
LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Wright Elementary School District
CDS Code: 49 71035 0000000
School Year: 2026-27
LEA contact information:
Lisa Reid
Superintendent
lreid@wrightesd.org
(707) 542-0550

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 Wright 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 Wright Elementary School District is $24,776,665, of which $17,036,843.00 is Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), $4,759,395.00 is other state funds, $2,344,000.00 is local funds, and $636,427.00 is federal funds. Of the $17,036,843.00 in LCFF Funds, $$3,983,397.00 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 Wright 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: Wright Elementary School District plans to spend $25,982,634.00 for the 2026-27 school year. Of that amount, $12,434,819.00 is tied to actions/services in the LCAP and $13,547,815 is not included in the LCAP. The budgeted expenditures that are not included in the LCAP will be used for the following:

The general fund expenditures that are not included in the LCAP are items including, but not limited to: operational expenses (RRM, electricity, water, garbage, etc.), contracted services (maintenance, legal services, special education services), salaries and benefits for board members, most administrative salaries, nurse, confidential, substitute teachers, extra duty, some classified employees, and some books and supplies.


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

In 2026-27, Wright Elementary School District is projecting it will receive $$3,983,397.00 based on the enrollment of Foster Youth, English learner, and low-income students. Wright Elementary School District must describe how it intends to increase or improve services for high needs students in the LCAP. Wright Elementary School District plans to spend $3,983,396.00 towards meeting this requirement, as described in the LCAP.

The amount budgeted to increase or improve services for high needs students in the 2026-27 LCAP is less than the projected revenue of LCFF supplemental and concentration grants for 2026-27 because the total planned percentage of improved services is not included in the dollar amount, as it is expressed as a percentage. The total planned percentage of Improved Services is 7.55%. The required planned percentage of improved or increased services for 2026-27 is 32.034%. The actual planned percentage to increase or improve services for the coming school year is 37.542% which is 5.508% higher.

LCFF Budget Overview for Parents

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



This chart compares what Wright 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 Wright 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, Wright Elementary School District's LCAP budgeted $4,221,111.00 for planned actions to increase or improve services for high needs students. Wright Elementary School District actually spent $4,290,088.00 for actions to increase or improve services for high needs students in 2025-26.

Local Control and Accountability Plan

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

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Wright Elementary School District	Lisa Reid Superintendent	lreid@wrightesd.org (707) 542-0550

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.

Wright Elementary School District was established in 1865. As of July 1, 2025 we are a TK-6 school district with approximately 1105 students enrolled. There are three elementary schools: JX Wilson, RL Stevens and Wright Elementary School, and they serve the West Santa Rosa area bordering on Sebastopol. The WESD Governing Board took action in December 2024 to close Wright Charter School effective June 30, 2025 and revert it back to a traditional TK-6 school of the district. It re-opened as Wright Elementary School on July 1, 2025. 79% of the students in the district are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged and 35% are English Learners. All three schools qualify for Supplemental/Concentration Grant and Title I funding due to high numbers of students who are English Learners, Foster Youth, or who are socioeconomically disadvantaged.

English learners receive Designated and Integrated English Language Development (ELD) support within their homeroom classes and additional support as needed. LTEL and EL actions include (in addition to the aforementioned) additional support within the school day and after school.

The District exited Differentiated Assistance for Students with Disabilities per the 2024 Dashboard results with red areas in the academic indicator but no longer the suspension indicator.

In order to continue to address suspension rates, the district is implementing Caring School Community, a CASEL approved social emotional learning (SEL) curriculum. In addition, the district will continue to employ a SEL Teacher On Special Assignment to continue to lead the implementation as well as facilitate a Behavior Steering Committee focused on effective Tier 1 behavior support in a district wide model.

The District also plans to train (staff, students, and families), communicate, and implement a district wide code of conduct.

In order to continue to address ELA and math needs, the District Instructional Leadership Team (comprised of 9 lead teachers, 3 principals, and 3 district administration) will participate in California Principal Support Network Year 4 Cohort.
Wright ESD Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Purpose statement:
The purpose of the Wright ESD's Instructional Leadership Team is to positively unite and support ALL staff through the use of data and mutual accountability in embracing evidence-based best practices to ensure an equitable education where ALL students achieve at grade level or above.
District staff to continue to work to:
1) Identify horizontally and vertically aligned essential standards in ELA and math at each grade level for ALL students to master.
2) Identify/create common assessments
3) Provide timely and targeted interventions within the school day for students who have not yet mastered essential standards via the common formative assessments.

The Wright Elementary School District does not qualify for Equity Multiplier funds. This LCAP serves as the district's strategic plan.

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

Key:
EXCEEDED: Exceeded the goal
MET: Met the goal
IMPROVED: Improved toward the goal, but didn't quite meet the goal
MAINTAINED: Did not change- no improvement and no decline
NOT MET: Did not meet the goal or declined from prior year

2025-26 Successes:
Goal 1:

1.1: 2025 Dashboard Percentage of English Learners district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency (2025 CA Dashboard): 46.9% (-.4%)
JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%)
RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%)
WES: 39.0% (+.4%)
MAINTAINED

1.2: Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL: 2025-26: 13% (-2%) MET

1.3: All students continue to have access to instructional materials: MET

1.4: State academic standards continue to be implemented: MET

1.6: Suspension rate: Meet or exceed State average for given year, including Students with Disabilities at JXW:
2025:
CA: 2.9%
JXW: 1.7% (+.1%) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
RLS: 0% (-.4%) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED
WES: 2.6% (-.2%) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED

English Learners (EL):
CA: 3.2%
EL JXW: 1.6% (+.2%) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 0% (no change) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
EL WES: 1.6% (-1.0) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED

Students With Disabilities (SWD):
CA: 5%
SWD JXW: 1.9% (0%) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 0% (-1.8%) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED
SWD WES: 3.6% (+1.1%)
Declined
CA: EXCEEDED

1.7: Expulsion rate maintains at 0%: MET

1.8: YouthTruth student perception of safety: (Goal is 5% points year over year): 2026:
67%: Do you feel safe at school? (+11% pts) EXCEEDED
YouthTruth student perception of importance: (Goal is 5% points year over year):
33%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+2% pts) IMPROVED

1.9: Chronic Absenteeism decreases in all areas being measured (Goal is 5% point decrease year over year):

2025 Dashboard:
JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts)
IMPROVED
RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts)
EXCEEDED
WES: 24.3% (-4.8% pts)
IMPROVED

EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts)
EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts)
EXCEEDED
EL WES: 16.1% (-6.8% pts)
EXCEEDED

SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts)
EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts)
EXCEEDED
SWD WES: 28% (-7% pts)
EXCEEDED

White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts)
IMPROVED
White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts)
EXCEEDED
White WES: 27.8% (-2% pts)
IMPROVED

1.10: 2025-26 Period 2 Average Daily Attendance: (Goal for 2027 is 95%)
94.1% (+0% pts): MAINTAINED (Now combined percent with all 3 schools)

1.12: YouthTruth student perception of teachers asking them to keep trying when the work gets hard: (Goal is 3% points year over year):
2026: 64% of students agree that their teachers ask them to keep trying when the work gets hard. (+5% pts)
EXCEEDED

1.13: 2025 Dashboard ELA: (Goal is increase of 5 points year over year)
JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points)
EXCEEDED
RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points)

IMPROVED

EL JXW: 49 points below standard (+3.9 points)
IMPROVED

SWD JXW: 89.4 points below standard (+13.2 points)
EXCEEDED
SWD: RLS: 32.9 points below standard (+20 points)
EXCEEDED
SWD WES: 93 points below standard (+5.1 points)
EXCEEDED

1.14: 2025 Dashboard Math: (Goal is increase of 5 points year over year)
2025 Dashboard Math:
RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points)
IMPROVED
WES: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points)
IMPROVED

EL WES: 102 points below standard (+2.6 points)
IMPROVED

SWD: RLS: 74.8 points below standard (+22.6 points)
EXCEEDED

1.15: 2026 STAR Reading- March 5th grade: (Goal is 3% point cohort increase year over year)
2026 March 5th grade:
JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED

1.17: 2026 Dibels mid-year 2nd grade % at grade level: (Goal is 3% point cohort increase year over year)
JXW: 54% (+32% points)
EXCEEDED
RLS: 51% (+5% points)
EXCEEDED
WCS: 43% (+7% points)
EXCEEDED

1.18: Retention rate maintains <1% by site: MET

1.19: All students, including unduplicated students and students with IEPs have access to a broad course of study, including Designated ELD for ELs and supports to ensure students with IEPs meet or exceed their IEP goals: MET

1.20: 2025-26 % mastering essential math standard:

TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET
1.1: 98%, 2.6 100%
K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED
CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92%
1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET
OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97%
2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET
3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79%
4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74%
5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80%
6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67%

1.21: 2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:

TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83%
K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78%
1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79%
2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58%
3: RF.4: 45%
4: RL.4.2: 68%
5: RI.5.2: 69%
6: RL.6.1: 50%

Goal 2:
2.1: YouthTruth staff perception of students being safe from violence at school increases 13% points from 67% to 80% (Goal is 3% points year over year): EXCEEDED
2.2: YouthTruth staff perception of their feeling safe from harm while at school: DISCONTINUED by YouthTruth in 2026
2.3: Youth Truth staff perception that their school sets high expectations for students increases 7% points from 67% to 74% (Goal is 3% points year over year): EXCEEDED
2.4: 2025-26 percentage of fully credentialed teachers: 95% (+3%) IMPROVED
2.6: YouthTruth staff perception of staff that their school supports them in implementing what they have learned in professional development increases 4% points from 52% to 56% (Goal is 3% points year over year):
2.8: Youth Truth staff perception that they have access to meaningful professional development increases 4% points from 46% to 50% (Goal is 3% points year over year): EXCEEDED
2.10: Youth Truth staff perception that their school encourages them to seek professional development opportunities to improve their practice

increases 4% points from 48% to 52% (Goal is 3% points year over year): EXCEEDED
2.11: YouthTruth staff perception that their PD over the last year has provided them with content support increases 7% points from 45% to 52% (Goal is 3% points year over year): EXCEEDED

Goal 3:
3.1: YouthTruth family perception of the safety of their child's learning environment increases 3% points from 84% to 87% (Goal is 3% points year over year): MET
3.3: Youth Truth family perception that they are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making increases 3% points from 60% to 63% (Goal is 3% points year over year): MET
3.4: 100% of families are contactable via ParentSquare. (Goal is 95%): EXCEEDED.
3.5: YouthTruth family perception that they regularly receive feedback about their child's progress, they receive info about what their child should learn and be able to do, and teachers clearly communicate expectations for their child's progress increases 3% points from 85% to 88% (Goal is 3% points year over year): MET

Goal 4:
4.1 All district schools meet at least the "GOOD" criteria (90- 98.99%) on the annual FIT report. EXCEEDED
June 2026:
EXEMPLARY: 99-100%
JXW: 99.80%: (-0.01%) EXEMPLARY
RLS: 99.55%: (-0.04%) EXEMPLARY
WES: 99.56%: (-0.03%) EXEMPLARY
4.2: 100% of Educational Partnership meetings are held each year to present LCAP/LCFF education, CAASPP, Dashboard, LCAP mid-year update, and YouthTruth data. Root cause analysis is conducted for identified areas of need, possible solutions are brainstormed: MET
4.3: Resources continue to be allocated based on data and lead to improved student outcomes via SBAC, ELPAC, and local data scores, RFEP rates, reduced chronic absenteeism, and exiting Differentiated Assistance. EXCEEDED

The following local indicators were at the "standard met" level:
- Basic Services
- Implementation of the Academic Standards
- Parent and Family Engagement
- Local Climate Survey
- Access to a Broad Course of Study

2025-26 Challenges:

Principals reported that student use of the "N" word was becoming problematic at their sites.

2025 Dashboard lowest (RED) performance level for ALL students (Equity report):
JX Wilson:
Multiple Race Students- Red Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

28% (+3% points)
Actions to address these areas:
Goal 1, Action 2: Social Emotional Learning (SEL)
Goal 1, Action 8: Counselors
Goal 1, Action 9: P.E.
Goal 1, Action 10: Music
Goal 1, Action 11: School Attendance Review Board (SARB)
Goal 1, Action 15: Transportation
Goal 1, Action 16: Field Trips and Assemblies
Goal 1, Action 17: Behaviorist
Goal 3, Action 3: Bilingual Community Liaisons
Goal 3, Action 5: ParentSquare

RL Stevens:
ELPI- 43% (-10% points)
Goals and Actions to address this area:
Goal 1, Action 3 Multilingual Learner Support
Goal 1, Action 5: Reading Support
Goal 1, Action 12: Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) principally benefitting English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth
Goal 1, Action 18: Instructional Assistants (IAs)
Goal 2, Action 1: Instructional Leadership Team- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Goal 2, Action 3: ELA Professional Development
Goal 2, Action 6: High Quality Teachers to principally benefit English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth through early release days for teacher planning time, professional development days, Tier 2 small group intervention within the school day

Wright Charter School Student Groups in RED on 2025 Dashboard:
Students with Disabilities- Red Academic Indicator
154 pts. below standard in math (-6.5 pts.)
English Language Learners- Red Academic Indicator
102 pts. below standard in math (+2.6 pts.)
Hispanic students- Red Academic Indicator
102 pts. below standard in math (-.4 pts.)
Actions to address these areas:
Goal 1, Action 5: Reading Support
Goal 1, Action 6: Math- flexible small group intervention time
Goal 1, Action 12: Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) principally benefitting English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth

Goal 1, Action 18: Instructional Assistants (IAs)
Goal 2, Action 1: Instructional Leadership Team- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Goal 2, Action 3: ELA Professional Development
Goal 2, Action 4: Math Professional Development
Goal 2, Action 6: High Quality Teachers to principally benefit English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth through early release days for teacher planning time, professional development days, Tier 2 small group intervention within the school day

Homeless Students- Red Suspension Indicator
9.1% (+5.8% pts.)
Actions to address these areas:
Goal 1, Action 2: Social Emotional Learning (SEL)
Goal 1, Action 8: Counselors
Goal 1, Action 9: P.E.
Goal 1, Action 10: Music
Goal 1, Action 11: School Attendance Review Board (SARB)
Goal 1, Action 15: Transportation
Goal 1, Action 16: Field Trips and Assemblies
Goal 1, Action 17: Behaviorist
Goal 3, Action 3: Bilingual Community Liaisons
Goal 3, Action 5: ParentSquare

Required Actions:
1) Differentiated Assistance: 1.2, 2.1, & 2.2
2) Long Term English Learners (LTELs): Wright ESD does not have more than 15 LTELs.
3) English Learners (ELs):
Goals and Actions to address this area:
Goal 1, Action 3 Multilingual Learner Support
Goal 1, Action 5: Reading Support
Goal 1, Action 12: Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) principally benefitting English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth
Goal 1, Action 18: Instructional Assistants (IAs)
Goal 2, Action 1: Instructional Leadership Team- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Goal 2, Action 3: ELA Professional Development
Goal 2, Action 6: High Quality Teachers to principally benefit English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth through early release days for teacher planning time, professional development days, Tier 2 small group intervention within the school day
Goal 1, Action 2: Social Emotional Learning (SEL)
Goal 1, Action 8: Counselors
Goal 1, Action 15: Transportation
Goal 1, Action 16: Field Trips and Assemblies
Goal 1, Action 17: Behaviorist

Goal 3, Action 3: Bilingual Community Liaisons
Goal 3, Action 5: ParentSquare

Wright ESD will have unexpended LREBG funds for the 2026-27 school year.
After conducting a Needs Assessment, the following Goals/Actions will be funded in whole or part with LREBG funds in 2026-27:
Goal 1, Action 2: SEL/Behavior TOSA to coach/mentor teachers in the implementation of SEL Program, Caring School Community. TOSA to co-lead District in conducting a needs assessment for Behavior MTSS, planning for Tiers 1-3 implementation. In addition, teachers identified and vetted by administration will work additional hours and serve on a Behavior Steering Committee to assist with conducting Behavior Needs Assessment and planning for MTSS, Tiers 1-3 implementation.

Goal 2, Action 1: Registration costs for participation of 11 teachers and 3 principals in Cohort 3 of the California Principal's Support Network, whose work is focused on implementation and sustainability of Professional Learning Communities. In addition, the 11 teachers work additional hours and serve on the District Instructional Leadership Team and lead the PLC work.

