through this process, however, we are finding that new teachers are feeling the pressure more with added work in studying for their own assessments on top of their normal job duties.

SUCCESSES
Professional Development has been an area of success per teacher survey feedback. HESD has continued with three days dedicated to professional development (August 7, 2025, October 17, 2025, and January 30, 2026) for all teachers which keeps our teachers well-trained in their content areas. There has been a PD focus on providing targeted individualized instruction (differentiated instruction) to struggling students (who are mostly unduplicated students). Weekly collaboration time for teachers continues to be a great success where teachers (and administration) conduct detailed, sophisticated analysis of students' performance on formative and summative assessments, and use information gained from this analysis to plan instruction and interventions. Teacher feedback is that teachers and administration truly appreciate this dedicated time to plan, analyze, and create standards-based lessons based on need.

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.

Goal #3 Overall: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Goal #3 was less than a 10% difference. The estimated actual expenditures were slightly more than the budgeted.
* Action 3.1: Teacher Professional Development: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.
* Action 3.2: Teacher Collaboration Time: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Action 3.2 was more than a 10% difference. Due to our internal Targeted Assistance Program, the district spent roughly $20,000 more in materials and supplies to assist school admin and teachers with data analysis and planning.
* Action 3.3: New Teacher Induction: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.

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

The actions under Goal #3 continue to be effective and led to the hiring, support, and retention of qualified teachers, support staff, and administrators.

* Action 3.1 was effective with the idea that all teachers had several opportunities for professional learning through the year and most professional learning offerings were evidence-based and research-based practices.
* Action 3.2 was effective as teachers were provided with weekly collaboration time. Administrators and teachers conduct detailed, sophisticated analysis of students' performance on formative and summative assessments, and use information gained from this analysis to plan instruction and interventions.
* Action 3.3 was effective as the district continue will operate a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) accredited new teacher induction program. New teachers received induction support, and those that were ready, cleared their credentials through the induction program.

A total of 5 metrics was included in Goal 3, for which all the data and disaggregated data points are provided in the detail above. For the purpose of this summary, we have included highlights from the related metrics:

Learning Directors developed and implemented training for teaching staff at their schools. Learning Directors provided ongoing support, training, and in-class coaching for teachers at their school sites. Teachers new to the profession, with preliminary teaching credentials, were provided with a beginning teacher support program that led toward the attainment of a professional clear credential. Teachers received three days of professional development. Teachers were provided with ongoing training, support, and in-class coaching through a Learning Director at each school site. Learning Directors support teachers at their school sites by assessing the specific professional development needs of teachers/grade level teams and providing that support directly or utilizing staff developers at county offices of education.

The HESD Teacher Survey indicates that teachers overwhelmingly believe that the three professional development days are an important resource that will lead to increased academic achievement for students with over 90% choosing "Strongly Agree" or "Agree".

Other highlights include:

ELA
Almost every student groups scored a higher proficiency level in 2025 compared to 2023 (CDE DataQuest)
* Overall increased 6.52%
* Students with Disabilities increased 4.88%
* Socially Economically Disadvantaged students increased 6.37%
* Long Term English Learners increased 1.35%
* Asian students increased 8.56%
* African American Students increased 8.37%
* Hispanic students increased 7.26%
* White students increased 1.60%
* Two or More Races increased 1.26%
* Homeless students increased 4.24%

Math
Almost every student group scored a higher proficiency level in 2025 compared to 2023 (CDE DataQuest)
* Overall increased 6.74%
* Students with Disabilities increased 3.77%
* Socially Economically Disadvantaged students increased 6.99%
* English Learners increased 3.77%
* Long Term English Learners increased 2.78%
* Asian students increased 11.25%
* Hispanic students increased 7.44%
* White students increased 5.46%
* Two or More Races increased 2.42%
* Homeless students increased 0.58%

* The percentage of students scoring proficient on the ELPAC continues to remain high at 52.98% scoring Level 3 or 4 compared to 2021: 50.77% (CDE DataQuest).

Actions to support English Learner's acquisition of the English Language seem to have mixed results. From the most recent CA Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator as proficiency levels improved from 41.09% in 2019 (pre-covid) to 47.8% in 2025. ELA CAASPP scores also show an increase of 12.07% from 2021 to 2025. Math CAASPP scores also show an increase of 14.66% from 2021 to 2025. English Learners, however, did not show the same improvements from the prior years in in ELA (21-22 at 25.03% to 24-25 at 19.35%), and therefore additional training may be needed in Integrated ELD supports in all content area classes. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum (English Learners), provided leadership and monitoring of the district's integrated and designated ELD programs. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum provided leadership that ensured all EL students received instructional support throughout the school day (integrated ELD) and specific instruction in learning the English language (designated ELD) each day. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum worked with school site principals and learning directors ensuring that implementation of integrated and designated ELD was in place and that teaching staff received professional development in ELD instruction. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum develops, implements, supervises, and monitors all activities at the district and school level that support English learners. A learning director at each school site, provided leadership and monitoring of ELD instruction at the school site level. Learning directors ensure that both integrated and designated ELD are in place and are effective. Learning directors provide leadership and support to teaching staff in identifying EL students requiring interventions. Learning directors monitor the implementation of interventions at their sites. Learning directors, working with the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, assess the ELD professional development needs of their individual school sites, and, working together, implement professional development that is targeted to individual school sites' needs. Successes in Implementation Hanford Elementary School District implemented services leading students to proficiency on the state-adopted standards. Classrooms were staffed so that no students in grades 1-6 were in a combination class. All students in Hanford Elementary who are English learners received language support across all academic subjects. English learners also received specific instruction in learning the English language.

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.

There are no planned changes to these actions in Goal 3.
* Action 3.2: Teacher Collaboration Time: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Action 3.2 was more than a 10% difference. Due to our internal Targeted Assistance Program, the district spent roughly $20,000 more in materials and supplies to assist school admin and teachers with data analysis and planning.

Budgeted expenditure amounts may change going forward due to salary differences or price changes on goods. Unless otherwise noted, such changes are not material and are not the result of changes to our programs.

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	Teacher Professional Development	Teachers are supported with leadership, training, and professional development. 33% Learning Directors 50% Admin. Secretary (Supports PD) Teacher PD Days This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA	$1,190,036.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		
3.2	Teacher Collaboration Time	Provide weekly collaboration time for teachers. Administrators and teachers conduct detailed, sophisticated analysis of students' performance on formative and summative assessments, and use information gained from this analysis to plan instruction and interventions. Teacher Resource Specialist Admin. Supplies, Materials This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red)	$146,056.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		
3.3	New Teacher Induction	The district will operate a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) accredited new teacher induction program. New teachers will receive induction support for two years and will clear their credentials through the induction program. Admin Secretary (Induction) Induction Program Supplies This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math	$148,453.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster students scored in the RED for Math: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
4	Students will learn in a safe, well maintained school where they are supported, engaged, and connected to their school.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The district developed this goal because we have significant numbers of high-needs (Unduplicated) students, and these students experience barriers to learning that go well beyond what all students experience. These barriers include health and wellness as well as social and emotional challenges. High-needs students, including students from Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) families and students who are foster youth, may lack the resources to access the types of health and social/emotional supports that reduce barriers to learning.

Differentiated Assistance
2025-26: Hanford Elementary School District was identified for Differentiated Assistance based on the Student group: Foster Youth. Foster Youth were identified in priority area 4 (Pupil Achievement for ELA) and in priority area 5 (Pupil Engagement – Chronic Absenteeism). HESD will work closely with the Kings County Office of Education over the course of the year to improve these areas through a series of meetings scheduled over the year. There are multiple actions that will address this work specifically to decrease chronic absenteeism and increase academic support for Foster students including social-emotional support to provide students and families with what they need to be successful. Looking at the broad educational goals, the arts and extra-curricular activities will continue to support engagement for Foster students at all grade levels. This includes transportation support to ensure students can be involved and engaged. Measures have been taken to increase student and family engagement and increase school connectedness and safety for students and families in the identified student group.

In November 2025, after the CA Dashboard was publicized and updated Differentiated Assistance criteria was known, Hanford Elementary School District qualified for the student group Foster Student student group, scoring Red on the CA Dashboard in ELA (and Orange in Math) (Priority 4) and also in Red Chronic Absenteeism Rate (Priority 5). Starting January 2026, the DA team focused on Foster Youth.

The district developed this goal:
* Because while suspensions have decreased significantly the previous 10 years prior to COVID, the two years after the pandemic there was/is a rise in behaviors leading to suspensions. Even though HESD suspension rate declined this past year, the rate is still above our pre-covid rates. Eight of the thirteen student groups are above the Overall student suspension rate, with two groups in the Orange category

(Foster and White).
* Because most groups of students are experiencing high rates of chronic absenteeism. Even though our rates are down (13.70% to 12.80%) from the previous year, these rates are substantially higher than pre-COVID times of 7.90%. The is a need to focus on re-establishing the practices that had HESD Chronic Absenteeism rates lower than both the county and state.
*Because the COVID pandemic has had a significant negative effect on students' social-emotional well-being, with students from SED families and students who are foster youth being especially impacted.

The metrics under Goal 4 measure school engagement and connectedness by monitoring the extent to which suspension, expulsion, and chronic absenteeism rates decline, the rate at which school attendance increases, and the extent to which parents feel that their children are safe at school.

CA Dashboard Lowest Performing Groups (Priority 5 & 6)

District
The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism and/or Priority 6: Suspension Rate on the 2025 Dashboard are:

Priority Area 5 (Chronic Absenteeism)
* African American student group (Red): 21.4% Chronically Absent (Increased 5.2%)
* Foster student group (Red): 31.9% Chronically Absent (Increased 8.5%)

Priority Area 6 (Suspension Rate)
* None

Schools
Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism and/or Priority 6: Suspension Rate on the 2025 Dashboard are:

Priority Area 5 (Chronic Absenteeism)
* King
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red): 20.8% chronically Absent (Increased 2.7% pts)
* Roosevelt
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red): 26.0% chronically Absent (Increased 6.9% pts)
 * White student group (Red): 22.6% chronically Absent (Increased 22.6% pts)
* Simas
 * Overall student group (Red): 20.8% chronically Absent (Increased 2.7% pts)
 * Socioeconomically Disadvantaged student group (Red): 16.2% chronically Absent (Increased 4.6% pts)
 * Hispanic student group (Red): 13.4% chronically Absent (Increased 4.7% pts)

Priority Area 6 (Suspension Rate)
* Hamilton
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red): 8.0% suspended (Increased 1.4% pts)
* Richmond
 * White student group (Red): 11.4% suspended (Increased 9.0% pts)
* Roosevelt
 * White student group (Red): 6.1% suspended (Increased 3.3% pts)
* Simas
 * Socioeconomically Disadvantaged student group (Red): 3.5% suspended (Increased 2.3% pts)
 * Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (Red): 6.2% suspended (Increased 4.9% pts)
* Washington
 * White student group (Red): 14.9% suspended (Increased 13.7% pts)

LEARNING RECOVERY AND EMERGENCY BLOCK GRANT
Hanford Elementary School District has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2025-2026 school year. LREBG funded actions can be found in Goal 4, Actions 1 and 2.

The Hanford Elementary School District's needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2025 CA Dashboard related to Suspension rates and Chronic Absenteeism. A review of state and local data indicates a significantly high suspension rate for Foster students at 12.2% compared to All Students at 2.9%. In addition, for Chronic Absenteeism, Students with Disabilities (SWD), Foster, and Homeless student groups were at 22.6%, 31.9%, and 23.7% respectively, which is significantly higher when compared to All Students (12.8%). Based on this, Goal 4, Metric 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 along with Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 directly address the health and wellness needs in addition to the social and emotional needs that go well beyond what all students need. Counselors, Social Workers, SPED Teachers, Psychologists, and School nurses provide accessible counseling and crisis intervention to support students in building resilience, developing coping strategies, and managing the emotional toll of their circumstances. These actions align to the allowable uses of funds in the area of integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, such as provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupils needs (EC Section 32526(c)(2)(c). This is evidenced by:

- Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf)
- Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf)
- The Link Between School Attendance and Good Health (https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AAP_policy_statement_chronic_absence_2019_.pdf)

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.1	Priority 6: School Climate as measured by: A. Pupil suspension rates (Also for LREBG)	The district's suspension rate was 5.4% (2023 CA Dashboard). All Students: 5.4% (Orange) EL: 4.6% (Orange) SED: 6.1% (Red) SWD: 6.3% (Red) Hispanic: 5.1% (Orange) Asian: 0% (Blue) African American: 11.6% (Red) Filipino: 0% (Blue) Two or More: 6.0% (Orange) White: 5.4% (Orange) Foster: 8.2% (Red) Homeless: 7.9% (Orange) District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension Rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: * African American (AA) subgroup (Red): 11.6% suspended (Increased 2.5% pts) * Socially Economically	The district's suspension rate was 4.2% (2024 CA Dashboard). All Students: 4.2% (Yellow) EL: 4.1% (Yellow) SED: 4.7% (Yellow) SWD: 6.7% (Red) Hispanic: 3.8% (Yellow) Asian: 2.0% (Orange) African American: 10.1% (Orange) Filipino: 1.9% (Orange) Two or More: 5.3% (Yellow) White: 4.7% (Yellow) Foster: 15.7% (Red) Homeless: 8.9% (Red) District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) back in 2023	The district's suspension rate was 2.9% (2025 CA Dashboard). All Students: 2.9% (Green) EL: 2.5% (Green) SED: 3.1% (Yellow) SWD: 4.8% (Yellow) Hispanic: 2.5% (Green) Asian: 0% (Green) African American: 7.5% (Yellow) Filipino: 1.6% (Yellow) Two or More: 3.3% (Yellow) White: 4.5% (Orange) Foster: 12.2% (Orange) Homeless: 5.6% (Yellow) District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6:	The district's suspension will be under 3.0% (CA Dashboard). All Students: 2.9% EL: 2.9% SED: 2.9% SWD: 2.9% Hispanic: 2.9% Asian: 0% (Maintain) African American: 2.9% Filipino: 0% (Maintain) Two or More: 2.9% White: 2.9% Foster: 2.9% Homeless: 2.9% District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension Rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: * African American (AA) subgroup (Red): 2.9% suspended	The difference in the district's suspension rate from baseline: All Students: -2.50% EL: -2.10% SED: -3.00% SWD: -1.50% Hispanic: -2.60% Asian: 0.00% African American: -4.10% Filipino: +1.60% Two or More: -2.70% White: -0.90% Foster: +4.00% Homeless: -2.30% District The student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in 2023 in Priority 6: Suspension Rate - Difference from Baseline: * African American (AA) subgroup (Red): -4.10%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Disadvantaged (SED) subgroup (Red): 6.1% suspended (Increased 1.1% pts) * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Red): 6.3% suspended (Maintained -0.1% pts) * Foster subgroup (Red): 8.2% suspended (Increased 3.7% pts) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension Rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: White: 6.9% suspended (Red) • Lincoln: AA: 7.1% suspended (Red) • Lincoln: SWD: 10.7% suspended (Red) • Roosevelt: White: 8.1% suspended (Red)	in Priority 6: Suspension Rate, Now scored at these levels on the 2024 Dashboard: * African American (AA) subgroup (Orange): 10.1% suspended (Declined 1.6% pts) * Socially Economically Disadvantaged (SED) subgroup (Yellow): 4.7% suspended (Declined 1.4% pts) * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Red): 6.7% suspended (Increased 0.4% pts) * Foster subgroup (Red): 15.7% suspended (Increased 7.5% pts) As Informational, student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level	Suspension Rate on the 2023 Dashboard, 2025 Dashboard scores are: * African American (AA) subgroup (Yellow): 7.50% suspended (Declined 1.3% pts) * Socially Economically Disadvantaged (SED) subgroup (Yellow): 3.1% suspended (Declined 1.3% pts) * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Yellow): 4.8% suspended (Declined 1.3% pts) * Foster subgroup (Orange): 12.2% suspended (Declined 3.4% pts) Information Only: The student groups within the district that received the lowest	* Socially Economically Disadvantaged (SED) subgroup: 2.9% suspended * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup: 2.9% suspended * Foster subgroup: 2.9% suspended Schools that had Red Indicators in 2023 • Hamilton: White: 2.9% suspended • Lincoln: AA: 2.9% suspended • Lincoln: SWD: 2.9% suspended • Roosevelt: White: 2.9% suspended • Kennedy: Overall (All	* Socially Economically Disadvantaged (SED) subgroup (Red): -3.00% * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Red): -1.50% * Foster subgroup (Red): +4.00% Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in 2023 in Priority 6: Suspension Rate - Difference from Baseline: • Hamilton: White: -6.90% • Lincoln: AA: -0.60% • Lincoln: SWD: -6.60% • Roosevelt: White: -2.00% • Kennedy: Overall

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		• Kennedy: Overall (All Students): 17.6% suspended (Red) • Kennedy: EL: 18.5% suspended (Red) • Kennedy: SED: 18.4% suspended (Red) • Kennedy: Hispanic: 16.3% suspended (Red) • Woodrow: SED: 19.4% suspended (Red) • Woodrow: Hispanic: 17.3% suspended (Red)	(Red) in Priority 6: Suspension Rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: * Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup (Red): 6.7% suspended (Increased 0.4% pts) * Foster subgroup (Red): 15.7% suspended (Increased 7.4% pts) * Homeless subgroup (Red): 8.9% suspended (Increased 1.1% pts) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in the baseline column on Priority 6: Suspension Rate, Now scored these levels on the 2024 Dashboard: • Hamilton: White: 6.1%	performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension Rate on the 2025 Dashboard are: * No students groups were red. Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension Rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: White: 0%% suspended (Blue) • Lincoln: AA: 6.5% suspended (Orange) • Lincoln: SWD: 4.1% suspended (Yellow) • Roosevelt: White: 6.1% suspended (Red)	Students) : 2.9% suspended • Kennedy: EL: 2.9% suspended • Kennedy: SED: 2.9% suspended • Kennedy: Hispanic: 2.9% suspended • Woodrow: SED: 2.9% suspended • Woodrow: Hispanic: 2.9% suspended	(All Students) : -10.70% • Kennedy: EL: -15.60% • Kennedy: SED: -11.70% • Kennedy: Hispanic: -10.20% • Woodrow: SED: -13.90% • Woodrow: Hispanic: -12.40%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			suspended (Orange) • Lincoln: AA: 10.3% suspended (Red) • Lincoln: SWD: 9.5% suspended (Orange) • Roosevelt: White: 2.8% suspended (Green) • Kennedy: Overall (All Students): 14.8% suspended (Orange) • Kennedy: EL: 12.3% suspended (Orange) • Kennedy: SED: 16.2% suspende	• Kennedy: Overall (All Students): 6.9% suspended (Green) • Kennedy: EL: 2.9% suspended (Green) • Kennedy: SED: 6.7% suspended (Green) • Kennedy: Hispanic: 6.1% suspended (Green) • Woodrow: SED: 5.5% suspended (Green) • Woodrow: Hispanic: 4.9% suspended (Green) Information Only: Schools within the district that received the lowest		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			d (Orange) • Kennedy: Hispanic: 13.9% suspended (Orange) • Woodrow: SED: 11.5% suspended (Yellow) • Woodrow: Hispanic: 10.2% suspended (Yellow) As Informational, schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension Rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 6.6% suspended (Red) • Lincoln: AA: 10.3%	performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension Rate on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 8.0% Suspended (Red) • Richmond: White: 11.4% Suspended (Red) • Roosevelt: White: 6.1% Suspended (Red) • Simas: SED: 3.5% Suspended (Red) • Simas: SWD: 6.2% Suspended (Red) • Washington: White: 14.9% Suspended (Red)		

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			suspended (Red) • Monroe: SWD: 6.3% suspended (Red) • Simas: AA: 10.0% suspended (Red) • Washington: EL: 6.4% suspended (Red) • Kennedy: Homeless: 27.3% suspended (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 15.6% suspended (Red)			
4.2	Priority 6: School Climate as measured by: B. Pupil expulsion rates	The district's expulsion rate for 2022-2023 was 0.6% (per Dataquest)	The district's expulsion rate for 2023-2024 was 0.4% (per Dataquest)	The district's expulsion rate for 2024-2025 was 0.1% (per Dataquest)	The district's expulsion rate will be below 0.50% (per Dataquest)	The district's expulsion rate difference from Baseline: -0.50%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.3	Priority 5: Pupil Engagement as measured by: A. School attendance rate (Also for LREBG)	The district's school attendance rate for 2022-2023 was 92.8% (per local SIS system)	The district's school attendance rate for 2023-2024 was 96.99% (per local SIS system)	The district's school attendance rate for 2024-2025 was 97.00% (per local SIS system)	The district's school attendance rate will be 96% (per local SIS system)	The district's school attendance rate difference from baseline: +4.20%
4.4	Priority 5: Pupil Engagement as measured by: B. Chronic absenteeism rates (Also for LREBG)	The District's chronic absenteeism rate was 22.1% (2023 CA Dashboard) Overall: 22.1% (Yellow) EL: 18.1% (Yellow) SED: 24.3% (Yellow) SWD: 29.6% (Yellow) Hispanic: 22.3% (Yellow) Asian: 6.4% (Green) African American: 29.3% (Yellow) Filipino: 9.1% (Green) Two or More: 23.6% (Yellow) White: 19.7% (Yellow) Foster Youth: 17.6% (Yellow) Homeless: 36.8% (Yellow) American Indian: 23.8% (Orange) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism	The District's chronic absenteeism rate was 13.7% (2024 CA Dashboard) Overall: 13.7% (Yellow) EL: 10.1% (Yellow) SED: 15.3% (Yellow) SWD: 23.6% (Yellow) Hispanic: 13.9% (Yellow) Asian: 2.0% (Yellow) African American: 16.1% (Yellow) Filipino: 5.6% (Green) Two or More: 11.9% (Yellow) White: 13.5% (Yellow) Foster Youth: 23.5% (Red) Homeless: 34.1% (Orange) American Indian: 16.1% (Yellow)	The District's chronic absenteeism rate was 12.8% (2025 CA Dashboard) Overall: 12.8% (Yellow) EL: 10.4% (Orange) SED: 14.2% (Yellow) SWD: 22.6% (Orange) Hispanic: 12.7% (Yellow) Asian: 13.0% (Orange) African American: 21.4% (Red) Filipino: 8.2% (Orange) Two or More: 9.5% (Green) White: 11.9% (Yellow) Foster Youth: 31.9% (Red) Homeless: 23.7% (Yellow) American Indian: 17.4% (No Color)	The District's chronic absenteeism rate will be under 10.0% (CA Dashboard) Overall: 9.9% EL: 9.9% SED: 9.9% SWD: 9.9% Hispanic: 9.9% Asian: 4.9% African American: 9.9% Filipino: 4.9% Two or More: 9.9% White: 9.9% Foster Youth: 9.9% Homeless: 9.9% American Indian: 9.9% Schools that had a Red Indicator in 2023 • Kennedy: White: 9.9% Chronicall	The District's chronic absenteeism rate difference from baseline: Overall: -9.30% EL: -7.70% SED: -10.10% SWD: -7.00% Hispanic: -9.60% Asian: +6.60% African American: -7.90% Filipino: -0.90% Two or More: -14.10% White: -7.80% Foster Youth: +14.30% Homeless: -13.10% American Indian: -6.40% Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in 2023 in Priority 5: Chronic

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: White: 36.8% Chronically Absent (Red)	As Informational, student groups within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2024 Dashboard are: * Foster subgroup (Red): 23.5% Chronically Absent (Increased 5.9% pts) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in the baseline column on Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism, Now scored these levels on the 2024 Dashboard: • Kennedy: White: 25.0% Chronically Absent (Orange)	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2023 Dashboard, 2025 Dashboard scores are: • Kennedy: White: 21.3% Chronically Absent (Orange) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2025 Dashboard are: • King: SWD: 20.8% Chronically Absent (Red)	y Absent rate	Absenteeism difference form baseline • Kennedy: White: -15.50%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			As Informational, schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Monroe: SWD: 24.7% Chronically Absent (Red) • Kennedy: Homeless: 58.1% Chronically Absent (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 36.9% Chronically Absent (Red)	• Roosevelt: SWD: 26.0% Chronically Absent (Red) • Roosevelt: White: 22.6% Chronically Absent (Red) • Simas: Overall: 12.3% Chronically Absent (Red) • Simas: SED: 16.2% Chronically Absent (Red) • Simas: Hispanic: 13.4% Chronically Absent (Red)		
4.5	Priority 5: Pupil Engagement as measured by: C. Middle school dropout rates	The district's middle school dropout rate for 2022-2023 was 0% (per local data)	The district's middle school dropout rate for 2023-2024 was 0% (per local data)	The district's middle school dropout rate for 2024-2025 was 0% (per local data)	Middle school dropout rate will be 0% (per local data)	The district's middle school dropout rate difference from baseline: 0%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.6	Priority 6: School Climate as measured by: C. Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness	SENSE OF SAFETY Per 2023-2024 HESD PARENT SURVEY 94% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school" 97% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe." 2023-2024 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 75.91% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school." 77.11% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school." 66.55% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to	SENSE OF SAFETY Per 2024-2025 HESD PARENT SURVEY 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school" 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe." 2024-2025 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 78.70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school." 76.04% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There is an adult that I can talk to if I	SENSE OF SAFETY Per 2025-2026 HESD PARENT SURVEY 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school" 97% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe." 2025-2026 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 77.94% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school." 77.97% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There is an adult that I can talk to if I	SENSE OF SAFETY Per HESD PARENT SURVEY 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school" 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe." Per HESD STUDENT SURVEY 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school."	SENSE OF SAFETY HESD PARENT SURVEY Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school" +2% difference Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe." 0% difference HESD STUDENT SURVEY Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school." +2.03% difference. Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		prevent bullying at my school." 85.77% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school." 70.37% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school." 81.90% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer." SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS: Per 2023-2024 HESD PARENT SURVEY: 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There are adequate opportunities for me to become	have a problem at school." 68.57% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school." 88.06% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school." 75.07% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer is an adult that I can talk to if I have a	have a problem at school." 68.22% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school." 88.54% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school." 73.73% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer is an adult that I can talk to if I have a	70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer is an adult that i can talk to if I have a problem at school." 70% of students agree or strongly	school." +0.86% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school." +1.67% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school." +2.77% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		informed about the school's programs." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom....." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement. "The Parent/Teacher conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards." 97% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "When I have a question about my child's class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's teacher." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent meetings/activities such as School Site Council,	problem at school." 86.79% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer." SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS: Per 2024-2025 HESD PARENT SURVEY: 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs." 97% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive information about my child's	problem at school." 85.12% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer." SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS: Per 2025-2026 HESD PARENT SURVEY: 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive information about my child's	agree with the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer." SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS: Per HESD PARENT SURVEY: 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs." 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom....." 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement. "The	school." +3.36% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer." +3.22 % difference SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS: HESD PARENT SURVEY: Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs." +2% difference Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive information about my child's progress in the

