School Year: **2026-27**

Schoolwide Plan Program (SWP)
School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)

School Name	County-District-School (CDS) Code	Schoolsite Council (SSC) Approval Date	Local Board Approval Date
La Mesa Dale Elementary	37-68197-6038475	May 21, 2026	June 16, 2026

The School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) is a strategic plan that maximizes the resources available to the school while minimizing duplication of effort with the ultimate goal of increasing student achievement. SPSA development should be aligned with and inform the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) process.

This SPSA template consolidates all school-level planning efforts into one plan for programs funded through the Consolidated Application (ConApp), and for federal Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), pursuant to California Education Code (EC) Section 64001 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This template is designed to meet schoolwide program planning requirements for both the SPSA and federal ATSI planning requirements.

California's ESSA State Plan supports the state's approach to improving student group performance through the utilization of federal resources. Schools use the SPSA to document their approach to maximizing the impact of federal investments in support of underserved students. The implementation of ESSA in California presents an opportunity for schools to innovate with their federally-funded programs and align them with the priority goals of the school and the local educational agency (LEA) that are being realized under the state's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF).

The LCFF provides schools and LEAs flexibility to design programs and provide services that meet the needs of students in order to achieve readiness for college, career, and lifelong learning. The SPSA planning process supports continuous cycles of action, reflection, and improvement. Consistent with EC 64001(g)(1), the Schoolsite Council (SSC) is required to develop and annually review the SPSA, establish an annual budget, and make modifications to the plan that reflect changing needs and priorities, as applicable.

This plan is being used by La Mesa Dale Elementary for meeting ESSA's planning requirements for Schoolwide Plan Program (SWP) in alignment with the LCAP and other federal, state, and local programs.

This template is based on the December, 2023 CDE revision of the School Plan for Student Achievement. Some modifications have been made inform the SPSA development process.

Table of Contents

SPSA Title Page 1
Table of Contents 2
Plan Description 4
Educational Partner Involvement 4
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components 4
California School Dashboard (Dashboard) Indicators 4
Other Needs 5
School and Student Performance Data 6
Student Enrollment 6
CAASPP Results 9
ELPAC Results 14
Student Population 18
Overall Performance 20
Academic Performance 22
Academic Engagement 32
Conditions & Climate 34
Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures 36
Goal 1 36
Goal 2 38
Goal 3 40
Goal 4 42
Budget Summary 45
Budget Summary 45
Other Federal, State, and Local Funds 45
Budgeted Funds and Expenditures in this Plan 46
Funds Budgeted to the School by Funding Source 46
Expenditures by Funding Source 46
Expenditures by Budget Reference 46
Expenditures by Budget Reference and Funding Source 47
Expenditures by Goal 47
School Site Council Membership 48
Recommendations and Assurances 49
Instructions 50
Appendix A: Plan Requirements 57
Appendix B: Plan Requirements for School to CSI/ATSI Planning Requirements 60
Appendix C: Select State and Federal Programs 63

Plan Description

Briefly describe your school's plan for effectively meeting the ESSA's planning requirements for Schoolwide Plan Program (SWP) in alignment with the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and other federal, state, and local programs.

Our School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) aligns with the District's Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) as each goal (and its associated strategy(ies)/activity(ies)) can be referenced in the current LCAP. The district's LCAP is the foundation for all expenditures incurred by the District. Based on the needs assessment and goals found in the LCAP, the school will utilize federal funds, when applicable, to supplement base funding in accordance with the purpose and goals of each specific goal. Federal funds, if received, will be used as outlined in the School Plan for Student Achievement to purchase supplemental materials not part of the adopted standards aligned curriculum and core base programs.

Educational Partner Involvement

How, when, and with whom did your La Mesa Dale Elementary consult as part of the planning process for this SPSA/Annual Review and Update?

Involvement Process for the SPSA and Annual Review and Update

Feedback and input from key educational partner groups are critical for the ongoing success of our students. As part of the planning process for the 2026-27 School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA), school leadership met with the School Site Council (SSC) and the English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC). Achievement data (local and state, if available) was shared with these groups and analyzed for trends and patterns of under-performance. That analysis is summarized in the SPSA as the Annual Review for each goal.

School educational partner involvement meeting dates were as follows:
* ELAC #4 Meeting, April 23, 2026
* SSC # 4 Meeting, April 23, 2026; SSC #5 Meeting, May 21, 2026
* Staff Meeting where the 2026-27 SPSA goals and metrics was discussed: April 28, 2026

Feedback from these meetings resulted in the development of goals to be included in the SPSA (Planned Improvement Goals). The district Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) was also reviewed to ensure that the Planned Improvement goals of the SPSA aligned with the goals outlined in the District's LCAP.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components

Identify and describe any areas that need significant improvement based on a review of Dashboard and local data, including any areas of low performance and significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators, and any steps taken to address those areas.

California School Dashboard (Dashboard) Indicators

Referring to the California School Dashboard (Dashboard), any state indicator for which overall performance was in the "Red" or "Orange" performance category.

All indicators on the Dashboard are green with the exception of overall suspension, which is orange.

Referring to the California School Dashboard (Dashboard), any state indicator for which performance for any student group was two or more performance levels below the "all student" performance.

Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students are two performance levels below "all students" in ELA performance. This gap will require strengthened Tier 1 instruction, strategic intervention, and expanded literacy access opportunities. Students with Disabilities are two performance levels below "all students" in Math performance.

Other Needs

In addition to Dashboard data, other needs may be identified using locally collected data developed by the LEA to measure pupil outcomes.

In addition to Dashboard data, locally collected data from i-Ready Diagnostics indicate a need to strengthen mathematics achievement across grade levels. While students are demonstrating growth, a significant number remain below grade-level expectations, particularly in foundational skills, problem-solving, and mathematical reasoning. These needs will be addressed through the implementation of the newly adopted math curriculum, with a focus on strengthening Tier 1 instruction, increasing opportunities for conceptual understanding, and providing targeted Tier 2 support based on ongoing formative and diagnostic data.

School and Student Performance Data

Student Enrollment

This report displays the annual K-12 public school enrollment by student ethnicity and grade level for La Mesa Dale Elementary. Annual enrollment consists of the number of students enrolled on Census Day (the first Wednesday in October). This information was submitted to the CDE as part of the annual Fall 1 data submission in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

Enrollment By Student Group

Student Enrollment by Subgroup						
Student Group	Percent of Enrollment			Number of Students		
	23-24	24-25	25-26	23-24	24-25	25-26
African American	11.73%	11.09%	10.37%	61	51	53
Asian	4.04%	2.83%	4.89%	21	13	25
Filipino	4.04%	2.61%	2.35%	21	12	12
Hispanic/Latino	54.04%	50.22%	46.58%	281	231	238
Pacific Islander	%	0.22%	0.20%		1	1
White	18.27%	22.17%	22.50%	95	102	115
Multiple/No Response	7.31%	10.22%	12.13%	38	47	62
			Total Enrollment	520	460	511

Enrollment By Grade Level

Student Enrollment by Grade Level			
Grade	Number of Students		
	23-24	24-25	25-26
Transitional Kindergarten		48	58
Kindergarten	67	53	84
Grade 1	81	71	64
Grade 2	77	73	75
Grade3	80	76	81
Grade 4	67	70	78
Grade 5	68	69	71
Grade 6	56		
Total Enrollment	520	460	511

Conclusions based on this data:

1. The most significant enrollment decline is explained by the transition of 6th grade to middle school. The drop from 520 students in 2023–24 to 460 in 2024–25 reflects the District's structural change moving 6th grade to the middle school. This shift accounts for a substantial portion of the decline and represents a reconfiguration rather than a loss of families from our community.

2. Upper elementary grades have remained relatively stable. Grades 3–5 show more consistency across years, with modest fluctuations rather than sharp declines. This stability suggests that once families enroll at La Mesa Dale, they tend to remain through upper elementary grades, reflecting sustained trust and satisfaction with the school experience.

3. While enrollment has declined, diversity remains a defining strength. Despite overall reductions in total enrollment, La Mesa Dale continues to serve a racially and ethnically diverse student population. This diversity continues to be a key asset in shaping an inclusive school culture and instructional approach.

School and Student Performance Data

English Learner (EL) Enrollment

This report displays the annual K-12 public school enrollment by English Language Acquisition Status (ELAS). This information was submitted to the CDE as part of the annual Fall 1 data submission in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

English Learner (EL) Enrollment						
Student Group	**Number of Students**			**Percent of Students**		
	23-24	**24-25**	**25-26**	**23-24**	**24-25**	**25-26**
English Learners	81	61	63	15.6%	15.6%	12.3%
Fluent English Proficient (FEP)	37	22	32	7.6%	7.1%	6.3%
Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP)				9.8%		

Conclusions based on this data:

1. The percentage of EL students decreased from 15.6% to 13.3% over three years.
2. FEP students decreased from 40 (7.6%) in 2022–23 to 22 (4.8%) in 2024–25.
3. With 6th grade no longer housed at the elementary level as of 24-25, we likely lost a group of long-term ELs who historically make up a portion of upper-grade counts. This structural change impacts trend analysis and should be acknowledged when interpreting multi-year comparisons.

School and Student Performance Data

CAASPP Results
English Language Arts/Literacy (All Students)

The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics are an annual measure of what students know and can do using the Common Core State Standards for English language arts/literacy and mathematics.

The purpose of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments is to assess student knowledge and skills for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics, as well as how much students have improved since the previous year. These measures help identify and address gaps in knowledge or skills early so students get the support they need for success in higher grades and for college and career readiness.

All students in grades three through eight and grade eleven take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments unless a student's active individualized education program (IEP) designates the California Alternate Assessments.

Visit the California Department of Education's Smarter Balanced Assessment System web page for more information.

Overall Participation for All Students												
Grade Level	# of Students Enrolled			# of Students Tested			# of Students with Scores			% of Enrolled Students Tested		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 3	75	75	81	73	74	76	73	74	76	97.3	98.7	93.8
Grade 4	68	67	70	67	65	70	67	65	70	98.5	97	100
Grade 5	53	69	70	51	65	68	51	65	68	96.2	94.2	97.1
Grade 6	63	54		62	51		62	51		98.4	94.4	
All	259	265	221	253	255	214	253	255	214	97.7	96.2	96.8

The "% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability purposes.