Goal 2, Action 3: Science of Reading professional development and per diem pay for participating teachers working during the summer in grades K-6.

Goal 2, Action 4: Math professional development and planning additional hours/release time for teachers in grades K-6.

The rationale for all 4 goals and actions is aligned with the allowable uses of fund identified in EC Section 32526(c)(2), and are:
(i) Tutoring or other one-on-one or small group learning supports provided by certificated or classified staff.
(ii) Learning recovery programs and materials designed to accelerate pupil academic proficiency or English language proficiency, or both.
(iii) Providing early intervention and literacy programs for pupils in preschool to grade 3, inclusive, including, but not limited to, school library access.
(vi) Providing professional development and coaching on the 2023 Mathematics Framework and/or the The English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve.
(C) Integrating evidence-based pupil supports to address other barriers to learning, and staff supports and training, such as the provision of health, counseling, or mental health services, access to school meal programs, before and after school programs, or programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, or referrals for support for family or pupil needs. This includes evidence-based resources for reducing chronic absenteeism.
(E) Additional academic services for pupils, such as diagnostic, progress monitoring, and benchmark assessments of pupil learning

The actions are aligned with the allowable uses of funds identified in EC Section 32526(c)(2) because they address the following areas of need identified in the needs assessment required by EC Section 32526(d): integrate staff supports and training as well as programs to address pupil trauma and social-emotional learning, as well as the attendance and academic needs of students.

2023-24 Dashboard Data:

2023-24 Successes:
Goal 1:

Number of parents of ELs volunteering in classrooms is 125: MET (Goal was 15)
Percentage of 5th grade ELL at-risk of 4-5 years plus LTEL is 16%: PARTIALLY MET (Goal was 10%). Noteworthy: 2022-23 was 23.6%
2024 Youth Truth survey percentage of families responding positively that they are engaged in their school and are empowered to influence decision-making is 68%: PARTIALLY MET (Goal was 69%)
P2 Average Daily Attendance for JXW and RLS combined was 91.38% (+.74%): PARTIALLY MET (Goal was 92.45%)
2024 Youth Truth survey percentage of staff who think their school sets high expectations for students is 70%: PARTIALLY MET (Goal was 71%)
Power of Being Seen percentage of students who have 4 known areas about them by staff is 100% for JXW and RLS: MET (Goal was 100%)
Parent Square percentage of families contactable is 99%: MET (Goal was 95%)

Goal 2:
STAR Reading- 3rd grade percentage of students reading at grade level in March 2024 is 64% (+25.5%) at RLS : MET (Goal was +10%)
STAR Math- 3rd grade percentage of students scoring at grade level in March 2024 is 77% (+8.5%) at RLS: PARTIALLY MET (Goal was +10%)

Goal 3:
Dibels- 3rd grade percentage of students reading at grade level on mid-year assessment is:
59% (+9.26%) at JXW: PARTIALLY MET (Goal was +10%) 68% (+65.85%) at RLS: MET (Goal was +10%)

Goal 4:
Retention rate is less than 1% district wide: MET (Goal is less than 1% district wide)
FIT report at RLS is 95.61% (Good): MET (Goal is Good)
2023 Dashboard lowest (red) performance levels (Equity report): JX Wilson: Students with Disabilities- Red Academic Indicator 119 pts. below standard in ELA (-46.9 pts.) 135 pts. below standard in math (-34.5 pts.) Student with Disabilities- Red Suspension Indicator 7.9% (+4.8%)

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

The Wright Elementary School District is not eligible for Differentiated Assistance.

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
1) Wright ESD Governing Board	1) 10/16/25: CAASPP presentation, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed 2) 12/18/25: Dashboard presentation, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed 3) 2/19/26: LCAP Mid-Year update presentation- root cause analysis for identifed areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed 4) 3/12/26: Youth Truth presentation- root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed 5) 5/14/26: 2024-25 Literacy Data (STAR 360 & Dibels) presentations, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed. 6) May 2026: All partners asked to participate in LCAP ranking around all of the possible brainstormed solutions collected. Data collected to determine top priorities for educational partners. 7) 6/18/26: Public Hearing and LCAP draft presented to Parent Advisory Committee (ELAC and SSCs). 8) 6/25/26: LCAP and budget adoption
2) Principals, staff (Local Bargaining Units), and students at RLS, JXW, and WES	1) CAASPP presentation, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed: 10/30/25 (RLS) 11/6/25 (WES) 11/6/25 (JXW) 2) Dashboard presentation, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed:

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	12/18/25 (RLS) 12/18/25 (WES) 12/18/25 (JXW) 3) LCAP Mid-Year update presentation- root cause analysis for identifed areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed: 2/19/26 (RLS) 2/19/26 (WES) 2/19/26 (JXW) 4) Youth Truth presentation- root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed 4/9/26 (WES) 4/9/26 (RLS) 4/9/26 (JXW) 5) 2025-26 Literacy Data (STAR 360 & Dibels) presentations, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed. 4/9/26 (RLS) 4/9//26 (WES) 4/23/26 (JXW) 6) May 2026: All partners asked to participate in LCAP ranking around all of the possible brainstormed solutions collected. Data collected to determine top priorities for educational partners.
3) District English Learner Advisory Committee/ Parent Advisory Committee/Parents (DELAC/PAC)	1) 1/9/26: Dashboard presentation, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed. 6) May 2026: All partners asked to participate in LCAP ranking around all of the possible brainstormed solutions collected. Data collected to determine top priorities for educational partners.
4) English Learner Advisory Committee/ Parent Advisory Committee/Parents (ELAC/PAC)	1) CAASPP presentation, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed: 10/24/25 (RLS) 11/23/24 (WCS) 11/14/25 (JXW)

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	2) Dashboard presentation, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed. 12/8/26 (RLS) 12/8/25 (WES) 1/9/26 (JXW) 3) LCAP Mid-Year update presentation- root cause analysis for identifed areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed: 2/12/26 (JXW) 2/12/26 (WES) 3/13/26 (RLS) 4) Youth Truth presentation- root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed: 5/15/26 (JXW) 5/15/26 (WES) 5/15/26 (RLS) 5) 2025-26 STAR 360 & Dibels data for windows 1 & 2 presentations, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed: 3/13/26 (JXW) 4/13/26: (WES) 5/15/26 (RLS) 6) May 2026: All partners asked to participate in LCAP ranking around all of the possible brainstormed solutions collected. Data collected to determine top priorities for educational partners.
5) School Site Council/ Parent Advisory Committee (SSC/PAC)	1) CAASPP presentation, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed: 10/21/25 (RLS) 11/3/25 (WES) 11/18/25 (JXW) 2) Dashboard presentation, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed:

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	12/9/25 (RLS) 12/8/25 (WCS) 12/9/25 (JXW) 3) LCAP Mid-Year update presentation- root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed: 2/17/26 (WES) 2/24/26 (JXW) 3/24/26 (RLS) 4) Youth Truth presentation- root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed: 4/13/25 (WES) 4/7/26 (JXW) 4/21/26 (RLS) 5) Literacy STAR 360 & Dibels data presentations, root cause analysis for identified areas of need and possible solutions brainstormed: 4/6/26 (WES) 4/14/26 (JXW) 4/21/26 (RLS) 6) May 2026: All partners asked to participate in LCAP ranking around all of the possible brainstormed solutions collected. Data collected to determine top priorities for educational partners.
6) Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)	May 11, 2026: Consultation with SELPA administrators was conducted with regard to the needs of Students with Disabilities.

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

Through multiple educational partnership meetings that included presenting data, identifying areas for growth and root causes, and brainstorming possible solutions and then providing opportunities for input to ranking them, the following actions were identified through feedback provided by educational partners and influenced the 2026-27 LCAP:

CAASPP, Dashboard, LCAP Mid-Year update, and local assessment data:
Math achievement:

1) Identifying essential standards at each grade level and creating and administering common formative assessments district wide to ensure all students reach mastery. (Goal 2, Action 1)
2) Provide flexible, small group math intervention support for students within the school day (Goal 2, Action 6)
3) Provide time for grade level teams to review assessment data, plan flexible groups, plan lessons, and monitor student progress (Goal 2, Action 6)
4) Focus on mastery of concepts (Goal 2, Action 1)
5) Provide effective and relevant PD for teachers (Goal 2, Metrics 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, & 2.11)
6) Provide time and training to improve instructional practices (Goal 2, Actions 4 & 6)
7) Ensure all teachers have the necessary training to successfully implement Amplify, the new math program (Goal 2, Actions 4 & 6)
8) Partner with COOL School to have them provide more math games, math fact practice, and number sense work (Goal 1, Action 7)
9) Recognize achievement and progress (Goal 2, Action 1)
10) Provide time for peer observation an collaboration across the district by grade level in math (Goal 2, Action 9)

ELA achievement:
1) Identifying essential standards at each grade level and creating and administering common formative assessments district wide to ensure all students reach mastery (Goal 2, Action 1)
2) Provide flexible, small group reading intervention support for students within the school day (Goal 2, Action 6)
3) Provide time for grade level teams to review assessment data, plan flexible groups, plan lessons, and monitor student progress (Goal 2, Action 6)
4) Provide effective and relevant PD for teachers (Goal 2, Metrics 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, & 2.11)
5) Ensure all teachers have the necessary training to successfully teach ELA (i.e. Literacy Fellowship/Orton-Gillingham) (Goal 2, Action 3)
6) Provide adequate classroom resources for Multilingual Learners (MLLs) (Goal 1, Action 3)
7) Provide time for peer observation an collaboration across the district by grade level in ELA (Goal 2, Action 9)
8) Recognize achievement and progress (Goal 2, Action 1)

Chronic Absenteeism:
1) Provide parent education about the consequences of chronic absenteeism (Goal 1, Action 11)
2) Continue to provide PE, Music, Band, field trips, and assemblies (Goal 1, Actions, 9, 10, & 16)
3) Continue to implement a social-emotional learning program focused on helping students feel a sense of connection and belonging to their school and growing their SEL core competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making (Goal 1, Action 2)
4) Implement consistent process and have bilingual community liaisons continue to track attendance and send School Attendance Review Board (SARB) letters to families (Goal 1, Action 11)
5) Provide prompt home communication from school staff when students are absent (Goal 1, Action 11)
6) Recognize and reward improved attendance (Goal 1, Action 11)
7) Provide welcome back activities after breaks (Goal 1, Action 11)

Youth Truth Survey:
Students feelings of safety at school:
1) Implement a district wide Code of Conduct and train staff, students, and families (Goal 2, Action 2)

2) Provide friendship groups for students (Goal 1, Action 8)
3) Continue to implement Caring School Community with an emphasis on Morning Circles to begin each school day, which provides students with feeling a sense of inclusion, belonging, and safety. (Goal 1, Action 2)

Students feelings of importance at school:
1) Ensure students are at the center of decision-making (Goal 1)
2) Include student voice in decision-making where appropriate (Goal 1)
3) Ask students what would make them feel important (Goal 1)

Students perception of teacher expectations:
1) Provide clear learning targets (Goal 2, Action 1)
2) Ensure mastery of essential standards (Goal 2, Action 1)
3) Teach students about mindset and grit (Goal 1, Action 2)

Staff perception of expectations for students:
1) Establish and clearly communicate expectations early (Goal 2, Action 2)
2) Celebrate more staff and student success (Goals 1, 2, & 3)
3) Identify essential standards in ELA and math and ensure that each student reaches mastery (Goal 2, Action 1)
4) Conduct interviews with staff to better understand why the perception exists and then identify solutions to address the perceptions (Goal 2, Actions 3 & 4)

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	Goal 1: All Students are Connected & Thriving	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 4: Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes)
Priority 5: Pupil Engagement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)
Priority 7: Course Access (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Data analysis from the Dashboard, LCAP mid-year update, Youth Truth survey, and local assessment data revealed that WESD needs to focus on ensuring that:

- Students feel safe, supported, and know they belong. Student voice matters.
- Students get what they need, when they need it to make progress toward their goals. This is equity.
- All students read at grade level by the end of 3rd grade.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	1) ELPAC Scores (Dashboard)	1) 2023 Dashboard Percentage of English Learners district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency (2023 CA Dashboard): 58.5% JXW: 66.7% (+10.2%)	1) 2024 Dashboard Percentage of English Learners district wide making progress toward English Language	1) 2025 Dashboard Percentage of English Learners district wide making progress toward English Language	1) 5% annual growth year over year (67.7% on 2026 Dashboard 2026)	1) 2025: District: 46.9% (-11.6%) JXW: 54.8% (-11.9%) RLS: 43.4% (-11.3%)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		RLS: 54.7% (-.7%) WCS: 45.4% (-23%)	Proficiency (2024 CA Dashboard): 47.3% (-11.1%) JXW: 39.5% (-27.1%) RLS: 53.4% (-1.3%) WCS: 38.6% (-6.8%) NOT MET	Proficiency (2025 CA Dashboard): 46.9% (-.4%) JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%) MET RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%). NOT MET WCS: 39.0% (+.4%) IMPROVED MAINTAINED		WCS: 39.0% (-6.4%)
1.2	2) Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest)	2) 2023-24: 16%	2) 2024-25: 15% (-1%) IMPROVED	2) 2025-26: 13% (-2%) MET	2) 10% decrease year over year (13% in 2026-27)	2) 2025-26: 13% (-3%)
1.3	3) Student access to instructional materials (Dashboard Local Indicator- as measured by rubric): https://www.caschooldashboard.org/reports/49710350000000/2025/conditions-and-climate#local-indicators	3) 2023-24: All students have access to instructional materials. MET	3) 2024-25: All students continue to have access to instructional materials. MET	3) 2025-26: All students continue to have access to instructional materials. MET	3) All students continue to have access to instructional materials.	3) 2025-26: All students continue to have access to instructional materials. MET
1.4	4) Implementation of State Academic Standards (Dashboard Local Indicator- as measured by rubric)	4) 2023-24: State Academic Standards are implemented.	4) 2024-25: State Academic Standards continue to be implemented. MET	4) 2025-26: State Academic Standards continue to be implemented. MET	4) State Academic Standards continue to be implemented.	4) 2025-26: State Academic Standards continue to be implemented.
1.5	5) Redesignated Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) status (Dataquest)	5) 2023-24: 9.6%	5) 2024-25: 9% NOT MET	5) 2025-26: 8% NOT MET	5) 5% increase year over year (11.11% in 2026-27)	5) 2025-26: 8% (-1.6%)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.6	6) Suspension rate (Dashboard) LREBG metric for G102	6) 2023: JXW: 2.6% RLS: .4% WCS: 2.8% English Learners (EL): EL JXW: 2.2% EL RLS: 0% EL WCS: 1.9% Students With Disabilities (SWD): SWD JXW: 7.9% SWD RLS: 0% SWD WCS: 2.4%	6) 2024: JXW: 1.6% (-1%) EXCEEDED RLS: .4% (no change) EXCEEDED WCS: 2.8% (no change) EXCEEDED English Learners (EL): EL JXW: 1.4% (-.8%) EL RLS: 0% (no change) EL WCS: 2.6% (+.7) EXCEEDED Students With Disabilities (SWD): SWD JXW: 1.9% (-6%) SWD RLS: 1.8% (+1.8%)	6) 2025: CA: 2.9% JXW: 1.7% (+.1%) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED RLS: 0% (-.4%) Improved CA: EXCEEDED WCS: 2.6% (-.2%) Improved CA: EXCEEDED English Learners (EL): CA: 3.2% EL JXW: 1.6% (+.2%) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED EL RLS: 0% (no change) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED EL WCS: 1.6% (-1.0) Improved CA: EXCEEDED Students With Disabilities (SWD): CA: 5% SWD JXW: 1.9% (0%) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 0% (-1.8%) Improved CA: EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 3.6% (+1.1%)	6) Beginning with 2024 Dashboard, Meet or exceed State average for given year, including Students with Disabilities at JXW.	6) 2025: JXW: 1.7% (-0.9%) RLS: 0% (-0.4%) WCS: 2.6% (-0.2%) English Learners (EL): EL JXW: 1.6% (-.6%) EL RLS: 0% (no change) EL WCS: 1.6% (-0.3%) Students With Disabilities (SWD): SWD JXW: 1.9% (-6%) SWD RLS: 0% (no change) SWD WCS: 3.6% (+1.2%)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			SWD WCS: 2.5% (+.1%) EXCEEDED	Declined CA: EXCEEDED		
1.7	7) Expulsion rate (Dataquest) LREBG metric for 1.2	7) 2022-23: 0%	7) 2023-24: 0% MET	7) 2024-25: 0% MET	7) Maintain <1%	7) 2024-25: 0% (No change)
1.8	8) Student perception of school safety, belonging, and importance (Youth Truth) LREBG metric for 1.2	8) 2024: 48%: Do you feel safe at school? 22%: Do you feel like an important part of your school?	8) 2025: 56%: Do you feel safe at school? (+8% pts) EXCEEDED 31%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+9% pts) EXCEEDED	8) 2026: 67%: Do you feel safe at school? (+11% pts) EXCEEDED 33%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+2% pts) IMPROVED	8) Improve positive percentages 5% points year over year (2027: 63%- Do you feel safe at school? 43%- Do you feel like an important part of your school?)	8) 2026: 67%: Do you feel safe at school? (+19% pts) 33%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+11% pts)
1.9	9) Chronic Absenteeism (Dashboard) LREBG metric for 1.2	9) 2023 Dashboard: JXW: 34% RLS: 29.3% WCS: 32.4% EL JXW: 31.6% EL RLS: 24.4% EL WCS: 31.4%	9) 2024 Dashboard: JXW: 20.9% (-13.1% pts) EXCEEDED RLS: 18.8% (-10.5% pts) EXCEEDED WCS: 29.1% (-3.3% pts) IMPROVED EL JXW: 22.7% (-8.9% pts) EXCEEDED EL RLS: 22.7% (-1.7% pts) IMPROVED EL WCS: 23% (-8.4% pts) EXCEEDED	9) 2025 Dashboard: JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED	9) Decrease 5% points year over year JXW: 19% RLS: 14.3% WCS: 17.4% EL JXW: 16.6% EL RLS: 9.4% EL WCS: 16.4% SWD JXW: 24.7% SWD RLS: 17.7% SWD WCS: 23.1%	9) 2025 Dashboard: JXW: 16.3% (-17.7% pts) RLS: 12.7% (-16.6% pts) WCS: 24.3% (-8.1% pts) EL JXW: 12.7% (-18.9% pts) EL RLS: 12.8% (-11.6% pts) EL WCS: 16.1% (-15.3% pts)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		SWD JXW: 39.7% SWD RLS: 32.7% SWD WCS: 38.1% White JXW: 43.8% White RLS: 47.6% White WCS: 30.1%	SWD JXW: 28.8% (-10.9% pts) EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 23.6% (-9.1% pts) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 35% (-3.1% pts) IMPROVED White JXW: 19.7% (-24.1% pts) EXCEEDED White RLS: 21.6% (-26% pts) EXCEEDED White WCS: 29.9% (-.2% pts) IMPROVED	SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED	White JXW: 28.8% White RLS: 32.6% White WCS: 15.1%	SWD JXW: 20.8% (-18.9% pts) SWD RLS: 15.6% (-17.1% pts) SWD WCS: 28% (-10.1% pts) White JXW: 19% (-24.8% pts) White RLS: 13% (-34.6% pts) White WCS: 27.8% (-2.3% pts)
1.10	10) Attendance rate (P2 Average Daily Attendance- Aeries local data) LREBG metric for 1.2	10) 2023-24: WCS: 90.67% JXW & RLS combined: 91.21%	10) 2024-25: WCS: 94% (+3.33% pts) IMPROVED JXW & RLS combined: 94.62% (+3.41% pts) IMPROVED	10) 2025-26: 94.01% MAINTAINED	10) 95% in 2026-27	10) 2025-26: 94.01%- NEW BASELINE due to WCS closure
1.11	11) WCS Middle School dropout rate (Dataquest)	11) 2023-24: 0%	12) 2024-25: 0% (no change) MET	11) 2025-26: N/A DISCONTINUE- no middle school as of June 30, 2025.	11) DISCONTINUE- no middle school as of June 30, 2025.	11) DISCONTINUE- no middle school as of June 30, 2025.
1.12	12) Student perception of teachers asking them to keep trying when the	12) 2024: 53% of students agree that their teachers ask them	12) 2025: 59% of students agree that their teachers	12) 2026: 64% of students agree that their teachers	12) Improve positive percentages 3%	12) 2026: 64% (+11%) of students agree that their