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night, and Parent Education Presentations." 2023-2024 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 74.21% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school." 84.78% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at school." 67.06% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school." 69.17% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I enjoy learning at my school."	progress in the classroom....." 99% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement. "The Parent/Teacher conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "When I have a question about my child's class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's teacher." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent meetings/activities	progress in the classroom....." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement. "The Parent/Teacher conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "When I have a question about my child's class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's teacher." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent meetings/activities	Parent/Teacher conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "When I have a question about my child's class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's teacher." 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent meetings/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night,	classroom....." 0% difference Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement. "The Parent/Teacher conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards." 0% difference Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "When I have a question about my child's class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's teacher." +1% difference Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Teacher Sense of Safety & School Connectedness: Teachers will provide their input and voice on school climate and their "sense of school connectedness" through monthly meetings with their HETA bargaining unit. For example, in September HETA Meet and Consult, topic 4: Teacher Safety (HETA/District): HETA is requesting training for de-escalating student behavior. District Assistance Superintendent shared there is a “choice” training opportunity at the upcoming professional development day in October. In addition, school psychologists can be invited to follow-up at individual staff meetings. There may also be training available through our Keenan website for school administrators to schedule as needed.	such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night, and Parent Education Presentations." 2024-2025 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 75.72% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school." 86.04% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at school." 65.58% of students agree or	such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night, and Parent Education Presentations." 2025-2026 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 74.26% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school." 86.31% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at school." 68.61% of students agree or	and Parent Education Presentations." Per HESD STUDENT SURVEY 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school."	meetings/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night, and Parent Education Presentations." 0% difference HESD STUDENT SURVEY Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school." +0.05% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at school." +1.53% difference

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		92% Agree/Strongly Agree: The three district-wide professional development days are an important with open-ended comments saying they appreciated the training de-escalation techniques. 94% of teachers Agree/Strongly Agree: "I feel safe at school." 88% of teachers Agree/Strongly Agree: "Parent events help staff and community to connect"	strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school." 65.94% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I enjoy learning at my school." Teacher Sense of Safety & School Connectedness: Teachers will provide their input and voice on school climate and their "sense of school connectedness" through monthly meetings with their HETA bargaining unit. For example, HESD started using Catapult Emergency Response system and teachers have provided their input to help make the system more	strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school." 64.57% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I enjoy learning at my school." Teacher Sense of Safety & School Connectedness: Teachers will provide their input and voice on school climate and their "sense of school connectedness" through monthly meetings with their HETA bargaining unit. For example, HESD started using Catapult Emergency Response system and teachers have provided their input to help make the system more	70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I enjoy learning at my school." Teacher Sense of Safety & School Connectedness: Teachers will provide their input and voice on school climate and their "sense of school connectedness" through monthly meetings with their HETA bargaining unit. 90% Agree/Strongly Agree: The three district-wide professional development days are an important with open-ended comments saying they appreciated the training de-escalation techniques.	Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school." +1.55% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I enjoy learning at my school." - 4.60% difference Teacher Sense of Safety & School Connectedness: Teachers continue to provide their input and voice on school climate and their "sense of school connectedness" through monthly meetings with their HETA bargaining unit. Teachers Agree/Strongly Agree with the statement, “The three district-wide

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			effective over multiple sessions. In September HETA Meet and Consult, topic 4: Teacher Safety (HETA/District): HETA and district worked on creating access for everyone through use of multiple devices. In March 2025, HETA asked about substitute access during Catapult events. Superintendent stated that School Operations Officers can manually enter substitutes into Catapult. 88.44% Agree/Strongly Agree: The three district-wide professional development days are an important with open-ended comments saying they appreciated the training de-	effective over multiple sessions. In September HETA Meet and Consult, topic 4: Teacher Safety (HETA/District): HETA and district worked on creating access for everyone through use of multiple devices. In March 2025, HETA asked about substitute access during Catapult events. Superintendent stated that School Operations Officers can manually enter substitutes into Catapult. 87.40% Agree/Strongly Agree: The three district-wide professional development days are an important with open-ended comments saying they appreciated the training de-	90% of teachers Agree/Strongly Agree: "I feel safe at school." 90% of teachers Agree/Strongly Agree: "Parent events help staff and community to connect"	professional development days are an important with open-ended comments saying they appreciated the training de-escalation techniques.” - 4.60% difference Teachers Agree/Strongly Agree with the statement, “I feel safe at school.” - 2.80% difference Teachers Agree/Strongly Agree with the statement, "Parent events help staff and community to connect" +1.76% difference

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			escalation techniques. 89.86% of teachers Agree/Strongly Agree: "I feel safe at school." 95.94% of teachers Agree/Strongly Agree: "Parent events help staff and community to connect"	escalation techniques. 91.20% of teachers Agree/Strongly Agree: "I feel safe at school." 89.76% of teachers Agree/Strongly Agree: "Parent events help staff and community to connect"		
4.7	Priority 1: Basic Services addresses the degree to which: C. School facilities are maintained in good repair	2023-24: Most schools received a score of “Exemplary” on the California Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT). These schools received a score of "Good": Monroe, Roosevelt, and Woodrow	2024-25: Five schools received a score of “Exemplary” on the California Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT). These seven schools received a score of "Good": Jefferson, MLK, Lincoln, Monroe, Simas, Kennedy, Woodrow	2025-26: All schools received a score of “Exemplary” on the California Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT).	All schools will receive a score of “Exemplary” on the California Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT)	The difference is schools receiving “Exemplary” from Baseline: +3 schools.

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.

Actions under Goal #4 were well implemented overall (and expanded) with students attending safe, well-maintained schools and having access to standards-aligned materials.

* Action 4.1: Coordination of Student Support: Learning directors at each school site monitored the social-emotional and health needs of students and coordinated the support that students received from counselors, social workers, nursing staff, student specialists, and other staff. Learning directors are the homeless liaison for each school site and coordinate services for homeless students with the district's homeless liaison and social workers. The use of LREBG funds allowed full implementation of this action.
* Action 4.2: Health Professionals (Physical/Mental/Social/Emotional): The district maintained its team of social-emotional and health services staff that was expanded previously, including nurses and counselors. The district team of LVNs (one per school site) was upgraded from part-time to full-time in 2021-2022 and the district maintained this level of support. The district maintained the addition of school counselors, which were expanded previously in order to have a school counselor at each elementary school and two counselors at each junior high. The use of LREBG funds allowed full implementation of this action.
* Action 4.3: Additional support staff: Provided direct services to students to promote a positive school climate, good citizenship, and school safety including student specialists, vice principals (junior highs), school resource officers, and yard supervisors. The district maintained a community day school for students with significant behavior challenges.
* Action 4.4: School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in both Chronically Absent and Suspension who scored red on the CA Dashboard: Provided direct services to students to promote a positive school climate, good citizenship, and school safety including student specialists, vice principals (junior highs), school resource officers, and yard supervisors. The district maintained a community day school for students with significant behavior challenges.
* Action 4.5: Transportation: HESD transportation was provided for elementary students who live 3/4 mile or more from school, and/or junior high students who live one mile or more from school.

CHALLENGES
Hanford Elementary School District continues to face challenges, similar to Kings County and the State of California, with Chronic Absenteeism and student discipline leading to suspension as the social-emotional effects of the COVID pandemic linger. Anecdotal information and internal student absenteeism and discipline data from 2025-2026, even though better than previous years, shows there is still a negative impact on students' social and emotional well-being since covid. The data measuring school climate, especially suspensions and absenteeism, over the last several years do not accurately reflect the impact that the district's programs and services have had on school climate. The district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions and chronic absenteeism. Over the last several years, we have seen chronic absenteeism decline as well as suspension rates, however, they are still not back to pre-covid numbers. There is a need to continue re-establishing the practices that had HESD Chronic Absenteeism rates lower than both the county and state and current times. Chronic Absenteeism increased significantly for our Foster students when compared to the previous year based on CDE DataQuest:
* Foster Students went from 54.00% chronically absent in 2022 to 17.60% in 2023, 23.50% in 2024, and 31.90% in 2025.

SUCCESSES
The successful implementation of actions and services that support students' social and emotional well-being continues to mitigate some of the negative impacts since the pandemic. Based on student survey data, 33.73% of the students in grades 5-8 had visited their school counselor, while 76.04% said there is an adult at the school that they can talk with if they have a problem. The district's team of student support staff worked throughout the year to improve students' physical health and social-emotional well-being. The district coordinated several funding sources (including the LCAP) to significantly expand the level of support for students' physical health and social-emotional well-being over the last few years. During the school year, to help with students' social and emotional well-being, the district continued with 2 social workers as well as our school counselors, having one at every elementary school and 2 at each junior high school. Learning directors at the elementary schools and vice principals at the junior high schools coordinate services to ensure that students who need services receive them. Overall Chronic Absenteeism decreased significantly when compared to the previous year based on CDE DataQuest:
* All Students went from 41.50% chronically absent in 2022 to 21.60% in 2023, 13.70% in 2024, and 12.8% in 2025
* Students with Disabilities went from 55.20% chronically absent in 2022 to 29.60% in 2023, 23.60% in 2024, and 22.6% in 2025
* Low-Income students went from 45.30% chronically absent in 2022 to 24.30% in 2023, 15.30% in 2024, and 14.2% in 2025
* English Learners went from 36.70% chronically absent in 2022 to 18.10% in 2023, 10.10% in 2024, and 10.4% in 2025
* Hispanic students went from 42.40% chronically absent in 2022 to 21.80% in 2023, 13.90% in 2024, and 12.7% in 2025
* White students went from 36.00% chronically absent in 2022 to 19.20% in 2023, 13.50% in 2024, and 11.9% in 2025
* Two or More Races went from 40.10% chronically absent in 2022 to 23.20% in 2023, 11.90% in 2024, and 9.5% in 2025

LEARNING RECOVERY AND EMERGENCY BLOCK GRANT
Hanford Elementary School District has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2026-2027 school year. LREBG funded actions can be found in Goal 4, Actions 1 and 2.

The Hanford Elementary School District's needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2025 CA Dashboard related to Suspension rates and Chronic Absenteeism. A review of state and local data indicates a significantly high suspension rate for Foster students at 12.2% compared to All Students at 2.9%. In addition, for Chronic Absenteeism, Students with Disabilities (SWD), Foster, and Homeless student groups were at 22.6%, 31.9%, and 23.7% respectively, which is significantly higher when compared to All Students (12.8%). Based on this, Goal 4, Metric 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 along with Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 directly address the health and wellness needs in addition to the social and emotional needs that go well beyond what all students need. Counselors, Social Workers, SPED Teachers, Psychologists, and School nurses provide accessible counseling and crisis intervention to support students in building resilience, developing coping strategies, and managing the emotional toll of their circumstances. These actions align to the allowable uses of funds in the area of integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, such as provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupils needs (EC Section 32526(c)(2)(c). This is evidenced by:

- Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf)
- Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf)

- The Link Between School Attendance and Good Health (https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AAP_policy_statement_chronic_absence_2019_.pdf)

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.

Goal #4 Overall: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Goal #4 was less than a 10% difference. The estimated actual expenditures were slightly less than the budgeted.
* Action 4.1: Coordination of Student Support: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures for Action 4.1.
* Action 4.2: Health Professionals (Physical/Mental/Social/Emotional): There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures for Action 4.2. The use of LREBG funds allowed full implementation of this action.
* Action 4.3: Additional support staff: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures for Action 4.3.
* Action 4.4: School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in both Chronically Absent and Suspension who scored red on the CA Dashboard: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures for Action 4.4
* Action 4.5: Transportation: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures for Action 4.5.

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

The actions under Goal #4 exhibited some degree of effectiveness towards the goal of students will learn in a safe, well maintained school where they are supported, engaged, and connected to their school.

* Action 4.1 was effective with direct supports being provided for students, from professionals within and outside of the district, were coordinated so that students in need received timely and effective programs and support (also includes LREBG).
* Action 4.2 was effective with school health professionals and counselors providing direct services to students to promote well-being and health and intervene with actual and potential health problems (also includes LREBG).
* Action 4.3 was effective overall with additional support staff providing direct services to students to promote a positive school climate, good citizenship, and school safety, even though some student groups had mixed results seen in the above metrics.
* Action 4.4 was effective with school sites allocations being prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard, even though some student groups had mixed results as seen in the above metrics.
* Action 4.5 was effective with the district providing transportation to elementary students who live 3/4 mile or more from school, and/or junior high students who live one mile or more from school.

A total of 7 metrics was included in Goal 4, for which all the data and disaggregated data points are provided in the detail above. For the purpose of this summary, we have included highlights from the related metrics:

Hanford Elementary School District is still feeling the lingering effects of the COVID pandemic, particularly in Chronic Absenteeism. Even though there is a decrease in both Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate from 2023-24 to 2025-26, rates have yet to reach the lower levels of pre-covid. Anecdotal observations along with internal data for the school year, as well as the couple of years, show that students have experienced a decline in social-emotional well-being. This decline is most significant at the district's junior high schools.

CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM
The COVID pandemic had a profound effect on student attendance. In the years leading up to the pandemic, the district's chronic absenteeism rate remained below that of the state and Kings County overall. Data continues to show that the district's programs and services supporting students' social-emotional well-being and physical health are effective. During the 2024-2025 and 2025-2026 school years, schools were able to re-incorporate programs and activities that promoted school attendance that the state and county departments of health required them to suspend the previously, and this year those programs and services have continued and expanded. This has helped to improve attendance, however, attendance rates are still not back to pre-COVID rates. Analysis of the district's Chronic Absenteeism rate shows the following: Overall (All Students) Chronic Absenteeism Rates (per CDE DataQuest):
* 2017: 8.0% (County: 9.5%, State: 10.8%)
* 2018: 7.7% (County: 9.4%, State: 11.1%)
* 2019: 7.9% (County: 9.7%, State: 12.0%)
* 2020: N/A (COVID Shutdown)
* 2021: 12.3% (County: 15.3%, State: 14.3%)
* 2022: 41.0% (County: 36.9%, State: 30.8%)
* 2023: 21.6% (County: 21.1%, State: 25.4%)
* 2024: 13.2% (County: 17.6%, State: 20.4%)
* 2025: 11.9% (County: 15.6%, State: 19.5%)

In looking at the Data, you can see in 2023 through 2025, our Chronic Absenteeism rate declined drastically and remains below the state level.

In looking at the district student groups, and comparing to years past, all the student groups have increased their Chronically Absenteeism rate from 2019 (pre-covid) but has lowered their rate since 2022. This reflects the district's efforts over the last few years have shown an improvement in the rate and is effective, however, there still work to do since rates are not yet back to where their were pre-covid.
* Students with Disabilities: 2025: 22.6% (2019: 13.70% and 2022: 55.20%)
* Socially Economically Disadvantaged: 2025: 14.2% (2019: 8.60% and 2022: 45.30%)
* English Learners: 2025: 10.4% (2019: 6.20% and 2022: 36.70%)
* Foster Youth: 2025: 31.9% (2019: 11.60% and 2022: 54.00%)
* Homeless: 2025: 23.7% (2019: 22.80% and 2022: 60.50%)
* African American students: 2025: 21.4% (2019: 10.90% and 2022: 47.80%)
* Hispanic students: 2025: 12.7% (2019: 7.60% and 2022: 13.90%)
* White students: 2025: 11.9% (2019: 8.20% and 2022: 36.00%)
* Two or More Races: 2025: 9.5% (2019: 8.30% and 2022: 40.10%)

SUSPENSION RATE
The data measuring school climate, especially suspensions and absenteeism, have been significantly impacted by the COVID pandemic, and do not accurately reflect the impact that the district's programs and services have had on school climate. The district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have led to a significant and steady decline in suspensions. The district's programs and services for students under Goal #4 during the pandemic have mitigated the negative effects on their social-emotional well-being. This indicates a need to continue, and where possible, expand the services and programs that support students' social-emotional well-being and physical health.

The district's suspension rate declined by more than fifty percent between 2013 and 2019 (the last data set prior to the pandemic). Analysis of the district's suspension rate shows the following: Overall (All Students) Suspension Rates (per CDE DataQuest):
* 2013: 6.3% (County: 8.0%)
* 2014: 5.0% (County: 6.8%)
* 2015: 5.4% (County: 6.4%)
* 2016: 4.5% (County: 5.7%)
* 2017: 3.4% (County: 5.9%)
* 2018: 3.1% (County: 5.7%)
* 2019: 2.8% (County: 4.9%)
* 2020: 2.9% (County: 3.9%)
* 2021: 0.5% (County: 1.0%) (School closures and extended periods of distance learning affected student suspensions and suspension rates in 2020-2021.)
* 2022: 4.5% (County: 5.8%)
* 2023: 5.6% (County: 6.8%)
* 2024: 4.5% (County: 6.0%)
* 2025: 3.1% (County: 4.9%)

Suspension rates continue to remain lower than the county, and school sites will continue to re-incorporate the strategies and supports that were in place prior to COVID when suspension rates were lower.

In looking at the district student groups, and comparing to years past, most have increased their suspension rate from 2019 (pre-covid) and most have lowered their rate since 2022. This reflects the district's efforts over the last few years have shown an improvement in the rate and is effective, however, there still work to do since Foster Youth, Homeless and Students with disabilities rates increased from 2022.
* Students with Disabilities: 2025: 4.8% (2019: 5.70% and 2022: 6.40%)
* Socially Economically Disadvantaged: 2025: 3.1% (2019: 2.90% and 2022: 5.00%)
* English Learners: 2025: 2.5% (2019: 1.40% and 2022: 4.60%)
* Foster Youth: 2025: 12.2% (2019: 12.20% and 2022: 4.50%)
* Homeless: 2025: 5.6% (2019: 4.90% and 2022: 9.40%)
* African American students: 2025: 7.5% (2019: 8.20% and 2022: 9.10%)
* Hispanic students: 2025: 2.5% (2019: 2.20% and 2022: 4.10%)
* White students: 2025: 4.5% (2019: 3.20% and 2022: 4.20%)
* Two or More Races: 2025: 3.3% (2019: 6.70% and 2022: 4.60%)

SUCCESSES
The district's team of student support staff worked throughout the year to improve students' physical health and social-emotional well-being. The district coordinated several funding sources (including the LCAP) to significantly expand the level of support for students' physical health and social-emotional well-being last year and continued this year. The expanded services are as follows. Some of the personnel listed below are funded with the LCAP and some are funded with other sources, such as LREBG:
* Counselor at each elementary school
* Two counselors at each junior high school
* Three social workers (increased from one)
* LVNs at each school site increased from part-time to full-time

CHALLENGES
As seen in the data above, the COVID pandemic has had a profound effect on students' physical health and social-emotional well-being in relation to pre-COVID data. This is especially evident with the district's junior high school students. The effects of the pandemic have manifested in increased discipline incidents and absenteeism, although in 2023-24 rates are trending back down. The district's team of student support staff have worked tirelessly to support students' physical health and social-emotional wellbeing and it's starting to show in the rate reversal starting in 2023-24 and continuing in 2025-26.

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.

Metrics will be switched back to CA Dashboard data from using DataQuest for monitoring Suspension Rates and Chronic Absenteeism Rates. DataQuest will still be used for comparison between district and county, however, for the metrics in the LCAP, the CA Dashboard data will be used for reporting and goal setting.
Baseline and Desired Outcomes for 2024–25 for the above metrics will be CA Dashboard based.
* Action 4.1: Coordination of Student Support: Annual salary schedule increases for employees (step & column) increased the amount of funding required to support this action. The use of LREBG funds allowed full implementation of this action.
* Action 4.2: Health Professionals (Physical/Mental/Social/Emotional): LVNs will continue as full-time to further increase/improve services for students. LVNs will also continue as full-time with plans to continue in the future. The use of LREBG funds allowed full implementation of this action.
* Action 4.3: Additional support staff: Annual salary schedule increases for employees (step & column) increased the amount of funding required to support this action.
* Action 4.4: School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in both Chronically Absent and Suspension who scored red on the CA Dashboard: Additional support staff: Annual salary schedule increases for employees (step & column) increased the amount of funding required to support this action. A change from Non-Contributing to Contributing for action 4.4 was implemented to help address our student groups in the red. The district's needs assessment draws on three data points side by side: All Students, SED, and SWD, because looking at any one of them alone understates the need:
- 83% of HESD's SWD students are also identified as SED, meaning the SWD population is, in large part, a subset of the SED population, not a separate group.

- Students who sit at the SWD/SED intersection have the highest rates on both Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate indicators in the district: 7.50% suspended (more than double All Students' 3.10%, and higher than SWD overall at 5.80%) and 19.00% chronically absent (well above All Students' 11.90% and above SWD overall at 18.00%).
- SED students overall (3.30% suspension, 13.30% chronic absenteeism) look only modestly elevated compared to All Students, but that district-wide SED average is masking a much higher-need population within it: SED students who are also SWD.

Because the overwhelming majority of SWD students are also SED, the elevated SWD rates are, in practice, telling the district something about a subgroup of its SED population. When the data is disaggregated to isolate SED students who are also SWD, the rates climb even further, to 7.50% suspension rate and 19.00% chronic absenteeism, confirming that the true magnitude of need inside the SED group is being driven by this dual-identified subgroup. This is consistent with the CA Dashboard's own Priority 5 and 6 "Red" school-site data already cited elsewhere in Action 4.4, where SED and SWD are the two student groups that recur most often (e.g., Simas: SED red for both chronic absenteeism and suspension; King, Roosevelt, and Hamilton: SWD red for chronic absenteeism and/or suspension). The needs assessment therefore treats SED as the identified unduplicated student group focus for this action, with SWD data serving as corroborating, within-group evidence of where the need is most concentrated.

Action 4.4 directs each School Site Council to prioritize its site allocation toward the student groups scoring in the Red on the CA Dashboard for Chronic Absenteeism and/or Suspension Rate, which based on the needs assessment above, are principally SED students (including the significant proportion of SED students who are also SWD). The action's specific components are designed to address the barriers driving SED students' disproportionate rates:

- Weekly outreach to chronically absent students — targeting the attendance gap that is largest for SED students (13.30% overall, 19.00% for SED students who are also SWD) compared to All Students (11.90%).
- Weekly MTSS grade-level team meetings to analyze data and deliver timely behavioral interventions — directly addressing the elevated suspension risk documented for SED students, and especially for the SED/SWD intersection (7.50%).
- Culturally responsive training for teachers, to build classroom practices that reduce exclusionary discipline for the student groups most affected.
- Site-level MTSS reporting to Instructional Cabinet and coordination with the District Support Team, so each site's use of funds is monitored against outcomes for its lowest-performing groups, which the CA Dashboard site-level data confirms are recurrently SED and SWD.

The 2025 CA Dashboard identifies SED students in the Red at multiple sites (e.g., Simas for both Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate) and SWD students in the Red at several others (Hamilton, King, Roosevelt) and because 83% of SWD students are also SED, these are substantially overlapping populations spread across the district's school sites. A schoolwide structure, in which every Site Council uses local dashboard and DataQuest data to direct its own allocation toward its own lowest-performing groups, allows the action to reach SED students (and the SED/SWD subgroup within them) at whichever sites the need is concentrated in a given year, rather than freezing the action's reach to a single school or a static list of students.

The metrics and targets used to measure Action 4.4's progress and effectiveness are SED as the primary unduplicated group, with SWD reported alongside as the corroborating dual-identified population.

Metric 4.1: Suspension Rate: Baseline (2023): All Students 5.4%, SED 6.1% (Red), SWD 6.3% (Red). Year 2 Outcome (2025): All Students 2.9%, SED 3.1% (Yellow), SWD 4.8% (Yellow). 3-Year Target: continue reducing SED and SWD suspension rates at a faster pace than the All-Students rate, with an explicit sub-target for SED students who are also SWD, using DataQuest dual-identification data (currently 7.50%) as the baseline for that sub-target.

Metric 4.4: Chronic Absenteeism: Baseline (2023): All Students 22.1%, SED 24.3%, SWD 29.6%. Year 2 Outcome (2025): All Students 12.8%, SED 14.2% (Yellow), SWD 22.6% (Orange). 3-Year Target: close the gap between SED and All Students chronic absenteeism, with

a specific sub-target for the SED/SWD dual-identified subgroup (currently 19.00%), which the data shows is the highest-need population within SED.
The district's needs assessment shows that Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students are the unduplicated student group most consistently identified in the Red for Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate across HESD school sites. This need is substantiated by DataQuest data showing that 83% of the district's Students with Disabilities (SWD) are also SED, and that SED students who are also SWD experience the highest rates in the district on both indicators: 7.50% suspended (compared to 3.10% for All Students and 3.30% for SED overall) and 19.00% chronically absent (compared to 11.90% for All Students and 13.30% for SED overall). Action 4.4 is principally directed toward SED students, using this dual-identification data to target Site Council resources toward the sites and practices most likely to reduce chronic absenteeism and exclusionary discipline for this population, and is provided on a schoolwide basis because SED and SWD Red designations recur across multiple school sites rather than being concentrated at a single site.
* Action 4.5: Transportation: There are no changes to this action.

LEARNING RECOVERY AND EMERGENCY BLOCK GRANT
Hanford Elementary School District has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2025-2026 school year. LREBG funded actions can be found in Goal 4, Actions 1 and 2.

The Hanford Elementary School District's needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2025 CA Dashboard related to Suspension rates and Chronic Absenteeism. A review of state and local data indicates a significantly high suspension rate for Foster students at 12.2% compared to All Students at 2.9%. In addition, for Chronic Absenteeism, Students with Disabilities (SWD), Foster, and Homeless student groups were at 22.6%, 31.9%, and 23.7% respectively, which is significantly higher when compared to All Students (12.8%). Based on this, Goal 4, Metric 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 along with Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 directly address the health and wellness needs in addition to the social and emotional needs that go well beyond what all students need. Counselors, Social Workers, SPED Teachers, Psychologists, and School nurses provide accessible counseling and crisis intervention to support students in building resilience, developing coping strategies, and managing the emotional toll of their circumstances. These actions align to the allowable uses of funds in the area of integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, such as provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupils needs (EC Section 32526(c)(2)(c). This is evidenced by:

- Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf)
- Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf)
- The Link Between School Attendance and Good Health (https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AAP_policy_statement_chronic_absence_2019_.pdf)

In November 2025, after the CA Dashboard was publicized and updated Differentiated Assistance criteria was known, Hanford Elementary School District qualified for the student group Foster Student student group, scoring Red on the CA Dashboard in Math (and Orange in ELA) (Priority 4) and also in Red Chronic Absenteeism Rate (Priority 5). Starting December 2025, the DA team focused on Foster Youth. More information about the Differentiated Assistance work can be found in these sections above:

- Plan Summary: Reflections: Technical Assistance section

- Goal 4: An Explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal section

Note: Budgeted expenditure amounts may change going forward due to salary differences or price changes on goods. Unless otherwise noted, such changes are not material and are not the result of changes to our programs.