Overall Achievement for All Students															
Grade Level	Mean Scale Score			% Standard Exceeded			% Standard Met			% Standard Nearly Met			% Standard Not Met		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 3	2430.	2419.	2425.	26.03	22.97	22.37	26.03	24.32	28.95	19.18	20.27	19.74	28.77	32.43	28.95
Grade 4	2470.	2474.	2481.	29.85	40.00	28.57	23.88	18.46	27.14	17.91	12.31	18.57	28.36	29.23	25.71
Grade 5	2464.	2494.	2493.	9.80	26.15	26.47	23.53	16.92	20.59	31.37	20.00	19.12	35.29	36.92	33.82
Grade 6	2490.	2516.		9.68	7.84		19.35	41.18		33.87	29.41		37.10	21.57	
All Grades	N/A	N/A	N/A	19.76	25.10	25.70	23.32	24.31	25.70	24.90	20.00	19.16	32.02	30.59	29.44

Reading Demonstrating understanding of literary and non-fictional texts									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25

Grade 3	27.40	22.97	11.84	52.05	52.70	71.05	20.55	24.32	17.11
Grade 4	23.88	23.08	24.29	59.70	58.46	54.29	16.42	18.46	21.43
Grade 5	7.84	20.00	20.59	64.71	58.46	51.47	27.45	21.54	27.94
Grade 6	9.68	17.65		50.00	58.82		40.32	23.53	
All Grades	18.18	21.18	18.69	56.13	56.86	59.35	25.69	21.96	21.96

Writing Producing clear and purposeful writing									
Grade Level	**% Above Standard**			**% At or Near Standard**			**% Below Standard**		
	22-23	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**
Grade 3	12.33	18.92	21.05	57.53	54.05	64.47	30.14	27.03	14.47
Grade 4	22.39	21.54	15.71	49.25	49.23	71.43	28.36	29.23	12.86
Grade 5	15.69	23.08	22.06	52.94	49.23	51.47	31.37	27.69	26.47
Grade 6	4.84	13.73		61.29	52.94		33.87	33.33	
All Grades	13.83	19.61	19.63	55.34	51.37	62.62	30.83	29.02	17.76

Listening Demonstrating effective communication skills									
Grade Level	**% Above Standard**			**% At or Near Standard**			**% Below Standard**		
	22-23	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**
Grade 3	9.59	14.86	7.89	67.12	72.97	76.32	23.29	12.16	15.79
Grade 4	13.43	15.38	21.43	71.64	67.69	62.86	14.93	16.92	15.71
Grade 5	9.80	16.92	7.35	60.78	67.69	76.47	29.41	15.38	16.18
Grade 6	11.29	3.92		72.58	86.27		16.13	9.80	
All Grades	11.07	13.33	12.15	68.38	72.94	71.96	20.55	13.73	15.89

Research/Inquiry Investigating, analyzing, and presenting information									
Grade Level	**% Above Standard**			**% At or Near Standard**			**% Below Standard**		
	22-23	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**
Grade 3	24.66	9.46	18.42	56.16	68.92	63.16	19.18	21.62	18.42
Grade 4	16.42	21.54	12.86	67.16	56.92	71.43	16.42	21.54	15.71
Grade 5	3.92	20.00	22.06	74.51	60.00	51.47	21.57	20.00	26.47
Grade 6	9.68	25.49		82.26	66.67		8.06	7.84	
All Grades	14.62	18.43	17.76	69.17	63.14	62.15	16.21	18.43	20.09

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall ELA performance shows areas of strength and opportunity across grade levels. The distribution across performance levels indicates that while a portion of students are meeting or exceeding standards, there remains a significant group in the Nearly Met and Not Met categories, signaling the need for continued Tier 1 strengthening and targeted intervention.

2. The transition of 6th grade to middle school changes longitudinal comparisons. With 6th grade no longer housed at the elementary site, trend analysis moving forward will need to focus on grades 3–5 only. Historical comparisons that included 6th grade will need to be interpreted cautiously, as the school's tested population has shifted.

3. Foundational literacy in earlier grades remains critical. Performance patterns reinforce the importance of strengthening reading comprehension, writing, and academic vocabulary in grades 3–5 to ensure students are prepared for grade-level texts and analytical writing demands.

School and Student Performance Data

CAASPP Results
Mathematics (All Students)

The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics are an annual measure of what students know and can do using the Common Core State Standards for English language arts/literacy and mathematics.

The purpose of the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments is to assess student knowledge and skills for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics, as well as how much students have improved since the previous year. These measures help identify and address gaps in knowledge or skills early so students get the support they need for success in higher grades and for college and career readiness.

All students in grades three through eight and grade eleven take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments unless a student's active individualized education program (IEP) designates the California Alternate Assessments.

Visit the California Department of Education's Smarter Balanced Assessment System web page for more information.

Overall Participation for All Students												
Grade Level	# of Students Enrolled			# of Students Tested			# of Students with Scores			% of Enrolled Students Tested		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 3	75	75	81	73	74	78	73	74	78	97.3	98.7	96.3
Grade 4	68	67	70	68	67	70	68	67	70	100.0	100	100
Grade 5	53	69	70	53	68	68	53	68	68	100.0	98.6	97.1
Grade 6	63	54		63	54		63	54		100.0	100	
All	259	265	221	257	263	216	257	263	216	99.2	99.2	97.7

* The "% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability purposes.

Overall Achievement for All Students															
Grade Level	Mean Scale Score			% Standard Exceeded			% Standard Met			% Standard Nearly Met			% Standard Not Met		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
Grade 3	2410.	2406.	2419.	12.33	8.11	16.67	24.66	27.03	30.77	30.14	28.38	19.23	32.88	36.49	33.33
Grade 4	2456.	2468.	2467.	22.06	20.90	24.29	16.18	34.33	15.71	30.88	16.42	25.71	30.88	28.36	34.29
Grade 5	2460.	2471.	2481.	3.77	20.59	20.59	11.32	11.76	10.29	37.74	23.53	26.47	47.17	44.12	42.65
Grade 6	2472.	2490.		3.17	7.41		14.29	18.52		30.16	33.33		52.38	40.74	
Grade 11															
All Grades	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.89	14.45	20.37	17.12	23.19	19.44	31.91	25.10	23.61	40.08	37.26	36.57

Concepts & Procedures Applying mathematical concepts and procedures									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25

Grade 3	10.96	10.81	14.10	57.53	54.05	50.00	31.51	35.14	35.90
Grade 4	22.06	23.88	32.86	41.18	44.78	34.29	36.76	31.34	32.86
Grade 5	5.66	20.59	17.65	50.94	33.82	38.24	43.40	45.59	44.12
Grade 6	3.17	9.26		42.86	44.44		53.97	46.30	
Grade 11									
All Grades	10.89	16.35	21.30	48.25	44.49	41.20	40.86	39.16	37.50

Problem Solving & Modeling/Data Analysis Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems									
Grade Level	**% Above Standard**			**% At or Near Standard**			**% Below Standard**		
	22-23	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**
Grade 3	17.81	14.86	16.67	52.05	52.70	56.41	30.14	32.43	26.92
Grade 4	22.06	23.88	20.00	47.06	43.28	48.57	30.88	32.84	31.43
Grade 5	5.66	14.71	16.18	58.49	44.12	44.12	35.85	41.18	39.71
Grade 6	3.17	5.56		47.62	48.15		49.21	46.30	
All Grades	12.84	15.21	17.59	50.97	47.15	50.00	36.19	37.64	32.41

Communicating Reasoning Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions									
Grade Level	**% Above Standard**			**% At or Near Standard**			**% Below Standard**		
	22-23	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**
Grade 3	17.81	13.51	16.67	61.64	66.22	60.26	20.55	20.27	23.08
Grade 4	19.12	23.88	22.86	51.47	55.22	55.71	29.41	20.90	21.43
Grade 5	5.66	14.71	16.18	54.72	57.35	47.06	39.62	27.94	36.76
Grade 6	6.35	7.41		68.25	70.37		25.40	22.22	
All Grades	12.84	15.21	18.52	59.14	61.98	54.63	28.02	22.81	26.85

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Math data shows a steady increase in the percentage of students exceeding standards over the three-year span. Across all grades, students exceeding standards grew from 10.89% in 2022–23 to 20.37% in 2024–25. This nearly doubling of students at the highest performance level suggests that core instruction is strengthening and that more students are being pushed beyond basic proficiency toward deeper conceptual understanding and mastery.
2. The Communicating Reasoning domain is a relative strength. More than half of students are consistently performing at or near standard in this area, with 54.63% at or near standard in 2024–25. This suggests that students are developing stronger skills in explaining their mathematical thinking and justifying their reasoning, which reflects an instructional emphasis on discourse, modeling, and mathematical argumentation rather than procedural fluency alone.
3. Sixth grade data appears in earlier years but is not included in 2024–25 due to the transition of sixth grade to middle school. This change impacts overall averages and cohort comparisons, meaning year-over-year shifts should be viewed with awareness of the different grade-level composition contributing to the overall results.

School and Student Performance Data

The English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) system is used to determine and monitor the progress of the English language proficiency for students whose primary language is not English. The ELPAC is aligned with the 2012 California English Language Development Standards and assesses four domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Visit the California Department of Education's English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) web page or the ELPAC.org website for more information about the ELPAC.