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	work gets hard (Youth Truth positive percentages) LREBG metric for 1.2	to keep trying when the work gets hard.	ask them to keep trying when the work gets hard. EXCEEDED	ask them to keep trying when the work gets hard. EXCEEDED	points year over year (62% in 2027)	teachers ask them to keep trying when the work gets hard.
1.13	13) SBAC ELA Scores (Dashboard) LREBG Metric for 2.1 & 2.3	13) 2023 Dashboard ELA: JXW: 18 points below standard RLS: 8.8 points above standard WCS: 23.2 points below standard EL JXW: 38 points below standard EL RLS: 6.4 points below standard EL WCS: 38.1 points below standard SWD JXW: 119 points below standard	13) 2024 Dashboard ELA: JXW: 22.6 points below standard (-4.6 points) NOT MET RLS: 21.3 points above standard (+12.5 points) EXCEEDED WCS: 35.8 points below standard (-12.6 points) NOT MET EL JXW: 52.9 points below standard (-14.9 points) NOT MET EL RLS: 2.3 points above standard (+8.7 points) EXCEEDED EL WCS: 59.9 points below standard (-21.8 points) NOT MET SWD JXW: 102.6 points below	13) 2025 Dashboard ELA: JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED WCS: 42.4 points below standard (-6.6 points) NOT MET EL JXW: 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) IMPROVED EL RLS: 3.2 points below standard (-5.5 points) NOT MET EL WCS: 69.5 points below standard (-9.7 points) NOT MET SWD JXW: 89.4 points below	13) Increase 5 points year over year JXW: 3 points below standard RLS: 23.8 points above standard WCS: 8.2 points below standard EL JXW: 23 points below standard EL RLS: 8.6 points above standard EL WCS: 23.1 points below standard SWD JXW: 104 points below standard	13) 2025 Dashboard ELA: JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+6.5 points) RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+15.4 points) WCS: 42.2 points below standard (-19 points) EL JXW: 49 points below standard (-11 points) EL RLS: 3.2 points below standard (+3.2 points) EL WCS: 69.5 points below standard (-31.4 points) SWD JXW: 89.4 points below

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		SWD: RLS: 70.4 points below standard SWD WCS: 89.9 points below standard	standard (+16.4 points) EXCEEDED SWD: RLS: 52.9 points below standard (+17.5 points) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 98.1 points below standard (-8.2 points) NOT MET	standard (+13.2 points) EXCEEDED SWD: RLS: 32.9 points below standard (+20 points) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 93 points below standard (+5.1 points) EXCEEDED	SWD: RLS: 55.4 points below standard SWD WCS: 74.9 points below standard	standard (+29.6 points) SWD: RLS: 32.9 points below standard (+37.5 points) SWD WCS: 93 points below standard (-3.1 points)
1.14	14) SBAC Math Scores (Dashboard) LREBG Metric for 2.1 & 2.4	14) 2023 Dashboard Math: JXW: 45.6 points below standard RLS: 19.9 points below standard WCS: 71.3 points below standard EL JXW: 67 points below standard EL RLS: 37.2 points below standard	14) 2024 Dashboard Math: JXW: 34.4 points below standard (+11.2 points) EXCEEDED RLS: 12.2 points above standard (+32.1 points) EXCEEDED WCS: 86.3 points below standard (-15 points) NOT MET EL JXW: 58.8 points below standard (+8.2 points) EXCEEDED EL RLS: 26.1 points below	14) 2025 Dashboard Math: JXW: 52.5 points below standard (-18 points) NOT MET RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points) IMPROVED WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points) IMPROVED EL JXW: 78.5 points below standard (-19.8 points) NOT MET EL RLS: 33.6 points below	14) Increase 5 points year over year 2026 Dashboard: JXW: 30.6 points below standard RLS: 4.9 points below standard WCS: 56.3 points below standard EL JXW: 52 points below standard	14) 2025 Dashboard Math: JXW: 52.5 points below standard (-6.9 points) RLS: 8.5 points above standard (+11.4 points) WCS: 85.9 points below standard (-14.6points) EL JXW: 78.5 points below standard (-11.5 points)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		EL WCS: 82.1 points below standard SWD JXW: 135 points below standard SWD: RLS: 109.2 points below standard SWD WCS: 136.4 points below standard	standard (+11.1 points) EXCEEDED EL WCS: 104.6 points below standard (-22.5 points) NOT MET SWD JXW: 105.2 points below standard (+29.8 points) EXCEEDED SWD: RLS: 97.3 points below standard (+11.9 points) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 147.5 points below standard (-11.1 points) NOT MET	standard (-7.5 points) NOT MET EL WCS: 102 points below standard (+2.6 points) IMPROVED SWD JXW: 137.5 points below standard (-32.3 points) NOT MET SWD: RLS: 74.8 points below standard (+22.6 points) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 153.7 points below standard (-6.2 points) NOT MET	EL RLS: 22.2 points below standard EL WCS: 67.1 points below standard SWD JXW: 120 points below standard SWD: RLS: 94.2 points below standard SWD WCS: 121.4 points below standard	EL RLS: 33.6 points below standard (+3.6 points) EL WCS: 102 points below standard (-19.9 points) SWD JXW: 137.5 points below standard (-2.5 points) SWD: RLS: 74.8 points below standard (+34.4points) SWD WCS: 153.7 points below standard (-17.3 points)
1.15	15) STAR Reading percentile rank (mid-year- cohort growth over time local data) 2025 mid-year 4th grade 2026 mid-year 5th grade 2027 mid-year 6th grade LREBG Metric for 2.1 & 2.3	15) 2024 March 3rd grade: JXW: 46% at Grade Level RLS: 70% at Grade Level WCS: 34% at Grade Level	15) 2025 March 4th grade: JXW: 56% at Grade Level (+10% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 72% at Grade Level (+2% points) IMPROVED	15) 2026 March 5th grade: JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED	15) Cohort increase 3% points year over year. 2027 6th grade mid-year outcome is: JXW: 55% at grade level RLS: 79% at grade level	15) 2026 March 5th grade: JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+14% points) RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+8% points) WCS: 49% at Grade Level +15% points)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			WCS: 50% at Grade Level (+16 points) EXCEEDED	WCS: 49% at Grade Level (-1% points) NOT MET	WCS: 43% at grade level	
1.16	DISCONTINUED 2025: 16) STAR Math (mid-year- cohort growth over time local data) 2024: 3rd grade baseline 2025: 4th grade 2026: 5th grade 2027: 6th grade	16) 2024 March 3rd grade: JXW: 55% at Grade Level RLS: 77% at Grade Level WCS: 45% at Grade Level	16) DISCONTINUED 2025- replaced with essential standard common assessment data in Metric 20.	16) DISCONTINUED 2025- replaced with essential standard common assessment data in Metric 20.	DISCONTINUED 2025- 16) Cohort increase 3% points year over year. 2027 6th grade mid-year outcome is: JXW: 64% at grade level RLS: 86% at grade level WCS: 54% at grade level	16) DISCONTINUED 2025- replaced with essential standard common assessment data in Metric 20.
1.17	17) Dibels/MCLASS (mid-year- cohort growth over time local data) 2024: kindergarten baseline 2025: 1st grade 2026: 2nd grade 2027: 3rd grade LREBG Metric for 2.1 & 2.3	17) Dibels 2024 mid-year Kindergarten % at grade level: JXW: 17% RLS: 46% WCS: 43%	17) Dibels 2025 mid-year 1st grade % at grade level: JXW: 22% (+5% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 46% (no change) MAINTAINED WCS: 36% (-7% points) NOT MET	17) Dibels 2026 mid-year 2nd grade % at grade level: JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED	17) Cohort increase 3% points year over year. 2027 3rd grade outcome is: JXW: RLS: WCS:	17) Dibels 2026 mid-year 2nd grade % at grade level: JXW: 54% (+37% points) RLS: 51% (+5% points) WCS: 43% (no change)
1.18	18) Retention rate (local data)	18) 2023-24 retention rate by site: JXW: 0% RLS: <1% WCS: <1%	18) 2024-25 retention rate by site: JXW: <1% EXCEEDED RLS: <1%	18) 2025-26 retention rate by site: JXW: 0% EXCEEDED RLS: <1%	18) Maintain <1% by site each year	18) 2025-26 retention rate by site: JXW: 0% RLS: <1%

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			MET WCS: 0% EXCEEDED	MET WES: 0% EXCEEDED		WCS: From <-1% to 0%
1.19	19) Access to a Broad Course of Study (local data)	19) All students, including unduplicated students and students with IEPs have access to a broad course of study, including Designated ELD for ELs and supports to ensure students with IEPs meet or exceed their IEP goals.	19) All students, including unduplicated students and students with IEPs have access to a broad course of study, including Designated ELD for ELs and supports to ensure students with IEPs meet or exceed their IEP goals. MET	19) All students, including unduplicated students and students with IEPs have access to a broad course of study, including Designated ELD for ELs and supports to ensure students with IEPs meet or exceed their IEP goals. MET	19) All students, including unduplicated students and students with IEPs have access to a broad course of study, including Designated ELD for ELs and supports to ensure students with IEPs meet or exceed their IEP goals.	19) All students, including unduplicated students and students with IEPs have access to a broad course of study, including Designated ELD for ELs and supports to ensure students with IEPs meet or exceed their IEP goals.
1.20	20) Essential standard for math mastered via common assessment (local data) LREBG Metric for 2.1 & 2.4	20) Will establish baseline in 2024-25: TK: 99% K: 73% 1: 97% 2: 85% 3: 92% 4: 83% 5: 79% 6: 63%	20) 2024-25 baseline % mastering essential math standard: TK: 99% K: 73% 1: 97% 2: 85% 3: 92% 4: 83% 5: 79% 6: 63%	20) 2025-26 % mastering essential math standard: TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET 1.1: 98%, 2.6 100% K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92% 1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%,	20) 100%	20) 2025-26 difference from 2024-25 baseline % mastering essential math standard: TK: -.67% (avg of 3 standards) K: +14.4% (avg of 5 standards) 1: -2.84% (avg. of 6 standards) 2: -12% 3: -10% (avg of 2 standards) 4: -16.5% (avg of 2 standards)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
				OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97% 2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET 3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79% 4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74% 5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80% 6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67%		5: -5.5% (avg of 2 standards) 6: +1% (avg of 2 standards)
1.21	21) Essential standard for ELA mastered via common assessment (local data)	21) NOT COMPLETED	21) Will establish baseline in 2025-26:	21) 2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline: TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83% K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78% 1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79% 2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58% 3: RF.4: 45% 4: RL.4.2: 68% 5: RI.5.2: 69%	21) 100%	21) 2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- New baseline data added in 2025-26 (See Year 2 Outcome). No comparison data available yet.

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
				6: RL.6.1: 50%		

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.

Successful Implementation:
Action 1.1: Youth Truth Survey (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.2: SEL & Behavior (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 1.3: Multilingual learner Support (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.4: Equity (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 1.5: Reading Support (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.6: Math (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.7: Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 1.8: Counselors (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.9: PE (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.10: Music (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.11: SARB (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.12: Student Support Instructional Assistants (Unduplicated) (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.13: Student Support Instructional Assistants (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.14: Universal TK Instructional Assistants (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.15: Transportation (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.16: Field Trips/Assemblies (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.17: Behaviorist (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.18: Instructional Assistants (Fully Implemented)
Action 1.19: Multilingual Learner Support (Title III) (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 1.20: Reading Support (Title I) (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 1.21: Data Analysis (Fully Implemented)

Challenges in Implementation: There were no challenges in implementation in the 2025-26 school year.

Changes in Implementation:

Action 2: Did not implement coaching/mentoring extra duty pay.

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.

Actions with Material Differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures:

Action 1: Actual cost came in lower than estimated.

Action 2: Did not implement coaching/mentoring extra duty pay.

Action 3: Personnel change in a 1.0 FTE ELD teacher from LCAP adoption in June 2025 to the start of the 2025-26 school year. The new teacher earned more.

Action 5: A Reading Intervention Program Assistant retired mid-year. The vacancy was not filled.

Action 7: Summer Program for July 2025 was added after the LCAP adoption in June 2025. 2025 Summer Program Instructional Assistants were hired after the LCAP adoption in June 2025.