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	Coordination of Student Support	Direct supports for students, from professionals within and outside of the district, are coordinated so that students in need receive timely and effective programs and support. 33% Learning Directors Assistant Superintendent of School Climate, Child Welfare and Attendance Supplies/Materials (for School Climate Child Welfare and Attendance) Supplies/Materials for Foster Youth School Social Workers (Some funded through LREBG Funding) SARB This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2023 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism • Suspension Rate: • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 6.1% suspension rate (RED) • Foster Youths: 8.2% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism	$1,651,834.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: EL: 18.5% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: SED: 18.4% suspension rate (Red) • Woodrow: SED: 19.4% suspension rate (Red) District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2024 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 23.5% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • Foster: 15.7% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism (only SWD and Homeless) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Washington: EL: 6.4% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 28.3% suspension rate (RED) District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 31.9% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 16.2% chronically absent (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 3.5% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 38.6% suspension rate (RED) LEARNING RECOVERY AND EMERGENCY BLOCK GRANT ($333,404) Hanford Elementary School District has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2025-2026 school year. LREBG funded actions can be found in Goal 4,		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Actions 1 and 2. The Hanford Elementary School District's needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2024 CA Dashboard related to Suspension rates and Chronic Absenteeism. A review of state and local data indicates a significantly high suspension rate for Foster students at 15.7% compared to All Students at 4.2%. In addition, Socio-economically disadvantaged students (SED), Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Homeless student groups were at 4.7%, 6.7%, and 8.9% respectively. Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) students were chronically absent at a higher rate (15.3%) compared to All Students (13.7%). Foster students were also Chronically Absent at a significantly higher rate (23.5%) compared to All Students (13.7%). Based on this, Goal 4, Metric 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 along with Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 directly address the health and wellness needs in addition to the social and emotional needs that go well beyond what all students need. Counselors, Social Workers, SPED Teachers, Psychologists, and School nurses provide accessible counseling and crisis intervention to support students in building resilience, developing coping strategies, and managing the emotional toll of their circumstances. These actions align to the allowable uses of funds in the area of integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, such as provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupils needs. This is evidenced by: • Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf) • Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf) • The Link Between School Attendance and Good Health (https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AAP_policy_statement_chronic_absence_2019_.pdf) Hanford Elementary School District has unexpended LREBG funds for the		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		2026-2027 school year. LREBG funded actions can be found in Goal 4, Actions 1 and 2. The Hanford Elementary School District's needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2025 CA Dashboard related to Suspension rates and Chronic Absenteeism. A review of state and local data indicates a significantly high suspension rate for Foster students at 12.2% compared to All Students at 2.9%. In addition, Socio-economically disadvantaged students (SED), Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Homeless student groups were at 3.1%, 4.8%, and 5.6% respectively. Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) students were chronically absent at a higher rate (14.2%) compared to All Students (12.8%). Foster students were also Chronically Absent at a significantly higher rate (31.9%) compared to All Students (12.8%). Based on this, Goal 4, Metric 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 along with Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 directly address the health and wellness needs in addition to the social and emotional needs that go well beyond what all students need. Counselors, Social Workers, SPED Teachers, Psychologists, and School nurses provide accessible counseling and crisis intervention to support students in building resilience, developing coping strategies, and managing the emotional toll of their circumstances. These actions align to the allowable uses of funds in the area of integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, such as provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupils needs. This is evidenced by: • Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf) • Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf) • The Link Between School Attendance and Good Health (https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AAP_policy_statement_chronic_absence_2019_.pdf)		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
4.2	Health Professionals (Physical/Mental/Social/Emotional)	School health professionals and counselors provide direct services to students to promote well-being and health and intervene with actual and potential health problems. School Nurses (RNs) (Some funded through LREBG Funding) School Nurses (LVNs) School Nursing Supplies/Materials Elementary Counselors (Some funded through LREBG Funding) Junior High Counselors (Some funded through LREBG Funding) Psychologists (Some funded through LREBG Funding) RSP & SDC Teachers (Some funded through LREBG Funding) This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2023 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism • Suspension Rate: • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 6.1% suspension rate (RED) • Foster Youths: 8.2% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: EL: 18.5% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: SED: 18.4% suspension rate (Red) • Woodrow: SED: 19.4% suspension rate (Red) District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2024 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 23.5% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate:	$4,613,037.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		• Foster: 15.7% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism (only SWD and Homeless) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Washington: EL: 6.4% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 28.3% suspension rate (RED) District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 31.9% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 16.2% chronically absent (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 3.5% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 38.6% suspension rate (RED) LEARNING RECOVERY AND EMERGENCY BLOCK GRANT ($2,186,055) Hanford Elementary School District has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2025-2026 school year. LREBG funded actions can be found in Goal 4, Actions 1 and 2. The Hanford Elementary School District's needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2024 CA Dashboard related to Suspension rates and Chronic Absenteeism. A review of state and local data indicates a significantly high suspension rate for Foster students at 15.7% compared to All Students at 4.2%. In addition, Socio-economically disadvantaged students (SED), Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Homeless student groups were at 4.7%, 6.7%, and 8.9% respectively. Socio-economically		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		disadvantaged (SED) students were chronically absent at a higher rate (15.3%) compared to All Students (13.7%). Foster students were also Chronically Absent at a significantly higher rate (23.5%) compared to All Students (13.7%). Based on this, Goal 4, Metric 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 along with Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 directly address the health and wellness needs in addition to the social and emotional needs that go well beyond what all students need. Counselors, Social Workers, SPED Teachers, Psychologists, and School nurses provide accessible counseling and crisis intervention to support students in building resilience, developing coping strategies, and managing the emotional toll of their circumstances. These actions align to the allowable uses of funds in the area of integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, such as provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupils needs. This is evidenced by: • Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf) • Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf) • The Link Between School Attendance and Good Health (https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AAP_policy_statement_chronic_absence_2019_.pdf) Hanford Elementary School District has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2026-2027 school year. LREBG funded actions can be found in Goal 4, Actions 1 and 2. The Hanford Elementary School District's needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2025 CA Dashboard related to Suspension rates and Chronic Absenteeism. A review of state and local data indicates a significantly high suspension rate for Foster students at 12.2% compared to All Students at 2.9%. In addition, Socio-economically disadvantaged students (SED), Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Homeless student		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		groups were at 3.1%, 4.8%, and 5.6% respectively. Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) students were chronically absent at a higher rate (14.2%) compared to All Students (12.8%). Foster students were also Chronically Absent at a significantly higher rate (31.9%) compared to All Students (12.8%). Based on this, Goal 4, Metric 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 along with Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 directly address the health and wellness needs in addition to the social and emotional needs that go well beyond what all students need. Counselors, Social Workers, SPED Teachers, Psychologists, and School nurses provide accessible counseling and crisis intervention to support students in building resilience, developing coping strategies, and managing the emotional toll of their circumstances. These actions align to the allowable uses of funds in the area of integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, such as provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupils needs. This is evidenced by: • Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf) • Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf) • The Link Between School Attendance and Good Health (https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AAP_policy_statement_chronic_absence_2019_.pdf)		
4.3	School Support Staff	Additional support staff provides direct services to students to promote a positive school climate, good citizenship, and school safety. Student Specialists (One at each elementary school) Vice Principals (One at each Junior High) School Resource Officers (not district employees) Yard Supervisors at each school	$3,643,132.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Community Day School (CDS): *CDS Principal/Youth Development *CDS Teachers *CDS Specialist *CDS Aides *Supplies This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2023 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism • Suspension Rate: • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 6.1% suspension rate (RED) • Foster Youths: 8.2% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: EL: 18.5% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: SED: 18.4% suspension rate (Red) • Woodrow: SED: 19.4% suspension rate (Red) District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2024 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 23.5% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • Foster: 15.7% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism (only SWD and Homeless)		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Washington: EL: 6.4% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 28.3% suspension rate (RED) District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 31.9% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 16.2% chronically absent (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 3.5% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 38.6% suspension rate (RED)		
4.4	School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in both Chronically Absent and Suspension who scored red on the CA Dashboard.	School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard. To address the low performing schools in a district and student group reds on the 2024 CA Dashboard (see “An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal”) and identified in the metrics appendix, including Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group (DA student group), each school will take the following actions to address the student group(s): Schools will conduct weekly outreach to students that are chronically absent, School site team (Student Specialist, Counselor, VP, and teachers) will work with and Instructional Leadership team to learn together using an inclusive, improvement model. They will be responsible to monitor SPSA actions and outcomes and identify next steps. Schools will conduct weekly MTSS grade-level teams to analyze data and provide timely behavioral interventions for students as well as monitor attendance. Teachers participate in Culturally Responsive training to establish a culture of learning in their classrooms. MTSS Team to report out during Instructional	$3,131.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Cabinet, which consists of School Site Admin and District Admin. School site team (Student Specialist, Counselor, VP, and teachers) will work with and District Support Team to learn together using an inclusive, improvement model. They will be responsible to monitor SPSA actions and outcomes and identify next steps to improve positive behavior and increase student engagement. See Reflections: Technical Assistance section for details of the work underway for Students with Disabilities (SWD) student group from 24-25 and Foster Youth for 25-26 school years. This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2023 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism: None • Suspension Rate: • African American students: 11.6% suspension rate (RED) • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 6.1% suspension rate (RED) • Students With Disabilities: 6.3% suspension rate (RED) • Foster Youths: 8.2% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: White: 36.8% chronically absent (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: White: 6.9% suspension rate (Red) • Lincoln: AA: 7.1% suspension rate (Red) • Lincoln: SWD: 10.7% suspension rate (Red) • Roosevelt: White: 8.1% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: Overall: 17.6% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: EL: 18.5% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: SED: 18.4% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: Hispanic: 16.3% suspension rate (Red) • Woodrow: SED: 19.4% suspension rate (Red) • Woodrow: Hispanic: 17.3% suspension rate (Red)		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2024 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism: • Foster: 23.5% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • Students with Disabilities (SWD): 6.7% suspension rate (RED) • Foster Youths: 15.7% suspension rate (RED) • Homeless: 8.9% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Monroe: SWD: 24.7% chronically absent (Red) • Kennedy: Homeless: 58.1% chronically absent (RED) • Kennedy: SWD: 36.9% chronically absent (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 6.6% suspension rate (Red) • Lincoln: African American (AA): 10.3% suspension rate (Red) • Monroe: SWD: 6.3% suspension rate (Red) • Simas: African American (AA): 10.0% suspension rate (RED) • Washington: EL: 6.4% suspension rate (RED) • Kennedy: Homeless: 27.3% suspension rate (RED) • Kennedy: SWD: 15.6% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: Overall: 28.1% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 28.3% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: Hispanic: 29.1% suspension rate (RED) District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism: • African American (AA): 21.4% chronically absent (Red) • Foster: 31.9% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • No student groups scored in the Red Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2025 Dashboard are: • King: SWD: 20.8% chronically absent (Red) • Roosevelt: SWD: 26.0% chronically absent (Red) • Roosevelt: White: 22.6% chronically absent (Red) • Simas: All Students: 12.3% chronically absent (Red)		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		• Simas: SED: 16.2% chronically absent (Red) • Simas: Hispanic: 13.4% chronically absent (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 8.0% suspension rate (Red) • Richmond: White: 11.4% suspension rate (Red) • Roosevelt: White: 6.1% suspension rate (RED) • Simas: SED: 3.5% suspension rate (RED) • Simas: SWD: 6.2% suspension rate (RED) • Washington: White: 13.7% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: Overall: 37.3% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 38.6% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: Hispanic: 35.1% suspension rate (RED)		
4.5	Transportation	Elementary students who live 3/4 mile or more from school, and/or junior high students who live one mile or more from school will be provided with transportation to and from school. This action addresses: 2023 • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 24.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 18.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 17.6% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 11.6%) 2024 • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 15.3% chronically absent, higher than All Students (13.7%) • English Learners had a rate of 10.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%)	$500,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		• Foster Youth Students had a rate of 23.5% chronically absent, higher than All Students (13.7%) 2025 • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 14.2% chronically absent, higher than All Students (12.8%) • English Learners had a rate of 10.4% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 31.9% chronically absent, higher than All Students (12.8%)		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
5	Communication between schools and home will be regular and meaningful.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

The district developed this goal because the district is committed to the belief that family engagement is one of the single most important factors in helping students succeed in school.

The district developed this goal:
* Because there is an ongoing need for parents/guardians to actively participate in their children's education and there is a need for home-to-school communication and parent/guardian involvement.
* Because parents need information and training to help their children achieve in school.
* Because parents have a right to be involved in the decision-making process at the school and district levels.

The metrics under Goal 5 will measure the extent to which parents are involved in their students' education. The actions under Goal 5 will support parents as they are involved in their students' education.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
5.1	Priority 3: Parental Involvement addresses: B. How the school district will promote parental participation in programs for unduplicated pupils C. How the school district will promote parental participation in	"Parents (including parents of unduplicated pupils and pupils with exceptional needs) received meaningful and timely communication on their students' progress/achievement as evidenced by district	"Parents (including parents of unduplicated pupils and pupils with exceptional needs) received meaningful and timely communication on their students'	"Parents (including parents of unduplicated pupils and pupils with exceptional needs) received meaningful and timely communication on their students'	The parent conference attendance rate will be 95% or greater. HESD Parent Survey:	No Difference: "Parents (including parents of unduplicated pupils and pupils with exceptional needs) received meaningful and timely communication on

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	programs for individuals with exceptional needs.	reviews of the numbers of parents attending conferences and parent survey responses. 2023-2024: Parent/teacher Conference attendance rate: 99.9%. 2023-2024 HESD Parent Survey: 97% Agree/Strongly Agree: Parent/Teacher Conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards. 98% Agree/Strongly Agree: The Report to Parent helps me to understand what my child is expected to achieve in English Language Arts and Math. 98% Agree/Strongly Agree: I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom (such as	progress/achievement as evidenced by district reviews of the numbers of parents attending conferences and parent survey responses. 2024-2025: Parent/teacher Conference attendance rate: 99.8%. 2024-2025 HESD Parent Survey: 99% Agree/Strongly Agree: Parent/Teacher Conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards. 97% Agree/Strongly Agree: The Report to Parent helps me to understand what my child is	progress/achievement as evidenced by district reviews of the numbers of parents attending conferences and parent survey responses. 2025-2026: Parent/teacher Conference attendance rate: 100%. 2025-2026 HESD Parent Survey: 98% Agree/Strongly Agree: Parent/Teacher Conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards. 98% Agree/Strongly Agree: The Report to Parent helps me to understand what my child is	95% Agree/Strongly Agree (or greater): Parent/Teacher Conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards. 95% Agree/Strongly Agree: (or greater) The Report to Parent helps me to understand what my child is expected to achieve in English Language Arts and Math. 95% Agree/Strongly Agree: (or greater) I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom (such as yellow cards, notes, phone calls, progress reports).	their students' progress/achievement as evidenced by district reviews of the numbers of parents attending conferences and parent survey responses. Parent/teacher Conference attendance rate: +0.1% difference HESD Parent Survey: Agree/Strongly Agree: Parent/Teacher Conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards. +1% difference Agree/Strongly Agree: The Report to Parent helps me to understand what my child is expected to

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		yellow cards, notes, phone calls, progress reports). "	expected to achieve in English Language Arts and Math. 97% Agree/Strongly Agree: I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom (such as yellow cards, notes, phone calls, progress reports). "	expected to achieve in English Language Arts and Math. 98% Agree/Strongly Agree: I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom (such as yellow cards, notes, phone calls, progress reports). "		achieve in English Language Arts and Math. 0% difference Agree/Strongly Agree: I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom (such as yellow cards, notes, phone calls, progress reports). " 0% difference
5.2	Priority 3: Parental Involvement addresses: B. How the school district will promote parental participation in programs for unduplicated pupils C. How the school district will promote parental participation in programs for individuals with exceptional needs. Priority 4: Pupil Achievement as measured by: CAASPP Data: ELA & Math	The District received a score of "Met" on the 2023 California School Dashboard local indicator for Parent Engagement. Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 44.77% SWD: 11.14% SED: 40.46% EL: 20.41% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 5.00%	The District received a score of "Met" on the 2024 California School Dashboard local indicator for Parent Engagement. Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 45.10% SWD: 12.44% SED: 41.14%	The District received a score of "Met" on the 2025 California School Dashboard local indicator for Parent Engagement. Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest) Overall: 51.29% SWD: 16.10% SED: 46.83%	The District will receive a score of "Met" on the California School Dashboard local indicator for Parent Engagement. Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP ELA (per Data Quest - Proposed Target) Overall: 54.00% SWD: 21.00%	No Difference: The District received a score of "Met" on the 2025 California School Dashboard local indicator for Parent Engagement. Priority 4: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient - Difference from baseline in ELA: Overall: +6.52% SWD: +4.88% SED: +6.37% EL: -1.06%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Asian: 65.52% African American: 34.15% Hispanic: 42.87% White: 57.11% Two or More: 54.47% Homeless: 31.06% Foster: 36.36% English Language Arts (per 2023 CA Dashboard): Overall: 16.4 points Below (Orange) EL: 36.5 points Below (Yellow) SED: 28.2 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 104.1 points Below (Red) Homeless: 46.8 points Below (Yellow) African American: 50.2 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 20.6 points Below (Orange) Two or More: 5.8 points Below (Orange) White: 14.9 points Above (Green) Foster: 19.9 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 53.1 points Below (No Color) Asian: 26.0 points Above (No Color)	EL: 16.08% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 3.45% Asian: 75.86% African American: 31.12% Hispanic: 42.96% White: 57.99% Two or More: 55.83% Homeless: 25.00% Foster: 13.33% English Language Arts (per 2024 CA Dashboard): Overall: 15.8 points Below (Orange) EL: 37.6 points Below (Orange) SED: 27.3 points Below (Orange) SWD: 104.6 points Below (Red) Homeless: 78.4 points Below (Red) African American: 48.8 points Below (Orange) Hispanic: 20.1 points Below (Orange) Two or More: 6.9 points Above (Green)	EL: 19.35% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% Asian: 74.08% African American: 42.52% Hispanic: 50.13% White: 58.71% Two or More: 55.73% Homeless: 35.30% Foster: 28.57% English Language Arts (per 2025 CA Dashboard): Overall: 2.6 points Below (Green) EL: 18.2 points Below (Yellow) SED: 13.4 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 87.0 points Below (Orange) Homeless: 39.7 points Below (Yellow) African American: 30.7 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 5.2 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 8.2 points Above (Yellow)	SED: 50.00% EL: 30.00% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 16.00% Asian: 71.00% African American: 44.00% Hispanic: 52.00% White: 64.00% Two or More: 64.00% Homeless: 41.00% Foster: 48.00% English Language Arts (per 2026 CA Dashboard): Overall: 6.4 points Below EL: 26.5 points Below SED: 18.2 points Below SWD: 80.1 points Below Homeless: 36.8 points Below African American: 40.2 points Below Hispanic: 10.6 points Below Two or More: 5.0 points Above White: 24.9 points Above Foster: 9.9 points Below	LTEL (Long-Term EL): +1.35% Asian: +8.56% African American: +8.37% Hispanic: +7.26% White: +1.60% Two or More: +1.26% Homeless: +4.24% Foster: -7.79% English Language Arts Difference (per CA Dashboard): Overall: +13.80 EL: +18.30 SED: +14.80 SWD: +17.10 Homeless: +7.10 African American: +19.50 Hispanic: +15.40 Two or More: -2.40 White: +1.00 Foster: -49.10 American Indian: -43.50 Asian: +28.90 Filipino: -1.20 The Difference between Baseline and Year 2 of Students Scoring Proficient on the

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Filipino: 61.0 points Above (No Color) Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2023 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 33.66% SWD: 8.60% SED: 29.12% EL: 12.50% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 3.57% Asian: 51.72% African American: 23.78% Hispanic: 31.32% White: 46.33% Two or More: 46.43% Homeless: 19.42% Foster: 36.36% Mathematics (per 2023 CA Dashboard): Overall: 45.8 points Below (Yellow) EL: 65.9 points Below (Yellow) SED: 57.6 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 126.5 points Below (Red) Homeless: 77.0 points Below (Orange) African American: 78.7 points Below (Yellow)	White: 9.4 points Above (Yellow) Foster: 44.7 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 100.3 points Below (No Color) Asian: 59.8 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 56.8 points Above (No Color) Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2024 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 37.67% SWD: 13.62% SED: 34.43% English Learners: 13.69% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 1.72% Asian: 55.17% African American: 21.71% Hispanic: 35.57% White: 51.85% Two or More: 48.34% Homeless: 16.30% Foster: 6.67%	White: 15.9 points Above (Green) Foster: 69.0 points Below (Orange) American Indian: 96.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 54.9 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 59.8 points Above (Blue) Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2025 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 40.40% SWD: 12.37% SED: 36.11% English Learners: 16.27% LTEL (Long-Term EL): 6.35% Asian: 62.97% African American: 23.44% Hispanic: 38.76% White: 51.79% Two or More: 48.85% Homeless: 20.00% Foster: 6.67%	American Indian: 43.0 points Below Asian: 35.0 points Above Filipino: 70.0 points Above Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: 43.00% SWD: 18.00% SED: 39.00% EL: 22.00% L-TEL (Long-Term EL): 15.00% Asian: 57.00% African American: 33.00% Hispanic: 41.00% White: 56.00% Two or More: 56.00% Homeless: 29.00% Foster 48.00% Mathematics (per 2026 CA Dashboard): Overall: 35.8 points Below EL: 55.9 points Below	CAASPP Math (per Data Quest) Overall: +6.74% SWD: +3.77% SED: +6.99% English Learners: +3.77% LTEL (Long-Term EL): +2.78% Asian: +11.25% African American: -0.34% Hispanic: +7.44% White: +5.46% Two or More: +2.42% Homeless: +0.58% Foster: -29.69% Mathematics Difference (per CA Dashboard): Overall: +15.40 EL: +21.80 SED: +16.90 SWD: +11.10 Homeless: +9.3 African American: +11.50 Hispanic: +15.70 Two or More: +19.00 White: +12.90 Foster: -38.50 American Indian: -15.30 Asian: +18.00

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		Hispanic: 49.9 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 23.6 points Below (Yellow) White: 18.4 points Below (Green) Foster: 73.0 points Below (Yellow) American Indian: 70.3 points Below (No Color) Asian: 7.1 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 7.2 points Above (No Color)	Mathematics (per 2024 CA Dashboard): Overall: 38.2 points Below (Yellow) EL: 59.9 points Below (Yellow) SED: 49.5 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 117.4 points Below (Orange) Homeless: 98.3 points Below (Red) African American: 81.7 points Below (Orange) Hispanic: 42.6 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 14.8 points Below (Green) White: 8.58 points Below (Green) Foster: 68.2 points Below (Yellow) American Indian: 67.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 31.5 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 7.1 points Above (No Color)	Mathematics (per 2025 CA Dashboard): Overall:30.4 points Below (Yellow) EL: 44.1 points Below (Yellow) SED: 40.7 points Below (Yellow) SWD: 1115.4 points Below (Red) Homeless: 67.7 points Below (Yellow) African American: 67.2 points Below (Yellow) Hispanic: 34.2 points Below (Yellow) Two or More: 4.6 points Below (Green) White: 5.5 points Below (Green) Foster: 111.5 points Below (Red) American Indian: 85.6 points Below (No Color) Asian: 25.1 points Above (No Color) Filipino: 5.3 points Above (Green)	SED: 47.6 points Below SWD: 90.0 points Below Homeless: 67.0 points Below African American: 68.7 points Below Hispanic: 39.9 points Below Two or More: 13.6 points Below White: 8.4 points Below Foster: 63.0 points Below American Indian: 60.0 points Below Asian: 17.0 points Above Filipino: 17.0 points Above	Filipino: -1.90

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
5.3	Priority 3: Parental Involvement addresses: A. The efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each individual school site	Parents(including parents of unduplicated pupils and pupils with exceptional needs) have input in programs and services, both district-wide and at the school-site level, based on district reviews of parent attendance at School Site Council meetings, District English Learner Advisory Committee meetings, Parent Advisory Committee meetings, and response to parent surveys. All schools maintained a school site council and the council met regularly. The district maintained a Parent Advisory Committee and a district English Learner Advisory Committee which met regularly. 2023-2024 HESD Parent Survey: 98% Agree/Strongly Agree: I receive adequate information regarding parent	Parents(including parents of unduplicated pupils and pupils with exceptional needs) have input in programs and services, both district-wide and at the school-site level, based on district reviews of parent attendance at School Site Council meetings, District English Learner Advisory Committee meetings, Parent Advisory Committee meetings, and response to parent surveys. All schools maintained a school site council and the council met regularly. The district maintained a Parent Advisory Committee and a district English Learner Advisory Committee which met regularly.	Parents (including parents of unduplicated pupils and pupils with exceptional needs) have input in programs and services, both district-wide and at the school-site level, based on district reviews of parent attendance at School Site Council meetings, District English Learner Advisory Committee meetings, Parent Advisory Committee meetings, and response to parent surveys. All schools maintained a school site council and the council met regularly. The district maintained a Parent Advisory Committee and a district English Learner Advisory Committee which met regularly.	The district and schools maintain the required committees. HESD Parent Survey: 95% Agree/Strongly Agree: (or greater) I receive adequate information regarding parent meeting/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent workshops, back to school night, and parent education presentations. 95% Agree/Strongly Agree: (or greater) There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs.	No Difference: Parents (including parents of unduplicated pupils and pupils with exceptional needs) have input in programs and services, both district-wide and at the school-site level, based on district reviews of parent attendance at School Site Council meetings, District English Learner Advisory Committee meetings, Parent Advisory Committee meetings, and response to parent surveys. No Difference: All schools maintained a school site council and the council met regularly. The district maintained a Parent Advisory Committee and a district English Learner Advisory

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		meeting/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent workshops, back to school night, and parent education presentations. 96% Agree/Strongly Agree: There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs.	2024-2025 HESD Parent Survey: 98% Agree/Strongly Agree: I receive adequate information regarding parent meeting/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent workshops, back to school night, and parent education presentations. 96% Agree/Strongly Agree: There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs.	2025-2026 HESD Parent Survey: 98% Agree/Strongly Agree: I receive adequate information regarding parent meeting/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent workshops, back to school night, and parent education presentations. 98% Agree/Strongly Agree: There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs.		Committee which met regularly. HESD Parent Survey: I receive adequate information regarding parent meeting/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent workshops, back to school night, and parent education presentations. 0% difference Agree/Strongly Agree: There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs. +2% difference

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.

The actions and services under Goal #5 were well-implemented with communication between schools and home being regular and meaningful.

* Action 5.1: Parent/Family Communication: The District and school sites provided parents with conferences, report cards, and other means of communication regarding students' progress.
* Action 5.2: Parent Involvement Activities: School sites and the district provided parents with a variety of informational, training/educational, and social activities that included parent/family activities to support academics and social-emotional well-being.
* Action 5.3: Required Committees: The district and school sites maintained the required committees for parent input. These committees met regularly throughout the year.