ELPAC Results

ELPAC Summative Assessment Data Number of Students and Mean Scale Scores for All Students												
Grade Level	Overall			Oral Language			Written Language			Number of Students Tested		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
K	1412.2	1381.2	*	1429.1	1397.9	*	1372.7	1342.4	*	15	11	7
1	1446.5	1441.6	1412.8	1457.3	1458.5	1437.7	1435.3	1424.4	1387.2	12	15	11
2	1483.9	1478.6	1486.4	1486.4	1475.7	1493.7	1480.9	1481.1	1478.5	14	12	16
3	*	1503.8	1479.4	*	1515.4	1476.3	*	1491.5	1482.1	4	13	13
4	1514.8	*	*	1532.3	*	*	1496.7	*	*	12	6	9
5	*	1507.0	*	*	1503.6	*	*	1509.8	*	7	15	5
6	1526.0	*		1529.9	*		1521.5	*		11	8	
All										75	80	61

Overall Language Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students															
Grade Level	Level 4			Level 3			Level 2			Level 1			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
K	0.00	18.18	*	46.67	18.18	*	46.67	18.18	*	6.67	45.45	*	15	11	*
1	0.00	0.00	18.18	33.33	40.00	9.09	50.00	53.33	9.09	16.67	6.67	63.64	12	15	11
2	7.14	8.33	6.25	57.14	50.00	68.75	35.71	25.00	12.50	0.00	16.67	12.50	14	12	16
3	*	30.77	0.00	*	30.77	53.85	*	23.08	30.77	*	15.38	15.38	*	13	13
4	25.00	*	*	41.67	*	*	16.67	*	*	16.67	*	*	12	*	*
5	*	15.38	*	*	46.15	*	*	23.08	*	*	15.38	*	*	13	*
6	18.18	*		45.45	*		18.18	*		18.18	*		11	*	
All	8.00	12.82	14.75	46.67	38.46	39.34	30.67	28.21	24.59	14.67	20.51	21.31	75	78	61

Oral Language Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students															
Grade Level	Level 4			Level 3			Level 2			Level 1			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25

K	13.33	27.27	*	33.33	9.09	*	46.67	18.18	*	6.67	45.45	*	15	11	*
1	25.00	0.00	18.18	25.00	73.33	27.27	41.67	20.00	27.27	8.33	6.67	27.27	12	15	11
2	28.57	25.00	56.25	42.86	33.33	25.00	21.43	25.00	6.25	7.14	16.67	12.50	14	12	16
3	*	53.85	30.77	*	23.08	30.77	*	15.38	23.08	*	7.69	15.38	*	13	13
4	66.67	*	*	16.67	*	*	0.00	*	*	16.67	*	*	12	*	*
5	*	30.77	*	*	46.15	*	*	7.69	*	*	15.38	*	*	13	*
6	45.45	*		36.36	*		9.09	*		9.09	*		11	*	
All	34.67	29.49	34.43	32.00	35.90	36.07	21.33	16.67	14.75	12.00	17.95	14.75	75	78	61

Written Language
Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students

Grade Level	Level 4			Level 3			Level 2			Level 1			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
K		9.09	*		9.09	*		54.55	*		27.27	*		11	*
1		0.00	9.09		13.33	18.18		40.00	18.18		46.67	54.55		15	11
2		8.33	0.00		41.67	56.25		33.33	25.00		16.67	18.75		12	16
3		0.00	7.69		38.46	15.38		38.46	46.15		23.08	30.77		13	13
4		*	*		*	*		*	*		*	*		*	*
5		7.69	*		30.77	*		30.77	*		30.77	*		13	*
6	0.00	*		27.27	*		45.45	*		27.27	*		11	*	
All	1.33	3.85	6.56	24.00	29.49	31.15	45.33	34.62	32.79	29.33	32.05	29.51	75	78	61

Listening Domain
Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students

Grade Level	Well Developed			Somewhat/Moderately			Beginning			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25
K	20.00	18.18	*	66.67	27.27	*	13.33	54.55	*	15	11	*
1	25.00	13.33	36.36	66.67	80.00	36.36	8.33	6.67	27.27	12	15	11
2	50.00	33.33	43.75	35.71	41.67	43.75	14.29	25.00	12.50	14	12	16
3	*	38.46	30.77	*	30.77	46.15	*	30.77	23.08	*	13	13
4	33.33	*	*	50.00	*	*	16.67	*	*	12	*	*
5	*	15.38	*	*	61.54	*	*	23.08	*	*	13	*
6	18.18	*		63.64	*		18.18	*		11	*	
All	28.00	21.79	34.43	56.00	51.28	49.18	16.00	26.92	16.39	75	78	61

Speaking Domain
Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students

Grade Level	Well Developed			Somewhat/Moderately			Beginning			Total Number of Students		
	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25	22-23	23-24	24-25

K	6.67	27.27	*	80.00	36.36	*	13.33	36.36	*	15	11	*
1	33.33	0.00	9.09	58.33	93.33	45.45	8.33	6.67	45.45	12	15	11
2	35.71	33.33	50.00	64.29	66.67	37.50	0.00	0.00	12.50	14	12	16
3	*	76.92	23.08	*	15.38	61.54	*	7.69	15.38	*	13	13
4	75.00	*	*	8.33	*	*	16.67	*	*	12	*	*
5	*	69.23	*	*	15.38	*	*	15.38	*	*	13	*
6	54.55	*		36.36	*		9.09	*		11	*	
All	40.00	42.31	34.43	48.00	43.59	47.54	12.00	14.10	18.03	75	78	61

Reading Domain Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students												
Grade Level	**Well Developed**			**Somewhat/Moderately**			**Beginning**			**Total Number of Students**		
	22-23	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**
K	0.00	0.00	*	93.33	63.64	*	6.67	36.36	*	15	11	*
1	8.33	13.33	18.18	50.00	40.00	27.27	41.67	46.67	54.55	12	15	11
2	7.14	8.33	6.25	71.43	58.33	68.75	21.43	33.33	25.00	14	12	16
3	*	7.69	7.69	*	61.54	61.54	*	30.77	30.77	*	13	13
4	8.33	*	*	50.00	*	*	41.67	*	*	12	*	*
5	*	7.69	*	*	61.54	*	*	30.77	*	*	13	*
6	0.00	*		45.45	*		54.55	*		11	*	
All	4.00	7.69	11.48	62.67	53.85	55.74	33.33	38.46	32.79	75	78	61

Writing Domain Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students												
Grade Level	**Well Developed**			**Somewhat/Moderately**			**Beginning**			**Total Number of Students**		
	22-23	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**	**22-23**	**23-24**	**24-25**
K	13.33	18.18	*	53.33	45.45	*	33.33	36.36	*	15	11	*
1	0.00	0.00	9.09	75.00	80.00	27.27	25.00	20.00	63.64	12	15	11
2	21.43	25.00	25.00	57.14	66.67	56.25	21.43	8.33	18.75	14	12	16
3	*	0.00	7.69	*	92.31	61.54	*	7.69	30.77	*	13	13
4	8.33	*	*	66.67	*	*	25.00	*	*	12	*	*
5	*	15.38	*	*	53.85	*	*	30.77	*	*	13	*
6	27.27	*		54.55	*		18.18	*		11	*	
All	12.00	10.26	14.75	61.33	67.95	54.10	26.67	21.79	31.15	75	78	61

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Steady upward movement in the percentage of English Learners reaching higher levels of proficiency. In both Reading and Writing, the percentage of students performing at the Well Developed level has increased overall, and in Overall Language we see growth at Level 4 from 8% in 22–23 to 14.75% in 24–25. This suggests that instructional refinements, designated and integrated ELD, and increased attention to academic language development are helping more students move beyond foundational skills and into stronger, more independent language use.

2. In Reading and Listening, the percentage of students at the Beginning level has decreased from last year to this year. Listening Beginning dropped significantly from 26.92% to 16.39%, and Reading Beginning also declined. This reflects

progress in building foundational comprehension and vocabulary, and it indicates that our early language supports are helping students gain traction more quickly.

3. Oral Language continues to be a relative strength compared to Written Language. Students demonstrate stronger performance in Listening and Speaking, with a larger percentage clustered in Level 3 and above. Written Language, however, still shows a concentration of students in Level 2. This pattern suggests that while students are gaining confidence and competence in oral expression and comprehension, academic writing and written language complexity remain an important area for continued instructional focus.

School and Student Performance Data

Student Population

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

This section provides information about the school's student population.

2024-25 Student Population			
Total Enrollment	**Socioeconomically Disadvantaged**	**English Learners**	**Foster Youth**
460	**68.3%**	**13.3%**	**0.0%**
Total Number of Students enrolled in La Mesa Dale Elementary.	Students who are eligible for free or reduced priced meals; or have parents/guardians who did not receive a high school diploma.	Students who are learning to communicate effectively in English, typically requiring instruction in both the English Language and in their academic courses.	Students whose well being is the responsibility of a court.

2024-25 Enrollment for All Students/Student Group		
Student Group	**Total**	**Percentage**
English Learners	61	13.3%
Foster Youth	0	0.0%
Homeless	24	5.2%
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	314	68.3%
Students with Disabilities	80	17.4%

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity		
Student Group	**Total**	**Percentage**
African American	51	11.1%
American Indian	0	0.0%
Asian	13	2.8%
Filipino	12	2.6%
Hispanic	231	50.2%
Two or More Races	47	10.2%
Pacific Islander	1	0.2%
White	102	22.2%

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Over two-thirds of students qualify as Socioeconomically Disadvantaged. This has implications for academic support, access to enrichment, attendance patterns, and family engagement structures. Continued focus on MTSS systems, wraparound supports, Community Schools strategies, and strong Tier 1 instruction remains essential to ensure equity and opportunity for all students.
2. With 13.3% English Learners and 17.4% Students with Disabilities, nearly one-third of students require targeted instructional supports beyond the core program. Investment in high-quality Tier 1 instruction, designated ELD, inclusive practices, and staff capacity-building will continue to be critical to meet the needs of diverse learners while maintaining high expectations.
3. Half of the student population identifies as Hispanic, followed by White (22.2%) and African American (11.1%) students, with additional representation across multiple racial groups. Culturally responsive practices and authentic family engagement strategies should remain a priority to ensure families feel seen, heard, and valued in partnership with the school.

School and Student Performance Data

Overall Performance

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”

Red

Lowest Performance

Orange

Yellow

Green

Blue

Highest Performance

2025 Fall Dashboard Overall Performance for All Students

Academic Performance	Academic Engagement	Conditions & Climate
English Language Arts Green	**Chronic Absenteeism** Green	**Suspension Rate** Orange
Mathematics Green		
English Learner Progress Green		

Conclusions based on this data:

1. All students are performing in the Green level in English Language Arts, Mathematics, English Learner Progress, and Chronic Absenteeism. This reflects solid Tier 1 instruction, effective attendance systems, and strong academic momentum across the school.

2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students are performing two levels below “All Students” in ELA. Closing this gap will require strengthened Tier 1 literacy instruction, strategic and timely intervention, expanded access to high-quality texts, and increased opportunities for reading, writing, and academic discourse throughout the school day.
3. Students with Disabilities are performing two levels below “All Students” in Mathematics. This gap calls for greater use of Universal Design for Learning strategies, targeted math intervention, and consistent progress monitoring to ensure access and growth.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance
English Language Arts

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”

Red

Lowest Performance

Orange

Yellow

Green

Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Equity Report				
Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
0	1	3	0	1

This section provides a view of how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the English Language Arts assessment. This measure is based on student performance on either the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11.