Action 12: Two new Student Support Instructional Assistants were hired who earned more.

Action 13: Two new Student Support Instructional Assistants were hired who earned more.

Action 14: Opened additional TK class after enrollment increased at start of 2025-26 school year and hired one 5.8 hour additional UTK Assistant

Action 15: There was an increased in actual costs for transportation compared to the original budgeted amount.

Action 18: There were unfilled vacancies for Instructional Assistants.

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

Action 1 was effective because the student perception of safety and importance at school exceeded the goal in 2026 (Goal was to improve positive percentages 5% points year over year).
67%: Do you feel safe at school? (+11% pts) EXCEEDED
33%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+2% pts) IMPROVED

Action 2 was effective because staff continued to implement Caring School Community, the adopted SEL program. The SEL TOSA provided leadership, mentoring, coaching, and support to ensure continued successful implementation.

The student perception of safety and importance at school improved and exceeded the goal in 2026 (Goal was to improve positive percentages 5% points year over year).
67%: Do you feel safe at school? (+11% pts) EXCEEDED

33%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+2% pts) IMPROVED

The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year)
JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED
RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED
WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED

EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED

SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED

White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED
White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED
White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED

Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27):
94.01%- now combined percentage for all 3 schools

Action 3 was only somewhat effective because:

- The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED
- The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED

JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%)
RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%)
WCS: 39.0% (+.4%)

- 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED

Action 4 was somewhat effective because the 2025 Dashboard suspension rate goal was exceeded (Goal is to meet or exceed the state average each year for corresponding student groups)
2025 Dashboard suspension rate:
English Learners (EL):
CA: 3.2%
EL JXW: 1.6% (+.2%) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 0% (no change) Maintained

CA: EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 1.6% (-1.0) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED

Students With Disabilities (SWD):
CA: 5%
SWD JXW: 1.9% (0%) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 0% (-1.8%) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 3.6% (+1.1%)
Declined
CA: EXCEEDED

The 2025 Dashboard SBAC ELA scores for student groups exceed the goal in some areas (Goal is 5% point increase)
2025 Dashboard SBAC ELA:
EL JXW: 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) IMPROVED

SWD JXW: 89.4 points below standard (+13.2 points) EXCEEDED
SWD: RLS: 32.9 points below standard (+20 points) EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 93 points below standard (+5.1 points) EXCEEDED

The 2025 Dashboard Math scores for student groups improved or exceeded the goal in some areas (Goal is 5% point increase)
2025 Dashboard SBAC Math
EL WCS: 102 points below standard (+2.6 points)
IMPROVED
SWD: RLS: 74.8 points below standard (+22.6 points)
EXCEEDED

Action 5 was somewhat effective because the 2025 Dashboard SBAC ELA scores improved or exceeded the goal in some areas (Goal is 5% point increase)
2025 Dashboard SBAC ELA:
JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED

The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade
JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points)
EXCEEDED
RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points)

EXCEEDED

The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade
JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED
WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED

The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:

TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83%
K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78%
1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79%
2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58%
3: RF.4: 45%
4: RL.4.2: 68%
5: RI.5.2: 69%
6: RL.6.1: 50%

Action 6 was somewhat effective because the 2025 Dashboard Math scores improved in some areas (Goal is 5% point increase)
RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points)
IMPROVED
WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points)
IMPROVED

The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%):

2025-26 % mastering essential math standard:

TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET
1.1: 98%, 2.6 100%
K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED
CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92%
1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET
OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97%
2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET
3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79%
4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74%
5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80%

6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67%

Action 7 was somewhat effective because The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year)
JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED
RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED
WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED

EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED

SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED

White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED
White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED
White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED

Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27):
94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools

Action 8 was somewhat effective because the student perception of safety and importance at school improved or exceeded the goal in 2026 (Goal was to improve positive percentages 5% points year over year).
Youth Truth 2026 student perception:
67%: Do you feel safe at school? (+11% pts) EXCEEDED
33%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+2% pts) IMPROVED

The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year)
2025 Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism
JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED
RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED
WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED

EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED

SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED

White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED
White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED
White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED

Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27):
94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools

Actions 9 and 10 were somewhat effective because the prep time the PE and Music teacher provided for classroom teachers to plan resulted in improving in/ exceeding goals for:
The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year)
2025 Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism:
JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED
RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED
WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED

EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED

SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED

White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED
White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED
White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED

Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27):
94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools

2025 Dashboard ELA:
JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED

2025 Dashboard Math:

RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points) IMPROVED
WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points) IMPROVED

The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade
JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED

The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade:
JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED
WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED

The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:

TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83%
K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78%
1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79%
2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58%
3: RF.4: 45%
4: RL.4.2: 68%
5: RI.5.2: 69%
6: RL.6.1: 50%

The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential math standards:

TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET
1.1: 98%, 2.6 100%
K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED
CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92%
1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET
OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97%
2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET
3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79%
4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74%
5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80%
6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67%

Action 11 was effective because:
The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year)
JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED
RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED
WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED

Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27):
94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools

Actions 12 & 13 were somewhat effective because SSIAs supported students and teachers in improving and exceeding goals on:
2025 Dashboard ELA:
JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED

2025 Dashboard Math:
RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points) IMPROVED
WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points) IMPROVED

The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED

The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase) :
JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED
WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED

The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:

TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83%
K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78%
1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79%
2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58%
3: RF.4: 45%
4: RL.4.2: 68%
5: RI.5.2: 69%
6: RL.6.1: 50%

The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential math standard:

TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET
1.1: 98%, 2.6 100%
K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED
CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92%
1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET
OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97%
2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET
3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79%
4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74%
5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80%
6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67%

Action 14 was somewhat effective because UTK Instructional Assistants supported TK students and teachers in establishing baseline data on:
2025-26 baseline % mastering essential ELA standards:
TK:
2025-26 % mastering essential math standards:
TK:

Action 15 was effective because providing transportation for WCS students supported them in improving goals on (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year):
2025 Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism
WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts)
IMPROVED

Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27):
94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools

Action 16 was effective because chronic absenteeism decreased and ADA maintained
The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year)
JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED
RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED
WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED

EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED

EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED

SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED

White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED
White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED
White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED

Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27):
94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools

Action 17 was somewhat effective because the Behaviorist was able to support students and staff in improving/exceeding on:
The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year)
JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED
RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED
WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED

EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED

SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED

White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED
White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED
White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED

Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27):
94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools

The 2025 Dashboard suspension rate exceeded (Goal was to meet or exceed State average for given year, including Students with Disabilities at JXW)
CA: 2.9%
JXW: 1.7% (+.1%) Maintained

CA: EXCEEDED
RLS: 0% (-.4%) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED
WCS: 2.6% (-.2%) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED

English Learners (EL):
CA: 3.2%
EL JXW: 1.6% (+.2%) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 0% (no change) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 1.6% (-1.0) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED

Students With Disabilities (SWD):
CA: 5%
SWD JXW: 1.9% (0%) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 0% (-1.8%) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 3.6% (+1.1%)
Declined
CA: EXCEEDED

Action 18 was somewhat effective because Instructional Assistants (IAs) supported students and teachers in improving and exceeding goals on:
2025 Dashboard ELA:
JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED

2025 Dashboard Math:
RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points) IMPROVED
WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points) IMPROVED

The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED

The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase) :

JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED
WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED

The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:

TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83%
K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78%
1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79%
2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58%
3: RF.4: 45%
4: RL.4.2: 68%
5: RI.5.2: 69%
6: RL.6.1: 50%

The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential math standard:

TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET
1.1: 98%, 2.6 100%
K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED
CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92%
1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET
OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97%
2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET
3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79%
4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74%
5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80%
6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67%

Action19 was somewhat effective because:

- The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED
- The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED

JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%)
RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%)
WCS: 39.0% (+.4%)

- 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED

Action 20 was somewhat effective because the 2025 Dashboard SBAC ELA scores improved or exceeded the goal in some areas (Goal is 5% point increase)
JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED

The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points)
EXCEEDED
RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points)
EXCEEDED

The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase) :
JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED
WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED

The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:

TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83%
K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78%
1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79%
2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58%
3: RF.4: 45%
4: RL.4.2: 68%
5: RI.5.2: 69%
6: RL.6.1: 50%

Action 21 was effective because:

- The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED
- The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED

JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%)
RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%)
WCS: 39.0% (+.4%)

- 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED

The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year)

JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED
RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED
WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED

EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED

SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED

White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED
White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED
White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED

Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27):
94.01%- now combined percentage for all 3 schools

The 2025 Dashboard suspension rate goal was exceeded (Goal is to meet or exceed the state average each year for corresponding student groups)
2025:

English Learners (EL):
CA: 3.2%
EL JXW: 1.6% (+.2%) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 0% (no change) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 1.6% (-1.0) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED

Students With Disabilities (SWD):
CA: 5%
SWD JXW: 1.9% (0%) Maintained
CA: EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 0% (-1.8%) Improved
CA: EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 3.6% (+1.1%)
Declined

CA: EXCEEDED

The 2025 Dashboard SBAC ELA scores for student groups improved or exceeded the goal in some areas (Goal is 5% point increase)
EL JXW: 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) IMPROVED

SWD JXW: 89.4 points below standard (+13.2 points) EXCEEDED
SWD: RLS: 32.9 points below standard (+20 points) EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 93 points below standard (+5.1 points) EXCEEDED

The 2025 Dashboard Math scores for student groups improved or exceeded the goal in some areas (Goal is 5% point increase)
EL WCS: 102 points below standard (+2.6 points) IMPROVED
SWD: RLS: 74.8 points below standard (+22.6 points) EXCEEDED

The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED

The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase) :
JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED
WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED

The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:

TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83%
K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78%
1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79%
2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58%
3: RF.4: 45%
4: RL.4.2: 68%
5: RI.5.2: 69%
6: RL.6.1: 50%

The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential math standard:

TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET
1.1: 98%, 2.6 100%
K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED

CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92%
1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET
OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97%
2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET
3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79%
4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74%
5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80%
6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67%

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

No planned changes for goals, metrics, target outcomes, or actions for 2026-27 resulting from reflection.
There will be reductions and funding changes in some program and personnel in 2026-27 primarily due to inflation, declining enrollment, and increased costs for special education.

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	Youth Truth Survey	Administer the Youth Truth Survey annually to students in grades 3-6 in order to include student voice into decision-making.	$750.00	No
1.2	Social Emotional Learning (SEL) & Behavior (LREBG Action)	District to continue implementation of Caring School Community, a social emotional learning curriculum, and employ a SEL & Behavior TOSA to continue to train and coach teachers and co-lead the District 2025-27 MTSS Tiers 1-3 Behavior Needs Assessment and planning process. LREBG research to support this action: MTSS Policy Briefs: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/ri/ What the Research Says: https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/what-does-the-research-say/ Making the Case for SEL: https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/how-can-you-make-the-case-for-sel/	$178,742.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		CC Network All Trauma Informed Resources: https://app.smartsheet.com/b/publish?EQBCT=f09ebb34b3ca4e78a04818bd90b0a002 Attendance Works - Research: https://www.attendanceworks.org/research/evidence-based-solutions/ LREBG Metrics being used to monitor the impact of this action: 1.6: Suspension rate (Dashboard) 1.7: Expulsion rate (Dataquest) 1.8: Student perception of school safety, belonging, and importance (Youth Truth) 1.9: Chronic Absenteeism (Dashboard) 1.10: Attendance rate (P2 Average Daily Attendance- Aeries local data) 1.12: Student perception of teachers asking them to keep trying when the work gets hard (Youth Truth positive percentages)		
1.3	Multilingual Learner Support: This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Designated and Integrated English Language Development (ELD) implementation	2.6 FTE ELD teachers will provide ELD intervention & coaching to classroom teachers 3 six hour per day ELD instructional assistants will provide support to English learners participating in ELD intervention 50% of Educational Services Coordinator will be committed to ELD support 50% of Educational Services Director will be committed to ELD support. A consultant will continue to provide professional development and coaching training to ELD teachers.	$529,207.00	Yes
1.4	Equity- Captured in: G101, G102, G103, G105, G10, G107, G108, G109, G110, G111, G112, G113, G115, G116, G117,	Continue focus on Equity through closing the opportunity gap and ensuring all students achieve at or above grade level. NEW for 2026-27: 1) Update Administrative Regulation 0415.1 Racial Equity 2) Plan and start a District Black Parent Network with SCOE and/or other Community Based Organization help	$0.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
	G118, G119, G120, G121, G201, G202, G203, G204, G206, G208, G209, G301, G303, G304, G305, G401, & G402	3) In each data collection point where we are able, begin disaggregating data for Black students as a student group and addressing any gaps that arise.		
1.5	Reading Support	1.68 FTE Reading Intervention Teachers to provide support to principally unduplicated students, participating in reading intervention in achieving grade level standards. Flexible intervention time provided, including small groups within regular classroom setting.	$234,128.00	Yes
1.6	Math	Flexible intervention time provided, including small groups within regular classroom setting.	$0.00	No
1.7	Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELO-P)	Provide after school and summer care, academic support, and enrichment for students.	$2,446,927.00	No
1.8	Counselors	Maintain one counselor at each site. Counselors to support principally unduplicated students with Social Emotional Learning through individual, small group, and whole class support. Counselors to provide friendship groups to support principally unduplicated students with feeling safe at school.	$323,548.00	Yes
1.9	P.E.	District to provide a 1.0 FTE P.E. teacher to provide prep time for teachers to address principally unduplicated student needs.	$154,639.00	Yes
1.10	Music	District to provide a 1.0 FTE Music teacher	$159,728.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.11	School Attendance Review Board (SARB)	Bilingual Community Liaisons and principals to adhere to SARB process, including attendance tracking, communication, and School Attendance Review Team (SART) meetings that identify obstacles to regular school attendance and brainstorm solutions to implement.	$6,000.00	No
1.12	Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) principally benefitting English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth	SSIAs to support students with achieving grade level standards	$175,355.00	Yes
1.13	Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) to support Students with IEPs with achieving grade level standards.	SSIAs to support Students with IEPs with achieving grade level standards	$149,376.00	No
1.14	Universal Transitional Kindergarten (UTK) Instructional Assistants	Provide a 5.8 hours UTK Instructional Assistant during instructional time for each class serving UTK students.	$246,546.00	No
1.15	Transportation	Provide busing for Wright Elementary School principally unduplicated students.	$463,755.00	Yes
1.16	Field trips and Assemblies	Teachers and principals provide field trips and assemblies to students in an effort to build interest in various topics and make school an exciting place to want to be.	$0.00	No
1.17	Behaviorist	District behaviorist to provide support for staff and principally unduplicated students when students are experiencing behavioral challenges at school.	$183,636.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.18	Instructional Assistants (IAs)	IAs to support principally unduplicated students with achieving grade level standards.	$279,249.00	Yes
1.19	Multilingual Learner Support: This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Designated and Integrated English Language Development (ELD) implementation	.4 ELD teacher will provide ELD intervention & coaching to classroom teachers	$47,109.00	No
1.20	Reading Support	1.32 FTE Reading Intervention Teachers to provide support to students participating in reading intervention in achieving grade level standards. Flexible intervention time provided, including small groups within regular classroom setting.	$180,555.00	No
1.21	Data Analysis staff (qualitative action toward MPP)	Dedicated staff to collect and analyze ELA, ELD, Math, SEL, Behavior, and Attendance data to monitor achievement of Unduplicated students (English Learners, socio-economically disadvantaged students, and Foster Youth), and coordinate supports.		Yes
1.22	Counselors	Maintain one counselor at each site. Counselors to support students with Social Emotional Learning through individual, small group, and whole class support. Counselors to provide friendship groups to support students with feeling safe at school.	$138,662.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.23	Amplify Math Adoption	New Amplify Math curriculum adoption that is better aligned to the Math Standards and Math Framework.	$136,833.00	No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Goal 2: All Staff are Connected & Thriving	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Data analysis from the Dashboard, LCAP mid-year update, Youth Truth survey, and local assessment data revealed that WESD needs to focus on ensuring that:

- Staff members feel they belong, are supported, are recognized, and that their voices matter.
- Staff members work together as a team to try new ideas, solve problems, and improve our impact on student success.
- Staff will continue to grow and embrace opportunities to learn and lead.
- Staff feel Wright Elementary School District is a great place to work, grow, and serve our school community.