CHALLENGES
A challenge the district faces is the use of ParentVue, our district's online program that shows grades and other details for their child. Based on the Parent Survey, only 49% of the parents said they use ParentVue to view their child's progress regularly, which is an increase from last year's 48% and 38% in 2022-23. 38% of Parents said they use ParentVue sometimes to view their child's progress, and 13% said they do not use ParentVue.

SUCCESSES
Parents in Hanford Elementary have multiple opportunities to receive information on their child's progress, to participate in educational and social activities, and to have their voices heard in decisions about the district's programs and services for students. The district's parent/teacher conference attendance rate is 99.8% for 2024-2025. On the district's surveys, parents overwhelmingly agree that there are opportunities to become involved in school activities, that they receive information about their child's progress, and that they have opportunities to provide input into the school's programs. To maintain and build upon this success, the district will continue to upgrade technology tools to facilitate outreach and communication with families, a parent outreach center will provide parents with resources and training that will help them support their children in school, educational partner groups will continue to provide input and recommendations on the district's programs and services.

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.

Goal #5 Overall: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Goal #5 was less than a 10% difference. The estimated actual expenditures were slightly more than the budgeted.
* Action 5.1: Parent/Family Communication: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.

* Action 5.2: Parent Involvement Activities: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.
* Action 5.3: Required Committees: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures.

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

The actions under Goal #5 continue to be effective in delivering meaningful, two-way communication to families:

* Action 5.1 was effective with Parent/Family Communication: The District and school sites provided parents with conferences, report cards, and other means of communication regarding students' progress. The parent conference attendance rate was 99.8%. Parents overwhelmingly strongly agree/agree that they receive meaningful and timely communication on their students' progress/achievement.

* Action 5.2 was effective with Parent Involvement Activities: School sites and the district provided parents with a variety of informational, training/educational, and social activities. The district and individual school sites provided a variety of parent/family activities to support academics and social-emotional wellbeing. Parents overwhelmingly Agree/Strongly Agree that:
** 99% Agree/Strongly Agree: Parent/Teacher Conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards.
** 97% Agree/Strongly Agree: The Report to Parent helps me to understand what my child is expected to achieve in English Language Arts and Math.
** 98% Agree/Strongly Agree: I receive adequate information regarding parent meetings/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent workshops, back-to-school night, and parent education presentations.
** 96% Agree/Strongly Agree: There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs.

* Action 5.3 was effective with Required Committees: The district and school sites maintained the required committees for parent input. These committees met regularly throughout the year. Input/recommendations from these committees were communicated regularly to the HESD Board of Trustees and incorporated into the district's LCAP.

A total of 3 metrics was included in Goal 5, for which all the data and disaggregated data points are provided in the detail above. For the purpose of this summary, we have included highlights from the related metrics:

A Parent Liaison provided outreach, education, and communication to families of students across the district. A Parent Outreach Center staffed by the Parent Liaison, for the parents of EL students was in place on the Kennedy campus. EL parents from across the district had access to this center, which was stocked with books, supplies, and materials. EL parents had access to an iPad lab at the outreach center. The center provided a variety of educational sessions as well as drop-in hours. Additionally, eBooks, (English and Spanish) that can be read on iPads or other devices were purchased for EL parents to check out.

Activities, including parent academies and training at the parent outreach center and at school sites, have been well-attended. Parents, in overwhelming numbers, agree that they are provided with information regarding parent meetings/activities such as school site council,

English learner advisory committee, parent Workshops, back-to-school night, and parent education presentations; that there are adequate opportunities to become informed about the school's programs; that parent/teacher conferences are helpful; and that they receive information about their students' progress.

Other highlights include:

ELA
Almost every student groups scored a higher proficiency level in 2025 compared to 2023 (CDE DataQuest)
* Overall increased 6.52%
* Students with Disabilities increased 4.88%
* Socially Economically Disadvantaged students increased 6.37%
* Long Term English Learners increased 1.35%
* Asian students increased 8.56%
* African American Students increased 8.37%
* Hispanic students increased 7.26%
* White students increased 1.60%
* Two or More Races increased 1.26%
* Homeless students increased 4.24%

Math
Almost every student group scored a higher proficiency level in 2025 compared to 2023 (CDE DataQuest)
* Overall increased 6.74%
* Students with Disabilities increased 3.77%
* Socially Economically Disadvantaged students increased 6.99%
* English Learners increased 3.77%
* Long Term English Learners increased 2.78%
* Asian students increased 11.25%
* Hispanic students increased 7.44%
* White students increased 5.46%
* Two or More Races increased 2.42%
* Homeless students increased 0.58%

* The percentage of students scoring proficient on the ELPAC continues to remain high at 52.98% scoring Level 3 or 4 compared to 2021: 50.77% (CDE DataQuest).

Actions to support English Learner’s acquisition of the English Language seem to have mixed results. From the most recent CA Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator as proficiency levels improved from 41.09% in 2019 (pre-covid) to 47.8% in 2025. ELA CAASPP scores also show an increase of 12.07% from 2021 to 2025. Math CAASPP scores also show an increase of 14.66% from 2021 to 2025. English Learners, however, did not show the same improvements from the prior years in in ELA (21-22 at 25.03% to 24-25 at 19.35%), and therefore additional training may be needed in Integrated ELD supports in all content area classes. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum

(English Learners), provided leadership and monitoring of the district's integrated and designated ELD programs. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum provided leadership that ensured all EL students received instructional support throughout the school day (integrated ELD) and specific instruction in learning the English language (designated ELD) each day. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum worked with school site principals and learning directors ensuring that implementation of integrated and designated ELD was in place and that teaching staff received professional development in ELD instruction. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum develops, implements, supervises, and monitors all activities at the district and school level that support English learners. A learning director at each school site, provided leadership and monitoring of ELD instruction at the school site level. Learning directors ensure that both integrated and designated ELD are in place and are effective. Learning directors provide leadership and support to teaching staff in identifying EL students requiring interventions. Learning directors monitor the implementation of interventions at their sites. Learning directors, working with the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, assess the ELD professional development needs of their individual school sites, and, working together, implement professional development that is targeted to individual school sites' needs. Successes in Implementation Hanford Elementary School District implemented services leading students to proficiency on the state-adopted standards. Classrooms were staffed so that no students in grades 1-6 were in a combination class. All students in Hanford Elementary who are English learners received language support across all academic subjects. English learners also received specific instruction in learning the English language.

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.

The question on the HESD Parent Survey, and thus the related expected outcome, "I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom (such as yellow cards, notes, phone calls, progress reports. (95% or greater)" will be discontinued. Most parents now receive information about their child's progress through the district's online portal called ParentVue. Some of the tools listed in the question (yellow cards, progress reports, and notes are no longer used as they have been replaced by the ParentVue system.) Parents requesting paper communication/progress reports will be provided with them.

Action 5.2: Due to the popularity of parent education activities and to the academic progress made by students whose parents participated in the activities, this action will continue to be expanded from serving only families of EL students to serving families of students who are low-income, foster youth, and English learners. The "Population Served" was changed to reflect this expansion (Low Income, Foster Youth, English learners, LEA-Wide). Data from district assessments show that Unduplicated (EL) students whose families participated in these activities had greater gains in achievement than students whose families did not. The amount budgeted for parent outreach and education activities was increased.

Note: Budgeted expenditure amounts may change going forward due to salary differences or price changes on goods. Unless otherwise noted, such changes are not material and are not the result of changes to our programs.

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
5.1	Parent/Family Communication	The District and school sites will provide parents with conferences, report cards, and other means of communication regarding students' progress.	$0.00	No
5.2	Parent Involvement Activities	School sites and the district will provide parents with a variety of informational, training/educational, and social activities. Parent Liaison Parent Education Center Supplies This action addresses: Our EL, Foster, and SED populations throughout the district.	$341,964.00	Yes
5.3	Required Committees	The district and school sites will maintain the required committees for parent input.	$0.00	No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
6	The students at Community Day School will learn in a safe, well-maintained school where they are supported, engaged, and connected to their school - Decreasing Suspension Rates by 3% by 2027.	Equity Multiplier Focus Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Based on the 2025 CA Dashboard data for suspension rate, Community Day School students show a greater disparity when compared to other schools and were identified to receive Equity Multiplier Funding. The goal for the use of Equity Funding is that CDS, within the 3 year LCAP cycle, will show:
* a decrease in Suspension Rates
* an increase in the in School Connectedness and Safety base on student survey data.

District 2025 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows
- All Students had a suspension rate of 2.9%
- Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 3.1% suspension rate
- Hispanic students: 2.5% suspension rate

School Site Identified for Equity Multiplier Funds:
- Community Day School Suspension Rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard
- All Students: 37.3% suspension rate (Red)
- Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 38.6% suspension rate (Red)
- Hispanic students: 35.1% suspension rate (Red)

Students at Community Day School (CDS) have needs for health and wellness as well as social and emotional supports that go well beyond what students at other schools need. Data from the 2025 California School Dashboard indicate that suspension rates at CDS are higher than students at other schools. The data also indicates that students at CDS have a higher rate of suspension (37.3%) whereas this district suspension rate was 2.9%. Students at CDS may lack the resources to access the types of health and wellness as well as social supports that reduce barriers to learning. These barriers may include inconsistent school attendance and discipline incidents that result in missed days of school, time out of class, or suspension. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered a priority and the services provided are based on these considerations and are designed to support students at CDS, providing an array of supports designed to decrease behavior incidents, thereby lowering suspensions. The Community Day School provides intensive interventions for students with more serious behavior challenges.

Schools with higher attendance rates and lower numbers of discipline incidents are safer. Data from the 2025 California School Dashboard shows suspension rates at the High (Red) level for All Students and Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Students (SED). In looking over historical data and seeing an increase of 9.1% from previous year, the 37.3% from the 2025 CA Dashboard is historically higher average looking back to 2018, showing theres a need to focus on the programs being put into place and need to work back on the effective programs of the past and build upon them.
CDS Suspension Rates
* 2025: 37.3% suspension rate
* 2024: 28.1% suspension rate
* 2023: 25.0% suspension rate
* 2022: 35.3% suspension rate
* 2020 & 2021: No data due to COVID
* 2019: 46.3% suspension rate
* 2018: 34.1% suspension rate

Students are placed at CDS either through expulsion or administrative placement. Students are placed at CDS because of behavior issues at their home school. These behavior issues are often long-standing. Students who are placed at CDS often come with significant social/emotional challenges that contribute to their behavioral challenges. Missed school due to suspensions is one of the root causes negatively impacting the achievement of students who are placed at CDS.
Many of the same needs that are addressed under chronic absenteeism also apply to suspensions for students at CDS.

- There is a need to strengthen the relationships between CDS students and adults in the school.
- There is a need to build the relationships between the families of CDS students and the school.
- There is a need to build CDS students' relationships with one another.
- There is a need to provide students with the skills that will enable them to foster and support these relationships.
- There is a need to provide ongoing support to students as they transition back to their home school.
- There is a need to provide families with education and support.

We expect this action to lead to a decrease in suspension rates as this action is focused on addressing the suspension needs of CDS.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
6.1	Priority 6: School Climate as measured by: A. Pupil suspension rates, including SED students at CDS	A. Pupil suspension rates District 2023 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows	A. Pupil suspension rates District 2024 CA Dashboard	A. Pupil suspension rates District 2025 CA Dashboard	A. Pupil suspension rates The district's suspension rate	A. Pupil suspension rates District 2024 CA Dashboard Suspension rate

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	C. Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness	• All Students had a suspension rate of 5.4% • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 6.1% suspension rate School Site Identified for Equity Multiplier Funds: • Community Day School Suspension Rate on the 2023 CA Dashboard • Overall: 25% suspension rate (Orange) • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 24.4% suspension rate (Orange) C. Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety	Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 4.2% • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 4.7% suspension rate School Site Identified for Equity Multiplier Funds: • Community Day School Suspension Rate on the 2024 CA Dashboard • Overall: 28.1% suspension rate (Red)	Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 2.9% • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 3.1% suspension rate • Hispanic students: 2.5% suspension rate School Site Identified for Equity Multiplier Funds: • Community Day School Suspension Rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard	will be under 3.0% (CA Dashboard). • All Students: 2.9% suspension rate (Yellow) • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 2.9% suspension rate (Yellow) School Site Identified for Equity Multiplier Funds: • Community Day School suspension rate will be under 3.0% (CA Dashboard). • Overall: 2.9% suspension rate (Yellow)	difference from baseline: • All Students: -2.5% • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: -3.0% School Site Identified for Equity Multiplier Funds: Difference from Baseline: • Community Day School Suspension Rate: • Overall: +12.3% • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: +14.2% C. Other local measures,

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		and school connectedness SENSE OF SAFETY Per 2022-2023 HESD PARENT SURVEY 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school"" 97% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe." Per 2022-2023 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 74.06% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school." 78.89% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, ""There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school."" 65.42% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, ""Teachers, principals, learning directors,	• Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 28.3% suspension rate (Red) C. Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness SENSE OF SAFETY Per 2024-2025 HESD PARENT SURVEY 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school" 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The	• Overall: 37.3% suspension rate (Red) • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 38.6% suspension rate (Red) • Hispanic students: 35.1% suspension rate (Red) C. Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness SENSE OF SAFETY Per 2025-2026 HESD PARENT SURVEY	• Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 2.9% suspension rate (Yellow) C. Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness SENSE OF SAFETY Per HESD PARENT SURVEY 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school" 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The School Resource	including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness SENSE OF SAFETY HESD PARENT SURVEY Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school" 0% difference Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe." 0% difference HESD STUDENT SURVEY Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school." +3.88% difference

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school."" 84.71% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school." 67.14% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer is an adult that i can talk to if I have a problem at school." 78.61% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer." SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS: Per 2022-2023 HESD PARENT SURVEY: 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There are	School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe." 2024-2025 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 78.70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school." 76.04% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school." 68.57% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school."	96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school" 97% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe." 2025-2026 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 77.94% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school." 77.97% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school." 68.22% of students agree or	Office helps keep my child's school safe." Per HESD STUDENT SURVEY 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school." 70% of students	Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school." -0.92% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school." +1.67% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school." +2.77% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement,

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs." 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom....." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement. "The Parent/Teacher conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "When I have a question about my child's class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's teacher." 99% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent	88.06% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school." 75.07% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school." 86.79% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer." SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS: Per 2024-2025	strongly agree with the statement, "Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school." 88.54% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school." 73.73% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school." 85.12% of students agree or strongly agree with	agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer is an adult that i can talk to if I have a problem at school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer." SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS: Per HESD PARENT SURVEY: 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the	"The school resource officer is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school." +3.36% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer." +3.22% difference SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS: HESD PARENT SURVEY: Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs." +2% difference Parents agree or strongly agree with

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		meetings/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night, and Parent Education Presentations." Per 2022-2023 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 73.37% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school." 80.83% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at school." 65.91% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school." 71.34% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, ""I enjoy learning at my	HESD PARENT SURVEY: 96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs." 97% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom....." 99% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement. "The Parent/Teacher conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards." 98% of parents	the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer." SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS: Per 2025-2026 HESD PARENT SURVEY: 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom....." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement. "The	statement, "There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs." 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom....." 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement. "The Parent/Teacher conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "When I have a question about my child's	the statement, "I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom....." +2% difference Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement. "The Parent/Teacher conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards." 0% difference Parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "When I have a question about my child's class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's teacher." 0% difference Parents agree or strongly agree with

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		school."	agree or strongly agree with the statement, "When I have a question about my child's class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's teacher." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent meetings/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night, and Parent Education Presentations." 2024-2025 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 75.72% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement,	Parent/Teacher conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "When I have a question about my child's class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's teacher." 98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent meetings/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night,	class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's teacher." 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent meetings/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night, and Parent Education Presentations." Per HESD STUDENT SURVEY 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at	the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent meetings/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night, and Parent Education Presentations." -1% difference HESD STUDENT SURVEY Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school." +0.05% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			"Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school." 86.04% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at school." 65.58% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school." 65.94% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I enjoy learning at my school."	and Parent Education Presentations." 2025-2026 HESD STUDENT SURVEY 74.26% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school." 86.31% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at school." 68.61% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school."	school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school." 70% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I enjoy learning at my school."	school." +1.53 % difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school." +1.55% difference Students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I enjoy learning at my school." - 4.60% difference

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
				64.57% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I enjoy learning at my school."		

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.

Actions under Goal #6 were well implemented overall (and expanded) with students attending safe, well-maintained schools and having access to standards-aligned materials.

* Action 6.1: Student Support: Direct support for students, School health professionals, Counselors, Psychologists, and other professionals within and outside of the district, are coordinated so that students in need receive timely and effective programs and support. Social-emotional and health needs of students are monitored and support students receive from counselors, social workers, nursing staff, student specialists, and other staff is coordinated. The use of Equity Multiplier Funds allowed full implementation of this action, and without the Equity Multiplier allocation, the position would not have been funded based on budget constraints.

CHALLENGES
Hanford Elementary School District continues to face challenges, similar to Kings County and the State of California, with student discipline leading to suspension as the social-emotional effects of the COVID pandemic linger. Anecdotal information and internal student discipline data from 2025-2026, even though better than previous years in HESD, shows there is still a negative impact on students' social and emotional well-being since covid. The data measuring school climate, especially suspensions over the last several years do not accurately reflect the impact that the district's programs and services have had on school climate. The district's programs and services for students under Goal #6, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to declines in suspensions in 2024-25 compared to 2022-23 based on the CA Dashboard:
* All students in HESD in 2025: 2.9% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 5.4%
* Low-Income students in HESD in 2025: 3.3% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 6.1%
* Hispanic students in HESD in 2025: 2.5% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 5.1%
* All students at CDS in 2025: 37.3% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 25.0%
* Low-Income students at CDS in 2025: 38.6% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 24.4%
* Hispanic students at CDS in 2025: 35.1% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 13.2%

SUCCESSES
The successful implementation of actions and services that support students' social and emotional well-being continues to mitigate some of the negative impacts since the pandemic. The district's team of student support staff worked throughout the year to improve students' physical health and social-emotional well-being. The district coordinated several funding sources, including the Equity Multiplier Funding for CDS, to significantly expand the level of support for students' physical health and social-emotional well-being. Overall Chronic Absenteeism decreased when compared to the previous year along with parent and student survey data showing well over 90% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school" and "The School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe."

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.

Goal #6 Overall: The difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actuals for Goal #6 was less than a 10% difference.
* Action 6.1: Student Support: There is no material difference between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures for Action 6.1. The use of Equity Multiplier funds allowed full implementation of this action.

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

The actions under Goal #6 continue to be effective in the students at Community Day School learning in a safe, well-maintained school where they are supported, engaged, and connected to their school.

* Action 6.1 was effective with direct support for students from school health professionals, Counselors, Psychologists, and other professionals within and outside of the district, who coordinated supports so students in need received timely and effective programs and support.

A total of 1 metric was included in Goal 6, for which all the data and disaggregated data points are provided in the detail above. For the purpose of this summary, we have included highlights from the related metrics:

Hanford Elementary School District is still feeling the lingering effects of the COVID pandemic, particularly in Chronic Absenteeism. Even though there is a decrease in both Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate from 2023-24 to 2025-26, rates have yet to reach the lower levels of pre-covid. Anecdotal observations along with internal data for the school year, as well as the couple of years, show that students have experienced a decline in social-emotional well-being. This decline is most significant at the district's junior high schools.

SUSPENSION RATE
The data measuring school climate, especially suspensions and absenteeism, have been significantly impacted by the COVID pandemic, and do not accurately reflect the impact that the district's programs and services have had on school climate. The district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have led to a significant and steady decline in suspensions. The district's programs and services for students under Goal #4 during the pandemic have mitigated the negative effects on their social-emotional well-

being. This indicates a need to continue, and where possible, expand the services and programs that support students' social-emotional well-being and physical health.

The district's suspension rate declined by more than fifty percent between 2013 and 2019 (the last data set prior to the pandemic). Analysis of the district's suspension rate shows the following: Overall (All Students) Suspension Rates (per CDE DataQuest):
* 2013: 6.3% (County: 8.0%)
* 2014: 5.0% (County: 6.8%)
* 2015: 5.4% (County: 6.4%)
* 2016: 4.5% (County: 5.7%)
* 2017: 3.4% (County: 5.9%)
* 2018: 3.1% (County: 5.7%)
* 2019: 2.8% (County: 4.9%)
* 2020: 2.9% (County: 3.9%)
* 2021: 0.5% (County: 1.0%) (School closures and extended periods of distance learning affected student suspensions and suspension rates in 2020-2021.)
* 2022: 4.5% (County: 5.8%)
* 2023: 5.6% (County: 6.8%)
* 2024: 4.5% (County: 6.0%)
* 2025: 3.1% (County: 4.9%)

Suspension rates continue to remain lower than the county, and school sites will continue to re-incorporate the strategies and supports that were in place prior to COVID when suspension rates were lower.

SUCCESSES
The district's team of student support staff worked throughout the year to improve students' physical health and social-emotional well-being. The district coordinated use Equity Multiplier funding to expand the level of support for students' physical health and social-emotional well-being.

CHALLENGES
As seen in the data above, the COVID pandemic has had a profound effect on students' physical health and social-emotional well-being in relation to pre-COVID data. This is especially evident with the district's CDS students. The data measuring school climate, especially suspensions over the last several years do not accurately reflect the impact that the district's programs and services have had on school climate. The district's programs and services for students under Goal #6, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to declines in suspensions in 2024-25 compared to 2022-23 based on the CA Dashboard:
* All students in HESD in 2025: 2.9% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 5.4%
* Low-Income students in HESD in 2025: 3.3% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 6.1%
* Hispanic students in HESD in 2025: 2.5% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 5.1%
* All students at CDS in 2025: 37.3% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 25.0%
* Low-Income students at CDS in 2025: 38.6% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 24.4%
* Hispanic students at CDS in 2025: 35.1% suspension rate compared to 2023 of 13.2%

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.

The description was changed by adding a SMART goal to the description, which added: "Decreasing Suspension Rates by 3% by 2027."
* Action 6.1: Student Support: Annual salary schedule increases for employees (step & column) increased the amount of funding required to support this action. Equity Multiplier Funding is being used to support this action.

Budgeted expenditure amounts may change going forward due to salary differences or price changes on goods. Unless otherwise noted, such changes are not material and are not the result of changes to our programs.

This action addresses the following RED Indicators
District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard
- Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups):
- Foster: 31.9% chronically absent (Red)
- Suspension Rate: No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism

Equity Multiplier Funding is only for Community Day School, unduplicated student groups that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2025 Dashboard are:
- None

Equity Multiplier Funding is only for Community Day School, unduplicated student groups that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2025 Dashboard are:
- Community Day School: SED: 38.6% suspension rate (RED)
- Community Day School: Hispanic: 35.1% suspension rate (RED)

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
6.1	Student Support	Direct support for students, School health professionals, Counselors, Psychologists, and other professionals within and outside of the district, are coordinated so that students in need receive timely and effective programs and support. The LEA has developed this goal for focused attention based on consultation with Education Partners that included: • Teacher at CDS through the SSC meeting shared that they are seeing more success with elementary students in getting the	$56,714.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		support that they need and recommends continuing with the current level of support for students (without Equity Multiplier Funds, support positions would be cut) • Teacher at CDS shared through the SSC meeting that a representative from Lemoore School District along with Joy Gabler, HESD Superintendent, were present to look at the model of how CDS works and flows. They wanted to check out the program. The teacher shared it was nice to get the acknowledgement and being recognized for the good work that is happening at CDS. The CDS school plan is to continue to support behavior and attendance with hands-on activities, a school counselor, counseling services, so the recommendation is to continue to implement the activities in the school plan. • Equity Multiplier Focus Goal was developed in response to parents of ELAC & SSC, teachers, students, and staff recommendation of have a counselor on campus		

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
$19,187,516	$2,211,291

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
30.823%	0.000%	$0.00	30.823%

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:** Supplies/Materials School Sites **Need:** Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math	To address these needs, we will provide support to school sites with supplies and materials that support the programs and services in the LCAP. In order to access a broad, standards-aligned instructional program in a way that is equitable, low-Income and EL pupils have needs for instructional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income, EL, and Foster student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.1 and 1.2 above.

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: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math	under Action 1.1 have been developed. The actions and services under 1.1 are based on these considerations and designed to support low-income and EL pupils by providing them with material supports that allow them to access the standards-aligned instruction in a way that is equitable to all students. Pupils from these student groups may not have access to school supplies such as paper, pencils, notebooks, chart paper, supplies for science experiments, and other materials necessary to fully participate in a broad educational program. Increasing the amount (quantity) of these types of supplies and materials at school sites helps to decrease the barrier to a broad educational program that exists for low-income and EL students. An indicator of "Met" on the California School Dashboard's Local Indicators for a "Broad Educational Program" shows that students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated students and individuals with exceptional needs. An indicator of "Met" on the California School Dashboard's Local Indicators for "Implementation of Academic Standards" shows that unduplicated students are receiving instruction and instructional materials that are aligned with California's academic content standards. The district has completed and published the Local Indicators and received a score of "Met" on the California School Dashboard. The services provided to low-income and EL students under Action 1.1 are effective in meeting Goal 1, that "Students will receive a broad educational program." Hanford Elementary School	3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient) On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient) We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff (Educational Partner groups) about instruction around HESD's broad educational program. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.4 above.