2025 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Performance for All Students/Student Group		
All Students	English Learners	Long-Term English Learners
Green	Yellow	
1.7 points below standard	29.2 points below standard	
Increased 8.2 points	Increased 13.8 points	
200 Students	34 Students	

Foster Youth	Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	Orange
0 Students	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	14.7 points below standard
	8 Students	Maintained 1.8 points
		146 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
Yellow	No Performance Color	No Performance Color
59.7 points below standard	30.5 points below standard	0 Students
Increased 42.6 points	Declined 20.6 points	
44 Students	22 Students	

Asian	Filipino	Hispanic
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	Yellow
Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	9.6 points below standard
5 Students	9 Students	Increased 19.4 points
		104 Students

Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	Blue
5.3 points above standard	0 Students	30.7 points above standard
Maintained -2.5 points		Increased 15.9 points
15 Students		44 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. All Students are performing in the Green level at 1.7 points below standard and increased 8.2 points, indicating that our overall instructional program is moving in a positive direction. This growth suggests that our Tier 1 core instruction and collective focus on literacy are having an impact. While we have not yet reached above standard performance, the upward trend reflects steady progress and reinforces the importance of maintaining strong instructional practices schoolwide.
2. Students with Disabilities are in the Yellow level at 59.7 points below standard, though they increased 42.6 points. The substantial growth reflects effective collaboration between general education and special education teams and stronger alignment of supports. At the same time, the wide gap underscores the need for continued focus on inclusive

Tier 1 instruction, scaffolded access to grade-level standards, and systematic progress monitoring. Sustaining this trajectory will require intentional planning, co-teaching structures, and consistent intervention cycles to ensure acceleration rather than remediation alone.

3. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students are performing in the Orange level at 14.7 points below standard and maintained performance with a slight increase of 1.8 points. Given that this group represents a large portion of our student population, this performance level meaningfully impacts our overall results. The data highlights the need to deepen equitable access to grade-level texts, high-quality instruction, and strategic intervention. Expanded literacy opportunities, including structured reading practice and vocabulary development, will be key levers for improvement.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance
Mathematics

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”

Red
Lowest Performance

Orange

Yellow

Green

Blue
Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Equity Report				
Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
0	1	3	0	1

This section provides a view of how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the Mathematics assessment. This measure is based on student performance either on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11.

2025 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Performance for All Students/Student Group		
All Students	English Learners	Long-Term English Learners
Green	Yellow	
24.7 points below standard	32.6 points below standard	
Increased 16.6 points	Increased 40 points	
201 Students	35 Students	

Foster Youth	Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
No Performance Color 0 Students	No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 8 Students	Yellow 39.7 points below standard Increased 7.9 points 147 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
Orange 95.1 points below standard Increased 22.2 points 44 Students	No Performance Color 39.8 points below standard Maintained 2.2 points 22 Students	No Performance Color 0 Students

Asian	Filipino	Hispanic
No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 5 Students	No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 9 Students	Yellow 44.9 points below standard Increased 16 points 105 Students

Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
No Performance Color 18.6 points below standard Declined 5.9 points 15 Students	No Performance Color 0 Students	Blue 26.9 points above standard Increased 31.7 points 44 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall, All Students are performing in the Green at 24.7 points below standard, reflecting significant growth of 16.6 points. This upward trend suggests that core math instruction and sitewide systems are moving in the right direction. While students are still below standard overall, the growth indicates that instructional adjustments and intervention efforts are yielding measurable improvement.
2. English Learners demonstrated substantial growth, increasing 40 points, and are now in Yellow at 32.6 points below standard. This level of acceleration is noteworthy and suggests that designated and integrated ELD supports, along with stronger access to core math instruction, are having an impact. Sustaining this momentum will require continued attention to academic language development within Tier 1 math instruction.

3. Students with Disabilities remain an area of significant need, performing in the Orange at 95.1 points below standard despite a 22.2-point increase. The growth is encouraging and signals that targeted interventions are helping. At the same time, the magnitude of the gap highlights the importance of strengthening inclusive Tier 1 instruction, ensuring appropriate scaffolds, and tightly aligning MTSS supports to individual student needs.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance
Science

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”

Red

Lowest Performance

Orange

Yellow

Green

Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Science Equity Report				
Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
0	0	1	1	0

This section provides a view of how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the Science assessment. This measure is based on student performance either on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11.

2025 Fall Dashboard Science Performance for All Students/Student Group		
All Students	English Learners	Long-Term English Learners
Green	No Performance Color	No Performance Color
53.9 science points	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	0 Students
Increased 4 points	8 Students	
63 Students		

Foster Youth	Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
No Performance Color 0 Students	No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 2 Students	Yellow 52.4 science points Maintained 1.5 points 48 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
No Performance Color 31.7 science points Maintained -1.1 points 16 Students	No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 7 Students	No Performance Color 0 Students

Asian	Filipino	Hispanic
No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 1 Student	No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 1 Student	Green 49.4 science points Increased 6.3 points 35 Students

Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
No Performance Color Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy 4 Students	No Performance Color 0 Students	No Performance Color 62.9 science points 15 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. All Students performance in 5th grade science is in the Green at 53.9 points, reflecting a 4-point increase. This upward trend indicates that core science instruction is strong and that our Tier 1 systems are supporting most learners effectively. Growth at the overall level suggests alignment between classroom instruction and the rigor of the state assessment.
2. Hispanic students are in the Green at 49.4 points with a significant 6.3-point increase. This growth reflects positive momentum and suggests that instructional strategies are supporting engagement and conceptual understanding. Continued focus on language-rich science instruction and structured academic talk will be important to sustain and accelerate this progress.

3. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students are in the Yellow at 52.4 points and maintained performance with a 1.5-point increase. While their score is relatively close to the All Students average, the difference in performance color signals a need to strengthen access and consistency in grade-level science experiences, particularly vocabulary development, academic discourse, and opportunities for hands-on investigation.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance
English Learner Progress

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”

This section provides a view of the percentage of current EL students making progress towards English language proficiency or maintaining the highest level.

2025 Fall Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator

English Learner Progress	Long-Term English Learner Progress
Green	No Performance Color
56.5 making progress.	making progress.
Number Students: 46 Students	Number Students: 0 Students

This section provides a view of the percentage of current EL students who progressed at least one ELPI level, maintained ELPI level 4, maintained lower ELPI levels (i.e, levels 1, 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H), or decreased at least one ELPI Level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Student English Language Acquisition Results

Decreased One ELPI Level	Maintained ELPI Level 1, 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H	Maintained ELPI Level 4	Progressed At Least One ELPI Level
10.9%	32.6%	4.3%	52.2%

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Our English Learner Progress indicator is Green, with 56.5% of students making progress and 52.2% progressing at least one ELPI level. With 46 English Learners included in the data set, this reflects strong, consistent language growth for more than half of our students and suggests that core instruction and designated ELD structures are supporting forward movement in proficiency.
2. At the same time, 32.6% of students maintained ELPI levels 1, 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H, and 10.9% decreased at least one level. While maintaining a level can represent stability, this group signals an opportunity to strengthen targeted language development within Tier 1 instruction and strategic small-group intervention to accelerate growth, particularly in academic vocabulary, structured discourse, and reading comprehension.
3. There are currently no Long-Term English Learners reflected in this report, which is an encouraging indicator that students are moving through proficiency levels before becoming long-term ELs. Continued focus on early language development, literacy access, and progress monitoring will be essential to sustain this trajectory and ensure that more students advance multiple levels over time.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Engagement
Chronic Absenteeism

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”

Red

Lowest Performance

Orange

Yellow

Green

Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Equity Report

Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
0	0	3	4	0

This section provides information about the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 8 who are absent 10 percent or more of the instructional days they were enrolled.

2025 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Performance for All Students/Student Group

All Students	English Learners	Long-Term English Learners
Green	Yellow	
8.2% Chronically Absent	11.6% Chronically Absent	
Declined 8.8	Declined 3.3	
501 Students	69 Students	

Foster Youth	Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	Yellow
0 Students	30.3% Chronically Absent	11% Chronically Absent
	Increased 8.9	Declined 9.2
	33 Students	346 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
Green	Yellow	No Performance Color
9.4% Chronically Absent	11.5% Chronically Absent	0 Students
Declined 17.9	Declined 7.9	
106 Students	61 Students	

Asian	Filipino	Hispanic
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	Green
21.4% Chronically Absent	0% Chronically Absent	8.4% Chronically Absent
Declined 1.3	Declined 4.8	Declined 11.1
14 Students	12 Students	249 Students

Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
Green	No Performance Color	Green
9.4% Chronically Absent	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	4.5% Chronically Absent
Declined 5.5	1 Student	Declined 5.6
53 Students		111 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Our overall attendance performance is a clear strength. With 8.2% of students chronically absent and a Green designation, the school is below the 10% threshold and moving in a positive direction, declining by 8.8 points. This indicates that schoolwide systems, family communication, and attendance messaging are having a meaningful impact for the majority of our 501 students.
2. Several student groups remain in the Yellow performance band, signaling a need for targeted support. English Learners (11.6%), Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students (11%), and African American students (11.5%) all fall above the 10% benchmark. While each of these groups showed declines in chronic absenteeism, the data suggests that strengthened outreach, relationship-building, and barrier removal strategies should remain a priority to close attendance gaps.
3. Several groups demonstrate particularly strong outcomes. Hispanic students (8.4%), White students (4.5%), Students with Disabilities (9.4%), and students identifying as Two or More Races (9.4%) are all in the Green performance band and have shown notable declines. While some smaller groups do not receive a performance color due to low enrollment, continued monitoring is important to ensure trends do not shift unnoticed. Overall, the data reflects a strong attendance foundation with clear opportunities for focused equity work.

School and Student Performance Data

Conditions & Climate
Suspension Rate

The 2025 California School Dashboard provides parents and educators with meaningful information on school and district progress so they can participate in decisions to improve student learning.

The California School Dashboard goes beyond test scores alone to provide a more complete picture of how schools and districts are meeting the needs of all students. To help parents and educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, California reports how districts, schools (including alternative schools), and student groups are performing across state and local measures.

Performance on state measures, using comparable statewide data, is represented by one of five colors. The performance level (color) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year. This is represented using a greyed out color dial with the words “No Performance Color.”

Red

Lowest Performance

Orange

Yellow

Green

Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each level.

2025 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate Equity Report

Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
0	6	0	1	1

This section provides information about the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 12 who have been suspended at least once in a given school year. Students who are suspended multiple times are only counted once.