Wright ESD Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Purpose statement:
The purpose of the Wright ESD's Instructional Leadership Team is to positively unite and support ALL staff through the use of data and mutual accountability in embracing evidence-based best practices to ensure an equitable education where ALL students achieve at grade level or above.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	1) Staff perception of students being safe from violence at school (Youth Truth percent positive)	1) 2023-24: 64%	1) 2024-25: 67% (+3% points) MET	1) 2025-26: 80% (+13% points) EXCEEDED	1) 3% point increase percent positive year over year	1) 2025-26: 80% (+16% points)
2.2	2) Staff perception of their feeling safe from	2) 2023-24: 70%	2) 2024-25: 81% (+11% points)	2) n/a DISCONTINUE	2) 3% point increase percent	2) DISCONTINUED

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	harm while at school (Youth Truth percent positive)		EXCEEDED		positive year over year	
2.3	3) Staff perception that their school sets high expectations for students (Youth Truth percent positive) LREBG Metric for G201, G203, & G204	3) 2023-24: 70%	3) 2024-25: 67% (-3% points) NOT MET	3) 2025-26: 74% (+7% points) EXCEEDED	3) 3% point increase percent positive year over year	3) 2025-26: 74% (+4% points)
2.4	4) Number of fully credentialed teachers (local data)	4) 2023-24: 91%	4) 2024-25: 92% (+1%) IMPROVED	4) 2025-26: 95% (+3%) IMPROVED	4) 100% fully credentialed teachers	4) 2025-26: 95% (+4%)
2.5	5) Staff perception that their work contributes to the goals of their school. (Youth Truth percent positive) LREBG Metric for G201, G203, & G204	5) 2023-24: 92%	5) 2024-25: 94% (+2% points) IMPROVED	5) 2025-26: 83% (-11% points) NOT MET	5) 3% point increase percent positive year over year	5) 2025-26: 83% (-9% points)
2.6	6) Staff perception that their school supports them in implementing what they have learned in professional development. (Youth Truth percent positive) LREBG Metric for G201, G203, & G204	6) 2023-24: 52%	6) 2024-25: 56% (+4% points) EXCEEDED	6) 2025-26: 49% (-7% points) NOT MET	6) 3% point increase percent positive year over year	6) 2025-26: 49% (-3% points)
2.7	7) DISCONTINUE: Staff perception that their school sets high expectations for students (Youth Truth percent positive)	7) 2023-24: 70%	7) DISCONTINUE-duplicate of 2.3 above	7) DISCONTINUE-duplicate of 2.3 above	7) 3% point increase percent positive year over year	7) DISCONTINUE-duplicate of 2.3 above

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.8	8) Staff perception that they have access to meaningful professional development. (Youth Truth percent positive) LREBG Metric for G201, G203, & G204	8) 2023-24: 66%	8) 2024-25: 46% (-20% points) NOT MET	8) 2025-26: 50% (+4% points) EXCEEDED	8) 3% point increase percent positive year over year	8) 2025-26: 50% (-16% points)
2.9	9) Staff perception that their PD over the last year has provided them with teaching strategies to better meet their students' needs. (Youth Truth percent positive) LREBG Metric for G201, G203, & G204	9) 2023-24: 61%	9) 2024-25: 48% (-13% points) NOT MET	9) 2025-26: 44% (-4% points) NOT MET	9) 3% point increase percent positive year over year	9) 2025-26: 44% (-17% points)
2.10	10) Staff perception that their school encourages them to seek professional development opportunities to improve their practice. (Youth Truth percent positive) LREBG Metric for G201, G203, & G204	10) 2023-24: 51%	10) 2024-25: 48% (-3% points) NOT MET	10) 2025-26: 52% (+4% points) EXCEEDED	10) 3% point increase percent positive year over year	10) 2025-26: 52% (+1% points)
2.11	11) Staff perception that their PD over the last year has provided them with content support. (Youth Truth percent positive) LREBG Metric for G201, G203, & G204	11) 2023-24: 45%	11) 2024-25: 52% (+7% points) EXCEEDED	11) 2025-26: 42% (-10% points) NOT MET	11) 3% point increase percent positive year over year	11) 2025-26: 42% (-3% points)

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.

Successful Implementation
Action 2.1: Instructional Leadership Team (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 2.2: Student Code of Conduct (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 2.3: ELA Professional Development (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 2.4: Math Professional Development (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 2.5: Growth Mindset & Grit (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 2.6: Highly Qualified Teachers (Unduplicated) (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 2.7: Alarm System (Fully Implemented)
Action 2.8: Certificated Teaching Staff (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 2.9: Release Time for Best Practice Observations (Ongoing Implementation)

Challenges in Implementation: There were no challenges in implementation in the 2025-26 school year.

Changes in Implementation:

Action 9: Was not implemented in 2025-26.

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.

Actions with Material Differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures:

Action 1: Extra duty pay for ILT members came in lower than projected.

Action 3: All participants were budgeted to 2025-26, but some participated in 2024-25.

Action 8: Budget amount was entered incorrectly.

Action 9: Was not implemented in 2025-26.

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

Action 1 was somewhat effective because:

- The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED
- The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED

JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%)
RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%)
WCS: 39.0% (+.4%)

- 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED

2025 Dashboard ELA:
JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED

2025 Dashboard Math:
RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points) IMPROVED
WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points) IMPROVED

The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED

The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase) :
JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED
WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED

The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:

TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83%
K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78%
1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79%
2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58%
3: RF.4: 45%
4: RL.4.2: 68%
5: RI.5.2: 69%
6: RL.6.1: 50%

The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential math standard:

TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET
1.1: 98%, 2.6 100%
K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED

CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92%
1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET
OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97%
2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET
3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79%
4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74%
5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80%
6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67%
Action 2 implementation is ongoing. Effectiveness is TBD.

Action 3 was somewhat effective because:

- The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED
- The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED

JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%)
RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%)
WCS: 39.0% (+.4%)

- 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED

2025 Dashboard ELA:
JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED

The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED

The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase) :
JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED
WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED

The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:

TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83%
K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78%
1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79%
2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58%
3: RF.4: 45%

4: RL.4.2: 68%
5: RI.5.2: 69%
6: RL.6.1: 50%

Action 4 was somewhat effective because:

2025 Dashboard Math:
RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points) IMPROVED
WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points) IMPROVED

The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential math standard:

TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET
1.1: 98%, 2.6 100%
K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED
CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92%
1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET
OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97%
2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET
3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79%
4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74%
5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80%
6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67%

Action 5- ongoing and is embedded in Caring School Community SEL program.

Actions 6 and 8 were somewhat effective because the 2026 YouthTruth student perception of teachers asking them to keep trying when the work gets hard increased to 64% (Goal was 62%).

- The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED
- The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED

JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%)
RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%)
WCS: 39.0% (+.4%)

- 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED

2025 Dashboard ELA:
JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED

2025 Dashboard Math:
RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points) IMPROVED
WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points) IMPROVED

The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):
JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED

The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase) :
JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED
RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED
WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED

The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:

TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83%
K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78%
1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79%
2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58%
3: RF.4: 45%
4: RL.4.2: 68%
5: RI.5.2: 69%
6: RL.6.1: 50%

The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%):
2025-26 % mastering essential math standard:

TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET
1.1: 98%, 2.6 100%
K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED
CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92%
1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET
OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97%
2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET
3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79%
4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74%
5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80%
6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67%

Action 7 was somewhat effective because the 2025 YouthTruth staff perception of their feeling safe from harm while at school increased 11% points from 70%- 81% (Goal was 3% points).

Action 9 is unknown because teachers have not yet begun taking release time to observe best practices for increasing outcomes for unduplicated students.

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 were no changes made to the planned goal, metrics, or targeted outcomes for 2026-27.

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	Instructional Leadership Team-Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) LREBG Action	District Instructional Leadership Team to participate in California Principal Support Network Year 3 Cohort. Wright ESD Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Purpose statement: The purpose of the Wright ESD's Instructional Leadership Team is to positively unite and support ALL staff through the use of data and mutual accountability in embracing evidence-based best practices to ensure an equitable education where ALL students achieve at grade level or above. District staff to continue to work to: 1) Identify horizontally and vertically aligned essential standards in ELA and math at each grade level for ALL students to master. 2) Identify/create common assessments 3) Provide timely and targeted interventions for students who have not yet mastered essential standards. LREBG research to support this action: MTSS Policy Briefs: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/ri/ Essentials of Intensive Intervention: https://www.guilford.com/books/Essentials-of-Intensive-Intervention/Edmonds-Gandhi-	$45,263.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		Evidence Review and Academic Interventions: Danielson/9781462539291#utm_source=ncii&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=edmonds-2019 https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/publication/Evidence-Review_The-Transformative-Potential-of-Tutoring.pdf National Student Support Accelerator- Stanford: https://studentsupportaccelerator.org/research UFLI: https://www.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Districtwide-Pilot-Study-of-UFLI-Foundations.pdf Jeff Zwiers Research: https://jeffzwiers.org/publications California Mathematics Project: https://csmp.online/_files/documents/cmp-overview.pdf California Subject Matter Project: https://csmp.online/ West Ed Research/Evaluation: https://www.wested.org/research-evaluation/ Tools for Teachers: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/tools-for-teachers.asp LREBG Metrics being used to monitor the impact of this action: 1.13: SBAC ELA 1.14: SBAC Math 1.15: STAR Reading 1.17: Dibels/mCLASS 1.20: Math Essential Standards common assessments 1.21: ELA Essential Standards common assessments 2.3: YouthTruth- staff perception of high expectations of students 2.5: YouthTruth- staff perception of contributing to school goals 2.6: YouthTruth- staff perception of school support in implementing PD learning 2.8: YouthTruth- staff perception of access to meaningful PD 2.9: YouthTruth- staff perception of PD providing strategies to best meet		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		student needs 2.10: YouthTruth- staff perception of school encouraging teachers to seek PD 2.11: YouthTruth- staff perception that PD has provided content support		
2.2	Student Code of Conduct (Family Handbook)	District to plan, train (staff and students), communicate, and implement a district wide code of conduct that includes banning the use of the "N" word. LREBG research to support this action: MTSS Policy Briefs: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/ri/ What the Research Says: https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/what-does-the-research-say/ Making the Case for SEL: https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/how-can-you-make-the-case-for-sel/ CC Network All Trauma Informed Resources: https://app.smartsheet.com/b/publish?EQBCT=f09ebb34b3ca4e78a04818bd90b0a002 Attendance Works - Research: https://www.attendanceworks.org/research/evidence-based-solutions/ LREBG Metrics being used to monitor the impact of this action: 1.6: Suspension rate (Dashboard) 1.7: Expulsion rate (Dataquest) 1.8: Student perception of school safety, belonging, and importance (Youth Truth) 1.9: Chronic Absenteeism (Dashboard) 1.10: Attendance rate (P2 Average Daily Attendance- Aeries local data) 1.12: Student perception of teachers asking them to keep trying when the work gets hard (Youth Truth positive percentages) 2.3: YouthTruth- staff perception of high expectations of students 2.5: YouthTruth- staff perception of contributing to school goals	$13,500.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.3	English Language Arts Professional Development- (LREBG Action)	Professional Development for teachers focused on reading, writing, listening, and speaking. LREBG research to support this action: MTSS Policy Briefs: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/ri/ Essentials of Intensive Intervention: https://www.guilford.com/books/Essentials-of-Intensive-Intervention/Edmonds-Gandhi- Evidence Review and Academic Interventions: Danielson/9781462539291#utm_source=ncii&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=edmonds-2019 https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/publication/Evidence-Review_The-Transformative-Potential-of-Tutoring.pdf National Student Support Accelerator- Stanford: https://studentsupportaccelerator.org/research UFLI: https://www.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Districtwide-Pilot-Study-of-UFLI-Foundations.pdf Jeff Zwiers Research: https://jeffzwiers.org/publications California Subject Matter Project: https://csmp.online/ West Ed Research/Evaluation: https://www.wested.org/research-evaluation/ Tools for Teachers: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/tools-for-teachers.asp LREBG Metrics being used to monitor the impact of this action: 1.13: SBAC ELA 1.15: STAR Reading 1.17: Dibels/mCLASS 1.21: Essential standards for ELA	$41,749.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		2.3: YouthTruth- staff perception of high expectations of students 2.5: YouthTruth- staff perception of contributing to school goals 2.6: YouthTruth- staff perception of school support in implementing PD learning 2.8: YouthTruth- staff perception of access to meaningful PD 2.9: YouthTruth- staff perception of PD providing strategies to best meet student needs 2.10: YouthTruth- staff perception of school encouraging teachers to seek PD 2.11: YouthTruth- staff perception that PD has provided content support		
2.4	Math Professional Development- (LREBG Action)	Professional Development for teachers focused on conceptual understanding and the Framework for Mathematics LREBG research: LREBG research to support this action: MTSS Policy Briefs: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/ri/ Essentials of Intensive Intervention: https://www.guilford.com/books/Essentials-of-Intensive-Intervention/Edmonds-Gandhi- Evidence Review and Academic Interventions: Danielson/9781462539291#utm_source=ncii&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=edmonds-2019 https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/publication/Evidence-Review_The-Transformative-Potential-of-Tutoring.pdf National Student Support Accelerator- Stanford: https://studentsupportaccelerator.org/research UFLI: https://www.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Districtwide-Pilot-Study-of-UFLI-Foundations.pdf Jeff Zwiers Research: https://jeffzwiers.org/publications	$10,007.00	No

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		California Mathematics Project: https://csmp.online/_files/documents/cmp-overview.pdf California Subject Matter Project: https://csmp.online/ West Ed Research/Evaluation: https://www.wested.org/research-evaluation/ Tools for Teachers: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/tools-for-teachers.asp LREBG Metrics being used to monitor the impact of this action: 1.14: SBAC Math 1.20: Math Essential Standards common assessments 2.3: YouthTruth- staff perception of high expectations of students 2.5: YouthTruth- staff perception of contributing to school goals 2.6: YouthTruth- staff perception of school support in implementing PD learning 2.8: YouthTruth- staff perception of access to meaningful PD 2.9: YouthTruth- staff perception of PD providing strategies to best meet student needs 2.10: YouthTruth- staff perception of school encouraging teachers to seek PD 2.11: YouthTruth- staff perception that PD has provided content support		
2.5	Growth Mindset and Grit- (Captured in G102, G201, G203, & G204)	Provide teachers materials and lessons to teach students about growth mindset and grit.	$0.00	No
2.6	High Quality Teachers to principally benefit English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth through:	District will recruit and retain diverse, bilingual (when possible), and high quality teachers by offering competitive salaries and effective professional development. This will also principally benefit English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth, who comprise 79% of the total district enrollment. Examples that principally benefit unduplicated students include but are not limited to: -Early release days weekly to provide professional development that principally benefit unduplicated students	$1,155,964.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
	• early release days for teacher planning time • professional development days • Tier 2 intervention small group flexible grouping within the school day	• Professional development days that address the needs of unduplicated students including SEL training • Professional Learning Community training and work to plan for effective learning that assists unduplicated students with achieving grade level or higher • Tier 2 intervention small group flexible grouping within the school day		
2.7	DISCONTINUE: Alarm System	DISCONTINUE: Upgrade alarm system district wide.	$0.00	No
2.8	Certificated teaching staff	District will recruit and retain diverse, bilingual (when possible), and high quality teachers by offering competitive salaries and effective professional development. This will also principally benefit English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth, who comprise 79% of the total district enrollment. In addition, Students with Disabilities are general education students first. Examples that principally benefit unduplicated students include but are not limited to: -Early release days weekly to provide professional development that principally benefit unduplicated students • Professional development days that address the needs of unduplicated students including SEL training • Professional Learning Community training and work to plan for effective learning that assists unduplicated students with achieving grade level or higher • Tier 2 intervention small group flexible grouping within the school day	$4,572,687.00	No
2.9	Release time for best practice observations	Release time for teachers to observe best practices for increasing outcomes for unduplicated students.	$5,034.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		LREBG research to support this action: MTSS Policy Briefs: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/ri/ Essentials of Intensive Intervention: https://www.guilford.com/books/Essentials-of-Intensive-Intervention/Edmonds-Gandhi- Evidence Review and Academic Interventions: Danielson/9781462539291#utm_source=ncii&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=edmonds-2019 https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/publication/Evidence-Review_The-Transformative-Potential-of-Tutoring.pdf National Student Support Accelerator- Stanford: https://studentsupportaccelerator.org/research UFLI: https://www.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Districtwide-Pilot-Study-of-UFLI-Foundations.pdf Jeff Zwiers Research: https://jeffzwiers.org/publications California Mathematics Project: https://csmp.online/_files/documents/cmp-overview.pdf California Subject Matter Project: https://csmp.online/ West Ed Research/Evaluation: https://www.wested.org/research-evaluation/ Tools for Teachers: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/tools-for-teachers.asp LREBG Metrics being used to monitor the impact of this action: 1.13: SBAC ELA 1.15: STAR Reading 1.17: Dibels/mCLASS 1.14: SBAC Math		

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
		1.20: Math Essential Standards common assessments 1.21: Essential standard for ELA 2.3: YouthTruth- staff perception of high expectations of students 2.5: YouthTruth- staff perception of contributing to school goals 2.6: YouthTruth- staff perception of school support in implementing PD learning 2.8: YouthTruth- staff perception of access to meaningful PD 2.9: YouthTruth- staff perception of PD providing strategies to best meet student needs 2.10: YouthTruth- staff perception of school encouraging teachers to seek PD 2.11: YouthTruth- staff perception that PD has provided content support		

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	Goal 3: Wright Elementary School District builds strong Family, Community, & School Relationships	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Data analysis from the Dashboard, LCAP mid-year update, Youth Truth survey, and local assessment data revealed that WESD needs to focus on ensuring that it develops and maintains strong relationships through exceptional service.