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
	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient)	District's educational partner has provided the district with consistent input that says a broad education is focused on reading and math, but is also well-rounded, providing science, history, art, music, and physical education and includes opportunities to travel to museums and scientific exhibits, participate in outdoor education, and to have access to modern technology. Supplies and materials that support these components are effective in the delivery of the Broad Educational Program. Students overwhelmingly indicate that they are receiving a broad educational program, and as such, their school experience is enriched, they are more motivated to come to school, and their future will be positively impacted because of these experiences (see below.) Moreover, 100% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement: In addition to English language arts and mathematics, it is important for my child to have instruction in science, history, art, music, and physical education per the 2025-2026 parent survey. The district received a score of "Met" on the California School Dashboard Local Indicator for Implementation of Academic Standards. The district received a score of "Met" on the California School Dashboard Local Indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study. Students strongly agree/agree with the following statements on the 2025-2026 LCAP Student Survey: Physical education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school: 74.26% Participating in physical education motivates me to come to school every day: 45.87%	

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
	• Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math	I think it is important to have music at my school: 81.89% Participating in music enriches (improves) my experience at school: 86.31% Participating in music motivates me to come to school every day: 73.86% Learning about music will help me in the future: 61.96% Participating in art motivates me to come to school every day: 63.38% Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school: 68.61% Learning about art will help me in the future: 61.96% I enjoy learning at my school: 64.57% I plan to go to college: 87.94% We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income and EL student learning as it's focused on addressing their identified needs. Our percent proficient target for low-income and ELs on the 2026 ELA CAASPP assessment is 50.00% (low-Income) and 30.00% (ELs). Over the last several years, our low-income and EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 for low-income and from 15.22% in 2021 to 19.35% in 2025 for EL students showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. Our percent proficient target for low-income and ELs on the 2026 Math CAASPP assessment is 39.00% (low-income) and 22.00% (ELs). Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 for EL students. To maximize the impact of	

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: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red)	this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	

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
	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math **Scope:** LEA-wide		
1.2	**Action:** School Libraries **Need:** Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient)	To address these needs, we will provide support to ensure school libraries are open during school hours and are supported with staff, books, periodicals, and technology. In order to access a broad, standards-aligned instructional program in a way that is equitable, low-Income and EL pupils have needs for instructional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 1.2 have been developed. The services under Action 1.2 are based on these considerations and designed to support low-income and EL pupils by providing them with material supports that allow them to access the standards-aligned instruction in a way that is equitable to all students. Students from these student groups may not have access to books,	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.1 and 1.2 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient)

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
	• Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red)	periodicals, or standards-aligned digital content/media at the same levels as all students as a whole. School libraries that are open and fully staffed during school hours provide low-income and EL pupils with increased access to books, periodicals, and electronic educational media at school and home. By providing increased library services to low-income and EL students, they have increased access to reading including books specific to our EL population. An indicator of "Met" on the California School Dashboard's Local Indicators for a "Broad Educational Program" shows that students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated students and individuals with exceptional needs. A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard: Implementation of Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator shows that the district has met all of the metrics (A, B, C) under [State] Priority 2. The services provided to low-income and EL students under Action 1.2 are effective in meeting Goal 1, that "Students will receive a broad educational program." Fully staffed school libraries are open each school day. Libraries are an important component of a Broad Educational Program. Students overwhelmingly indicate that they are receiving a broad educational program, and as such, their school experience is enriched, they are more motivated to come to school, and their future will be positively impacted because of these experiences (see above.) Moreover, 100% of	Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient) On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Studnet groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient) We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff (Educational Partner groups) about the libraries and instruction within HESD's broad educational program. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.4 above.

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
	Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions	parents agree or strongly agree with the statement: In addition to English language arts and mathematics, it is important for my child to have instruction in science, history, art, music, and physical education, per the 2025-2026 Parent Survey. The district received a score of “Met” on the California School Dashboard Local Indicator for Standards Aligned Instruction. The district received a score of “Met” on the California School Dashboard Local Indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study. We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income and EL student learning as it’s focused on addressing their identified needs. Our percent proficient target for low-income and ELs on the 2026 ELA CAASPP assessment is 50.00% (low-Income) and 30.00% (ELs). Over the last several years, our low-income and EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 for low-income and from 15.22% in 2021 to 19.35% in 2025 for EL students showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. Our percent proficient target for low-income and ELs on the 2026 Math CAASPP assessment is 39.00% (low-income) and 22.00% (ELs). Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 for EL students. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	

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 Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient)		

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: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math		

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
	Scope: LEA-wide		
1.3	**Action:** Technology **Need:** Through home visits and parent engagement, there is a disparity among low-income and EL students with technology in the home compared to their peers which creates a gap in learning at home and is carried over into the classroom. Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest)	To address these needs, students in grades TK-8 have access to laptop computers and standards-aligned digital content. In order to access a broad, standards-aligned instructional program in a way that is equitable, low-Income and EL pupils have needs for instructional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services under Action 1.3 have been developed. The services provided under Action 1.3 are based on these considerations and have been designed to support low-income and EL pupils by providing them with material support that allows them to access the standards-aligned instruction in a way that is equitable to all students. Unduplicated Pupils have needs for instructional support that go well beyond what all students need. Pupils from low-income and EL families may not have access to the technology that is essential for success in K-12, college, and in today's workplaces. Providing low-income and EL students with increased access to technological resources including internet-connected iPads and laptops along with digital content helps to decrease the barrier to academic achievement and to a broad educational program that exists for low-income and EL students. Access to technology is an integral component of a Broad Course of Study. An indicator of "Met" on the California School Dashboard's Local Indicators for a "Broad Educational Program" shows that	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.1 and 1.2 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient) On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient)

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
	• All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on	students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated students and individuals with exceptional needs. A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard: Implementation of Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator shows that the district has met all of the metrics (A, B, C) under [State] Priority 2. The services provided to low-income students under Action 1.3 are effective in meeting Goal 1, that "Students will receive a broad educational program." Hanford Elementary School District's educational partners have provided the district with consistent input that says a broad education includes access to modern technology. The services in Action 1.3 have provided each low-income and EL student in grades 3-8 with a laptop computer. Students in grades K-2 are provided with iPads. Low-income and EL students have access to a suite of standards-aligned digital content. Access to technology, both computers and digital content are an integral component of a broad educational program. The district's Local Indicators on the California School Dashboard show that students are receiving a "Broad Course of Study." A score of "Met" on the CA School Dashboard: Implementation of Access to a Broad Course of Study Local Indicator shows that the district has met all of the metrics (A, B, C) under [State] Priority 2. Students overwhelmingly indicate that they are receiving a broad educational program, and as such, their school experience is enriched, they are	We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff (Educational Partner groups) about the technology and instruction within HESD's broad educational program. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.4 above.

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
	statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math	more motivated to come to school, and their future will be positively impacted because of these experiences (see above.) We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income and EL student learning as it's focused on addressing their identified needs. Our percent proficient target for low-income and ELs on the 2026 ELA CAASPP assessment is 50.00% (low-Income) and 30.00% (ELs). Over the last several years, our low-income and EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 for low-income and from 15.22% in 2021 to 19.35% in 2025 for EL students showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. Our percent proficient target for low-income and ELs on the 2026 Math CAASPP assessment is 39.00% (low-income) and 22.00% (ELs). Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 for EL students. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	

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
	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient)		

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
	• Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math **Scope:** LEA-wide		

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
1.4	**Action:** Study Trips **Need:** Through home visits and parent engagement, there is a disparity between low-income and EL students and their peers in opportunities for educational exposure and experiences outside of the local town, which creates a gap in learning that carries over into the classroom. Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient)	To address these needs, students in grades TK-8 have access to study trips that are aligned with content standards and broaden their educational exposure. In order to access a broad, standards-aligned instructional program in a way that is equitable, low-Income and EL pupils have needs for instructional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 1.4 have been developed. The services provided under Action 1.4 are based on these considerations and designed to support low-income and EL pupils by providing them with material supports that allow them to access the standards-aligned instruction in a way that is equitable to all students. Pupils from low-income and EL families may lack the resources to experience activities that have been shown to increase content knowledge, interest in academics, and engagement in school. Providing students from low-income and EL families with travel to museums, zoos, and state and national parks, ensures that a lack of resources does not prevent them from receiving an important component of a broad educational program. An indicator of "Met" on the California School Dashboard's Local Indicators for a "Broad Educational Program" shows that students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated students and individuals with exceptional needs. An indicator of "Met" on the California School Dashboard's Local Indicators for "Implementation	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.1 and 1.2 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient) On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient) We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff (Educational Partner groups) about the Study

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
	• English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient)	of Academic Standards" shows that unduplicated students are receiving instruction and instructional materials that are aligned with California's academic content standards. The services provided to low-income and EL students under Action 1.4 are effective in meeting Goal 1, that "Students will receive a broad educational program." Hanford Elementary School District's educational partners have provided the district with consistent input that says a broad education is focused on reading and math, but is also well-rounded, providing science, history, art, music, and physical education and includes opportunities to travel to museums and scientific exhibits, participate in outdoor education, and to have access to modern technology. The services in Action 1.4 have provided low-income and EL students with opportunities to experience these activities. All students are provided with the opportunity to attend an academic study trip that is aligned with the academic standards for their grade level. Students overwhelmingly indicate that they are receiving a broad educational program, and as such, their school experience is enriched, they are more motivated to come to school, and their future will be positively impacted because of these experiences (see above.) Moreover, 99% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement: It is important for my child to attend academic study trips that are aligned with classroom instruction including travel to museums, zoos, and state and national parks. The district received a score of "Met" on the California School Dashboard Local	Trips and instruction within HESD's broad educational program. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.4 above.

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
	• Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are:	Indicator for Standards Aligned Instruction. The district received a score of “Met” on the California School Dashboard Local Indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study. We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income and EL student learning as it’s focused on addressing their identified needs. Our percent proficient target for low-income and ELs on the 2026 ELA CAASPP assessment is 50.00% (low-Income) and 30.00% (ELs). Over the last several years, our low-income and EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 for low-income and from 15.22% in 2021 to 19.35% in 2025 for EL students showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. Our percent proficient target for low-income and ELs on the 2026 Math CAASPP assessment is 39.00% (low-income) and 22.00% (ELs). Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 for EL students. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	

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
	• No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient)		

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
	• English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math Parent Survey for 2025-2026: Question: It is important for my child to attend academic study trips that are aligned with classroom instruction. 99% Agree/Strongly Agree **Scope:**		

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		
1.5	**Action:** Art, Music, PE **Need:** Through home visits and parent engagement, there is a disparity between low-income and EL students in the Arts, Music, and Physical education opportunities compared to their peers. This creates a gap in learning that carries over into the classroom. Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient)	To address these needs, students in grades TK-8 have access to the Arts, Music, and Physical Education that are aligned with content standards and broaden their educational exposure. In order to access a broad, standards-aligned instructional program in a way that is equitable, low-income and EL students have needs for enrichment activities that go beyond what all students need. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 1.5 have been developed. Pupils from low-income and EL families may lack the resources to experience activities and courses of study that have been shown to increase content knowledge, interest in academics, and engagement in school. The actions and services under 1.5 are based on these considerations and designed to support these students by providing them with art, music, physical education, and athletics--a broad educational program. The State of California has designated a Broad Educational Program as one of its Eight Priorities. The services provided to low-income and EL students under Action 1.5 are effective in meeting Goal 1, that "Students will receive a broad educational program." Hanford Elementary School District's educational partners have provided consistent input that says a broad education is focused on reading and math, but is also well-rounded, providing science, history, art, music, and physical education and includes opportunities to travel to museums and exhibits, participate in	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.1 and 1.2 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient) On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient) We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff

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
	• Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math	outdoor education, and to have access to modern technology. An indicator of "Met" on the California School Dashboard's Local Indicators for a "Broad Educational Program" shows that students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study including the programs and services developed and provided to low-income and EL students and individuals with exceptional needs. An indicator of "Met" on the California School Dashboard's Local Indicators for "Implementation of Academic Standards" shows that low-income and EL students are receiving instruction and instructional materials that are aligned with California's academic content standards. Students in elementary schools received a minimum of 200 minutes of physical education every ten days. Students at the junior high schools received 400 minutes of physical education every 10 days. Students at the junior high schools had opportunities to select additional athletic electives and to participate in after-school sports. Students at the elementary schools were provided opportunities to participate in an after-school enrichment program and after-school sports. All elementary school students received art instruction. Approximately 504 elementary students in grades 5 and 6 elected to participate in band. All 4th grade students received music instruction. Students self-select elective classes at the junior high schools and choose from a variety of classes that included art, music, and athletics. Approximately 217 students chose art instruction and 254 students chose music instruction at the two junior high schools.	(Educational Partner groups) about the Art, Music, and Physical Education programs within HESD's broad educational program. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.3 above.

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: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math	Students overwhelmingly indicate that they are receiving a broad educational program, and as such, their school experience is enriched, they are more motivated to come to school, and their future will be positively impacted because of these experiences (see above.) Moreover, 100% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement: In addition to English language arts and mathematics, it is important for my child to have instruction in science, history, art, music, and physical education per the 2025-2026 parent survey. The district received a score of “Met” on the California School Dashboard Local Indicator for Standards Aligned Instruction. The district received a score of “Met” on the California School Dashboard Local Indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study. Students received instruction in art, music, and physical education, and participated in these subjects as evidenced by the numbers of students in art, music, and PE along with the number of minutes of PE students receive. Elementary Schools: Art: All Students received art Instruction. Music: 5th and 6th grade students self-select participation in band: 5th Grade: For 2025-26: 335 6th Grade: For 2025-26: 169 (Total 504) All students in 4th grade received music instruction. (The schools with the highest #s of low-income students were prioritized) (2025-26: 642 students)	

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
	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient)	Junior High 217 students chose art. 254 students chose music. Based on student survey results, students are enriched by art, music, and physical education, feel more engaged in school, and are motivated to achieve as a result of participating in these activities as evidence by survey results below: Parent Survey 2025-2026 Question: In addition to ELA and Math, it is important for my child to have instruction in science, history, art, music, and physical education. 100% Agree/Strongly Agree Student Survey 2025-2026 Physical Education Physical education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school: 74.26% Participating in physical education motivates me to come to school every day: 45.87% Agree/Strongly Agree Music Participating in music enriches (improves) my experience at school: 86.31% Agree/Strongly Agree Participating in music motivates me to come to school every day: 73.86% Agree/Strongly Agree Learning about music will help me in the future: 80.39% Agree/Strongly Agree Art	

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
	• Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math Parent Survey for 2025-2026: Question: It is important for my child to attend academic study trips that are aligned with classroom	Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school: 68.61% Agree/Strongly Agree Participating in art motivates me to come to school every day: 63.38% Agree/Strongly Agree Learning about art will help me in the future: 61.96% Agree/Strongly Agree We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income student exposure to the performing arts to address their identified needs. In our elementary schools, we expect all Students will receive art Instruction. We expect at least 200 of 5th grade and 175 of 6th grade students will self-select participation in band. At the junior high schools we expect 200 students will choose art and 200 students will choose music. For the student survey, we expect the percentages of: * 80% to Agree/Strongly Agree with: Physical education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school * 75% to Agree/Strongly Agree with: Participating in physical education motivates me to come to school every day * 90% to Agree/Strongly Agree with: Participating in music enriches (improves) my experience at school * 80% to Agree/Strongly Agree with: Participating in music motivates me to come to school every day] * 80% to Agree/Strongly Agree with: Learning about music will help me in the future * 80% to Agree/Strongly Agree with: Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school * 75% to Agree/Strongly Agree with: Participating in art motivates me to come to school every day	

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. 99% Agree/Strongly Agree **Scope:** LEA-wide	* 75% to Agree/Strongly Agree with: Learning about art will help me in the future To maximize the impact of this action in improving student exposure throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	
1.6	**Action:** After School Program **Need:** Through Advisory Committees, parents and students have expressed the need for after-school enrichment programs, especially for our low-income and EL population who may not have the resources themselves to participate in community events. This shows there is a disparity between low-income and EL students in the after-school enrichment opportunities compared to their peers. This creates a gap in learning that carries over into the classroom. Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient)	To address these needs, the district will provide support to the junior high school (elementary sites have afterschool enrichment funded through ELOP) sites for afterschool enrichment that support the programs and services in the LCAP. In order to access a broad, standards-aligned instructional program in a way that is equitable, low-Income and EL students have needs for instructional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 1.6 have been developed. The services provided under Action 1.6 are based on these considerations and are designed to support low-income and EL pupils by providing them with material supports that allow them to access the standards-aligned instruction in a way that is equitable to all students. Students from low-income and EL families may lack the resources to provide their children with after-school enrichment, including support and homework help in reading, math, science, and history. Students from low-income EL families may lack the resources to provide after-school enrichment including art, music, and physical education for their students. Parents in low-income and EL families may lack the resources to provide safe, supervised after-school childcare each evening. An indicator of	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.1 and 1.2 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient) On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient)

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
	• English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Junior High Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA at the Junior High Schools	"Met" on the California School Dashboard's Local Indicators for a "Broad Educational Program" shows that students have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated students and individuals with exceptional needs. An indicator of "Met" on the California School Dashboard's Local Indicators for "Implementation of Academic Standards" shows that unduplicated students are receiving instruction and instructional materials that are aligned with California's academic content standards. The services provided to low-income and EL students under Action 1.6 are effective in meeting Goal 1, that "Students will receive a broad educational program." Hanford Elementary School District's educational partners have provided consistent input that says a broad education is focused on reading and math, but is also well-rounded, providing science, history, art, music, and physical education and includes opportunities to travel to museums and scientific exhibits, participate in outdoor education, and to have access to modern technology. Moreover, the State of California has designated a Broad Educational Program as one of its Eight Priorities. The services in Action 1.6 are providing low-income and EL students with a broad educational program that continues after the end of the regular school day containing these components. Students overwhelmingly indicate that they are receiving a broad educational program, and as such, their school experience is enriched, they are more motivated to come to school, and their future	Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient) We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff (Educational Partner groups) about the After-School Programs within HESD's broad educational program. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 1.4 above.

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
	Junior High Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math at the Junior High Schools Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient)	will be positively impacted because of these experiences (see above.) Moreover, 100% of parents agree/strongly agree with the statement: "In addition to English language arts and mathematics, it is important for my child to have instruction in science, history, art, music, and physical education" per the 2025-2026 parent survey. The district received a score of "Met" on the California School Dashboard Local Indicator for Standards Aligned Instruction. The district received a score of "Met" on the California School Dashboard Local Indicator for Access to a Broad Course of Study. We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income and EL student learning as it's focused on addressing their identified needs through after-school tutoring and enrichment. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 2.6 points below standard, "Low-Income students" scored 13.4 points below standard, and "EL students" scored 18.2 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the ELA CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 50% and 30% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 15.22% in 2021 to 19.35% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 30.4 points below standard, "Low-Income students" scored 40.7 points below standard, and "EL students" scored 44.1 points	

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
	• Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Junior High Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA at the Junior High Schools Junior High Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math at the Junior High Schools Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient)	below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the Math CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 39% and 22% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in Math. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student exposure throughout the district, this action is being provided on an schoolwide basis.	

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
	• Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are:		

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
	• No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math **Scope:** Schoolwide		
2.1	**Action:** Eliminate Combination Classes/Reduce Class Sizes **Need:** The State of California has determined that schools serving over 55% enrollment of low-income, English learners, and/or students in foster care need additional certificated and classified staff to provide direct services to students, compared to schools with a lower enrollment of these target student groups. Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient)	To address these needs and to reduce equity gaps and support staffing structures that are responsive to academic needs at our highest-need schools, the district will focus on classroom staffing levels that will be maintained or increased to reduce or eliminate combination classes in grades 1-6 and to lower class sizes. Based on the Hanford Elementary Teachers Association (HETA) Collective Bargaining Agreement, grade-level staffing shall be based on the following teacher/pupil ratios and ceilings set forth below: Grade TK – Ratio: State Mandate Grades TK through 3rd – Ratio: 1:25, Ceiling: 1:25 (*The ratio and ceiling of 1:25 for Grades TK-3 is contingent upon the District's participation in the Class Size Reduction Program.) Grades 4 through 8 – Ratio: 1:30, Ceiling: 1:33 Having additional teachers will help to reduce class sizes and eliminate combination classes. HESD could operate within the HETA contract without these additional teachers. Lower class	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient)

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
	• Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are:	sizes has evidence showing those students that normally struggle, achieve at higher levels than in a larger class size. In order to access standards-aligned instruction in a way that is equitable, Unduplicated Pupils have needs for instructional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Data from the California School Dashboard (2025) indicate that Unduplicated students performed below “All Students” in both ELA and Math. Combination classes divide the teacher's time and effort, requiring the teaching of two grade levels in the same classroom. Therefore, the needs of these (Unduplicated) students are considered first as services provided under Action 2.1 have been developed. The services under Action 2.1 are based on these considerations and are designed to support Unduplicated Pupils by providing them with increased support in the form of teachers' time and effort. Action 2.1 is designed to support our low-income, EL, and foster youth students, improving and/or increasing the services they receive in the following ways: Providing these Unduplicated Pupils with a single-grade classroom ensures that the instruction they receive is aligned with the standards for their grade level, and that the teachers time and effort are focused entirely on the students in the grade level. Teachers working with a single grade level in the classroom have more time to provide individualized instruction to struggling students, who are mostly unduplicated students, (an increased service) and are able to focus their planning and delivery of lessons on a single grade level (an improved service).	On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient) We will also monitor the English Learner Progress on the CA Dashboard and the Summative ELPAC. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 above.

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
	• No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient)	The services provided to students under Action 2.1 are effective in leading to the achievement of Goal 2, that all students will make progress toward proficiency on the state-adopted standards and that English learners will make progress learning the English language. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 2.6 points below standard, “Low-Income students” scored 13.4 points below standard, “English Learners” scored 18.2 points below standard, and “Foster students” scored 69.0 points below standard. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 30.4 points below standard, “Low-Income students” scored 40.7 points below standard, “English Learners” scored 44.1 points below standard, and “Foster students” scored 111.5 points below standard. Test scores for students from these unduplicated groups were in the "Yellow" range in ELA and Math on the CA Dashboard (2025) and showed an “Increased”, expect Foster students showed a decline of 24.3 points in ELA (Orange) and 43.4 points in Math (Red) compared to the previous year. 47.8% (2025 California School Dashboard) of English learners made progress on the state assessment for English Learners Progress Indicator, 15.29% (CDE Dataquest) of English learners scored at the "Proficient" level on the 2025 Summative ELPAC.	

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
	• Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient)	Based on our most recent 2025 CASSPP scores, both ELA and Math showed gains in proficiency levels compared to 2020-2021. This indicates a need to continue to build upon and strengthen the district's existing instructional programs. The services under Action 2.1 continue to be effective in making progress toward meeting Goal #2	

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
	• Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are:		

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
	• No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math **Scope:** LEA-wide		
2.2	**Action:** Summer Program **Need:** Through Advisory Committees, parents and students have expressed the need for summer enrichment programs, especially for our low-income, English Learner, and/or Foster youth population who may not have the resources themselves to participate in community events. This shows there is a disparity between our unduplicated population's summer enrichment opportunities compared to their peers. This creates a gap in learning that carries over into the classroom. Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest)	To address these needs, the district will provide support to the junior high school (elementary sites have summer enrichment funded through ELOP) sites for summer enrichment that support the programs and services in the LCAP. In order to access standards-aligned instruction in a way that is equitable, Unduplicated Pupils have needs for instructional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Data from the California School Dashboard (2025) and CDE Dataquest (2025) indicate that low-income students, English learners, and foster youth (at the district's two junior high schools) performed below “All Students” in both ELA and Math. The needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 2.2 have been developed. The services provided under Action 2.2 are based on these considerations and are designed to support Unduplicated Pupils by providing additional instructional time that includes both academic instruction and enrichment activities during the summer when school is not normally in	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient)

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
	• All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for	session. Providing additional hours/days of instruction to these students is an increase in services. Action 2.2 is intended to help achieve an increase in academic achievement in ELA and math for students in grades 7 and 8. Evidence-based research indicates that providing increased instructional time that is adapted to students' individual (or small group needs) and that includes engaging learning experiences can lead to increased academic achievement See: What Works Clearinghouse: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/10 We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income, foster, and English Learner student learning as it's focused on addressing their identified needs. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 2.6 points below standard, "Low-Income students" scored 13.4 points below standard, and "EL students" scored 18.2 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the ELA CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 50% and 30% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 15.22% in 2021 to 19.35% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 30.4 points below standard,	On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient) We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff (Educational Partner groups) about the Summer Programs within HESD's broad educational program.

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
	a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient)	“Low-Income students” scored 40.7 points below standard, and “EL students” scored 44.1 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the Math CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 39% and 22% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in Math. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	

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
	• English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest)		

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
	• All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for		

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
	a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math **Scope:** Schoolwide		
2.3	**Action:** Supplemental Instructional Materials **Need:** Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient)	To address these needs, we will provide support with supplies, materials, books, and technology that support the programs and services in the LCAP. In order to access standards aligned instruction in a way that is equitable, Unduplicated Pupils have a need for instructional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Low-income students and English learners performed below “All Students” in both ELA and Math. Per CDE Dataquest for the 2025 school year, "All Students" scored 51.29% Proficient in ELA and 40.40% Proficient in Math. EL students scored 19.35% Proficient in ELA and 16.27% Proficient in Math. Low-Income students scored 46.83% Proficient in ELA and 36.11% Proficient in Math. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 2.3 have been developed. The services provided under Action 2.3 are based on these considerations and designed	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient)

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
	• Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red)	to support Unduplicated Pupils improving and/or increasing services they receive in the following ways: Up-to-date/upgraded instructional materials provide specialized lessons, materials, and technology components that are specifically designed to provide additional (increased) supports for struggling students (who are mostly Unduplicated Pupils). Up-to-date instructional materials also provide specialized lessons, materials, technology components and other supports specifically designed to ensure that students who are English learners can understand, learn, and master the state adopted content standards, even though they may not yet be proficient in the English language. The services under Action 2.3 provide low-income students, English learners and foster youth with up-to-date/upgraded instructional materials that contain these specialized supports and are thereby effective in increasing the quantity of resources available to them. Classroom teachers' use of these upgraded materials in their instruction qualitatively improves the instruction Unduplicated Pupils receive. The services provided to low-income students, English learners, and foster youth under Action 2.3 are effective in meeting the Expected Outcome for Goal 2, that says "All students have State Board of Education approved, Common Core standards-aligned instructional materials." The HESD Board of Trustees Sufficiency of Instructional Materials Resolution, passed on September 10, 2025, confirms that students have access to standards-aligned instructional materials. Test scores for students from low-income families increased from the prior	On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient)

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
	Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions	year and English Learners increased in math. 47.8% of English learners made progress on the state assessment for English Learners Progress Indicator (2025 California School Dashboard) and 15.29% of English learners scored at the "Proficient" level on the 2025 Summative ELPAC. Based on our most recent 2025 CASSPP scores, both ELA and Math showed gains in proficiency levels compared to 2020-2021. This indicates a need to continue to build upon and strengthen the district's existing instructional programs. The services under Action 2.3 continue to be effective in making progress toward meeting Goal #2. We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income, foster, and English Learner student learning as it’s focused on addressing their identified needs. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 2.6 points below standard, “Low-Income students” scored 13.4 points below standard, and “EL students” scored 18.2 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the ELA CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 50% and 30% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 15.22% in 2021 to 19.35% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 30.4 points below standard,	

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 Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient)	“Low-Income students” scored 40.7 points below standard, and “EL students” scored 44.1 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the Math CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 39% and 22% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in Math. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on a school-wide basis.	