2025 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate for All Students/Student Group

All Students	English Learners	Long-Term English Learners
Orange	Orange	
2% suspended at least one day	4.3% suspended at least one day	
Increased 0.9%	Increased 3.2%	
512 Students	69 Students	

Foster Youth	Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
No Performance Color	Blue	Orange
Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	0% suspended at least one day	2% suspended at least one day
1 Student	Maintained 0%	Increased 0.6%
	35 Students	352 Students

Students with Disabilities	African American	American Indian
Orange	Orange	No Performance Color
5.7% suspended at least one day	1.6% suspended at least one day	0 Students
Increased 2.8%	Increased 1.6%	
106 Students	63 Students	

Asian	Filipino	Hispanic
No Performance Color	No Performance Color	Green
6.7% suspended at least one day	8.3% suspended at least one day	0.8% suspended at least one day
Increased 6.7%	Increased 3.6%	Maintained -0.2%
15 Students	12 Students	250 Students

Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
Orange	No Performance Color	Orange
1.8% suspended at least one day	Fewer than 11 students - No Data for Privacy	3.5% suspended at least one day
Increased 1.8%	1 Student	Increased 1.5%
56 Students		115 Students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Our overall suspension rate increased from 1.1% to 2.0%, a 0.9 percentage point rise. Even with this increase, the rate remains very low with 10 of 512 students being suspended over the course of the year. 98% of students were not suspended at all.
2. The 10 students suspended are not 10 separate subgroup cases as some students fall into multiple categories, such as English Learners who are also Students with Disabilities or Socioeconomically Disadvantaged. This overlap helps explain why certain subgroup percentages appear elevated despite the small total number of students involved. It also reinforces the need for integrated supports, ensuring that academic, behavioral, and language-development systems work together for students with intersecting needs rather than addressing each category in isolation.
3. Because our total enrollment is relatively small, a difference of just a few students significantly impacts percentages and Dashboard colors. The increase reflects a small number of individual cases rather than a widespread climate concern.

Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

Goal 1

Title and Description of School Goal

Broad statement that describes the desired result to which all strategies/activities are directed.

English Language Arts
By June 2027, all students, including English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, will achieve or surpass the expected outcomes outlined in the Annual Measurable Outcomes section below, as measured by CAASPP ELA (grades 3–5) and the i-Ready ELA Diagnostic in English Language Arts.

LCAP Goal to which this School Goal is Aligned

LCAP goal to which this school goal is aligned.

Goal 1 - ACHIEVE - We will increase achievement for all of our students while decreasing performance gaps and educational inequities. (State Priority 4-Pupil Achievement, 8-Other Pupil Outcomes)

Identified Need

A description of any areas that need significant improvement based on a review of Dashboard and local data, including any areas of low performance and significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators, and any steps taken to address those areas.

A review of CAASPP ELA Dashboard data and local assessment measures (iReady, formative assessments, and cohort analysis) indicates an area of significant improvement in English Language Arts performance, particularly for Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students. While overall ELA outcomes show a portion of students meeting or exceeding standards, a substantial percentage remain in the Nearly Met and Not Met performance levels. SED students are performing approximately two performance levels below "All Students" in ELA. This represents a performance gap and signals the need for strengthened access to grade-level instructional materials, academic language development, and comprehension of informational text.

Local data trends mirror these findings. iReady diagnostic results indicate that students requiring strategic and intensive support demonstrate particular difficulty with vocabulary, background knowledge, and comprehension of complex informational text. These barriers suggest that improvements must occur first within Tier 1 core instruction, ensuring consistent exposure to grade-level text, explicit vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and opportunities for writing about reading.

To address these areas, the school has implemented a school-wide system of differentiated ELA instruction supported by a Reading Specialist and an Extended Learning and Early Intervention (ELEI) Teacher on Special Assignment. Teachers utilize diagnostic and formative data to identify students in need of targeted intervention and provide evidence-based small-group instruction focused on foundational skills and comprehension. Grade-level teams engage in regular data cycles to monitor progress and adjust instruction accordingly. Additionally, the school is strengthening Tier 1 instruction through content-focused coaching and professional learning centered on close reading, vocabulary instruction, collaborative academic conversations, writing across content areas, and the Gradual Release of Responsibility, an instructional approach that moves students between teacher modeling, guided practice, collaborative learning, and ultimately independent application.

Through these combined efforts, the school aims to reduce performance gaps, increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards, and ensure equitable access to rigorous literacy instruction for all student groups.

Annual Measurable Outcomes

Identify the metric(s) and/or state indicator(s) that your school will use as a means of evaluating progress toward accomplishing the goal.

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
SBAC ELA Assessment - % of students meeting standard (of testing age)	CAASPP May 2025 All students, Grades 3-5 - 51% English Learners, Grades 3-5 - 23% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students, Grades 3-5 - 44% Students with Disabilities, Grades 3-5 - 25%	CAASPP 2025-2026: All students, Grades 3-5 - 54% English Learners, Grades 3-5 - 28% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students, Grades 3-5 - 49% Students with Disabilities, Grades 3-5 - 30%
i-Ready ELA Assessment - % of students mid and above, grade level on i-Ready Diagnostic 2 (All grades)	2025-2026 i-Ready Diagnostic 2 ALL students - 32% English Learners - 6% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students - 25% Students with Disabilities - 20%	January 2027 ALL students - 37% English Learners - 16% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students - 35% Students with Disabilities - 30%

Strategies/Activities

Complete the Strategy/Activity Table with each of your school's strategies/activities. Add additional rows as necessary.

Strategy/ Activity #	Description	Students to be Served	Proposed Expenditures
1.1	Reading Specialist to provide daily, targeted, evidence-based small-group reading intervention and to build teacher capacity in foundational literacy instruction to close identified ELA achievement gaps.	All Students, English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	143,932 Title I 1000-1999: Certificated Personnel Salaries Reading Specialist
1.2	Content-Focused Coach (ELEI) to provide ongoing, job-embedded coaching to strengthen Tier 1 standards-aligned ELA instruction and support data-informed intervention practices in order to improve student literacy outcomes.	All Students	
1.3	Provide structured collaboration time for teachers to plan and implement ELA instruction aligned to the Gradual Release of Responsibility, reflect on the effectiveness of Tier 1 and Tier 2 practices, and adjust instruction based on student engagement and formative assessment data.	All Students, English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	
1.4	ELEI teacher to provide after school instruction in ELA for students performing below grade level.	All Students, English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	

Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

Goal 2

Title and Description of School Goal

Broad statement that describes the desired result to which all strategies/activities are directed.

Math
By June 2027, all students will achieve or surpass the expected outcomes outlined in the Annual Measurable Outcomes section below, as measured by CAASPP Math (grades 3–5) and the i-Ready ELA Diagnostic in Math.

LCAP Goal to which this School Goal is Aligned

LCAP goal to which this school goal is aligned.

Goal 1 - ACHIEVE - We will increase achievement for all of our students while decreasing performance gaps and educational inequities. (State Priority 4-Pupil Achievement, 8-Other Pupil Outcomes)

Identified Need

A description of any areas that need significant improvement based on a review of Dashboard and local data, including any areas of low performance and significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators, and any steps taken to address those areas.

The trend in mathematics mirrors the upward trajectory observed in English Language Arts (ELA), with all student groups except English Learners showing progress toward or surpassing their goals. Unfortunately, like ELA, the CA Dashboard shows an increase in the points below standard despite SBAC showing an increase in the percent of students demonstrating proficiency. Flocabulary has been purchased to support math vocabulary acquisition and development for Multilingual English Learners and Students with Disabilities.

Annual Measurable Outcomes

Identify the metric(s) and/or state indicator(s) that your school will use as a means of evaluating progress toward accomplishing the goal.

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
SBAC Math Assessment - % of students meeting standard (of testing age)	2024-2025 SBAC Math, Grades 3-5: All students - 40% English Learners, Grades 3-5 - 21% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students, Grades 3-5 - 33% Students with Disabilities, Grades 3-5 - 16%	2025-2026 SBAC Math, Grades 3-5: All students - 43% English Learners, of testing age - 29% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students of testing age- 41% Students with Disabilities of testing age - 24%
i-Ready Math Assessment - % of students at or above grade level (ALL grades)	2025-2026 i-Ready Diagnostic 2: All Students - 19% English Learners - 0% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students - 12% Students with Disabilities - 9%	2026-2027 i-Ready Diagnostic 2: All Students - 24% English Learners - 10% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students - 22% Students with Disabilities - 19%

Strategies/Activities

Complete the Strategy/Activity Table with each of your school's strategies/activities. Add additional rows as necessary.

Strategy/ Activity #	Description	Students to be Served	Proposed Expenditures
2.1	Implement a schoolwide system of differentiated math instruction and targeted intervention, prioritizing multilingual english learners, students with disabilities and other students performing below grade level, including after-school tutoring to increase math achievement.	All Students, Students with Disabilities	4500 Community Schools Grant 1000-1999: Certificated Personnel Salaries After School Math Tutoring 2,949.00 Title I 0000: Unrestricted Flocabulary 1500 Title I 1000-1999: Certificated Personnel Salaries After School Math Tutoring
2.2	Provide teacher collaboration time for teachers to collaboratively explore and implement the new math curriculum, reflect on lesson effectiveness, and adjust instruction based on student engagement and formative assessment date.	All Students, Students with Disabilities	
2.3	ELEI teacher to provide after school instruction in math for students performing below grade level.	All Students, Students with Disabilities	

Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

Goal 3

Title and Description of School Goal

Broad statement that describes the desired result to which all strategies/activities are directed.

Student Engagement
By June 2027, the school will maintain a single-digit chronic absenteeism rate as measured by end of year chronic absenteeism rates by addressing the barriers through the strategies listed below.

LCAP Goal to which this School Goal is Aligned

LCAP goal to which this school goal is aligned.

Goal 2 - ENGAGE - We will engage our students and the learning community in order to ensure the skills and supports necessary for social, emotional, and physical well-being. (State Priority 3-Parent Involvement, 5-Pupil Engagement, 6-School Climate)

Identified Need

A description of any areas that need significant improvement based on a review of Dashboard and local data, including any areas of low performance and significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators, and any steps taken to address those areas.

Chronic absenteeism remains an area for continued focus to sustain progress and reach target attendance levels. There are no significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators. The school continues to address attendance through regular data monitoring, proactive family communication, early intervention for at-risk students, and the use of Independent Study Agreements (ISAs) to support academic continuity during absences.

Annual Measurable Outcomes

Identify the metric(s) and/or state indicator(s) that your school will use as a means of evaluating progress toward accomplishing the goal.

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
California Dashboard Rate of Chronic Absenteeism	At the end of 24-25 school year, our rate of chronic absenteeism was 8.2%.	In 2025-2026, we will maintain the rate of chronic absenteeism at 8% or lower.

Strategies/Activities

Complete the Strategy/Activity Table with each of your school's strategies/activities. Add additional rows as necessary.