- Families have what they need when they need it to support their child/ren to reach their goals.
- Ensures sound two-way communication between our team, our families, and our greater community.
- Ensures community members have meaningful opportunities to contribute to the success of our students.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	Family perception of the safety of their child's learning environment (Youth Truth percent positive)	1) 2023-24: 75%	1) 2024-25: 84% (+9% points) EXCEEDED	1) 2025-26: 87% (+3% points) MET	1) 3% percent positive increase year over year	1) 2025-26: 87% (+12% points)
3.2	Family perception of their child being safe from bullying during school (Youth Truth percent positive)	2) 2023-24: 57%	2) 2024-25: 67% (+10% points) EXCEEDED	2) 2025-26: 64% (-3% points) NOT MET	2) 3% percent positive increase year over year	2) 2025-26: 64% (+7% points)
3.3	Family perception that they are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence	3) 2023-24: 60%	3) 2024-25: 60% (no change) NOT MET	3) 2025-26: 63% (+3% points) MET	3) 3% percent positive increase year over year	3) 2025-26: 63% (+3% points)

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	decision-making (Youth Truth percent positive)					
3.4	ParentSquare usage-local data	4) 2023-24: 99% of families are contactable	4) 2024-25: 99.8% (+.8% points) EXCEEDED	4) 2025-26: 100% (+.2% points) EXCEEDED	4) 95% of families are contactable.	4) 2025-26: 100% (+1% points)
3.5	Family Perception that: (Youth Truth percent positive) • they regularly receive feedback about their child's progress • they receive info about what their child should learn and be able to do and • teachers clearly communicate expectations for their child's progress	5) 2023-24: 81%	5) 2024-25: 85% (+4% points) EXCEEDED	5) 2025-26: 88% (+3% points) MET	5) 3% percent positive increase year over year	5) 2025-26: 88% (+7% points)

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.

Successful Implementation
Action 3.1: Educational Partner Engagement (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 3.2: District Mission Statement (Fully Implemented)
Action 3.3: Bilingual Community Liaisons (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 3.4: Translation & Interpretation (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 3.5: Parent Square (Ongoing Implementation)

Challenges in Implementation: There were no challenges in implementation in the 2025-26 school year.

Changes in Implementation: There were no changes in implementation in the 2025-26 school year

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.

Actions with Material Differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures

Action 4: Changed Board meeting translation to by request only as it was becoming cost prohibitive and several meetings were held where no translation was needed.

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

Action 1 was somewhat effective because YouthTruth 2026 indicated that 63% (+3% pts) of families continue to agree that they are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making (Goal is 3% positive increase)

Action 3 was somewhat effective with the use of Bilingual Community Liaisons because the 2026 YouthTruth family perception that:

- they regularly receive feedback about their child's progress
- they receive info about what their child should learn and be able to do and
- teachers clearly communicate expectations for their child's progress

increased 3% (Goal was 3% positive increase)

The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year)
JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED
RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED
WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED

EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED
EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED

SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED
SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED

White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED
White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED
White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED

Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27):

94.01%- now combined percentage for all 3 schools

Action 4 was somewhat effective with the use of additional interpretation and translation because the 2026 YouthTruth family perception that:

- they regularly receive feedback about their child's progress
- they receive info about what their child should learn and be able to do and
- teachers clearly communicate expectations for their child's progress

increased 3% (Goal was 3% positive increase)

Action 5 was somewhat effective with the use of ParentSquare because the 2026 YouthTruth family perception that:

- they regularly receive feedback about their child's progress
- they receive info about what their child should learn and be able to do and
- teachers clearly communicate expectations for their child's progress

increased 3% (Goal was 3% positive increase)

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 were no changes made to the planned goal, metrics, or targeted outcomes for 2026-27.

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	Educational partners are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making.	Through multiple educational partner engagement opportunities, families feel engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making. Examples of educational partner engagement opportunities include but are not limited to: • District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) • English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) • School Site Councils (SSC) • Parent Teacher Clubs (PTC) • Booster Clubs • LCAP Parent Advisory Committee (PAC)	$1,000.00	Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.2	DISCONTINUE: District Mission Statement	DISCONTINUE: The district mission statement is reviewed and re-evaluated with input and feedback from educational partners. The updated mission statement is publicized widely.	$0.00	No
3.3	Bilingual Community Liaisons (BCLs)	Bilingual Community Liaisons (BCLs) are provided at each site to bridge the communication gap between English only speaking staff and Spanish only speaking families. In addition, BCLs provide family education regarding the importance of regular school attendance. BCLs assist ELD teachers with meeting the compliance needs of English Learners.	$221,966.00	Yes
3.4	Translation and Interpretation	Provide translation and interpretation services to families and staff for meetings, conferences, and written translation needs that cannot be put on Parent Square.	$7,000.00	Yes
3.5	Parent Square	Parent Square is provided as the district and school communication platform, allowing two-way communication between staff and families in any language(s).	$7,500.00	No

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
4	Goal 4: Wright Elementary School District implements sound Financial Planning & Decision-Making	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Data analysis from the Dashboard, LCAP mid-year update, Youth Truth survey, and local assessment data revealed that WESD needs to focus on:

- Ensuring resources are allocated where they are most needed, when they are needed.
- Ensuring our resource planning and budget development process engages ALL educational partners to meet immediate needs and ensure long-term fiscal responsibility.
- Ensuring our identified and funded priorities are data driven and lead to improved student outcomes.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.1	1) Annual District Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT) report (local data) Link to LCAP Local Indicator Data: https://www.caschooldashboard.org/reports/49710350000000/2025/conditions-and-climate#local-indicators	1) June 2024: JXW: 86.80%: FAIR RLS: 95.61%: GOOD WCS: 84.74%: FAIR	1) June 2025: EXEMPLARY: 99-100% JXW: 99.81%: (+13.01%) EXEMPLARY RLS: 99.59%: (+3.98%) EXEMPLARY WCS: 99.59%: (+14.85%) EXEMPLARY	1) June 2026: EXEMPLARY: 99-100% JXW: 99.80%: (-0.01%) EXEMPLARY RLS: 99.55%: (-0.04%) EXEMPLARY WCS: 99.56%: (-0.03%) EXEMPLARY	1) All district schools meet at least the "GOOD" criteria (90-98.99%) on the annual FIT report.	1) June 2026: EXEMPLARY: 99-100% JXW: 99.80%: (+13%) EXEMPLARY RLS: 99.55%: (+3.94%) EXEMPLARY WCS: 99.56%: (+14.82%) EXEMPLARY

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			EXCEEDED	EXCEEDED		
4.2	2) Educational Partnership meetings (staff, DELAC/ELAC, SSC, Student Council, and PAC) are held to present LCAP/LCFF education, Dashboard, LCAP mid-year update, and YouthTruth data. Root cause analysis is conducted for identified areas of need, possible solutions are brainstormed. Promoting parental participation in programs for unduplicated pupils and student with IEPs	2) 2023-24: 100% of Educational Partnership meetings are held each year to present LCAP/LCFF education, Dashboard, LCAP mid-year update, and YouthTruth data. Root cause analysis is conducted for identified areas of need, possible solutions are brainstormed.	2) 2024-25: 100% MET	2) 2025-26: 100% MET	2) 100% of Educational Partnership meetings are held each year to present LCAP/LCFF education, Dashboard, LCAP mid-year update, and YouthTruth data. Root cause analysis is conducted for identified areas of need, possible solutions are brainstormed.	2) 2025-26: 100% (no change)
4.3	3) Data Informed Resource Allocation Budgets for: -Certificated salaries -Classified salaries -Benefits -Books and supplies	3) 2023-24: Resources for: -Certificated salaries -Classified salaries -Benefits -Books and supplies are allocated based on data and lead to improved student outcomes via SBAC, ELPAC, and local data scores, RFEP rates, reduced chronic absenteeism, and exiting Differentiated Assistance.	3) 2024-25: Resources continue to be allocated based on data and lead to improved student outcomes via SBAC, ELPAC, and local data scores, RFEP rates, and reducing chronic absenteeism. Differentiated Assistance is exited. EXCEEDED	3) 2025-26: Resources continue to be allocated based on data and lead to improved student outcomes via SBAC, ELPAC, and local data scores, RFEP rates, and reducing chronic absenteeism. EXCEEDED	3) Resources continue to be allocated based on data and lead to improved student outcomes via SBAC, ELPAC, and local data scores, RFEP rates, reduced chronic absenteeism, and exiting Differentiated Assistance.	3) 2025-26: Resources continue to be allocated based on data and lead to improved student outcomes via SBAC, ELPAC, and local data scores, RFEP rates, and reducing chronic absenteeism. Differentiated Assistance is exited.

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.

Successful Implementation
Action 4.1: Maintenance of Facilities (Ongoing Implementation)
Action 4.2: Educational Technology (Ongoing Implementation)

Challenges in Implementation: There were no challenges in implementation in the 2025-26 school year.

Changes in Implementation: There were no changes in implementation in the 2025-26 school year

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.

Actions with Material Differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures:

Action 2: Not all items budgeted were purchased.

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

Action 1 was effective because more preventive maintenance tasks are being completed to assist with ensuring that each school meets the GOOD or EXCEPTIONAL range on the FIT report each year. June 2026:
EXEMPLARY: 99-100%

JXW: 99.80%: (-0.01%)
EXEMPLARY
RLS: 99.55%: (-0.04%) EXEMPLARY
WCS: 99.56%: (-0.03%)
EXEMPLARY

EXCEEDED

Action 2 was somewhat effective because all of the hardware replacement items identified were purchased and deployed to staff and students, keeping our district tech needs adequately met.

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

No changes are being made in 2026-27.

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	Maintenance of Facilities	District will prioritize Preventive Maintenance tasks in order to improve site FIT reports and ensure they consistently score in the "GOOD and EXEMPLARY" ranges.	$177,073.00	No
4.2	Educational Technology	District to provide replacement hardware annually to staff and students on a staggered basis.	$190,830.00	No
4.3	DISCONTINUE: Dean of Students-Wright Charter School	DISCONTINUE: In order to effectively plan and implement programs to increase the achievement of unduplicated students, additional administrative time is necessary.	$0.00	Yes

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
$$3,983,397	$471,069.00

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
32.034%	0.000%	$0.00	32.034%

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
1.3	**Action:** Multilingual Learner Support: This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Designated and Integrated English Language Development (ELD) implementation **Need:** • The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2%	Prioritizing Designated and Integrated ELD instruction in the school day and providing coaching to teachers will address the needs of English learners. It is provided LEA-wide because there are English learners needing to improve in their progress, RFEP rates, and LTEL rates LEA-wide.	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services for unduplicated student groups via: 1.1: ELPAC Scores (Dashboard) 1.2: Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (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
	points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED • The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%) RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%) WCS: 39.0% (+.4%) • 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED **Scope:** LEA-wide		1.5: RFEP rate (Dataquest) 1.13: SBAC ELA Scores (Dashboard)
1.4	**Action:** Equity- Captured in: G101, G102, G103, G105, G10, G107, G108, G109, G110, G111, G112, G113, G115, G116, G117, G118, G119, G120, G121, G201, G202, G203, G204, G206, G208, G209, G301, G303, G304, G305, G401, & G402 **Need:** **Scope:** LEA-wide		
1.5	**Action:** Reading Support	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because providing additional support with reading to students will assist them with reading at grade	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Need: This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing additional support in English Language Arts. 2025 Dashboard SBAC ELA: JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase): 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase): 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%): 2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline:	level. Due to the large numbers of unduplicated students not reading at grade level, this is necessary to provide on an LEA-wide basis.	for unduplicated student groups via: 1.13: Dashboard ELA 1.1: Dashboard Percentage of English Learners district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency 1.2: Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) 1.5: RFEP rate (Dataquest) 1.15: STAR Reading (Local Data) 1.17: Dibels/mCLASS (Local Data) 1.21: Essential standard for ELA

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
	TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83% K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78% 1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79% 2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58% 3: RF.4: 45% 4: RL.4.2: 68% 5: RI.5.2: 69% 6: RL.6.1: 50% • The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED • The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%) RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%) WCS: 39.0% (+.4%) • 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED **Scope:** LEA-wide		
1.8	**Action:** Counselors **Need:**	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because providing additional social emotional support to students with needs will assist them with their sense of safety and belonging at school, improve their attendance, and reduce suspension	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services for unduplicated student groups via:

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 is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Social Emotional Counseling. Youth Truth 2026 student perception: 67%: Do you feel safe at school? (+11% pts) EXCEEDED 33%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+2% pts) IMPROVED The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year) 2025 Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27): 94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools	rates. Due to the large numbers of unduplicated students who are chronically absent and/or not feeling safe or that they are an important part of their school, this is necessary to provide on an LEA-wide basis.	1.6: Suspension rate (Dashboard) 1.7: Expulsion rate (Dataquest) 1.8: Student perception of school safety, belonging, and importance (Youth Truth) 1.9: Chronic Absenteeism (Dashboard) 1.10: Attendance rate (P2 ADA- Aeries local data)

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		
1.9	**Action:** P.E. **Need:** This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Physical Education prep time so teachers can plan. • The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED • The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%) RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%) WCS: 39.0% (+.4%) 2025 Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism: JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because providing additional P.E.to students will assist teachers with planning for instruction.	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services for unduplicated student groups via: 1.1: ELPAC Scores (Dashboard) 1.2: Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) 1.5: RFEP rate (Dataquest) 1.13: SBAC ELA Scores (Dashboard) 1.14: SBAC Math Scores (Dashboard) 1.15: STAR Reading 1.17: Dibels 1.20: Common essential standards math assessments 1.21: Essential standard for ELA

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
	SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27): 94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools 2025 Dashboard ELA: JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED 2025 Dashboard Math: RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points) IMPROVED WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points) IMPROVED The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase): 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point		

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
	cohort increase): 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade: JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%): 2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline: TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83% K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78% 1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79% 2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58% 3: RF.4: 45% 4: RL.4.2: 68% 5: RI.5.2: 69% 6: RL.6.1: 50% The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%): 2025-26 % mastering essential math standard: TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET 1.1: 98%, 2.6 100% K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92% 1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4):		