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: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math		

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
	Scope: LEA-wide		
2.4	**Action:** School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard. **Need:** Groups Identified for Required Actions: This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • ELA: Students with Disabilities (SWD): 104.1 point below (Red) • Math: Students with Disabilities (SWD): 126.5 point below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 115.7 points below (Red) • Monroe: SWD: 100 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 82.7 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 132.4 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 124.9 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are:	Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL, and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: All Students: 6.4 pts below standard (54%)-All Student group in this section to show need SWD: 80.1 pts below standard (21%)-SWD in this section to show need SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient) On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups:

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
	• Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) • Hamilton: SWD: 157.0 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 116.3 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 174.9 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 144 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • ELA: Students with Disabilities (SWD): 104.1 point below (Red) • ELA: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 80.6 point below (Red) • ELA: Homeless: 78.4 point below (Red) • Math: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 113.8 point below (Red) • Math: Homeless: 98.3 point below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: SWD: 139.3 points below (Red) • Roosevelt: SWD: 109.0 points below (Red) • Simas: SWD: 101.8 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 85.7 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 132.5 points below (Red)	• No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient)	All Students: 35.8 pts below standard (43%)-All Student group in this section to show need SWD: 90.0 pts below standard (18%)-SWD in this section to show need SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient)

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
	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) • Monroe: SWD: 102.6 points below (Red) • Richmond: SWD: 125.4 points below (Red) • Roosevelt: SWD: 140.5 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 129.0 points below (Red) District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • ELA: All Students: 2.6 points below (Green)-All Student group in this section to show need • ELA: Student with Disabilities (SWD): 87.0 points below (Orange) • ELA: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 83.8 points below (Red) • Math: All Studnets: 30.4 points below (Yellow)- All Student group in this section to show need • Math: Long-Term English Learners (LTEL): 125.3 points below (Red) • Math: Students with Disabilities (SWD): 115.4 points below (Red) • Math: Foster: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient)	

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
	• Kennedy: LTEL: 87.2 points below (Red) • Woodrow: LTEL: 85.4 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SWD: 108.5 points below (Red) • Kennedy: LTEL: 134.7 points below (Red) • Kennedy: SWD: 174.9 points below (Red) • Woodrow: LTEL: 125.6 points below (Red) • Woodrow: SWD: 131.5 points below (Red) **Scope:** LEA-wide	• English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math	

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
		In doing a needs assessment, we found that: • SWD is the lowest-performing group in the district by a wide margin — 1.55 (ELA) / 1.47 (Math) average achievement level, roughly a full level below All Students (2.46 / 2.26). • SED students make up 79% of all testers, so SED performance (2.34 / 2.15 average achievement levels) tracks close to the district average — but that average masks meaningful variation within the SED group. • 85% of all SWD are also SED, and about 15% of all SED testers score even lower than SWD as a whole (1.47 / 1.42 average achievement levels), making them the single most academically vulnerable slice of the SED population. These dual-identified students face the economic barriers common to SED students (limited access to tutoring, enrichment, stable housing/routines that support learning) layered on top of disability related learning barriers (processing, pacing, and skill-gap challenges tied to their IEPs). The result is a proficiency level for this dual-identified group that falls nearly a full point below the district average and below SED students overall. This issue is not and "SED students need support" and "SWD students need support" as two separate claims, it is one claim, that SED students' needs are most severe, especially the subset of SED students who also have a disability. This action is designed to reach that population without narrowing eligibility to benefit every SED student while being especially consequential for the 15%	

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
		of SED students who are also SWD. Looking at the 24-25 CAASPP assessment, All Students scored an average proficiency level of 2.46 in ELA and 2.26 in Math. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students (79% of all testers) scored 2.34 in ELA and 2.15 in Math, slightly below the district average. Students with Disabilities (SWD) (14% of all testers) scored substantially lower, at 1.55 in ELA and 1.47 in Math. Critically, 85% of the SWD testers are also SED. This dual-identified group scored 1.47 in ELA and 1.42 in Math, lower than SWD students overall and nearly a full proficiency level below SED students as a whole. This tells us that within the SED student group, students who also have a disability are experiencing the most significant barriers to proficiency, and that the SWD data is not describing a separate population's needs, it is describing the depth of need that exists inside the SED group itself. This action is LEA-wide since SED students make up 79% of enrollment and are present in significant numbers at every school site. Because the action reaches every classroom, it is principally directed toward and effective for SED students specifically, while incidentally benefiting all students, which is the standard for an LEA-wide contributing action. SED Student Group: • CAASPP ELA Proficiency for SED: 24-25: 46.83% with a target of improving by 6% in 27-28 • CAASPP Math Proficiency for SED: 24-25: 21.81% with a target of improving by 6% in 27-28	

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
		Dual-Identified SED/SWD Student Group: • CAASPP ELA Proficiency for SED/SWD: 24-25: 16.10% with a plan to monitor this dual-identified student group for growth over the next couple of years, looking for 3% growth each year. • CAASPP ELA Proficiency for SED/SWD: 24-25: 8.75% with a plan to monitor this dual-identified student group for growth over the next couple of years, looking for 3% growth each year.	
3.1	**Action:** Teacher Professional Development **Need:** Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient)	To address these needs, the district will provide teachers with support from leadership, training, and professional development that support the programs and services in the LCAP. Students from low-income families, who are English learners, and who are foster youth have needs for exceptionally well-trained teachers that go beyond the needs of students who are more affluent, are proficient in English, and live with their families. Data from CDE Dataquest (2025) Low-income students and English learners performed below “All Students” in both ELA and Math. Per CDE Dataquest for the 2025 school year, "All Students" scored 51.29% Proficient in ELA and 40.40% Proficient in Math. EL students scored 19.35% Proficient in ELA and 16.27% Proficient in Math. Low-Income students scored 46.83% Proficient in ELA and 36.11% Proficient in Math. A teacher who is exceptionally well-trained has deep knowledge of the content areas for which they are responsible and is able to provide targeted individualized instruction (differentiated instruction)	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our Unduplicated student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient)

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: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a	to struggling students (who are mostly unduplicated students). An exceptionally well-trained teacher is able to deliver specialized instruction to students who are English learners. An exceptionally well-trained teacher is able to deliver a qualitatively better (improved) education to unduplicated students than a teacher who is merely adequately trained. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 3.1 have been developed. Action 3.1 is based on these considerations and designed to support our low-income students and students who are English learners improving and/or increasing services they receive in the following ways: Providing the teachers of low-income students and English learners with training that includes content area knowledge and pedagogy, strategies for supporting struggling students, strategies for providing language supports to English learners in all content areas, and in providing designated English language development instruction for EL students ensures that these students receive instruction targeted to their specific needs (a qualitative improvement). The services provided for low-income students under Action 3.1 are effective in meeting Goal 3 that “The district will support teachers and staff with professional development, training, and collaboration time.” The training teachers receive, supports them in their efforts to increase the achievement of low-income students and English learners. Test scores for students from low-income families and English learners increased from the prior year. 47.8% of English learners made progress on the state assessment for English	On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient) We will also seek feedback from staff on professional development programs within HESD's broad educational program.

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
	greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard	Learners Progress Indicator (2025 California School Dashboard) and 15.29% of English learners scored at the "Proficient" level on the 2025 Summative ELPAC. Based on our most recent 2025 CASSPP scores, both ELA and Math showed gains in proficiency levels compared to 2020-2021. This indicates a need to continue to build upon and strengthen the district's existing instructional programs. The services under Action 3.1 continue to be effective in making progress toward meeting Goal #3 We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income, foster, and English Learner student learning as it’s focused on addressing their identified needs. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 2.6 points below standard, “Low-Income students” scored 13.4 points below standard, and “EL students” scored 18.2 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the ELA CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 50% and 30% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 15.22% in 2021 to 19.35% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 30.4 points below standard, “Low-Income students” scored 40.7 points below standard, and “EL students” scored 44.1 points	

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
	• No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest)	below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the Math CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 39% and 22% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in Math. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on a school-wide basis.	

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
	• All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math **Scope:**		

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		
3.2	**Action:** Teacher Collaboration Time **Need:** Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient)	To address these needs, the district will provide teachers with support from leadership, training, and professional development that supports the programs and services in the LCAP. Students who are from low-income families, who are English learners, and who are foster youth have needs for individualized (differentiated) instruction that goes beyond the needs of students who are more affluent, are proficient in English, and live with their families. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 3.2 have been developed. The actions and services under 3.2 are based on these considerations and designed to support these students by providing teachers with collaboration time to identify struggling students (by analyzing their work and assessment results), and to plan specialized/targeted instruction for these students (who are mostly unduplicated students). These efforts provide unduplicated students with a qualitatively better (improved) education. Per CDE Dataquest for the 2025 school year, "All Students" scored 51.29% Proficient in ELA and 40.40% Proficient in Math. EL students scored 19.35% Proficient in ELA and 16.27% Proficient in Math. Low-Income students scored 46.83% Proficient in ELA and 36.11% Proficient in Math. The services provided for low-income students under Action 3.2 are effective in meeting Goal 3 that “The district will support teachers and staff with professional development, training, and	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient) On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient) We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 above.

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
	• Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient)	collaboration time." The collaboration time teachers receive supports them in their efforts to increase the achievement of low-income students and English learners. Test scores for students from low-income families, English learners, and Foster youth increased in both ELA and Math when compared to the previous year. 47.8% of English learners made progress on the state assessment for English Learners Progress Indicator (2025 California School Dashboard) and 15.29% of English learners scored at the "Proficient" level on the 2025 Summative ELPAC. Based on our most recent 2025 CASSPP scores, both ELA and Math showed gains in proficiency levels compared to 2020-2021. This indicates a need to continue to build upon and strengthen the district's existing instructional programs. The services under Action 3.2 continue to be effective in making progress toward meeting Goal #3. We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income, foster, and English Learner student learning as it's focused on addressing their identified needs. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 2.6 points below standard, "Low-Income students" scored 13.4 points below standard, and "EL students" scored 18.2 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the ELA CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 50% and 30% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 and our EL population has	We will also seek feedback from staff regarding collaboration time and the specialized/targeted instruction for these students (who are mostly unduplicated students).

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
	• English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for	raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 15.22% in 2021 to 19.35% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 30.4 points below standard, “Low-Income students” scored 40.7 points below standard, and “EL students” scored 44.1 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the Math CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 39% and 22% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in Math. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on a school-wide basis.	

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
	an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient)		

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
	This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math **Scope:** LEA-wide		
3.3	**Action:** New Teacher Induction **Need:** Based on the 2022-2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math	To address these needs, the district will provide teachers with support from leadership, training, and professional development that support the programs and services in the LCAP. Students who are from low-income families, who are English learners, and who are foster youth have needs for exceptionally well-trained teachers that go beyond the needs of students who are	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. 3-Year Target:

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: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math	more affluent, are proficient in English, and live with their families. Data from the California School Dashboard (2025) indicate that low-income students, English Learners, and Foster students performed below “All Students” in both ELA and Math. A new teacher who is exceptionally well trained and is supported through their first two years in the profession develops a deep knowledge of the content areas for which they are responsible and is able to provide targeted individualized instruction (differentiated instruction) to struggling students (who are mostly unduplicated students). An exceptionally well-trained/supported new teacher is able to deliver specialized instruction to students who are English learners. An exceptionally well-trained/supported new teacher is able to deliver a qualitatively better (improved) education to unduplicated students than a teacher who is merely adequately trained. Action 3.3 is based on these considerations and principally directed to our low-income students and students who are English learners, improving and/or increasing services they receive in the following ways: Providing the teachers of low-income students and English learners with training that includes content area knowledge and pedagogy, strategies for supporting struggling students, strategies for providing language support to English learners in all content areas, and in providing designated English language development instruction for EL students ensure that these students receive instruction targeted to their specific needs (a qualitative improvement). The services provided for low-income students under Action 3.3 are effective in meeting Goal 3	On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient) Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient) On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient) We will also seek feedback from new teachers and administration regarding the induction program. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 above.

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
	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient)	that “The district will support teachers and staff with professional development, training, and collaboration time.” New teachers in the Induction Program receive additional training beyond what all teachers receive. New teachers in the Induction Program receive support from a full-time mentor teacher. The training and support that new teachers receive supports them in their efforts to increase the achievement of low-income students and English learners. Test scores for students from low-income families, English learners, and Foster youth increased in both ELA and Math when compared to the previous year. 47.8% of English learners made progress on the state assessment for English Learners Progress Indicator (2025 California School Dashboard) and 15.29% of English learners scored at the "Proficient" level on the 2025 Summative ELPAC. Based on our most recent 2025 CASSPP scores, both ELA and Math showed gains in proficiency levels compared to 2020-2021. This indicates a need to continue to build upon and strengthen the district's existing instructional programs. The services under Action 3.3 continue to be effective in making progress toward meeting Goal #3. We expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income, foster, and English Learner student learning as it’s focused on addressing their identified needs. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 2.6 points below standard, “Low-Income students” scored 13.4 points below standard, and “EL students” scored 18.2 points below standard.	

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
	• Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math	Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the ELA CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 50% and 30% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 15.22% in 2021 to 19.35% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 30.4 points below standard, “Low-Income students” scored 40.7 points below standard, and “EL students” scored 44.1 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the Math CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 39% and 22% respectively. Over the last several years, our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in Math. Foster students, in ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, scored 69.0 points below standard, and in Math, Foster students scored 111.5 points below standard. In 2024, Fosters students were 13.33% proficient in ELA and 6.67% proficient in Math. In 2025, Fosters students showed improvement in ELA scoring 28.57% proficient, however, they remained at 6.67% proficient in Math.	

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: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red)	To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on a school-wide basis.	

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
	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math **Scope:** LEA-wide		
4.1	**Action:** Coordination of Student Support **Need:** Based on the 2023 CA Dashboard data for Chronic Absenteeism, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. For suspension rate, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income), and Foster youth students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. District 2023 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 22.1% chronically absent	To address these needs, the district will provide Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth with an array of supports designed to improve health, promote wellness and school attendance, and decrease behavior incidents and suspensions. Unduplicated Pupils have needs for health and wellness as well as social and emotional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Data from the California School Dashboard indicate that suspension rates and chronic absenteeism rates for Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth are higher than for “All Students”. For 2025, "All Students" had a chronic absenteeism rate of 12.8% and a suspension rate of 2.9% whereas Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a chronic absenteeism rate of 14.2%	We will monitor progress on Chronically Absent students and Suspension rates, both locally and from the CA Dashboard our Unduplicated student groups in comparison to all students. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 Dashboard for Chronic absenteeism for our Unduplicated Student groups: EL: 9.9% SED: 9.9% SWD: 9.9% Foster Youth: 9.9%

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
	• Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 24.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 18.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 17.6% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 11.6%) District 2023 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 5.4% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 6.1% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 4.6% (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of only 1.4%) • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 8.2% This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2023 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism	and a suspension rate of 3.1% and Foster youth had a chronic absenteeism rate of 31.9% and a suspension rate of 12.2%. Pupils from Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) families and students who are foster youth may lack the resources to access the types of health and wellness as well as social supports that reduce barriers to learning. These barriers may include inconsistent school attendance and discipline incidents that result in missed days of school, time out of class, or suspension. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 4.1 have been developed. The services provided under Action 4.1 are based on these considerations and are designed to support Unduplicated Pupils by providing Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth with an array of supports designed to improve health, promote wellness and school attendance, and decrease behavior incidents and suspensions. Learning Directors; the Assistant Superintendent of Student Services, School Climate, Child Welfare and Attendance; and the School Social Worker coordinate these services, ensuring that Unduplicated Pupils in need receive the appropriate services, that the services are delivered on time, and that they are effective. (These support staff also deliver services directly to students.) The services provided to students under Action 4.1 are effective in meeting Goal 4 “Students will learn in a safe, well-maintained school where they are supported, engaged, and connected to their school." Schools with higher attendance rates and	On the 2026 Dashboard for Suspension Rate for our Unduplicated Student groups: EL: 2.9% SED: 2.9% Foster: 2.9% We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 above.

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
	• Suspension Rate: • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 6.1% suspension rate (RED) • Foster Youths: 8.2% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: EL: 18.5% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: SED: 18.4% suspension rate (Red) • Woodrow: SED: 19.4% suspension rate (Red) Based on the 2024 CA Dashboard data for Chronic Absenteeism, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. For suspension rate, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income), and Foster youth students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. District 2024 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 13.7% chronically absent	lower numbers of discipline incidents are safer. Data from the 2025 California School Dashboard shows suspension rates at the Green level for All Students, Yellow for Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students, and a Orange for Foster Youths. Prior to COVID these rates were improving (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4), showing there is a great need to assist these students with their social-emotional needs and connectedness to school. The district received a score of Yellow on the 2025 CA School Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Indicator for All Students, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students, an Orange level for EL students and Foster Youths, indicating there is still a need to assist families with attendance strategies. The COVID pandemic has had a profound effect on student attendance and on students' overall social-emotional well-being. Since the COVID pandemic, there continues to be high rate of chronic absenteeism than pre-COVID and since COVID, the suspension rate has yet to return to pre-COVID level. The data measuring school climate, especially suspensions and absenteeism, have been significantly impacted by the COVID pandemic, and do not accurately reflect the impact that the district's programs and services have had on school climate over the past 10 to 15 years where numbers were consistently improving. The district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions and chronic absenteeism.	

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
	• Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 15.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 10.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 23.5% chronically absent District 2024 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 4.2% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 4.7% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 4.1% (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of only 1.4%) • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 15.7% This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2024 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 23.5% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • Foster: 15.7% suspension rate (RED)	We expect this action to lead to a decrease in Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and Foster youth student chronic absenteeism and suspension rates as this action is focused on addressing their identified needs. Our 2026 suspension rate target on the CA Dashboard is 2.90% for both Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and foster youths. Over the last several years (not looking at 2020-2021 when schools were closed for much of the year and students were on distance learning), our suspension rate for our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) population increased from 2.90% in 2019 to 3.1% in 2025. For foster youth, the suspension rate remained the same from 12.2% in 2019 to 12.2% in 2025. Prior to the COVID years, the district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions from 2013 through 2019 (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4), showing a need to continue these actions. HESD chronic absenteeism rate target on the 2026 CA Dashboard is 5.9% for both Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and foster youths. Over the last several years (not looking at 2021 when schools were closed for much of the year and students were on distance learning), our chronic absenteeism rate for our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) population increased from 8.6% in 2019 to 14.2% in 2025 and also increased for our foster youth from 11.6% in 2019 to 31.9% in 2025. For 2021-2022, the COVID pandemic had a profound negative impact on chronic absenteeism rates.	

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
	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism (only SWD and Homeless) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Washington: EL: 6.4% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 28.3% suspension rate (RED) Based on the 2025 CA Dashboard data for Chronic Absenteeism, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. For suspension rate, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income), and Foster youth students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. District 2025 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 12.8% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 14.2% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 10.4% chronically absent	Prior to the COVID years, the district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in chronic absenteeism from 2013 through 2019 showing a need to continue these actions (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4). To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	

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
	• Foster Youth Students had a rate of 31.9% chronically absent District 2025 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 2.9% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 3.1% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 2.5 • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 12.2% This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 31.9% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Suspension Rate Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 16.2% cronically absent (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are:		

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
	• Simas: SED: 3.5% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 38.6% suspension rate (RED) LEARNING RECOVERY AND EMERGENCY BLOCK GRANT Hanford Elementary School District has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2025-2026 school year. LREBG funded actions can be found in Goal 4, Actions 1 and 2. The Hanford Elementary School District's needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2025 CA Dashboard related to Suspension rates and Chronic Absenteeism. A review of state and local data indicates a significantly high chronical absenteeism rate and suspension rate for Foster students at 31.9% and 12.2% compared to All Students at 12.8% and 2.9%. In addition, for chronic absenteeism rate, Socio-economically disadvantaged students (SED), Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Homeless student groups were at 14.2%, 22.6%, and 23.7% respectively. Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) students were chronically absent at a higher rate (14.2%) compared to All Students (12.8%). Foster students were also Chronically Absent at a significantly higher rate (31.9%) compared to All Students (12.8%). Based on this, Goal 4, Metric 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 along with Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 directly address the health and wellness needs in addition to the social and emotional needs that go well beyond what		

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
	all students need. Counselors, Social Workers, SPED Teachers, Psychologists, and School nurses provide accessible counseling and crisis intervention to support students in building resilience, developing coping strategies, and managing the emotional toll of their circumstances. These actions align to the allowable uses of funds in the area of integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, such as provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupils needs. This is evidenced by: • Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf) • Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf) • The Link Between School Attendance and Good Health (https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AAP_policy_statement_chronic_absence_2019_.pdf)		

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
	Scope: LEA-wide		
4.2	**Action:** Health Professionals (Physical/Mental/Social/Emotional) **Need:** Based on the CA Dashboard data for Chronic Absenteeism, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. For suspension rate, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income), and Foster youth students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. District 2023 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 22.1% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 24.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 18.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 17.6% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students,	To address these needs, the district will provide Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth with an array of supports designed to improve health, promote wellness and school attendance, and decrease behavior incidents and suspensions. Based on Parent and Student surveys, there is a need to continue with action 4.2 as seen by these results Parent Survey Questions and responses for 2025-2026: • Having a school nurse at each site is important: 100% Agree/Strong Agree • Having a school counselor at each site is important: 99% Agree/Strongly Agree Student Survey Questions and responses for 2025-2026: • Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school: 68.22% Agree/Strongly Agree • There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school: 77.97% Agree/Strongly Agree • I have visited the school nurse this year: 69.39% Yes • I have visited the school counselor this year: 32.51% Yes Unduplicated Pupils have needs for health and wellness as well as social and emotional supports	We will monitor progress on Chronically Absent students and Suspension rates, both locally and from the CA Dashboard our Unduplicated student groups in comparison to all students. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 Dashboard for Chronic absenteeism for our Unduplicated Student groups: EL: 9.9% SED: 9.9% SWD: 9.9% Foster Youth: 9.9% On the 2026 Dashboard for Suspension Rate for our Unduplicated Student groups: EL: 2.9% SED: 2.9% Foster: 2.9% We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 above.

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
	it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 11.6%) District 2023 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 5.4% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 6.1% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 4.6% (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of only 1.4%) • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 8.2% This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2023 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism • Suspension Rate: • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 6.1% suspension rate (RED) • Foster Youths: 8.2% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2023 Dashboard are:	that go well beyond what all students need. Data from the California School Dashboard indicate that suspension rates and chronic absenteeism rates for Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth are higher than for “All Students”. For 2025, "All Students" had a chronic absenteeism rate of 12.8% and a suspension rate of 2.9% whereas Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a chronic absenteeism rate of 14.2% and a suspension rate of 3.1% and Foster youth had a chronic absenteeism rate of 31.9% and a suspension rate of 12.2%. Pupils from Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) families and students who are foster youth may lack the resources to access the types of health and wellness as well as social supports that reduce barriers to learning. These barriers may include inconsistent school attendance and discipline incidents that result in missed days of school, time out of class, or suspension. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 4.2 have been developed. The services provided under Action 4.2 are based on these considerations and are designed to support Unduplicated Pupils by providing Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth with an array of supports designed to improve health, promote wellness and school attendance, and decrease behavior incidents and suspensions. School nurses and school counselors deliver direct services to students to eliminate barriers to attendance and learning.	We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff (Educational Partner groups) about the Health Professionals. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 4.6 above.

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
	• No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: EL: 18.5% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: SED: 18.4% suspension rate (Red) • Woodrow: SED: 19.4% suspension rate (Red) District 2024 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 13.7% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 15.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 10.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 23.5% chronically absent District 2024 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 4.2% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 4.7% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 4.1% (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still	The services provided to students under Action 4.1 are effective in meeting Goal 4 “Students will learn in a safe, well-maintained school where they are supported, engaged, and connected to their school." Schools with higher attendance rates and lower numbers of discipline incidents are safer. Data from the 2025 California School Dashboard shows suspension rates at the Green level for All Students, Yellow for Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students, and a Orange for Foster Youths. Prior to COVID these rates were improving (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4), showing there is a great need to assist these students with their social-emotional needs and connectedness to school. The district received a score of Yellow on the 2025 CA School Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Indicator for All Students, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students, an Orange level for EL students and Foster Youths, indicating there is still a need to assist families with attendance strategies. The COVID pandemic has had a profound effect on student attendance and on students' overall social-emotional well-being. Since the COVID pandemic, there continues to be high rate of chronic absenteeism than pre-COVID and since COVID, the suspension rate has yet to return to pre-COVID level. The data measuring school climate, especially suspensions and absenteeism, have been significantly impacted by the COVID pandemic, and do not accurately reflect the impact that the district's programs and services have had on school climate over the past 10 to 15 years where numbers were consistently improving. The	

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
	substantially higher than pre-covid rate of only 1.4%) • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 15.7% This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2024 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 23.5% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • Foster: 15.7% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism (only SWD and Homeless) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Washington: EL: 6.4% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 28.3% suspension rate (RED) Based on the 2025 CA Dashboard data for Chronic Absenteeism, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students show a greater disparity in areas beyond	district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions and chronic absenteeism. We expect this action to lead to a decrease in Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and Foster youth student chronic absenteeism and suspension rates as this action is focused on addressing their identified needs. Our 2026 suspension rate target on the CA Dashboard is 2.90% for both Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and foster youths. Over the last several years (not looking at 2020-2021 when schools were closed for much of the year and students were on distance learning), our suspension rate for our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) population increased from 2.90% in 2019 to 3.1% in 2025. For foster youth, the suspension rate remained the same from 12.2% in 2019 to 12.2% in 2025. Prior to the COVID years, the district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions from 2013 through 2019 (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4), showing a need to continue these actions. HESD chronic absenteeism rate target on the 2026 CA Dashboard is 5.9% for both Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and foster youths. Over the last several years (not looking at 2021 when schools were closed for much of the year and students were on distance learning), our chronic absenteeism rate for our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income)	

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
	academics when compared to their peers. For suspension rate, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income), and Foster youth students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. District 2025 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 12.8% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 14.2% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 10.4% chronically absent • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 31.9% chronically absent District 2025 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 2.9% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 3.1% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 2.5 • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 12.2% This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups):	population increased from 8.6% in 2019 to 14.2% in 2025 and also increased for our foster youth from 11.6% in 2019 to 31.9% in 2025. For 2021-2022, the COVID pandemic had a profound negative impact on chronic absenteeism rates. Prior to the COVID years, the district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in chronic absenteeism from 2013 through 2019 showing a need to continue these actions (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4). To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	

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
	• Foster: 31.9% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Suspension Rate Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 16.2% cronically absent (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 3.5% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 38.6% suspension rate (RED) LEARNING RECOVERY AND EMERGENCY BLOCK GRANT Hanford Elementary School District has unexpended LREBG funds for the 2025-2026 school year. LREBG funded actions can be found in Goal 4, Actions 1 and 2. The Hanford Elementary School District's needs assessment substantiated findings from the 2025 CA Dashboard related to Suspension rates and Chronic Absenteeism. A review of state and local data indicates a significantly high chronical absenteeism rate and suspension rate for Foster students at 31.9% and 12.2% compared to All Students at 12.8%		

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
	and 2.9%. In addition, for chronic absenteeism rate, Socio-economically disadvantaged students (SED), Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Homeless student groups were at 14.2%, 22.6%, and 23.7% respectively. Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) students were chronically absent at a higher rate (14.2%) compared to All Students (12.8%). Foster students were also Chronically Absent at a significantly higher rate (31.9%) compared to All Students (12.8%). Based on this, Goal 4, Metric 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 along with Goal 4 Actions 1 and 2 directly address the health and wellness needs in addition to the social and emotional needs that go well beyond what all students need. Counselors, Social Workers, SPED Teachers, Psychologists, and School nurses provide accessible counseling and crisis intervention to support students in building resilience, developing coping strategies, and managing the emotional toll of their circumstances. These actions align to the allowable uses of funds in the area of integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, such as provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupils needs. This is evidenced by: • Guiding Principles for Creating Safe, Inclusive, Supportive, and Fair School Climates (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf)		

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
	• Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs (https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf) • The Link Between School Attendance and Good Health (https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AAP_policy_statement_chronic_absence_2019_.pdf) **Scope:** LEA-wide		
4.3	**Action:** School Support Staff **Need:** Based on the CA Dashboard data for Chronic Absenteeism, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. For suspension rate, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income), and Foster youth students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. District 2023 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows	To address these needs, the district will provide Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth with an array of supports designed to improve health, promote wellness and school attendance, and decrease behavior incidents and suspensions. Based on Parent and Student surveys, there is a need to continue with action 4.3 as seen by these results Parent Survey Questions and responses for 2025-2026: • The School Resource Officer helps keep my child's school safe: 97% Agree/Strongly Agree • My child is safe at school: 96% Agree/Strongly Agree	We will monitor progress on Chronically Absent students and Suspension rates, both locally and from the CA Dashboard our Unduplicated student groups in comparison to all students. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 Dashboard for Chronic absenteeism for our Unduplicated Student groups: EL: 9.9% SED: 9.9% SWD: 9.9%

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
	• All Students had a rate of 22.1% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 24.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 18.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 17.6% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 11.6%) District 2023 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 5.4% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 6.1% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 4.6% (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of only 1.4%) • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 8.2% This action addresses the following RED Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2023 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism:	Student Survey Questions and responses for 2025-2026: • Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school: 68.22% Agree/Strongly Agree • There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school: 77.97% Agree/Strongly Agree • I feel safe at school: 77.94% Agree/Strongly Agree • I know and have spoken with the resource officer at my school: 38.99% Yes • The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school: 88.54% Agree/Strongly Agree • The school resource officer is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school: 73.73% Agree/Strongly Agree • The school resource officer makes my school safer: 85.12% Agree/Strongly Agree Unduplicated Pupils have needs for health and wellness as well as social and emotional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Data from the California School Dashboard indicate that suspension rates and chronic absenteeism rates for Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth are higher than for “All Students”. For 2025, "All Students" had a chronic absenteeism rate of 12.8% and a suspension rate of 2.9% whereas Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a chronic absenteeism rate of 14.2% and a suspension rate of 3.1% and Foster youth	Foster Youth: 9.9% On the 2026 Dashboard for Suspension Rate for our Unduplicated Student groups: EL: 2.9% SED: 2.9% Foster: 2.9% We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 above. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff (Educational Partner groups) about the school’s support staff. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 4.6 above.