Strategy/ Activity #	Description	Students to be Served	Proposed Expenditures
3.1	Implement a schoolwide attendance improvement system grounded in relationship-building and tiered intervention to reduce chronic absenteeism and improve student attendance outcomes.	All Students	500 Community Schools Grant 0000: Unrestricted Attendance Awards
3.2	Identify a small group of "Spotlight Students" in each classroom to monitor throughout the year. Teachers will regularly seek feedback, observe engagement, and discuss these students during VAPA time. The principal will meet with each student after diagnostics to set goals and celebrate growth. Insights will be used to adjust Tier 1 and	Multilingual English Learners, Students with Disabilities, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	

	Tier 2 instruction, strengthen relationships, and ensure every student feels connected and supported.		

Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

Goal 4

Title and Description of School Goal

Broad statement that describes the desired result to which all strategies/activities are directed.

School Climate & Culture
By June 2027, the school will improve overall school climate by reducing suspension rates, increasing student and parent perceptions of safety, belonging, and school satisfaction, and strengthening parent engagement and partnership in school decision-making and activities, as measured by the indicators in the Annual Measurable Outcomes section below.

LCAP Goal to which this School Goal is Aligned

LCAP goal to which this school goal is aligned.

Goal 2 - ENGAGE - We will engage our students and the learning community in order to ensure the skills and supports necessary for social, emotional, and physical well-being. (State Priority 3-Parent Involvement, 5-Pupil Engagement, 6-School Climate)

Identified Need

A description of any areas that need significant improvement based on a review of Dashboard and local data, including any areas of low performance and significant performance gaps among student groups on Dashboard indicators, and any steps taken to address those areas.

As it relates to the SEL survey, La Mesa Dale's greatest area for growth is related to Emotional Regulation, Self-Efficacy, and Growth Mindset.

Annual Measurable Outcomes

Identify the metric(s) and/or state indicator(s) that your school will use as a means of evaluating progress toward accomplishing the goal.

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
Panorama Student Survey Results (3rd-5th grades only)	The percentage of 3rd-5th grade students who responded favorably in the 2026 Spring Panorama domains listed below are as follows: Emotional Regulation 46% Grit 55% Growth Mindset 53% School Climate 58% School Safety 58% Self-Efficacy 48% Self-Management 67% Sense of Belonging 62% Social Awareness 69% Supportive Relationships 88%	The percentage of students who will respond favorably in the 2027 Spring Panorama Survey will increase to the following percentages are as follows: Emotional Regulation 49% Grit 58% Growth Mindset 55% School Climate 61% School Safety 61% Self-Efficacy 51% Self-Management 70% Sense of Belonging 65% Social Awareness 72% Supportive Relationships 90%
La-Mesa Spring Valley Annual Spring Parent Survey Results	The percentage of parents who responded favorably in the 2026 Spring domains listed below are as follows: 157 responses Support for Academic Learning - 97%	The percentage of parents who respond favorably in the Spring 2027 survey will maintain at or above the following percentages in each domain: Support for Academic Learning - 97% Sense of Community - 95% Sense of Safety - 93%

	Sense of Community - 95% Sense of Safety - 93%	
California Dashboard Suspension Data	Based on the California Dashboard, our school's 2024-2025 suspension rate is 2%.	Based on the California Dashboard, our school's 2025-2026 percentage will maintain at 2% or lower.
Average Number of Views of School's Weekly Newsletter	The school's weekly newsletter has received an average of 1260 views between August 1, 2025 and January 30, 2026. This is an average of 2.5 views per student per week.	We will maintain a rate of a minimum average of 2 views per student per week.

Strategies/Activities

Complete the Strategy/Activity Table with each of your school's strategies/activities. Add additional rows as necessary.

Strategy/ Activity #	Description	Students to be Served	Proposed Expenditures
4.1	Climate and Culture Implement a schoolwide culture and climate system that fosters belonging, positive behavior, and family partnership through enrichment opportunities, including garden and choir instruction, to strengthen student engagement and overall school connectedness.	All Students	1700 Community Schools Grant 0000: Unrestricted Choir Instructor 2600 Community Schools Grant 0000: Unrestricted Garden instructor and materials for garden 13421.59 Title I 0000: Unrestricted Garden instructor and materials
4.2	Parent - Community Engagement and Support Implement a comprehensive parent and community engagement system that strengthens two-way communication, representative family leadership, and meaningful participation in school learning experiences to support student success.	All Families	1000 Community Schools Grant 0000: Unrestricted Child care for parent events 1700 Community Schools Grant 0000: Unrestricted Family Math and Science Night - Mad Science
4.3	Social and Emotional Learning Provide a comprehensive social-emotional and behavioral education and support system, including school-based social work services, to strengthen students' self-regulation, conflict resolution skills, and overall well-being.	All Students	
4.4	Campus Safety Trained Campus Attendants supervise all recess and lunch periods, and paraprofessionals and attendants engage in ongoing professional learning focused on student regulation and safe, supportive interactions. Safety Patrol and supervision teams are equipped with necessary materials to support safe arrival and dismissal.	All Students	3000 Community Schools Grant 2000-2999: Classified Personnel Salaries Extra time for classified training outside of their scheduled work time.
4.5	Hire parent liaisons to empower parents to support their child/children's education and increase parent engagement and involvement within the school and the district.	All Students	1,949.29 Title I Part A: Parent Involvement

			2000-2999: Classified Personnel Salaries Parent Liaison

Budget Summary

Complete the Budget Summary Table below. Schools may include additional information, and adjust the table as needed. The Budget Summary is required for schools funded through the Consolidated Application (ConApp).

Budget Summary

DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
Total Funds Provided to the School Through the Consolidated Application	$TBD
Total Funds Budgeted for Strategies to Meet the Goals in the SPSA	$178,751.88
Total Federal Funds Provided to the School from the LEA for CSI	$--

Other Federal, State, and Local Funds

List the additional Federal programs that the school includes in the schoolwide program. Adjust the table as needed.

Note: If the school is not operating a Title I schoolwide program, this section is not applicable and may be deleted.

Federal Programs	Allocation ($)
Title I	$161,802.59
Title I Part A: Parent Involvement	$1,949.29

Subtotal of additional federal funds included for this school: $163,751.88

List the State and local programs that the school is including in the schoolwide program. Duplicate the table as needed.

State or Local Programs	Allocation ($)
Community Schools Grant	$15,000.00

Subtotal of state or local funds included for this school: $15,000.00

Total of federal, state, and/or local funds for this school: $178,751.88

Budgeted Funds and Expenditures in this Plan

Budget Allocations

- Budget allocations will be added to this document.
- Totals will auto-populate from expenses entered in the SPSA.
    - **Do not adjust numbers on this page.**

If total expenses exceed available funds, revise your **funding sources** in the SPSA.

For **duplicate costs** (e.g., an intervention teacher supporting ELA and Math)

- List the funding source twice
- Enter the cost only once; leave the second entry as duplicate (no dollar amount).

Funding Notes:
All Title I and CSI funds must be fully budgeted

Other funding sources may be used but do not require SSC approval.

Community Schools: Document Community Schools grant-funded expenses in the SPSA

The tables below are provided to help the school track expenditures as they relate to funds budgeted to the school.

Funds Budgeted to the School by Funding Source

Funding Source	Amount	Balance
Title I	161,853.59	51.00
Title I Part A: Parent Involvement	2,074.37	125.08
Community Schools Grant	15,000	0.00

Expenditures by Funding Source

Funding Source	Amount
Community Schools Grant	15,000.00
Title I	161,802.59
Title I Part A: Parent Involvement	1,949.29

Expenditures by Budget Reference

Budget Reference	Amount
0000: Unrestricted	23,870.59
1000-1999: Certificated Personnel Salaries	149,932.00

2000-2999: Classified Personnel Salaries	4,949.29

Expenditures by Budget Reference and Funding Source

Budget Reference	Funding Source	Amount
0000: Unrestricted	Community Schools Grant	7,500.00
1000-1999: Certificated Personnel Salaries	Community Schools Grant	4,500.00
2000-2999: Classified Personnel Salaries	Community Schools Grant	3,000.00
0000: Unrestricted	Title I	16,370.59
1000-1999: Certificated Personnel Salaries	Title I	145,432.00
2000-2999: Classified Personnel Salaries	Title I Part A: Parent Involvement	1,949.29

Expenditures by Goal

Goal Number	Total Expenditures
Goal 1	143,932.00
Goal 2	8,949.00
Goal 3	500.00
Goal 4	25,370.88

School Site Council Membership

California Education Code describes the required composition of the School Site Council (SSC). The SSC shall be composed of the principal and representatives of: teachers selected by teachers at the school; other school personnel selected by other school personnel at the school; parents of pupils attending the school selected by such parents; and, in secondary schools, pupils selected by pupils attending the school. The current make-up of the SSC is as follows:

1 School Principal

3 Classroom Teachers

1 Other School Staff

5 Parent or Community Members

Name of Members	Role

At elementary schools, the school site council must be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers, and other school personnel, and (b) parents of students attending the school or other community members. Classroom teachers must comprise a majority of persons represented under section (a). At secondary schools there must be, in addition, equal numbers of parents or other community members selected by parents, and students. Members must be selected by their peer group.

Recommendations and Assurances

The School Site Council (SSC) recommends this school plan and proposed expenditures to the district governing board for approval and assures the board of the following:

The SSC is correctly constituted and was formed in accordance with district governing board policy and state law.

The SSC reviewed its responsibilities under state law and district governing board policies, including those board policies relating to material changes in the School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) requiring board approval.

The SSC sought and considered all recommendations from the following groups or committees before adopting this plan:

Signature	Committee or Advisory Group Name
	English Learner Advisory Committee

The SSC reviewed the content requirements for school plans of programs included in this SPSA and believes all such content requirements have been met, including those found in district governing board policies and in the local educational agency plan.

This SPSA is based on a thorough analysis of student academic performance. The actions proposed herein form a sound, comprehensive, coordinated plan to reach stated school goals to improve student academic performance.

This SPSA was adopted by the SSC at a public meeting on May 22, 2025.

Attested:

Principal, Tammie Babbitt on May 21, 2026

SSC Chairperson, Brandon Barker on May 21, 2026

Instructions

The School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) is a strategic plan that maximizes the resources available to the school while minimizing duplication of effort with the ultimate goal of increasing student achievement. SPSA development should be aligned with and inform the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) process.

This SPSA template consolidates all school-level planning efforts into one plan for programs funded through the Consolidated Application (ConApp) pursuant to California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 64001 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This template is designed to meet schoolwide program planning requirements.

California's ESSA State Plan supports the state's approach to improving student group performance through the utilization of federal resources. Schools use the SPSA to document their approach to maximizing the impact of federal investments in support of underserved students. The implementation of ESSA in California presents an opportunity for schools to innovate with their federally-funded programs and align them with the priority goals of the school and the local educational agency (LEA) that are being realized under the state's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF).