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97% 2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET 3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79% 4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74% 5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80% 6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67% **Scope:** LEA-wide		
1.12	**Action:** Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) principally benefitting English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth **Need:** This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) • The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED • The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%) RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%) WCS: 39.0% (+.4%) 2025 Dashboard ELA:	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because providing additional support with ELA and math to students will assist them with achieving at grade level. Due to the large numbers of unduplicated students not achieving at grade level, this is necessary to provide on an LEA-wide basis.	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services for unduplicated student groups via: 1.1: ELPAC Scores (Dashboard) 1.2: Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) 1.5: RFEP rate (Dataquest) 1.13: SBAC ELA Scores (Dashboard) 1.14: SBAC Math Scores (Dashboard) 1.15: STAR Reading 1.17: Dibels 1.20: Common essential standards math assessments 1.21: Common essential standards ELA assessments

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
	JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED 2025 Dashboard Math: RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points) IMPROVED WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points) IMPROVED The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase): JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase) : JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%): 2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline: TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83% K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78% 1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3):		

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
	79% 2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58% 3: RF.4: 45% 4: RL.4.2: 68% 5: RI.5.2: 69% 6: RL.6.1: 50% The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%): 2025-26 % mastering essential math standard: TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET 1.1: 98%, 2.6 100% K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92% 1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97% 2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET 3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79% 4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74% 5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80% 6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67% **Scope:** LEA-wide		
1.15	**Action:** Transportation **Need:** Home to school transportation is a critical need in order for students to be able to attend school regularly and benefit from school.	Home to school transportation is a critical need in order for students to be able to attend school regularly and benefit from school.	1.10: Average Daily Attendance 1.09: Chronic Absenteeism 1.13 & 1.14: SBAC Scores 1.1: ELPAC Scores

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
	2025 Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27): 94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools **Scope:** Schoolwide		
1.17	**Action:** Behaviorist **Need:** This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing support for staff and students when students are experiencing behavioral challenges at school. The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year) JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because providing additional support with students experiencing significant behavioral issues will assist them with managing themselves more successfully and achieving school success. Due to the numbers of unduplicated students experiencing significant behavioral challenges at all schools, this is necessary to provide on an LEA-wide basis.	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services for unduplicated student groups via: 1.6: Suspension rate (Dashboard) 1.7: Expulsion rate (Dataquest) 1.8: Student perception of school safety, belonging, and importance (Youth Truth) 1.9: Chronic Absenteeism (Dashboard) 1.10: Attendance rate (P2 ADA- Aeries local data)

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
	SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27): 94.1% combined new percentage for all 3 schools The 2025 Dashboard suspension rate exceeded (Goal was to meet or exceed State average for given year, including Students with Disabilities at JXW) CA: 2.9% JXW: 1.7% (+.1%) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED RLS: 0% (-.4%) Improved CA: EXCEEDED WCS: 2.6% (-.2%) Improved CA: EXCEEDED English Learners (EL): CA: 3.2% EL JXW: 1.6% (+.2%) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED EL RLS: 0% (no change) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED EL WCS: 1.6% (-1.0) Improved CA: EXCEEDED Students With Disabilities (SWD):		

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
	CA: 5% SWD JXW: 1.9% (0%) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 0% (-1.8%) Improved CA: EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 3.6% (+1.1%) Declined CA: EXCEEDED **Scope:** LEA-wide		
1.18	**Action:** Instructional Assistants (IAs) **Need:** This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Instructional Assistants (IAs) 2025 Dashboard ELA: JXW: 11.5 points below standard (+11 points) EXCEEDED RLS: 24.2 points above standard (+2.9 points) IMPROVED 2025 Dashboard Math: RLS: 8.5 points below standard (+3.7 points) IMPROVED WCS: 85.9 points below standard (+.4 points) IMPROVED The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase):	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because providing additional support with ELA and math to students will assist them with achieving at grade level. Due to the large numbers of unduplicated students not achieving at grade level, this is necessary to provide on an LEA-wide basis.	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services for unduplicated student groups via: 1.1: ELPAC Scores (Dashboard) 1.2: Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) 1.5: RFEP rate (Dataquest) 1.13: SBAC ELA Scores (Dashboard) 1.14: SBAC Math Scores (Dashboard) 1.15: STAR Reading 1.17: Dibels 1.20: Common essential standards math assessments 1.21: Essential standard for ELA

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
	JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase) : JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%): 2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline: TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83% K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78% 1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79% 2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58% 3: RF.4: 45% 4: RL.4.2: 68% 5: RI.5.2: 69% 6: RL.6.1: 50% The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%): 2025-26 % mastering essential math standard: TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET 1.1: 98%, 2.6 100%		

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
	K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92% 1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97% 2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET 3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79% 4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74% 5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80% 6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67% 6: 6: 63% **Scope:** LEA-wide		
1.21	**Action:** Data Analysis staff (qualitative action toward MPP) **Need:** This action is improving the services for unduplicated students by providing staff to collect and analyze ELA, ELD, Math, SEL, Behavior, and Attendance data to monitor achievement of Unduplicated students (English Learners, socio-economically disadvantaged students, and Foster Youth), and coordinate supports. Wright ESD is using a portion of existing staff time to analyze data relating to Unduplicated students (English Learners, socio-economically disadvantaged students, and Foster Youth). The amount of existing staff time used to analyze data and coordinate supports related to Unduplicated	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because providing staff to collect and analyze ELA, ELD, Math, SEL, Behavior, and Attendance data to monitor achievement of Unduplicated students (English Learners, socio-economically disadvantaged students, and Foster Youth), and coordinate supports will assist them with achieving at grade level. Due to the large numbers of unduplicated students not achieving at grade level, this is necessary to provide on an LEA-wide basis.	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services for unduplicated student groups via: 1.1: ELPAC Scores (Dashboard) 1.2: Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) 1.5: RFEP rate (Dataquest) 1.6: Suspension rate (Dashboard) 1.8: YouthTruth Student perception of school safety, belonging, and importance

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
	students (English Learners, socio-economically disadvantaged students, and Foster Youth) will be equivalent to the time that the 6.58 full-time staff would have spent doing the work equivalent to the amount of $938,892.00. Wright ESD divided the estimated cost of $938,892.00 by $12,434,819 (the LCFF base grant) and converted the quotient to a percentage. The proportional contribution of the action contributes 7.55 percent towards meeting Wright ESD's MPP of 32.03%. • The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED • The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%) RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%) WCS: 39.0% (+.4%) • 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year) JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED		1.9: Chronic Absenteeism (Dashboard) 1.10: Attendance Rate (P2 Average Daily Attendance)- Aeries local data 1.13: SBAC ELA Scores (Dashboard) 1.14: SBAC Math Scores (Dashboard) 1.15: STAR Reading 1.17: Dibels/mCLASS 1.20: Common essential standards math assessments 1.21: Essential standard for ELA

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
	EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27): 94.01%- now combined percentage for all 3 schools The 2025 Dashboard suspension rate goal was exceeded (Goal is to meet or exceed the state average each year for corresponding student groups) 2025: English Learners (EL): CA: 3.2% EL JXW: 1.6% (+.2%) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED EL RLS: 0% (no change) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED EL WCS: 1.6% (-1.0) Improved CA: EXCEEDED Students With Disabilities (SWD): CA: 5%		

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
	SWD JXW: 1.9% (0%) Maintained CA: EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 0% (-1.8%) Improved CA: EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 3.6% (+1.1%) Declined CA: EXCEEDED The 2025 Dashboard SBAC ELA scores for student groups improved or exceeded the goal in some areas (Goal is 5% point increase) EL JXW: 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) IMPROVED SWD JXW: 89.4 points below standard (+13.2 points) EXCEEDED SWD: RLS: 32.9 points below standard (+20 points) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 93 points below standard (+5.1 points) EXCEEDED The 2025 Dashboard Math scores for student groups improved or exceeded the goal in some areas (Goal is 5% point increase) EL WCS: 102 points below standard (+2.6 points) IMPROVED SWD: RLS: 74.8 points below standard (+22.6 points) EXCEEDED The 2026 STAR Reading scores in March 5th grade exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase): JXW: 60% at Grade Level (+4% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 78% at Grade Level (+6% points) EXCEEDED		

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
	The 2026 Dibels Reading scores in March 2nd grade improved/exceeded (Goal was 3% point cohort increase) : JXW: 54% (+32% points) EXCEEDED RLS: 51% (+5% points) EXCEEDED WCS: 43% (+7% points) EXCEEDED The 2025-26 Essential standards baseline for ELA mastered via common assessment was established (Goal is 100%): 2025-26 % mastering essential ELA standard- this is baseline: TK: 2.4: 100%, 2.7: 93%, 2.2: 83% K: RF.K.3: 84%, RF.K.2(1): 88%, RF.K.2(2): 82%, RF.K.3-C: 78% 1: RF.1.3(1): 87%, RF.1.3(2): 89%, RF.1.3(3): 79% 2: RF.2.3: 73%, RF.2.4: 58% 3: RF.4: 45% 4: RL.4.2: 68% 5: RI.5.2: 69% 6: RL.6.1: 50% The 2025-26 Essential standards for math mastered via common assessment (local data) improved/met (Goal is 100%): 2025-26 % mastering essential math standard: TK: 1.2: 97%- NOT MET 1.1: 98%, 2.6 100% K: CC.1: 81%- IMPROVED CC.5: 86%, CC.B.4(1): 84%, CC.B.4(2): 94%, CC.B.4(3): 92% 1: OA.A.1(1): 94%- NOT MET		

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
	OA.A.1(2): 98%, OA.A.1(3): 96%, OA.A.1(4): 95%, OA.A.1(5): 85%, NBT2: 97% 2: OA.B: 73%- NOT MET 3: OA.7: 85%- NOT MET, NF.1: 79% 4: OA.B.4: 59%- NOT MET, NBT.5: 74% 5: NBT.5.5: 67%- NOT MET, NBT.5.3b: 80% 6: RP.1: 61%- NOT MET, RP.A.3C: 67% **Scope:** LEA-wide		
2.6	**Action:** High Quality Teachers to principally benefit English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth through: • early release days for teacher planning time • professional development days • Tier 2 intervention small group flexible grouping within the school day **Need:** This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Certificated Teaching Staff. See metrics 1.1 through 1.21 in Goal 1. **Scope:** LEA-wide	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because providing high quality teachers is paramount to meeting the needs of district students LEA-wide, 79% of whom are unduplicated.	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services for unduplicated student groups via: See metrics 1.1 through 1.21 in Goal 1.
2.9	**Action:** Release time for best practice observations		

Goal and Action #	Identified Need(s)	How the Action(s) Address Need(s) and Why it is Provided on an LEA-wide or Schoolwide Basis	Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness
	Need: **Scope:** LEA-wide		
3.1	**Action:** Educational partners are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making. **Need:** This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing regular opportunities for educational partners to be engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making: 2026: YT percent positive- students 67%: Do you feel safe at school? (+11 % pts) EXCEEDED 33%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+2% pts) IMPROVED The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year) JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because educational partner engagement opportunities are provided at each site to help families feel engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making. Examples of educational partner engagement opportunities include but are not limited to: • District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) • English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) • School Site Councils (SSC) • Parent Teacher Clubs (PTC) • Booster Clubs • LCAP Parent Advisory Committee (PAC)	1.1: ELPAC Scores (Dashboard) 1.2: Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) 1.5: RFEP rate (Dataquest) 1.9: Chronic Absenteeism (Dashboard) 1.10: P2 ADA (Local data) 3.3: YouthTruth- Family perception that they are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making

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
	SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27): 94.01%- now combined percentage for all 3 schools YouthTruth 2026 indicated that 63% (+3% pts) of families continue to agree that they are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making (Goal is 3% positive increase) • The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED • The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%) RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%) WCS: 39.0% (+.4%) • 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED		

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		
3.3	**Action:** Bilingual Community Liaisons (BCLs) **Need:** This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Bilingual Community Liaisons (BCLs). 2026: YT percent positive- students 67%: Do you feel safe at school? (+11 % pts) EXCEEDED 33%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+2% pts) IMPROVED The Chronic Absenteeism rates on the 2025 Dashboard improved or exceeded goals in all areas (Goal was to decrease 5% points year over year) JXW: 16.3% (-4.6% pts) IMPROVED RLS: 12.7% (-6.2% pts) EXCEEDED WCS: 24.3% (-4.8% pts) IMPROVED EL JXW: 12.7% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL RLS: 12.8% (-10% pts) EXCEEDED EL WCS: 16.1% (-6.8% pts) EXCEEDED SWD JXW: 20.8% (-8.1% pts) EXCEEDED SWD RLS: 15.6% (-8% pts) EXCEEDED SWD WCS: 28% (-7% pts) EXCEEDED White JXW: 19% (-0.7% pts) IMPROVED White RLS: 13% (-8.6% pts) EXCEEDED	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because Bilingual Community Liaisons (BCLs) are provided at each site to bridge the communication gap between English only speaking staff and Spanish only speaking families. (EL percentage is 38%) In addition, BCLs provide family education regarding the importance of regular school attendance (EL chronic absenteeism rate is high). BCLs assist ELD teachers with meeting the compliance needs of English Learners.	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services for unduplicated student groups via: 1.1: ELPAC Scores (Dashboard) 1.2: Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) 1.5: RFEP rate (Dataquest) 1.8: YouthTruth- student safety & importance 1.9: Chronic Absenteeism (Dashboard) 1.10: P2 ADA (Local data) 3.3: YouthTruth- Family perception that they are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making

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
	White WCS: 27.8% (-2% pts) IMPROVED Period 2 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) maintained in 2025-26 (Goal is 95% in 2026-27): 94.01%- now combined percentage for all 3 schools 2026: YT percent positive- students 67%: Do you feel safe at school? (+11 % pts) EXCEEDED 33%: Do you feel like an important part of your school? (+2% pts) IMPROVED YouthTruth 2026 indicated that 63% (+3% pts) of families continue to agree that they are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making (Goal is 3% positive increase) • The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED • The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%) RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%) WCS: 39.0% (+.4%) • 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED		

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		
3.4	**Action:** Translation and Interpretation **Need:** This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Translation Services. YouthTruth 2026 indicated that 63% (+3% pts) of families continue to agree that they are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making (Goal is 3% positive increase) • The percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) improved 2% points to 13% (Goal was 10% decrease) IMPROVED • The 2025 Dashboard percentage of ELLs district wide making progress toward English Language Proficiency maintained at 46.9% (-.4%) MAINTAINED JXW: 54.8% (+15.2%) RLS: 43.4% (-10.1%) WCS: 39.0% (+.4%) • 2025 JXW ELA SBAC scores for ELs was 49 points below standard (+3.9 points) (Goal was 5 point increase) IMPROVED **Scope:** LEA-wide	This action is provided on an LEA-wide basis because contracted translators/interpreters bridge the communication gap between English only speaking staff and families speaking languages other than English. (EL percentage is 38%)	To ensure effectiveness, we will monitor increased and/or improved services for unduplicated student groups via: 1.1: ELPAC Scores (Dashboard) 1.2: Percent of ELL "at risk 4-5 years" plus LTEL (Dataquest) 1.5: RFEP rate (Dataquest) 3.3: YouthTruth- Family perception that they are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making

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
4.3	**Action:** DISCONTINUE: Dean of Students- Wright Charter School **Need:** DISCONTINUED **Scope:** Schoolwide	DISCONTINUED	DISCONTINUED

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

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.

N/A

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.

Wright ESD is rich with support staff providing direct services to students at schools that have a high concentration (above 55%) of foster youth, English learners, and low-income students.

79% of Wright ESD students are socioeconomically disadvantaged. Support staff funded from additional concentration grant include classroom teachers, an ELD teacher, Reading Intervention teachers, ELD assistants, Student Support Instructional Assistants, and Instructional assistants.