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
	• No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism • Suspension Rate: • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 6.1% suspension rate (RED) • Foster Youths: 8.2% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: EL: 18.5% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: SED: 18.4% suspension rate (Red) • Woodrow: SED: 19.4% suspension rate (Red) District 2024 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 13.7% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 15.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 10.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%)	had a chronic absenteeism rate of 31.9% and a suspension rate of 12.2%. Pupils from Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) families may lack the resources to access the types of social and emotional supports that reduce barriers to learning. These barriers may include inconsistent school attendance and discipline incidents that result in missed days of school, time out of class, or suspension. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 4.3 have been developed. The services provided under Action 4.3 are based on these considerations and designed to support Unduplicated Pupils ensuring that a lack of resources does not create a barrier to learning or attendance for these students. The services under Action 4.3 are designed to support our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students, and foster youth, by improving and/or increasing services they receive in the following ways: The services provided under Action 4.3 provide Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth with an array of supports designed to decrease behavior incidents (thereby lowering suspensions) and to increase school attendance. Student specialists at the elementary schools and vice principals at the junior high schools work directly with unduplicated pupils, providing support for good behavior and citizenship as well as interventions when behavior incidents occur. The Community Day School provides additional intensive interventions for students with more serious behavior challenges. School resource officers provide an additional layer of safety and support for students.	

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
	• Foster Youth Students had a rate of 23.5% chronically absent District 2024 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 4.2% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 4.7% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 4.1% (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of only 1.4%) • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 15.7% This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2024 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 23.5% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • Foster: 15.7% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism (only SWD and Homeless)	Effective in Meeting the District's Goals for Unduplicated Pupils: The services provided to students under Action 4.3 are effective in meeting the component of Goal 4 that says, "Students will attend a safe school." Schools with lower numbers of discipline incidents are safer. Data from the 2025 California School Dashboard shows suspension rates at the Green level for All Students and Yellow for Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students, and Orange for Foster Youths. Prior to COVID these rates were improving (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4), showing there is a great need to assist these students with their social-emotional needs and connectedness to school. The district received a score of Yellow on the 2025 CA School Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Indicator for All Students, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students, Orange for EL students, and Red for Foster Youths indicating there is still a need to assist families with attendance strategies. The COVID pandemic has had a profound effect on student attendance and on students' overall social-emotional well-being. Since the COVID pandemic, there continues to be high rate of chronic absenteeism than pre-COVID and since COVID, the suspension rate has yet to return to pre-COVID level. The data measuring school climate, especially suspensions and absenteeism, have been significantly impacted by the COVID pandemic, and do not accurately reflect the impact that the district's programs and services have had on school climate over the past 10 to 15 years where numbers were consistently improving. The	

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
	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Washington: EL: 6.4% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 28.3% suspension rate (RED) Based on the 2025 CA Dashboard data for Chronic Absenteeism, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. For suspension rate, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income), and Foster youth students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. District 2025 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 12.8% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 14.2% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 10.4% chronically absent • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 31.9% chronically absent District 2025 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 2.9% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 3.1%	district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions and chronic absenteeism. We expect this action to lead to a decrease in Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and Foster youth student chronic absenteeism and suspension rates as this action is focused on addressing their identified needs. Our 2026 suspension rate target on the CA Dashboard is 2.90% for both Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and foster youths. Over the last several years (not looking at 2020-2021 when schools were closed for much of the year and students were on distance learning), our suspension rate for our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) population increased from 2.90% in 2019 to 3.1% in 2025. For foster youth, the suspension rate remained the same from 12.2% in 2019 to 12.2% in 2025. Prior to the COVID years, the district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions from 2013 through 2019 (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4), showing a need to continue these actions. HESD chronic absenteeism rate target on the 2026 CA Dashboard is 5.9% for both Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and foster youths. Over the last several years (not looking at 2021 when schools were closed for much of the year and students were on distance learning), our chronic absenteeism rate for our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income)	

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
	• English Learners had a suspension rate of 2.5 • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 12.2% This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 31.9% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Suspension Rate Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 16.2% cronically absent (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 3.5% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 38.6% suspension rate (RED) **Scope:** LEA-wide	population increased from 8.6% in 2019 to 14.2% in 2025 and also increased for our foster youth from 11.6% in 2019 to 31.9% in 2025. For 2021-2022, the COVID pandemic had a profound negative impact on chronic absenteeism rates. Prior to the COVID years, the district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in chronic absenteeism from 2013 through 2019 showing a need to continue these actions (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4). To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	

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
4.4	**Action:** School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in both Chronically Absent and Suspension who scored red on the CA Dashboard. **Need:** Based on the CA Dashboard data for Chronic Absenteeism, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. For suspension rate, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income), and Foster youth students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. District 2023 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 22.1% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 24.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 18.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 17.6% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 11.6%)	To address these needs, the district will provide Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth with an array of supports designed to improve health, promote wellness and school attendance, and decrease behavior incidents and suspensions. Based on Parent and Student surveys, there is a need to continue with action 4.3 as seen by these results Parent Survey Questions and responses for 2025-2026: • The School Resource Officer helps keep my child's school safe: 97% Agree/Strongly Agree • My child is safe at school: 96% Agree/Strongly Agree Student Survey Questions and responses for 2025-2026: • Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school: 68.22% Agree/Strongly Agree • There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school: 77.97% Agree/Strongly Agree • I feel safe at school: 77.94% Agree/Strongly Agree • I know and have spoken with the resource officer at my school: 38.99% Yes • The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school: 88.54% Agree/Strongly Agree • The school resource officer is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school: 73.73% Agree/Strongly Agree	We will monitor progress on Chronically Absent students and Suspension rates, both locally and from the CA Dashboard our Unduplicated student groups in comparison to all students. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 Dashboard for Chronic absenteeism for our Unduplicated Student groups: EL: 9.9% SED: 9.9% SWD: 9.9% Foster Youth: 9.9% On the 2026 Dashboard for Suspension Rate for our Unduplicated Student groups: EL: 2.9% SED: 2.9% SWD: 2.9% Foster: 2.9% We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 above. We will also seek feedback from students,

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 2023 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 5.4% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 6.1% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 4.6% (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of only 1.4%) • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 8.2% This action addresses the following RED Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2023 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism • Suspension Rate: • Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students: 6.1% suspension rate (RED) • Foster Youths: 8.2% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups were in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism	• The school resource officer makes my school safer: 85.12% Agree/Strongly Agree Unduplicated Pupils have needs for health and wellness as well as social and emotional supports that go well beyond what all students need. Data from the California School Dashboard indicate that suspension rates and chronic absenteeism rates for Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth are higher than for “All Students”. For 2025, "All Students" had a chronic absenteeism rate of 12.8% and a suspension rate of 2.9% whereas Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a chronic absenteeism rate of 14.2% and a suspension rate of 3.1% and Foster youth had a chronic absenteeism rate of 31.9% and a suspension rate of 12.2%. Pupils from Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) families may lack the resources to access the types of social and emotional supports that reduce barriers to learning. These barriers may include inconsistent school attendance and discipline incidents that result in missed days of school, time out of class, or suspension. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 4.3 have been developed. The services provided under Action 4.3 are based on these considerations and designed to support Unduplicated Pupils ensuring that a lack of resources does not create a barrier to learning or attendance for these students. The services under Action 4.3 are designed to support our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students, and foster youth, by improving and/or	parents, and staff (Educational Partner groups) about the school’s support staff. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 4.6 above.

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
	Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Kennedy: EL: 18.5% suspension rate (Red) • Kennedy: SED: 18.4% suspension rate (Red) • Woodrow: SED: 19.4% suspension rate (Red) District 2024 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 13.7% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 15.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 10.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 23.5% chronically absent District 2024 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 4.2% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 4.7% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 4.1% (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of only 1.4%)	increasing services they receive in the following ways: The services provided under Action 4.3 provide Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students and foster youth with an array of supports designed to decrease behavior incidents (thereby lowering suspensions) and to increase school attendance. Student specialists at the elementary schools and vice principals at the junior high schools work directly with unduplicated pupils, providing support for good behavior and citizenship as well as interventions when behavior incidents occur. The Community Day School provides additional intensive interventions for students with more serious behavior challenges. School resource officers provide an additional layer of safety and support for students. Effective in Meeting the District's Goals for Unduplicated Pupils: The services provided to students under Action 4.3 are effective in meeting the component of Goal 4 that says, "Students will attend a safe school." Schools with lower numbers of discipline incidents are safer. Data from the 2025 California School Dashboard shows suspension rates at the Green level for All Students and Yellow for Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students, and Orange for Foster Youths. Prior to COVID these rates were improving (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4), showing there is a great need to assist these students with their social-emotional needs and connectedness to school. The district received a score of Yellow on the 2025 CA School Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Indicator for All Students, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income)	

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
	• Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 15.7% This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2024 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 23.5% chronically absent (Red) • Suspension Rate: • Foster: 15.7% suspension rate (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Chronic Absenteeism (only SWD and Homeless) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Washington: EL: 6.4% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 28.3% suspension rate (RED) Based on the 2025 CA Dashboard data for Chronic Absenteeism, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. For suspension rate, Socio-economically	students, Orange for EL students, and Red for Foster Youths indicating there is still a need to assist families with attendance strategies. The COVID pandemic has had a profound effect on student attendance and on students' overall social-emotional well-being. Since the COVID pandemic, there continues to be high rate of chronic absenteeism than pre-COVID and since COVID, the suspension rate has yet to return to pre-COVID level. The data measuring school climate, especially suspensions and absenteeism, have been significantly impacted by the COVID pandemic, and do not accurately reflect the impact that the district's programs and services have had on school climate over the past 10 to 15 years where numbers were consistently improving. The district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions and chronic absenteeism. We expect this action to lead to a decrease in Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and Foster youth student chronic absenteeism and suspension rates as this action is focused on addressing their identified needs. Our 2026 suspension rate target on the CA Dashboard is 2.90% for both Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and foster youths. Over the last several years (not looking at 2020-2021 when schools were closed for much of the year and students were on distance learning), our suspension rate for our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) population increased from 2.90% in 2019 to 3.1% in 2025.	

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
	disadvantaged (SED-Low Income), and Foster youth students show a greater disparity in areas beyond academics when compared to their peers. District 2025 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 12.8% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 14.2% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 10.4% chronically absent • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 31.9% chronically absent District 2025 CA Dashboard Suspension rate shows • All Students had a suspension rate of 2.9% • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a suspension rate of 3.1% • English Learners had a suspension rate of 2.5% • Foster Youth Students had a suspension rate of 12.2% This action addresses the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions: District: For Chronic Absenteeism & Suspension rate on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Chronic Absenteeism (for unduplicated student groups): • Foster: 31.9% chronically absent (Red)	For foster youth, the suspension rate remained the same from 12.2% in 2019 to 12.2% in 2025. Prior to the COVID years, the district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions from 2013 through 2019 (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4), showing a need to continue these actions. HESD chronic absenteeism rate target on the 2026 CA Dashboard is 5.9% for both Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and foster youths. Over the last several years (not looking at 2021 when schools were closed for much of the year and students were on distance learning), our chronic absenteeism rate for our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) population increased from 8.6% in 2019 to 14.2% in 2025 and also increased for our foster youth from 11.6% in 2019 to 31.9% in 2025. For 2021-2022, the COVID pandemic had a profound negative impact on chronic absenteeism rates. Prior to the COVID years, the district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in chronic absenteeism from 2013 through 2019 showing a need to continue these actions (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4). To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis. The district's needs assessment draws on three data points side by side: All Students, SED, and	

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
	• Suspension Rate: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Suspension Rate Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism on the 2025 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 16.2% cronically absent (RED) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 6: Suspension rate on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Simas: SED: 3.5% suspension rate (RED) • Community Day School: SED: 38.6% suspension rate (RED) **Scope:** LEA-wide	SWD, because looking at any one of them alone understates the need: • 83% of HESD's SWD students are also identified as SED, meaning the SWD population is, in large part, a subset of the SED population, not a separate group. • Students who sit at the SWD/SED intersection have the highest rates on both Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate indicators in the district: 7.50% suspended (more than double All Students' 3.10%, and higher than SWD overall at 5.80%) and 19.00% chronically absent (well above All Students' 11.90% and above SWD overall at 18.00%). • SED students overall (3.30% suspension, 13.30% chronic absenteeism) look only modestly elevated compared to All Students, but that district-wide SED average is masking a much higher-need population within it: SED students who are also SWD. Because the overwhelming majority of SWD students are also SED, the elevated SWD rates are, in practice, telling the district something about a subgroup of its SED population. When the data is disaggregated to isolate SED students who are also SWD, the rates climb even further, to 7.50% suspension rate and 19.00% chronic absenteeism, confirming that the true magnitude of need inside the SED group is being driven by this dual-identified subgroup. This is consistent with the CA Dashboard's own Priority 5 and 6 "Red" school-site data already cited elsewhere in Action 4.4, where SED and SWD are the two student groups	

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
		that recur most often (e.g., Simas: SED red for both chronic absenteeism and suspension; King, Roosevelt, and Hamilton: SWD red for chronic absenteeism and/or suspension). The needs assessment therefore treats SED as the identified unduplicated student group focus for this action, with SWD data serving as corroborating, within-group evidence of where the need is most concentrated. Action 4.4 directs each School Site Council to prioritize its site allocation toward the student groups scoring in the Red on the CA Dashboard for Chronic Absenteeism and/or Suspension Rate, which based on the needs assessment above, are principally SED students (including the significant proportion of SED students who are also SWD). The action's specific components are designed to address the barriers driving SED students' disproportionate rates: • Weekly outreach to chronically absent students — targeting the attendance gap that is largest for SED students (13.30% overall, 19.00% for SED students who are also SWD) compared to All Students (11.90%). • Weekly MTSS grade-level team meetings to analyze data and deliver timely behavioral interventions — directly addressing the elevated suspension risk documented for SED students, and especially for the SED/SWD intersection (7.50%). • Culturally responsive training for teachers, to build classroom practices that reduce exclusionary discipline for the student groups most affected.	

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
		• Site-level MTSS reporting to Instructional Cabinet and coordination with the District Support Team, so each site's use of funds is monitored against outcomes for its lowest-performing groups, which the CA Dashboard site-level data confirms are recurrently SED and SWD. The 2025 CA Dashboard identifies SED students in the Red at multiple sites (e.g., Simas for both Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate) and SWD students in the Red at several others (Hamilton, King, Roosevelt) and because 83% of SWD students are also SED, these are substantially overlapping populations spread across the district's school sites. A schoolwide structure, in which every Site Council uses local dashboard and DataQuest data to direct its own allocation toward its own lowest-performing groups, allows the action to reach SED students (and the SED/SWD subgroup within them) at whichever sites the need is concentrated in a given year, rather than freezing the action's reach to a single school or a static list of students. The metrics and targets used to measure Action 4.4's progress and effectiveness are SED as the primary unduplicated group, with SWD reported alongside as the corroborating dual-identified population. Metric 4.1: Suspension Rate: Baseline (2023): All Students 5.4%, SED 6.1% (Red), SWD 6.3% (Red). Year 2 Outcome (2025): All Students 2.9%, SED 3.1% (Yellow), SWD 4.8% (Yellow). 3-Year Target: continue reducing SED and SWD suspension rates at a faster pace than the All-Students rate, with an explicit sub-target for SED students who are also SWD, using DataQuest	

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
		dual-identification data (currently 7.50%) as the baseline for that sub-target. Metric 4.4: Chronic Absenteeism: Baseline (2023): All Students 22.1%, SED 24.3%, SWD 29.6%. Year 2 Outcome (2025): All Students 12.8%, SED 14.2% (Yellow), SWD 22.6% (Orange). 3-Year Target: close the gap between SED and All Students chronic absenteeism, with a specific sub-target for the SED/SWD dual-identified subgroup (currently 19.00%), which the data shows is the highest-need population within SED. The district's needs assessment shows that Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students are the unduplicated student group most consistently identified in the Red for Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate across HESD school sites. This need is substantiated by DataQuest data showing that 83% of the district's Students with Disabilities (SWD) are also SED, and that SED students who are also SWD experience the highest rates in the district on both indicators: 7.50% suspended (compared to 3.10% for All Students and 3.30% for SED overall) and 19.00% chronically absent (compared to 11.90% for All Students and 13.30% for SED overall). Action 4.4 is principally directed toward SED students, using this dual-identification data to target Site Council resources toward the sites and practices most likely to reduce chronic absenteeism and exclusionary discipline for this population, and is provided on a schoolwide basis because SED and SWD Red designations recur across multiple school sites rather than being concentrated at a single site.	

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
4.5	**Action:** Transportation **Need:** Based on the 2025 CAASPP data, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income), Foster youth, and English Learner students show a greater disparity in areas of their chronic Absenteeism rate compared to their peers. Both Foster Youths (31.9%) and Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students (14.2%) have chronic absenteeism rates higher than "All Students" (12.8%), showing a great need to improve this disparity. District 2023 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 22.1% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 24.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 18.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 17.6% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 11.6%) District 2024 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows	To address these needs, the district will provide unduplicated elementary students who live 3/4 mile or more from school and/or junior high unduplicated students who live one mile or more from school will be provided with transportation to and from school. Both Foster Youths (31.9%) and Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students (14.2%) have chronic absenteeism rates higher than "All Students" (12.8%), showing a great need to improve this disparity. Data from the CDE Dataquest indicate that Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students have a higher rate of chronic absenteeism than all students. For 2025, "All Students" had a chronic absenteeism rate of 12.8% whereas Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a chronic absenteeism rate of 14.2%. and Foster Youth's chronic absenteeism rate of 31.9% were worse that that of "All Students", showing there is still a great need. Therefore, the needs of these students are considered first as services provided under Action 4.4 have been developed. The services under Action 4.4 are based on these considerations and are designed to support Unduplicated Pupils by providing transportation to and from school. This action serves to shorten the distance these pupils must walk, provides relief for families who may lack transportation, and provides safer routes to and from school (e.g. providing bus transportation to pupils who would otherwise cross a busy street).	We will monitor progress on Chronically Absent students and Suspension rates, both locally and from the CA Dashboard our Unduplicated student groups in comparison to all students. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 Dashboard for Chronic absenteeism for our Unduplicated Student groups: EL: 9.9% SED: 9.9% SWD: 9.9% Foster Youth: 9.9% We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 4.4 above.

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
	• All Students had a rate of 13.7% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 15.3% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 10.1% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 23.5% chronically absent District 2025 CA Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism rate shows • All Students had a rate of 12.8% chronically absent • Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students had a rate of 14.2% chronically absent • English Learners had a rate of 10.4% chronically absent (even though this rate is below All Students, it is still substantially higher than pre-covid rate of 6.2%) • Foster Youth Students had a rate of 31.9% chronically absent **Scope:** LEA-wide	Effective in Meeting the District's Goals for Unduplicated Pupils The services provided to students under Action 4.4 are effective in meeting the component of Goal 4 that says: "Students will attend a safe school." Action 4.4 provides Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students with a safe route to and from school. Data from the 2025 California School Dashboard shows the district received a score of Yellow for the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator for All Students, Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) students, while English Learner students received a indicator of Orange, and Foster Youth showed an indicator of Red indicating a great need to assist families with transportation needs. The COVID pandemic has had a profound effect on student attendance and on students' overall social-emotional well-being. Since the COVID pandemic, there continues to be high rate of chronic absenteeism than pre-COVID and since COVID, the suspension rate has yet to return to pre-COVID level. The data measuring school climate, especially suspensions and absenteeism, have been significantly impacted by the COVID pandemic, and do not accurately reflect the impact that the district's programs and services have had on school climate over the past 10 to 15 years where numbers were consistently improving. The district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions and chronic absenteeism.	

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
		We expect this action to lead to a decrease in Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and Foster youth student chronic absenteeism and suspension rates as this action is focused on addressing their identified needs. Our 2026 suspension rate target on the CA Dashboard is 2.90% for both Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and foster youths. Over the last several years (not looking at 2020-2021 when schools were closed for much of the year and students were on distance learning), our suspension rate for our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) population increased from 2.90% in 2019 to 3.1% in 2025. For foster youth, the suspension rate increased from 12.2% in 2019 to 12.2% in 2025. Prior to the COVID years, the district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in suspensions from 2013 through 2019 (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4), showing a need to continue these actions. HESD chronic absenteeism rate target on the 2026 CA Dashboard is 5.9% for both Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) and foster youths. Over the last several years (not looking at 2021 when schools were closed for much of the year and students were on distance learning), our chronic absenteeism rate for our Socio-economically disadvantaged (SED-Low Income) population increased from 8.6% in 2019 to 14.2% in 2025 and also increased for our foster youth from 11.6% in 2019 to 31.9% in 2025. For 2021-2022, the COVID pandemic had a profound negative impact on chronic absenteeism rates.	

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
		Prior to the COVID years, the district's programs and services for students under Goal #4, leading up to the pandemic, have been effective and have led to significant and steady declines in chronic absenteeism from 2013 through 2019 showing a need to continue these actions (see Annual Performance: Reflection section under Goal 4). To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	
5.2	**Action:** Parent Involvement Activities **Need:** Research shows that more parental involvement leads to improved academics (article in Education Week by Libby Stanford, July 25, 2023). When parents are involved in their children's schooling, students show higher academic achievement, school engagement, and motivation, according to a 2019 American Psychological Association review of 448 independent studies on parent involvement. A 2005 study from researchers at the Johns Hopkins University Center on School, Family and Community Partnerships, for example, showed that school practices encouraging families to support their child's math learning at home led to higher percentages of students scoring at or above proficiency on standardized math tests. Research shows that parent involvement with reading activities has a positive impact on reading achievement, language	To address these needs, the district will continue to provide parents with a variety of informational, training/educational, and social activities based on the survey results above. Students who are from low-income families, who are English learners, and who are foster youth have academic needs that go beyond the needs of students who are more affluent, are proficient in English, and live with their families. These needs extend to students' families as well. Parents of Unduplicated Pupils regularly request additional training and education in how to support their children both academically and socially. The data from the California School Dashboard (2025) indicate that low-income students, English learners, and Foster youth performed below "All Students" in both ELA and Math showing a disparity between "All Students" and our unduplicated population. * 8% of parents disagree/strongly disagree with the following statement on the 25-26 HESD Parent Survey: "I have been given suggestions/ideas to use at home to help my child meet grade level	We will monitor progress on parent involvement activities across the district. We will also seek feedback from students, parents, and staff (Educational Partner groups) about the school's and district parent involvement activities. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 above. 3-Year Target: On the 2026 CAASPP ELA for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 18.2 pts below standard (50% Proficient) EL: 26.5 pts below standard (30% Proficient)

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
	comprehension, and expressive language skills, as well as students' interest in reading, attitudes toward reading, and level of attention in the classroom, according to a research summary by the National Literacy Trust. "When parents become involved at school by, for example, attending events such as open houses or volunteering in the classroom, they build social networks that can provide useful information, connections to school personnel (e.g., teachers), or strategies for enhancing children's achievement," the APA research review said. "In turn, parents with heightened social capital are better equipped to support their children in succeeding in school as they are able to call on resources (e.g., asking a teacher to spend extra time helping their children) and utilize information they have gathered (e.g., knowing when and how their children should complete their homework)." Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL, and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard (44.77% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 28.2 points below standard (40.46% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard (20.41% Proficient)	standards in English Language Arts and Math." (Thus indicating a need to provide more training support for parents/families). The services under Action 5.2 are based on these considerations and are designed to support Unduplicated Pupils by providing their families with specific, concrete actions and activities that they can do at home with their children to support the learning children are doing in school in English language arts and mathematics. The district primarily serves students in grades TK-2 with these informational, training/educational, and social activities. Data from district local formative and summative assessments show that: ** Unduplicated (EL and low-income) students whose families participated in these activities had greater gains in achievement than students whose families did not. *Kindergarten EL students whose parents participated in Kinder Cuenta scored above the district average on the HESD Letters & Sounds Assessment *Kindergarten EL students whose parents participated in Kinder Cuenta scored above the district average on the HESD Sight Words Assessment *Kindergarten EL students whose parents participated in Kinder Cuenta scored above the district average on the HESD Phonological Awareness Assessment *Kindergarten EL students whose parents participated in Kinder Cuenta scored above the district average on the HESD Alphabetic Principle Assessment	Foster: 9.9 points below standard (48% Proficient) On the 2026 CAASPP Math for our Unduplicated Student groups: SED: 47.6 points below standard (39% Proficient) EL: 55.9 points below standard (22% Proficient) Foster: 63.0 points below standard (48% Proficient)

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
	• Foster Youth students scored 19.9 points below standard (36.36% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard (33.66% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 57.6 points below standard (29.12% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard (12.50% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 73 points below Standard (36.36% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red)	** Note: The district uses many sources of data/information to measure students' progress/needs beyond the official metrics that are part of the LCAP. State test scores become available only after the school year has ended. Additionally, students in grades TK-2 do not participate in state testing. Therefore, internal measures of progress, called local formative and summative assessments that show students' areas of progress and need are used to "fine tune" the instructional program in real-time and guide school sites', grade levels', and teachers' planning. This data may also be used to make adjustments to the district's programs and services as areas of progress/need become apparent during the school year. We expect this action to lead to maintaining/improving unduplicated parent involvement and support as this action is focused on addressing their identified needs. To maximize the impact of this action in maintaining/improving parent involvement and support throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis. We also expect this action to lead to an increase in low-income, foster, and English Learner student learning as it's focused on addressing their identified needs. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 2.6 points below standard, "Low-Income students" scored 13.4 points below standard, and "EL students" scored 18.2 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the ELA CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 50% and 30% respectively. Over the last several	

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
	Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL, and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard (45.10% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 27.3 points below standard (41.14% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard (16.08% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 44.7 points below standard (13.33% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard (37.67% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 49.5 points below standard (34.43% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard (13.69% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 68.2 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions	years (per CDE Dataquest), our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 33.45% in 2021 to 46.83% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 15.22% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in ELA. Our foster population is not significant enough to show on CDE Dataquest. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 30.4 points below standard, “Low-Income students” scored 40.7 points below standard, and “EL students” scored 44.1 points below standard. Our percent proficient target for low-income and EL on the Math CAASPP assessment in 2026 is 39% and 22% respectively. Over the last several years (per CDE Dataquest), our low-income population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 20.84% in 2021 to 36.11% in 2025 and our EL population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 showing HESD is on track to meet our expectations in Math. Our foster population is not significant enough to show on CDE Dataquest. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on a school-wide basis.	