The LCFF provides schools and LEAs flexibility to design programs and provide services that meet the needs of students in order to achieve readiness for college, career, and lifelong learning. The SPSA planning process supports continuous cycles of action, reflection, and improvement. Consistent with *EC* 64001(g)(1), the Schoolsite Council (SSC) is required to develop and annually review the SPSA, establish an annual budget, and make modifications to the plan that reflect changing needs and priorities, as applicable.

For questions related to specific sections of the template, please see instructions below.

Instructions: Table of Contents

- Plan Description
- Educational Partner Involvement
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment
- Goals, Strategies/Activities, and Expenditures
- Annual Review
- Budget Summary
- Appendix A: Plan Requirements for Title I Schoolwide Programs
- Appendix B: Select State and Federal Programs

For additional questions or technical assistance related to LEA and school planning, please contact the CDE's Local Agency Systems Support Office, at LCFF@cde.ca.gov.
For programmatic or policy questions regarding Title I schoolwide planning, please contact the LEA, or the CDE's Title I Policy and Program Guidance Office at TITLEI@cde.ca.gov.

Plan Description

Briefly describe the school's plan to effectively meet the ESSA requirements in alignment with the LCAP and other federal, state, and local programs.

Additional CSI Planning Requirements:
Schools eligible for CSI must briefly describe the purpose of this plan by stating that this plan will be used to meet federal CSI planning requirements.

Additional ATSI Planning Requirements:
Schools eligible for ATSI must briefly describe the purpose of this plan by stating that this plan will be used to meet federal ATSI planning requirements.

Educational Partner Involvement

Meaningful involvement of parents, students, and other stakeholders is critical to the development of the SPSA and the budget process. Within California, these stakeholders are referred to as educational partners. Schools must share the SPSA with school site-level advisory groups, as applicable (e.g., English Learner Advisory committee, student advisory groups, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, as appropriate, etc.) and seek input from these advisory groups in the development of the SPSA.

The Educational Partner Engagement process is an ongoing, annual process. Describe the process used to involve advisory committees, parents, students, school faculty and staff, and the community in the development of the SPSA and the annual review and update.

Additional CSI Planning Requirements:
When completing this section for CSI, the LEA must partner with the school and its educational partners in the development and implementation of this plan.

Additional ATSI Planning Requirements:
This section meets the requirements for ATSI.

Resource Inequities

This section is required for all schools eligible for ATSI and CSI.

Additional CSI Planning Requirements:

- Schools eligible for CSI must identify resource inequities, which may include a review of LEA- and school-level budgeting as a part of the required school-level needs assessment.
- Identified resource inequities must be addressed through implementation of the CSI plan.
- Briefly identify and describe any resource inequities identified as a result of the required school-level needs assessment and summarize how the identified resource inequities are addressed in the SPSA.

Additional ATSI Planning Requirements:

- Schools eligible for ATSI must identify resource inequities, which may include a review of LEA- and school-level budgeting as a part of the required school-level needs assessment.
- Identified resource inequities must be addressed through implementation of the ATSI plan.
- Briefly identify and describe any resource inequities identified as a result of the required school-level needs assessment and summarize how the identified resource inequities are addressed in the SPSA.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Referring to the California School Dashboard (Dashboard), identify: (a) any state indicator for which overall performance was in the "Red" or "Orange" performance category AND (b) any state indicator for which performance for any student group was two or more performance levels below the "all student" performance. In addition to Dashboard data, other needs may be identified using locally collected data developed by the LEA to measure pupil outcomes.

SWP Planning Requirements:
When completing this section for SWP, the school shall describe the steps it is planning to take to address these areas of low performance and performance gaps to improve student outcomes.

Completing this section fully addresses all SWP relevant federal planning requirements.

CSI Planning Requirements:
When completing this section for CSI, the LEA shall describe the steps the LEA will take to address the areas of low performance, low graduation rate, and/or performance gaps for the school to improve student outcomes.

Completing this section fully addresses all relevant federal planning requirements for CSI.

ATSI Planning Requirements:
Completing this section fully addresses all relevant federal planning requirements for ATSI.

Goals, Strategies/Activities, and Expenditures

In this section, a school provides a description of the annual goals to be achieved by the school. This section also includes descriptions of the specific planned strategies/activities a school will take to meet the identified goals, and a description of the expenditures required to implement the specific strategies and activities.

Additional CSI Planning Requirements:
When completing this section to meet federal planning requirements for CSI, improvement goals must also align with the goals, actions, and services in the LEA's LCAP.

Additional ATSI Planning Requirements:
When completing this section to meet federal planning requirements for ATSI, improvement goals must also align with the goals, actions, and services in the LEA's LCAP.

Goal
Well-developed goals will clearly communicate to educational partners what the school plans to accomplish, what the school plans to do in order to accomplish the goal, and how the school will know when it has accomplished the goal. A goal should be specific enough to be measurable in either quantitative or qualitative terms. Schools should assess the performance of their student groups when developing goals and the related strategies/activities to achieve such goals. SPSA goals should align to the goals and actions in the LEA's LCAP.

A goal is a broad statement that describes the desired result to which all strategies/activities are directed. A goal answers the question: What is the school seeking to achieve?

It can be helpful to use a framework for writing goals such the S.M.A.R.T. approach.
A S.M.A.R.T. goal is:

- **S**pecific,
- **M**easurable,
- **A**chievable,
- **R**ealistic, and
- **T**ime-bound.

A level of specificity is needed in order to measure performance relative to the goal as well as to assess whether it is reasonably achievable. Including time constraints, such as milestone dates, ensures a realistic approach that supports student success.
A school may number the goals using the "Goal #" for ease of reference.

Additional CSI Planning Requirements:
Completing this section as described above fully addresses all relevant federal CSI planning requirements.

Additional ATSI Planning Requirements:
Completing this section as described above fully addresses all relevant federal ATSI planning requirements.

Identified Need
Describe the basis for establishing the goal. The goal should be based upon an analysis of verifiable state data, including local and state indicator data from the Dashboard and data from the School Accountability Report Card, including local data voluntarily collected by districts to measure pupil achievement.

Additional CSI Planning Requirements:
Completing this section as described above fully addresses all relevant federal CSI planning requirements.

Additional ATSI Planning Requirements:
Completing this section as described above fully addresses all relevant federal ATSI planning requirements.

Annual Measurable Outcomes
Identify the metric(s) and/or state indicator(s) that the school will use as a means of evaluating progress toward accomplishing the goal. A school may identify metrics for specific student groups. Include in the baseline column the most recent data associated with the metric or indicator available at the time of

adoption of the SPSA. The most recent data associated with a metric or indicator includes data reported in the annual update of the SPSA. In the subsequent Expected Outcome column, identify the progress the school intends to make in the coming year.

Additional CSI Planning Requirements:
When completing this section for CSI, the school must include school-level metrics related to the metrics that led to the school's eligibility for CSI.

Additional ATSI Planning Requirements:
Completing this section as described above fully addresses all relevant federal ATSI planning requirements.

Strategies/Activities Table

Describe the strategies and activities being provided to meet the goal.
Complete the table as follows:

- Strategy/Activity #: Number the strategy/activity using the "Strategy/Activity #" for ease of reference.
- Description: Describe the strategy/activity.
- Students to be Served: Identify in the Strategy/Activity Table either All Students or one or more specific student groups that will benefit from the strategies and activities. ESSA Section 1111(c)(2) requires the schoolwide plan to identify either "All Students" or one or more specific student groups, including socioeconomically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and English learners.
- Proposed Expenditures: List the amount(s) for the proposed expenditures.
  Proposed expenditures that are included more than once in a SPSA should be indicated as a duplicated expenditure and include a reference to the goal and strategy/activity where the expenditure first appears in the SPSA. Pursuant to *EC* Section 64001(g)(3)(C), proposed expenditures, based on the projected resource allocation from the governing board or governing body of the LEA, to address the findings of the needs assessment consistent with the state priorities including identifying resource inequities which may include a review of the LEA's budgeting, its LCAP, and school-level budgeting, if applicable.
- Funding Sources: List the funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal, identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Planned strategies/activities address the findings of the comprehensive needs assessment consistent with state priorities and resource inequities, which may have been identified through a review of the LEA's budgeting, its LCAP, and school-level budgeting, if applicable.

Additional CSI Planning Requirements:
- When completing this section for CSI, this plan must include evidence-based interventions and align to the goals, actions, and services in the LEA's LCAP.
- When completing this section for CSI, this plan must address through implementation, identified resource inequities, which may have been identified through a review of LEA- and school-level budgeting.

Note: Federal school improvement funds for CSI shall not be used in schools identified for TSI or ATSI. In addition, funds for CSI shall not be used to hire additional permanent staff.

Additional ATSI Planning Requirements:
- When completing this section for ATSI, this plan must include evidence-based interventions and align with the goals, actions, and services in the LEA's LCAP.

- When completing this section for ATSI, this plan must address through implementation, identified resource inequities, which may have been identified through a review of LEA- and school-level budgeting.
- When completing this section for ATSI, at a minimum, the student groups to be served shall include the student groups that are consistently underperforming, for which the school received the ATSI designation.

Note: Federal school improvement funds for CSI shall not be used in schools identified for ATSI. Schools eligible for ATSI do not receive funding but are required to include evidence-based interventions and align with the goals, actions, and services in the LEA's LCAP.

Annual Review

In the following Goal Analysis prompts, identify any material differences between what was planned and what actually occurred as well as significant changes in strategies/activities and/or expenditures from the prior year. This annual review and analysis should be the basis for decision-making and updates to the plan.

Goal Analysis

Using actual outcome data, including state indicator data from the Dashboard, analyze whether the planned strategies/activities were effective in achieving the goal. Respond to the prompts as instructed. Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal.

- Describe the overall implementation and effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.
- Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or material difference between the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
- Describe any changes that will be made to the goal, expected annual measurable outcomes, metrics/indicators, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis and analysis of the data provided in the Dashboard, as applicable. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.

Note: *If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, the Annual Review section is not required and this section may be left blank and completed at the end of the year after the plan has been executed.*

Additional CSI Planning Requirements:

- When completing this section for CSI, any changes made to the goals, annual measurable outcomes, metrics/indicators, or strategies/activities, shall meet the federal CSI planning requirements.
- CSI planning requirements are listed under each section of the Instructions. For example, as a result of the Annual Review and Update, if changes are made to a goal(s), see the Goal section for CSI planning requirements.