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	N/A	1:37
Staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students	N/A	1:25

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	$12,434,819.00	$3,983,397	32.034%	0.000%	32.034%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$8,734,003.00	$3,182,445.00	$190,830.00	$377,040.00	$12,484,318.00	$9,189,296.00	$3,295,022.00

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	Youth Truth Survey	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$0.00	$750.00	$750.00				$750.00	
1	1.2	Social Emotional Learning (SEL) & Behavior (LREBG Action)	All	No			All Schools	2026-27	$178,742.00	$0.00		$178,742.00			$178,742.00	
1	1.3	Multilingual Learner Support: This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Designated and Integrated English Language Development (ELD) implementation	English Learners	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	All Schools	2024-2027	$523,207.00	$6,000.00	$529,207.00				$529,207.00	
1	1.4	Equity- Captured in: G101, G102, G103, G105, G10, G107, G108, G109, G110, G111, G112, G113, G115, G116, G117, G118, G119, G120, G121, G201, G202, G203, G204, G206, G208, G209, G301, G303, G304, G305, G401, & G402	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2025-27	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
1	1.5	Reading Support	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2024-2027	$234,128.00	$0.00	$234,128.00				$234,128.00	
1	1.6	Math	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
1	1.7	Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELO-P)	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$185,646.00	$2,261,281.00		$2,446,927.00			$2,446,927.00	
1	1.8	Counselors	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2024-2027	$323,548.00	$0.00	$323,548.00				$323,548.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
1	1.9	P.E.	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2026-27	$154,639.00	$0.00	$154,639.00				$154,639.00	
1	1.10	Music	All	No			All Schools	2026-27	$159,728.00	$0.00		$159,728.00			$159,728.00	
1	1.11	School Attendance Review Board (SARB)	All	No			All Schools	2024-27	$0.00	$6,000.00		$6,000.00			$6,000.00	
1	1.12	Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) principally benefitting English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2024-2027	$175,355.00	$0.00	$175,355.00				$175,355.00	
1	1.13	Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) to support Students with IEPs with achieving grade level standards.	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$149,376.00	$0.00				$149,376.00	$149,376.00	
1	1.14	Universal Transitional Kindergarten (UTK) Instructional Assistants	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$246,546.00	$0.00	$246,546.00				$246,546.00	
1	1.15	Transportation	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Wright Elementary School	2024-2027	$0.00	$463,755.00	$463,755.00				$463,755.00	
1	1.16	Field trips and Assemblies	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
1	1.17	Behaviorist	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2024-2027	$183,636.00	$0.00	$183,636.00				$183,636.00	
1	1.18	Instructional Assistants (IAs)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2024-2027	$279,249.00	$0.00	$279,249.00				$279,249.00	
1	1.19	Multilingual Learner Support: This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Designated and Integrated English Language Development (ELD) implementation	English Language Learners	No			All Schools	2025-2027	$47,109.00	$0.00				$47,109.00	$47,109.00	
1	1.20	Reading Support	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$180,555.00	$0.00				$180,555.00	$180,555.00	

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	1.21	Data Analysis staff (qualitative action toward MPP)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2025-27								7.55
1	1.22	Counselors	All	No			All Schools	2026-27	$138,662.00	$0.00		$138,662.00			$138,662.00	
1	1.23	Amplify Math Adoption	All	No			All Schools	2026-27	$0.00	$136,833.00		$136,833.00			$136,833.00	
2	2.1	Instructional Leadership Team- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) LREBG Action	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$20,263.00	$25,000.00		$45,263.00			$45,263.00	
2	2.2	Student Code of Conduct (Family Handbook)	All	No			All Schools	2024-27	$1,500.00	$12,000.00		$13,500.00			$13,500.00	
2	2.3	English Language Arts Professional Development- (LREBG Action)	All	No			All Schools	2025-26	$41,749.00	$0.00		$41,749.00			$41,749.00	
2	2.4	Math Professional Development- (LREBG Action)	All	No			All Schools	2026-27	$10,007.00	$0.00		$10,007.00			$10,007.00	
2	2.5	Growth Mindset and Grit- (Captured in G102, G201, G203, & G204)	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
2	2.6		English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2024-2027	$1,155,964.00	$0.00	$1,155,964.00				$1,155,964.00	
2	2.7	DISCONTINUE: Alarm System	All	No			All Schools	2024-2025	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
2	2.8	Certificated teaching staff	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$4,572,687.00	$0.00	$4,572,687.00				$4,572,687.00	
2	2.9	Release time for best practice observations	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2026-27	$5,034.00	$0.00		$5,034.00			$5,034.00	
3	3.1	Educational partners are engaged in their school and	English Learners Foster Youth	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth	All Schools	2024-2027	$0.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00				$1,000.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
		feel empowered to influence decision-making.	Low Income			Low Income										
3	3.2	DISCONTINUE: District Mission Statement	All	No			All Schools	2024-2025	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	
3	3.3	Bilingual Community Liaisons (BCLs)	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2024-2027	$221,966.00	$0.00	$221,966.00				$221,966.00	
3	3.4	Translation and Interpretation	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	2024-2027	$0.00	$7,000.00	$7,000.00				$7,000.00	
3	3.5	Parent Square	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$0.00	$7,500.00	$7,500.00				$7,500.00	
4	4.1	Maintenance of Facilities	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$0.00	$177,073.00	$177,073.00				$177,073.00	
4	4.2	Educational Technology	All	No			All Schools	2024-2027	$0.00	$190,830.00			$190,830.00		$190,830.00	
4	4.3	DISCONTINUE: Dean of Students- Wright Charter School	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: WCS	2024-2025	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00				$0.00	

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
$12,434,819.00	$3,983,397	32.034%	0.000%	32.034%	$3,729,447.00	7.550%	37.542 %	**Total:**	$3,729,447.00
								LEA-wide Total:	$3,265,692.00
								Limited Total:	$0.00
								Schoolwide Total:	$463,755.00

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	**1.3**	Multilingual Learner Support: This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Designated and Integrated English Language Development (ELD) implementation	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners	All Schools	$529,207.00	
1	**1.4**	Equity- Captured in: G101, G102, G103, G105, G10, G107, G108, G109, G110, G111, G112, G113, G115, G116, G117, G118, G119, G120, G121, G201, G202, G203, G204, G206, G208, G209, G301, G303, G304, G305, G401, & G402	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$0.00	

Goal	Action #	Action Title	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Planned Expenditures for Contributing Actions (LCFF Funds)	Planned Percentage of Improved Services (%)
1	1.5	Reading Support	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$234,128.00	
1	1.8	Counselors	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$323,548.00	
1	1.9	P.E.	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$154,639.00	
1	1.12	Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) principally benefitting English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$175,355.00	
1	1.15	Transportation	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: Wright Elementary School	$463,755.00	
1	1.17	Behaviorist	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$183,636.00	
1	1.18	Instructional Assistants (IAs)	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$279,249.00	
1	1.21	Data Analysis staff (qualitative action toward MPP)	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		7.55
2	2.6	High Quality Teachers to principally benefit English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth through: • early release days for teacher planning time • professional development days	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,155,964.00	

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 (%)
		• Tier 2 intervention small group flexible grouping within the school day						
2	**2.9**	Release time for best practice observations	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools		
3	**3.1**	Educational partners are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making.	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$1,000.00	
3	**3.3**	Bilingual Community Liaisons (BCLs)	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$221,966.00	
3	**3.4**	Translation and Interpretation	Yes	LEA-wide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	All Schools	$7,000.00	
4	**4.3**	DISCONTINUE: Dean of Students- Wright Charter School	Yes	Schoolwide	English Learners Foster Youth Low Income	Specific Schools: WCS	$0.00	

2025-26 Annual Update Table

Totals	Last Year's Total Planned Expenditures (Total Funds)	Total Estimated Expenditures (Total Funds)
Totals	$12,424,813.00	$12,705,976.91

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**	Youth Truth Survey	No	$2,213.00	$768.00
1	**1.2**	Social Emotional Learning (SEL) & Behavior (LREBG Action)	No	$202,943.00	$171,902.64
1	**1.3**	Multilingual Learner Support: This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Designated and Integrated English Language Development (ELD) implementation	Yes	$740,802.00	$762,665.08
1	**1.4**	Equity- Captured in: G101, G102, G103, G105, G10, G107, G108, G109, G110, G111, G112, G113, G115, G116, G117, G118, G119, G120, G121, G201, G202, G203, G204, G206, G208, G209, G301, G303, G304, G305, G401, & G402	Yes	$0.00	$0.00
1	**1.5**	Reading Support	Yes	$281,466.00	$258,507.62
1	**1.6**	Math	No	$0.00	$0.00
1	**1.7**	Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELO-P)	No	$2,103,204.00	$2,281,411.36
1	**1.8**	Counselors	Yes	$455,979.00	$451,967.43

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	1.9	P.E.	Yes	$154,424.00	$154,631.42
1	1.10	Music	No	$159,544.00	$159,723.00
1	1.11	School Attendance Review Board (SARB)	No	$0.00	$0.00
1	1.12	Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) principally benefitting English Learners, Foster Youth, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth	Yes	$196,311.00	$204,333.24
1	1.13	Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) to support Students with IEPs with achieving grade level standards.	No	$167,228.00	$173,031.26
1	1.14	Universal Transitional Kindergarten (UTK) Instructional Assistants	No	$199,415.00	$246,224.62
1	1.15	Transportation	Yes	$279,734.00	$443,010.00
1	1.16	Field trips and Assemblies	No	$0.00	$0.00
1	1.17	Behaviorist	Yes	$179,293.00	$179,518.67
1	1.18	Instructional Assistants (IAs)	Yes	$390,825.00	$371,906.51
1	1.19	Multilingual Learner Support: This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Designated and Integrated English	No	$58,593.00	$55,682.67

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)
		Language Development (ELD) implementation			
1	1.20	Reading Support	No	$230,100.00	$225,128.63
1	1.21	Data Analysis staff (qualitative action toward MPP)	Yes	$0.00	$0.00
2	2.1	Instructional Leadership Team-Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) LREBG Action	No	$44,557.00	$38,110.77
2	2.2	Student Code of Conduct (Family Handbook)	No	$0.00	$0.00
2	2.3	English Language Arts Professional Development- (LREBG Action)	No	$24,871.00	$12,826.00
2	2.4	Math Professional Development- (LREBG Action)	No	$6,113.00	$5,863.77
2	2.5	Growth Mindset and Grit- (Captured in G102, G201, G203, & G204)	No	$0.00	$0.00
2	2.6	High Quality Teachers to principally benefit Unduplicated students through early release days for planning time, prof. dev. days, Tier 2 intervention within the school day.	Yes	$1,208,589.00	$1,210,041.41
2	2.7	DISCONTINUE: Alarm System	No	$0.00	$0.00
2	2.8	Certificated teaching staff	No	$4,677,656.00	$4,742,947.78
2	2.9	Release time for best practice observations	Yes	$61,115.00	$0.00
3	3.1	Educational partners are engaged in their school and feel empowered to influence decision-making	No	$0.00	$0.00

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)
3	3.2	DISCONTINUE: District Mission Statement	No	$0.00	$0.00
3	3.3	Bilingual Community Liaisons (BCLs)	Yes	$247,573.00	$247,296.60
3	3.4	Translation and Interpretation	Yes	$25,000.00	$6,209.97
3	3.5	Parent Square	No	$7,500.00	$7,500.00
4	4.1	Maintenance of Facilities	No	$183,865.00	$183,865.00
4	4.2	Educational Technology	No	$135,900.00	$110,903.46
4	4.3	DISCONTINUE: Dean of Students-Wright Charter School	Yes	$0.00	$0.00

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)
$3,870,973	$4,221,111.00	$4,290,087.95	($68,976.95)	8.000%	8.000%	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	1.3	Multilingual Learner Support: This action is increasing and/or improving the services for unduplicated students by providing Designated and Integrated English Language Development (ELD) implementation	Yes	$740,802.00	$762,665.08		
1	1.4	Equity- Captured in: G101, G102, G103, G105, G10, G107, G108, G109, G110, G111, G112, G113, G115, G116, G117, G118, G119, G120, G121, G201, G202, G203, G204, G206, G208, G209, G301, G303, G304, G305, G401, & G402	Yes	$0.00	$0.00		
1	1.5	Reading Support	Yes	$281,466.00	$258,507.62		
1	1.8	Counselors	Yes	$455,979.00	$451,967.43		
1	1.9	P.E.	Yes	$154,424.00	$154,631.42		
1	1.12	Student Support Instructional Assistants (SSIAs) principally benefitting English Learners, Foster Youth, and	Yes	$196,311.00	$204,333.24		

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)
		Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Youth					
1	1.15	Transportation	Yes	$279,734.00	$443,010.00		
1	1.17	Behaviorist	Yes	$179,293.00	$179,518.67		
1	1.18	Instructional Assistants (IAs)	Yes	$390,825.00	$371,906.51		
1	1.21	Data Analysis staff (qualitative action toward MPP)	Yes			8	8
2	2.6	High Quality Teachers to principally benefit Unduplicated students through early release days for planning time, prof. dev. days, Tier 2 intervention within the school day.	Yes	$1,208,589.00	$1,210,041.41		
2	2.9	Release time for best practice observations	Yes	$61,115.00	$0.00		
3	3.3	Bilingual Community Liaisons (BCLs)	Yes	$247,573.00	$247,296.60		
3	3.4	Translation and Interpretation	Yes	$25,000.00	$6,209.97		
4	4.3	DISCONTINUE: Dean of Students- Wright Charter School	Yes	$0.00	$0.00		

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)
$11,927,584	$3,870,973	4.415	36.869%	$4,290,087.95	8.000%	43.968%	$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 32526(c)(2); and
            - An explanation of how the action is expected to address the area(s) of need of students and schools identified in the needs assessment required by *EC* Section 32526(d).
                - For information related to the allowable uses of funds and the required needs assessment, please see the Program Information tab on the LREBG Program Information web page.
            - Actions may be grouped together for purposes of these explanations.
            - The LEA may provide these explanations as part of the action description rather than as part of the Reflections: Annual Performance.
    - If the LEA does not have unexpended LREBG funds, the LEA is not required to conduct the needs assessment required by *EC* Section 32627(d), to provide the information identified above or to include actions funded with LREBG funds within the 2026-27, 2026-27 and 2027-28 LCAPs.

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

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

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

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

Schools Identified

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

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

Support for Identified Schools

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

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

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

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

Engaging Educational Partners

Purpose

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

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

Requirements

Requirements

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

- Teachers,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Respond to the prompts as follows:

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Educational Partners

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

Process for Engagement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Goals and Actions

Purpose

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

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

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

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

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

Requirement to Address the LCFF State Priorities

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

Respond to the following prompts, as applicable:

Focus Goal(s)

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

Description

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

Focus goals for Equity Multiplier schoolsites must address the following:

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

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Explain why the LEA has chosen to prioritize this goal.

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

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

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

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

Broad Goal

Description

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

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Maintenance of Progress Goal

Description

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

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

Type of Goal

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

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

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

Measuring and Reporting Results:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Metric #

- Enter the metric number.

Metric

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

Baseline

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

Year 1 Outcome

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

Year 2 Outcome

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

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

Target for Year 3 Outcome

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

Current Difference from Baseline

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

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

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

Goal Analysis:

Enter the LCAP Year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The reasons for the ineffectiveness, and
- How changes to the action will result in a new or strengthened approach.

Actions:

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

Action #

- Enter the action number.

Title

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

Description

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

Total Funds

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

Contributing

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

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

Required Actions

For English Learners and Long-Term English Learners

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

For Technical Assistance

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

For Lowest Performing Dashboard Indicators

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

For LEAs With Unexpended LREBG Funds

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

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

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

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

Purpose

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

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

Statutory Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

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

For School Districts Only

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

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

Requirements and Instructions

Complete the tables as follows:

Total Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants

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

Projected Additional 15 percent LCFF Concentration Grant

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover — Percentage

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

LCFF Carryover — Dollar

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

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

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

Required Descriptions:

LEA-wide and Schoolwide Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

Limited Actions

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

Identified Need(s)

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

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

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

Metric(s) to Monitor Effectiveness

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

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

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

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

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

Additional Concentration Grant Funding

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

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

Provide the following descriptions, as applicable to the LEA:

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

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

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

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

Complete the table as follows:

- Provide the staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students with a concentration of unduplicated students that is 55 percent or less and the staff-to-student ratio of classified staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, as applicable to the LEA.
    - The LEA may group its schools by grade span (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and High Schools), as applicable to the LEA.
    - The staff-to-student ratio must be based on the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff and the number of enrolled students as counted on the first Wednesday in October of each year.
- Provide the staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is 55 percent or less and the staff-to-student ratio of certificated staff providing direct services to students at schools with a concentration of unduplicated students that is greater than 55 percent, as applicable to the LEA.
    - The LEA may group its schools by grade span (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and High Schools), as applicable to the LEA.
    - The staff-to-student ratio must be based on the number of FTE staff and the number of enrolled students as counted on the first Wednesday in October of each year.

Action Tables

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

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

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

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

Total Planned Expenditures Table

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Annual Update Table

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

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

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

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

Calculations in the Action Tables

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

Contributing Actions Table

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

Contributing Actions Annual Update Table

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

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

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

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

LCFF Carryover Table

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

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

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

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

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

California Department of Education
November 2024