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 Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 103.7 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL, and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient)		

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: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA & Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA • Foster Youths: ELA: 111.5 points below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for an unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are:		

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
	• No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math Beyond the above Research, based on Parent and Student surveys, there is a need to continue with action 5.2 as seen by these results Parent Survey Questions and responses for 2025-2026: • I have been given suggestions/ideas to use at home to help my child meet grade-level standards in English Language Arts and Math: 92% Agree/Strongly Agree • There are adequate opportunities for me to become informed about the school's programs: 96% Agree/Strongly Agree • I receive information about my child's progress in the classroom (such as yellow cards, notes, phone calls, progress reports, Parent Square communications, etc.): 98% Agree/Strongly Agree • The Report to Parent (Report Card) helps me to understand what my child is expected to achieve in English Language Arts and Math: 98% Agree/Strongly Agree • The Parent/Teacher Conference was helpful to me in understanding my child's progress towards meeting English Language Arts and Math Standards: 98% Agree/Strongly Agree		

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
	• When I have questions about my child's class work, I can ask for clarification and assistance from my child's school: 98% Agree/Strongly Agree • I receive adequate information regarding parent meeting/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night, and Parent Education Presentations: 98% Agree/Strongly Agree **Scope:** LEA-wide		

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
2.5	**Action:** Supplemental Support for Designated and Integrated ELD for English Learners **Need:** As a comprehensive approach to ELD, the English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework for California Public Schools states: “English	We expect this action to lead to an increase in English Learner student learning as it’s focused on addressing their identified needs. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, “All Students” scored 2.6 points below standard, “English Learners” scored 18.2 points below standard. Over the last several years, our English Learner population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 15.22% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 showing HESD is	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	learners at all English proficiency levels and at all ages require both Integrated ELD and specialized attention to their particular language learning needs, or Designated ELD." Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores English Learners scored below the student group "All Students" showing a disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Unduplicated student groups show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard • English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard • Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) scored 5.00% proficient District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard • Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) scored 3.57% proficient This action address the following Red Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions for ELs:	maintaining great progress in increasing EL Proficiency in ELA. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 30.4 points below standard, "English Learners" scored 44.1 points below standard. Over the last several years, our English Learner population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2024 showing HESD is maintaining great progress in increasing EL Proficiency in Math. Long-Term English Learner (LTELs) scored well below "All Students" in both ELA and Math. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 51.29% proficient, "English Learners" scored 19.35% proficient, and "L-TELs" scored 6.35% proficient. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 40.40% proficient, "English Learners" scored 16.27% proficient, and "LTELs" scored 6.35% proficient. To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis.	2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 above. 3-Year Target: Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP ELA EL: 30.00% Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP Math: EL: 22.00%

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • None (only SWD) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • None (only SWD) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores English Learners scored below the student group “All Students” showing a disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Unduplicated student groups show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard • Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) scored 80.6 points below standard District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard		

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	• Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) scored 113.8 points below standard This action address the following Red Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions for ELs: District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • EL student group did not score in the red for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No schools had their EL student group score in the red for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient)		

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	• Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions (Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are:		

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	• No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)		
2.6	**Action:** Supplemental Support for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) **Need:** As a comprehensive approach to ELD, the English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework for California Public Schools states: "English learners at all English proficiency levels and at all ages require both Integrated ELD and specialized attention to their particular language learning needs, or Designated ELD." Based on the 2022-2023 CAASPP scores English Learners scored below the student group "All Students" showing a disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. Based on the 2023 CAASPP scores, Unduplicated student groups show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. District: In ELA, on the 2023 CA Dashboard • All Students scored 16.4 points below standard	We expect this action to lead to an increase in English Learner student learning as it's focused on addressing their identified needs. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 2.6 points below standard, "English Learners" scored 18.2 points below standard. Over the last several years, our English Learner population has raised their proficiency percentage in ELA from 15.22% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2025 showing HESD is maintaining great progress in increasing EL Proficiency in ELA. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 30.4 points below standard, "English Learners" scored 44.1 points below standard. Over the last several years, our English Learner population has raised their proficiency percentage in Math from 8.95% in 2021 to 16.27% in 2024 showing HESD is maintaining great progress in increasing EL Proficiency in Math. Long-Term English Learner (LTELs) scored well below "All Students" in both ELA and Math. In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 51.29% proficient, "English Learners" scored 19.35% proficient, and "L-TELs" scored 6.35% proficient. In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard, "All Students" scored 40.40% proficient, "English Learners" scored 16.27% proficient, and "LTELs" scored 6.35% proficient.	We will monitor progress on the ELA and Math CAASPP assessments for our low-income and EL student groups in comparison to all students. We expect this action to reach our desired outcomes seen in Metrics 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 above. 3-Year Target: Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP ELA EL: 30.00% Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient (Exceeded or Met) on the 2026 CAASPP Math: EL: 22.00%

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	• English Learner (EL) students scored 36.5 points below standard • Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) scored 5.00% proficient District: In Math, on the 2023 CA Dashboard • All Students scored 45.8 points below standard • English Learner (EL) students scored 65.9 points below standard • Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) scored 3.57% proficient This action addressed the following RED Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions for ELs: District: In ELA & Math on the 2023 CA Dashboard • None (only SWD) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2023 Dashboard are: • None (only SWD) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2023 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red) Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores English Learners scored below the student group “All Students” showing a disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. Based on the 2024 CAASPP scores, Unduplicated student groups show a greater	To maximize the impact of this action in improving student learning throughout the district, this action is being provided on an LEA-wide basis	

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math. District: In ELA, on the 2024 CA Dashboard • All Students scored 15.8 points below standard • English Learner (EL) students scored 37.6 points below standard • Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) scored 80.6 points below standard District: In Math, on the 2024 CA Dashboard • All Students scored 38.2 points below standard • English Learner (EL) students scored 59.9 points below standard • Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) scored 113.8 points below standard This action address the following Red Indicators Groups Identified for Required Actions for ELs: District: In ELA & Math on the 2024 CA Dashboard • EL student group did not score in the red for ELA or Math Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: ELA on the 2024 Dashboard are: • No schools had their EL student group score in the red for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4: Math on the 2024 Dashboard are: • Hamilton: EL: 97.4 points below (Red)		

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Based on the 2025 CAASPP scores, Low-Income, EL and Foster students show a greater disparity in student learning when compared to their peers as measured on statewide assessments in ELA and Math District: In ELA, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 2.6 points below standard (51.29% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 13.4 points below standard (46.83% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 18.2 points below standard (19.35% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 69.0 points below standard (28.57% Proficient) District: In Math, on the 2025 CA Dashboard (% Proficient per Data Quest) • All Students scored 30.4 points below standard (40.40% Proficient) • Low-Income students scored 40.7 points below standard (36.11% Proficient) • English Learner (EL) students scored 44.1 points below standard (16.27% Proficient) • Foster Youth students scored 111.5 points below Standard (6.67% Proficient) This action addresses the following Red Indicators: Groups Identified for Required Actions		

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) are Designed to Address Need(s)	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	(Unduplicated Reds): District: In ELA on the 2025 CA Dashboard • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA District: In Math on the 2025 CA Dashboard • Foster youths: 111.5 pts below (Red) Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: ELA on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for ELA Schools within the district that received the lowest performance level (Red) in Priority 4 for a unduplicated student group: Math on the 2025 Dashboard are: • No unduplicated student groups scored in the RED for Math **Scope:** Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(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.

The total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year is 30.823%. Hanford Elementary District's estimated Unduplicated Pupils (UDP) count is approximately 80%. Total supplemental and concentration grant funding generated by UDP is estimated at $19,187,516. The expenditures for these funds are detailed in LCAP. Since the District has approximately 80% percent UDP students that are Low-Income (SED), Els, or Foster Youth, the expenditures described in the LCAP represent a majority of our students, therefore most action expenditures are considered LEA-wide expenditures. There are specific actions and services that address Foster Youth (FY), English Learners (EL) and/or Low-Income students that are specified in the LCAP. The planned actions in the LCAP would increase or improve services by at least the percentage calculated as compared to the services provided for all students, resulting in the required proportional

increase or improvement in services for Unduplicated pupils of 30.823%. The descriptions below explain how services for English learners, low-income students, and foster youth are being increased or improved by the required 30.823%.
The actions listed in this LCAP plan are a direct result of district-wide efforts involving all educational partner groups to provide input on the type of activities, services, programs, etc., which increase or improve services for these pupils. Supplemental and concentration funds will be allocated, in consultation with educational partners, to direct these funds to improve services to UDP in order to enhance school climate, student engagement, social-emotional well-being, and academic achievement. Our student groups with the most persistent achievement gaps and the greatest need of support are EL, FY, and low-income students, therefore, the district will designate a majority of its actions and services as district-wide services. Given that, EL, FY, and low-income students are represented in all of our schools, with 11 of 12 schools having UDP rates of 55% or more, there is a need to provide systematic, coordinated, and targeted actions and services across the district for the UDP student groups and all students.

The LEA wide and school wide services provided in the LCAP are designed to support High Needs students and are effective in achieving the District's six goals. Around eighty percent of students in the Hanford Elementary School District are Unduplicated students. These students, who are English learners, students from low-income families, and/or foster youth, face barriers to learning that more affluent, English only students, who live with their families do not. Although no students are excluded from receiving services provided in the LCAP, Unduplicated students have greater needs for these services, and therefore, receive them at a proportion that is greater than what all students receive (i.e. they receive increased services). Because of the high percentage of Unduplicated students at every school in the district, and because it is more efficient and/or cost effective, the services discussed above are provided on a LEA or school wide basis. Taken together, the LEA and/or school wide services discussed above, along with the actions and services that are limited to Unduplicated student groups (detailed in the Goals, Actions & Services section of the LCAP) provide a proportional increase or improvement in services for Unduplicated pupils that is equal to or greater than the "Percentage to Increase or Improve Services" shown above.

FOSTER & HOMELESS YOUTH, LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS & ENGLISH LEARNERS
Increase or Improved Services %
Hanford Elementary School District has demonstrated an increase in the EL reclassification percentage, based on local data, from 6% in 21-22, 15% in 22-23, to 13% in 24-25. (an increase of 13% over 3 years).
47.8% of EL Students are making progress toward English Language Proficiency in 2025 based on the CDE Dashboard compared to 41.9% in 2019 (pre-covid) (an increase of 5.9%).

On the ELA CAASPP, the percentage of:
* Homeless students who scored proficient increased from 31.06% in 2023 to 35.30% in 2025 (an increase of 4.24%).
* Low-Income students that scored proficient increased from 40.46% in 2023 to 46.83% in 2025 (an increase of 6.37%).
* EL students who scored proficient decreased from 20.41% in 2023 to 19.35% in 2025 (a decrease of 1.06%).

On the Math CAASPP, the percentage of:
* Homeless students who scored proficient increased from 19.42% in 2023 to 20.00% in 2024 (an increase of 0.58%).
* Low-Income students that scored proficient increased from 29.12% in 2023 to 36.11% in 2024 (an increase of 6.99%).
* EL students who scored proficient increased from 12.50% in 2023 to 16.27% in 2024 (an increase of 3.77%).

English Learners
Our group of English learners are approximately 24% of our student population. Through our educational partner groups, we have developed actions that include interventions, parent engagement, professional development focused on integrated and designated ELD instruction and academic language, support, supplemental materials, and study trips just to name a few. We will use our ELPAC, local assessments, student and family surveys, and CAASPP data to monitor and improve teaching and learning for our students throughout the school year.

District administration and other support staff will improve academic outcomes for English Learners across the district through monitoring the reclassification of students, modeling/coaching Integrated and designated ELD for teachers through professional development, model and support data analysis and dialogue about EI student achievement, and provide additional ELD instruction to English learners, including LTEL, At-Risk students, and Newcomers. Extended language learning opportunities will be afforded as an increased service for English Learners and their families (through parent workshops) in order to allow students and families to further increase the instance of access to English language development.
Goals (English Learners): 2.5, 2.6
Goals (Unduplicated): 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.4, 5.2

Foster Youth
Foster students are provided with increased and improved services to meet rigorous academic standards. In order to do so, the district will provide support to foster students in academics, social-emotional learning, and support with foster families. Foster students will be provided with access to the school site administration (Learning Director), school social worker, student specialist, School Resource Officer, and both the school Nurse and LVN. In order to meet the social-emotional needs of foster students, counselors will be provided in order to pull foster students into small groups and address individualized needs. Foster students will have increased access to extended learning opportunities in order to enhance school connectedness.
Goals (Foster & Low-Income): 4.1, 4.2, 4.3
Goals (Unduplicated): 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.4, 5.2

Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students (SED)
Hanford Elementary School District experienced low academic achievement with our socioeconomically disadvantaged students (SED) in comparison to all students. In order to improve services, SED students will have increased access to intervention and enrichment activities in order to allow students to have experiences outside the classroom setting, including study trips outside the local area that are aligned with grade-level content standards, that SED students may not otherwise get to experience. Through the LCAP as addressed in the actions above, SED students will have increased services in technology with every student having their own iPad/laptop device throughout the year. In addition to enhancing their educational experience through study trips, and through technology, there will be an increase in services with a focus on Art and Music to ensure our SED population have the experience of a well-rounded education.

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.

The additional concentration grant add-on funding will be used to improve the quality of the services currently provided to English Learners, Foster Youth, and Low-income students and to increase the number of staff providing direct services and interventions to students at schools that have a high concentration (above 55 percent) of foster youth, English learners, and low-income students which is 11 of the 12 schools in HESD. By utilizing surveys with our various educational partners, and analyzing the results, as seen here, we are using the supplemental and concentration grant to increase or retain positions outlined below. Survey results are:

SENSE OF SAFETY
Per 2025-2026 HESD PARENT SURVEY
96% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "My child is safe at school"
97% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The School Resource Office helps keep my child's school safe."

Per 2025-2026 HESD STUDENT SURVEY
77.94% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I feel safe at school."
77.97% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "There is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school."
68.22% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Teachers, principals, learning directors, student specialists, counselors, or other adults are able to prevent bullying at my school."
88.54% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer has a good relationship with students at my school."
73.73% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer is an adult that I can talk to if I have a problem at school."
85.12% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "The school resource officer makes my school safer."

SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS:
Per 2025-2026 HESD PARENT SURVEY:
98% of parents agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I receive adequate information regarding parent meeting/activities such as School Site Council, English Learner Advisory Committee, parent Workshops, Back to School Night, and Parent Education Presentations."

Per 2025-2026 HESD STUDENT SURVEY
74.26% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Physical Education activities enrich (improve) my experience at school."
86.31% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in band enriches (improves) my experience at school."
68.61% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "Participating in art enriches (improves) my experience at school."
64.57% of students agree or strongly agree with the statement, "I enjoy learning at my school."

The supplemental and concentration grant will be used for additional staffing, which includes:

* Additional teachers to support class size reduction (action 2.1)
* Additional teachers to eliminate combination classes (action 2.1)

The supplemental and concentration grant will also be used to maintain a high level of staffing even as student enrollment is declining:
* Art and Music teachers (action 1.5)
* Increase of Library media technicians from part-time to full-time (action 1.2)
* Teacher resource specialist (actions 2.3 and 3.2)
* English Language Development support staff (action 2.5, 2.6)
* Professional development and new teacher induction staff (actions 3.1 and 3.3)
* Support staff for student safety and social well-being including social worker, counselors, student specialists, school resource officers, and increasing the LVNs from part-time to full-time (actions 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

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	1:29.90	1:23.93
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	1:26.00	1:21.03

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	62,251,003	19,187,516	30.823%	0.000%	30.823%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$19,591,693.00	$2,576,173.00	$0.00	$0.00	$22,167,866.00	$18,607,794.00	$3,560,072.00

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	Supplies/Materials School Sites	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$164,234.00	$164,234.00				$164,234.00	
1	1.2	School Libraries	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$957,184.00	$35,670.00	$992,854.00				$992,854.00	
1	1.3	Technology	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$991,923.00	$1,214,548.00	$2,206,471.00				$2,206,471.00	
1	1.4	Study Trips	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$390,000.00	$390,000.00				$390,000.00	
1	1.5	Art, Music, PE	English Learners Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$1,857,122.00	$236,416.00	$2,093,538.00				$2,093,538.00	
1	1.6	After School Program	English Learners Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Kennedy and Wilson Grades 7 & 8	Ongoing	$0.00	$200.00	$200.00				$200.00	
2	2.1	Eliminate Combination Classes/Reduce Class Sizes	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$2,488,493.00	$0.00	$2,488,493.00				$2,488,493.00	
2	2.2	Summer Program	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	School wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Kennedy, Wilson	Ongoing	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	

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
2	2.3	Supplemental Instructional Materials	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$195,805.00	$195,805.00				$195,805.00	
2	2.4	School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard.	Foster Youth	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth	All Schools	Ongoing	$182,181.00	$195,805.00	$377,986.00				$377,986.00	
2	2.5	Supplemental Support for Designated and Integrated ELD for English Learners	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	Ongoing	$933,357.00	$8,500.00	$941,857.00				$941,857.00	
2	2.6	Supplemental Support for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs)	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	Ongoing	$1,971.00	$20,100.00	$22,071.00				$22,071.00	
3	3.1	Teacher Professional Development	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$765,036.00	$425,000.00	$1,190,036.00				$1,190,036.00	
3	3.2	Teacher Collaboration Time	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$146,056.00	$146,056.00				$146,056.00	
3	3.3	New Teacher Induction	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$120,897.00	$27,556.00	$148,453.00				$148,453.00	
4	4.1	Coordination of Student Support	Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$1,616,730.00	$35,104.00	$1,131,695.00	$520,139.00			$1,651,834.00	
4	4.2	Health Professionals (Physical/Mental/Social/ Emotional)	Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$4,589,937.00	$23,100.00	$2,613,717.00	$1,999,320.00			$4,613,037.00	
4	4.3	School Support Staff	Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$3,400,622.00	$242,510.00	$3,643,132.00				$3,643,132.00	
4	4.4	School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to	Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$0.00	$3,131.00	$3,131.00				$3,131.00	

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
		support the lowest performing student groups in both Chronically Absent and Suspension who scored red on the CA Dashboard.														
4	**4.5**	Transportation	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$500,000.00	$0.00	$500,000.00				$500,000.00	
5	**5.1**	Parent/Family Communication	All	No				Ongoing	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
5	**5.2**	Parent Involvement Activities	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	Ongoing	$145,627.00	$196,337.00	$341,964.00				$341,964.00	
5	**5.3**	Required Committees	All	No				Ongoing	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
6	**6.1**	Student Support	All	No			Specific Schools: Community Day School	Ongoing	$56,714.00	$0.00		$56,714.00			$56,714.00	

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
62,251,003	19,187,516	30.823%	0.000%	30.823%	$19,591,693.00	0.000%	31.472 %	**Total:**	$19,591,693.00
								LEA-wide Total:	$18,627,565.00
								Limited Total:	$963,928.00
								Schoolwide Total:	$200.00

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**	Supplies/Materials School Sites	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$164,234.00	
1	**1.2**	School Libraries	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$992,854.00	
1	**1.3**	Technology	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$2,206,471.00	
1	**1.4**	Study Trips	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$390,000.00	
1	**1.5**	Art, Music, PE	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Low Income	All Schools	$2,093,538.00	
1	**1.6**	After School Program	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Low Income	Specific Schools: Kennedy and Wilson Grades 7 & 8	$200.00	
2	**2.1**	Eliminate Combination Classes/Reduce Class Sizes	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$2,488,493.00	
2	**2.2**	Summer Program	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth	Specific Schools: Kennedy, Wilson	$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 (%)
					Low Income			
2	2.3	Supplemental Instructional Materials	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$195,805.00	
2	2.4	School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard.	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth	All Schools	$377,986.00	
2	2.5	Supplemental Support for Designated and Integrated ELD for English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$941,857.00	
2	2.6	Supplemental Support for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs)	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners	All Schools	$22,071.00	
3	3.1	Teacher Professional Development	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,190,036.00	
3	3.2	Teacher Collaboration Time	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$146,056.00	
3	3.3	New Teacher Induction	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$148,453.00	
4	4.1	Coordination of Student Support	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,131,695.00	
4	4.2	Health Professionals (Physical/Mental/Social/Emotional)	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$2,613,717.00	
4	4.3	School Support Staff	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$3,643,132.00	
4	4.4	School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in both Chronically Absent	Yes	LEA-wide	Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$3,131.00	

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 (%)
		and Suspension who scored red on the CA Dashboard.						
4	**4.5**	Transportation	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$500,000.00	
5	**5.2**	Parent Involvement Activities	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$341,964.00	

2025-26 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$22,843,279.50	$21,684,435.00

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**	Supplies/Materials School Sites	Yes	$200,615.00	167,314
1	**1.2**	School Libraries	Yes	$965,231.00	972,134
1	**1.3**	Technology	Yes	$2,392,563.00	1,387,603
1	**1.4**	Study Trips	Yes	$390,000.00	391,550
1	**1.5**	Art, Music, PE	Yes	$2,352,633.00	2,446,199
1	**1.6**	After School Program	Yes	$800.00	600
2	**2.1**	Eliminate Combination Classes/Reduce Class Sizes	Yes	$2,919,829.00	3,002,115
2	**2.2**	Summer Program	Yes	$29,707.00	27,260
2	**2.3**	Supplemental Instructional Materials	Yes	$236,805.00	190,805
2	**2.4**	School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in red on the CA Dashboard.	No	$144,805.00	272,509

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	2.5	Supplemental Support for Designated and Integrated ELD for English Learners	Yes	$920,095.00	924,554
2	2.6	Supplemental Support for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs)	Yes	$27,500.00	33,543
3	3.1	Teacher Professional Development	Yes	$1,181,364.50	1,202,841
3	3.2	Teacher Collaboration Time	Yes	$115,678.00	133,873
3	3.3	New Teacher Induction	Yes	$141,360.00	143,198
4	4.1	Coordination of Student Support	Yes	$1,445,814.00	1,497,061
4	4.2	Health Professionals (Physical/Mental/Social/Emotional)	Yes	$4,914,050.00	4,482,799
4	4.3	School Support Staff	Yes	$3,535,370.00	3,479,032
4	4.4	School Site Allocations to be Prioritized by each School's Site Council to support the lowest performing student groups in both Chronically Absent and Suspension who scored red on the CA Dashboard.	No	$3,131.00	3,133
4	4.5	Transportation	Yes	$500,000.00	500,000
5	5.1	Parent/Family Communication	No	$0.00	0
5	5.2	Parent Involvement Activities	Yes	$337,510.00	337,893
5	5.3	Required Committees	No	$0.00	0

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)
6	**6.1**	Student Support	No	88,419	88,419

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)
18,701,670	$20,087,465.50	$19,175,533.00	$911,932.50	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%

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	Supplies/Materials School Sites	Yes	$200,615.00	167,314		
1	1.2	School Libraries	Yes	$965,231.00	972,134		
1	1.3	Technology	Yes	$2,392,563.00	1,387,603		
1	1.4	Study Trips	Yes	$390,000.00	391,550		
1	1.5	Art, Music, PE	Yes	$2,352,633.00	2,446,199		
1	1.6	After School Program	Yes	$800.00	600		
2	2.1	Eliminate Combination Classes/Reduce Class Sizes	Yes	$2,919,829.00	3,002,115		
2	2.2	Summer Program	Yes	$29,707.00	27,260		
2	2.3	Supplemental Instructional Materials	Yes	$236,805.00	190,805		
2	2.5	Supplemental Support for Designated and Integrated ELD for English Learners	Yes	$920,095.00	924,554		
2	2.6	Supplemental Support for Long-Term English Learners (LTELs)	Yes	$27,500.00	33,543		
3	3.1	Teacher Professional Development	Yes	$1,181,364.50	1,202,841		

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)
3	3.2	Teacher Collaboration Time	Yes	$115,678.00	133,873		
3	3.3	New Teacher Induction	Yes	$141,360.00	143,198		
4	4.1	Coordination of Student Support	Yes	$1,112,410.00	1,143,263		
4	4.2	Health Professionals (Physical/Mental/Social/Emotional)	Yes	$2,727,995.00	2,691,756		
4	4.3	School Support Staff	Yes	$3,535,370.00	3,479,032		
4	4.5	Transportation	Yes	$500,000.00	500,000		
5	5.2	Parent Involvement Activities	Yes	$337,510.00	337,893		

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)
59,612,228	18,701,670	0.00	31.372%	$19,175,533.00	0.000%	32.167%	$0.00	0.000%

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 32627(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 32627(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 32627(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 32627(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