Additional ATSI Planning Requirements:

- When completing this section for ATSI, any changes made to the goals, annual measurable outcomes, metrics/indicators, or strategies/activities, shall meet the federal ATSI planning requirements.
- ATSI planning requirements are listed under each section of the Instructions. For example, as a result of the Annual Review and Update, if changes are made to a goal(s), see the Goal section for ATSI planning requirements.

Budget Summary

In this section, a school provides a brief summary of the funding allocated to the school through the ConApp and/or other funding sources as well as the total amount of funds for proposed expenditures described in the SPSA. The Budget Summary is required for schools funded through the ConApp.

Note: *If the school is not operating a Title I schoolwide program, this section is not applicable and may be deleted.*

Additional CSI Planning Requirements:

- From its total allocation for CSI, the LEA may distribute funds across its schools that are eligible for CSI to support implementation of this plan. In addition, the LEA may retain a portion of its total allocation to support LEA-level expenditures that are directly related to serving schools eligible for CSI.

Note: *CSI funds may not be expended at or on behalf of schools not eligible for CSI.*

Additional ATSI Planning Requirements:
Note: *Federal funds for CSI shall not be used in schools eligible for ATSI.*

Budget Summary Table

A school receiving funds allocated through the ConApp should complete the Budget Summary Table as follows:

- **Total Funds Provided to the School Through the ConApp:** This amount is the total amount of funding provided to the school through the ConApp for the school year. The school year means the fiscal year for which a SPSA is adopted or updated.
- **Total Funds Budgeted for Strategies to Meet the Goals in the SPSA:** This amount is the total of the proposed expenditures from all sources of funds associated with the strategies/activities reflected in the SPSA. To the extent strategies/activities and/or proposed expenditures are listed in the SPSA under more than one goal, the expenditures should be counted only once.

A school receiving funds from its LEA for CSI should complete the Budget Summary Table as follows:

- **Total Federal Funds Provided to the School from the LEA for CSI:** This amount is the total amount of funding provided to the school from the LEA for the purpose of developing and implementing the CSI plan for the school year set forth in the CSI LEA Application for which funds were received.

Appendix A: Plan Requirements

Schoolwide Program Requirements

This School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) template meets the requirements of a schoolwide program plan. The requirements below are for planning reference.
A school that operates a schoolwide program and receives funds allocated through the ConApp is required to develop a SPSA. The SPSA, including proposed expenditures of funds allocated to the school through the ConApp, must be reviewed annually and updated by the Schoolsite Council (SSC). The content of a SPSA must be aligned with school goals for improving student achievement.

Requirements for Development of the Plan

I. The development of the SPSA shall include both of the following actions:
   A. Administration of a comprehensive needs assessment that forms the basis of the school's goals contained in the SPSA.
      1. The comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school shall:
         a. Include an analysis of verifiable state data, consistent with all state priorities as noted in Sections 52060 and 52066, and informed by all indicators described in Section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act, including pupil performance against state-determined long-term goals. The school may include data voluntarily developed by districts to measure pupil outcomes (described in the Identified Need).
         b. Be based on academic achievement information about all students in the school, including all groups under §200.13(b)(7) and migratory children as defined in section 1309(2) of the ESEA, relative to the State's academic standards under §200.1 to:
            i. Help the school understand the subjects and skills for which teaching and learning need to be improved.
            ii. Identify the specific academic needs of students and groups of students who are not yet achieving the State's academic standards.
            iii. Assess the needs of the school relative to each of the components of the schoolwide program under §200.28.
            iv. Develop the comprehensive needs assessment with the participation of individuals who will carry out the schoolwide program plan.
            v. Document how it conducted the needs assessment, the results it obtained, and the conclusions it drew from those results.
   B. Identification of the process for evaluating and monitoring the implementation of the SPSA and progress towards accomplishing the goals set forth in the SPSA (described in the Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes and Annual Review and Update).

Requirements for the Plan

II. The SPSA shall include the following:
   A. Goals set to improve pupil outcomes, including addressing the needs of student groups as identified through the needs assessment.
   B. Evidence-based strategies, actions, or services (described in Strategies and Activities)

1. A description of the strategies that the school will be implementing to address school needs, including a description of how such strategies will:
    a. Provide opportunities for all children including each of the subgroups of students to meet the challenging state academic standards
    b. Use methods and instructional strategies that:
        i. Strengthen the academic program in the school,
        ii. Increase the amount and quality of learning time, and
        iii. Provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education.
    c. Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging State academic standards, so that all students demonstrate at least proficiency on the State's academic standards through activities which may include:
        i. Strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas;
        ii. Preparation for and awareness of opportunities for postsecondary education and the workforce;
        iii. Implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior;
        iv. Professional development and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data; and
        v. Strategies for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs.

C. Proposed expenditures, based on the projected resource allocation from the governing board or body of the LEA (may include funds allocated via the ConApp, federal funds, and any other state or local funds allocated to the school), to address the findings of the needs assessment consistent with the state priorities, including identifying resource inequities, which may include a review of the LEAs budgeting, it's LCAP, and school-level budgeting, if applicable (described in Proposed Expenditures and Budget Summary). Employees of the schoolwide program may be deemed funded by a single cost objective.

D. A description of how the school will determine if school needs have been met (described in the Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes and the Annual Review and Update).
    1. Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement;
    2. Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and
    3. Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

E. A description of how the school will ensure parental involvement in the planning, review, and improvement of the schoolwide program plan (described in Educational Partner Involvement and/or Strategies/Activities).
F. A description of the activities the school will include to ensure that students who experience difficulty attaining proficient or advanced levels of academic achievement standards will be provided with effective, timely additional support, including measures to:
    1. Ensure that those students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis; and
    2. Provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance to those students.
G. For an elementary school, a description of how the school will assist preschool students in the successful transition from early childhood programs to the school.
H. A description of how the school will use resources to carry out these components (described in the Proposed Expenditures for Strategies/Activities).
I. A description of any other activities and objectives as established by the SSC (described in the Strategies/Activities).

Authority Cited: Title 34 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (34 *CFR*), sections 200.25-26, and 200.29, and sections-1114(b)(7)(A)(i)-(iii) and 1118(b) of the ESEA. *EC* sections 64001 et. seq.

Appendix B: Plan Requirements for School to CSI/ATSI Planning Requirements

For questions or technical assistance related to meeting federal school improvement planning requirements, please contact the CDE's School Improvement and Support Office at SISO@cde.ca.gov.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

The LEA shall partner with educational partners (including principals and other school leaders, teachers, and parents) to locally develop and implement the CSI plan for the school to improve student outcomes, and specifically address the metrics that led to eligibility for CSI (Educational Partner Involvement).

The CSI plan shall:

1. Be informed by all state indicators, including student performance against state-determined long-term goals (S*ections: Goal, Identified Need, Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes, Annual Review and Update, as applicable*);

2. Include evidence-based interventions (*Sections: Strategies/Activities, Annual Review and Update, as applicable*) (For resources related to evidence-based interventions, see the U.S. Department of Education's "Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments" at https://www2.ed.gov/fund/grant/about/discretionary/2023-non-regulatory-guidance-evidence.pdf);

   Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments

3. Be based on a school-level needs assessment (Se*ctions: Goal, Identified Need, Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes, Annual Review and Update, as applicable*); and

4. Identify resource inequities, which may include a review of LEA- and school-level budgeting, to be addressed through implementation of the CSI plan (S*ections: Goal, Identified Need, Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes, Planned Strategies/Activities; and Annual Review and Update, as applicable*).

Authority Cited: Sections 1003(e)(1)(A), 1003(i), 1111(c)(4)(B), and 1111(d)(1) of the ESSA.

Single School Districts and Charter Schools Eligible for ESSA School Improvement

Single school districts (SSDs) or charter schools that are eligible for CSI, TSI, or ATSI, shall develop a SPSA that addresses the applicable requirements above as a condition of receiving funds (*EC* Section 64001[a] as amended by Assembly Bill 716, effective January 1, 2019).

However, a SSD or a charter school may streamline the process by combining state and federal requirements into one document which may include the LCAP and all federal planning requirements, provided that the combined plan is able to demonstrate that the legal requirements for each of the plans is met (*EC* Section 52062[a] as amended by AB 716, effective January 1, 2019).

Planning requirements for single school districts and charter schools choosing to exercise this option are available in the LCAP Instructions.

Authority Cited: *EC* sections 52062(a) and 64001(a), both as amended by AB 716, effective January 1, 2019.

CSI Resources

For additional CSI resources, please see the following links:

- **CSI Planning Requirements** (see Planning Requirements tab): https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/csi.asp
- **CSI Webinars**: https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/csiwebinars.asp
- **CSI Planning Summary for Charters and Single-school Districts**: https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/csiplansummary.asp

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement

A school eligible for ATSI shall:

5. Identify resource inequities, which may include a review of LEA- and school-level budgeting, which will be addressed through implementation of its TSI plan (*Sections: Goal, Identified Need, Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes, Planned Strategies/Activities, and Annual Review and Update, as applicable*).

Authority Cited: Sections 1003(e)(1)(B), 1003(i), 1111(c)(4)(B), and 1111(d)(2)(c) of the ESSA.

Single School Districts and Charter Schools Eligible for ESSA School Improvement

Single school districts (SSDs) or charter schools that are eligible for CSI, TSI, or ATSI, shall develop a SPSA that addresses the applicable requirements above as a condition of receiving funds (*EC* Section 64001[a] as amended by Assembly Bill [AB] 716, effective January 1, 2019).

However, a SSD or a charter school may streamline the process by combining state and federal requirements into one document which may include the local control and accountability plan (LCAP) and all federal planning requirements, provided that the combined plan is able to demonstrate that the legal requirements for each of the plans is met (*EC* Section 52062[a] as amended by AB 716, effective January 1, 2019).

Planning requirements for single school districts and charter schools choosing to exercise this option are available in the LCAP Instructions.

Authority Cited: *EC* sections 52062(a) and 64001(a), both as amended by AB 716, effective January 1, 2019.

ATSI Resources:

For additional ATSI resources, please see the following CDE links:

- ATSI Planning Requirements (see Planning Requirements tab): https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/tsi.asp
- ATSI Planning and Support Webinar: https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/documents/atsiplanningwebinar22.pdf
- ATSI Planning Summary for Charters and Single-school Districts: https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/atsiplansummary.asp

Appendix C: Select State and Federal Programs

For a list of active programs, please see the following links:

- Programs included on the ConApp: https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/co/
- ESSA Title I, Part A: School Improvement: https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/schoolsupport.asp
- Available Funding: https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/af/

Updated by the California Department of Education, October 2023