Local Control and Accountability Plan

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

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Cambrian School District	Trisha Lee Principal	leet@cambriansd.com 408-377-3022

Plan Summary [2025-26]

General Information

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

Introduction - School Site LCAPs and District Oversight

Each of the six schools in our district, including the four charter schools, is required to develop a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) to ensure alignment with California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). The LCAP is a critical planning tool that outlines how each school intends to meet annual goals for all students, with specific attention to underserved student groups. Although charter schools have certain autonomy, they are still legally required to develop and adopt an LCAP that meets state expectations. Similarly, non-charter (district-operated) schools also prepare an LCAP that reflects their local priorities, goals, and services. The school site LCAPs are tailored as modified school plans to reflect each school's unique context and specific community needs. These modified LCAPs serve both as a compliance document and as a meaningful guide for site-level planning and improvement.

All school site LCAPs, whether from charter or non-charter schools, are submitted to and approved by the District Board of Education. In contrast, the District LCAP, which encompasses goals and services for the entire district, undergoes review and approval by the County Office of Education. This distinction ensures that site-level planning remains grounded in the local school community while contributing to broader district-wide priorities and accountability.

CAMBRIAN SCHOOL DISTRICT VISION

The Cambrian School District is committed to being recognized for creativity, innovation, academic excellence, and a strong focus on educating the whole child. Our schools provide safe and supportive environments where all students can thrive. Collaboration among all stakeholders is central to our mission, guiding our continuous path of growth and improvement.

CAMBRIAN SCHOOL DISTRICT VISION

The Cambrian School District is a caring and collaborative community that nurtures creative and critical thinkers who communicate effectively, value diversity, and are prepared to excel in a global society.

STEINDORF BIG 5

1. Sustained Inquiry
2. Student-Driven
3. Feedback that Fortifies
3. Authenticity
4. Social Justice

STEINDORF STEAM SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Steindorf STEAM School is a K–8 magnet school within the Cambrian School District, serving nearly 500 students. Our diverse student body includes 3.7% socio-economically disadvantaged students, 10% English language learners, 6.7% receiving special education services, and no current foster youth. As a 2023 California Distinguished School, Steindorf is dedicated to challenging students to reach their academic and social potential and equipping them for future success. Our instructional approach emphasizes STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Math) through Project-Based Learning (PBL) and interdisciplinary integration.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM and STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Through PBL, students engage in meaningful, extended learning experiences that address complex, real-world problems. Each week, K–5 students participate in Maker Lab and music classes, with art instruction every other week. Middle school students visit the Maker Lab twice weekly and have access to a variety of electives. Steindorf fosters essential 21st-century skills—creativity, collaboration, critical thinking, and communication. High academic standards are consistently supported and achieved. Our school culture ensures that every student has the opportunity to succeed, both academically and socially. Visitors to our campus will see evidence of sustained inquiry, student-driven learning, constructive feedback, authentic real-world projects, and restorative practices. Learning happens in an environment where students are known, valued, and supported by intentional, high-quality teaching.

SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL SUPPORT AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

Social-emotional learning is embedded throughout the school day. We implement Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to promote a culture of respect, responsibility, and problem-solving. Our expectations are that all students are caring and respectful, responsible decision-makers, and effective problem-solvers.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INSTRUCTIONAL EXCELLENCE

Steindorf teachers participate in ongoing professional development and collaborate to refine instructional practices, develop engaging lessons, and provide differentiated support to meet the needs of all learners.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

We recognize that strong family partnerships are vital to student success. Steindorf warmly invites families to engage in their children's education through workshops, community-building events, Principal's Coffee, and numerous volunteer opportunities. Our Home and School Club (HSC) partners with staff and families to organize events and fundraisers that enrich our school community. Parents also contribute to

school improvement through participation in the School Site Council, DELAC, district meetings, and by supporting student learning through classroom volunteering, PBL presentations, and mentorship.

In addition to family involvement, Steindorf values its partnerships with local organizations that enhance student experiences through after-school programs and field trips. Our broader community actively supports student achievement and is dedicated to creating enriching learning environments.

COMMITMENT TO SAFETY
Cambrian School District has a strong tradition of ensuring student safety. This year, Steindorf once again participated in Incident Command System (ICS) training and conducted regular lockdown, earthquake, and fire drills. We maintain close partnerships with local police and fire departments to ensure the ongoing safety of our campus.

Reflections: Annual Performance

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

As we reflect on the past year at Steindorf STEAM School, reviewing our performance on the California State Dashboard is important. This comprehensive tool provides valuable insights into various aspects of our school's performance, highlighting areas of success and identifying growth opportunities.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE
2025-26 Targeted areas of focus:
- Data-driven decision-making: at the classroom instructional level and school-wide programing level (Data Cycles, Designated ELD, Differentiation at all levels)
- Reading performance
- Increased achievement across the school and closing the achievement gap of SWD by focusing on barrier removal
- High Quality First Instruction and GLAD Strategies
- School culture of belonging - Social emotional learning and support

SBAC ASSESSMENTS - SPRING 2024
ELA 3rd-8th: All students 80% scored at or above level; this is down 2% from last year
Math 3rd-8th: All students 82% scored at or above level; this is up 4% from last year
California Science Test (CAST) 5th: All Students 70% scored at or above level; this is down 2% from last year
California Science Test (CAST) 8th: All Students 86% scored at or above level; this is up 20% from the previous year

Our teachers' dedication and our students' hard work have resulted in impressive scores that exceed state averages. Our STEAM-focused curriculum has played a significant role in this success, fostering critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving skills essential for academic excellence.

FASTBRIDGE BENCHMARK ASSESSMENTS - 2024-25
FastBridge assessments are designed to help our educators to efficiently identify students' academic and social-emotional behavioral needs, inform targeted interventions, and monitor progress over time.- Spring 2025
ELA: 79.2% of K-1 students scored low risk: 17.7% some risk and 3.1% high risk
ELA: 87% of 2-8 students scored at/above or low risk: 10.7% low risk, 2.3% high risk
Math: 98% of K-1 students scored low risk: 1% some risk and 1% high risk
Math: 92% of 2-8 students scored at/above or low risk: 7% low risk, 2% high risk

ENGLISH LEARNER PROGRESS
The English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) on the California School Dashboard tracks the percentage of English learner (EL) students in grades 1-12 who progress toward English language proficiency. This progress is measured by comparing students' results on the Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) from the current year to the previous year.

55.2% of our 39 English Learners were progressing towards English language proficiency in 2024, a decline of 10.2% from the previous year. We have implemented several strategies to support student success. These include assigning kindergarten through 2nd grade instructional assistants to support vocabulary development for English learner students; holding a Multilingual Learner Parent Night; providing parents with tools to help their children practice for the ELPAC; and offering ongoing GLAD training throughout the school year.

CONDITIONS AND CLIMATE
Chronic Absenteeism: The California School Dashboard includes chronic absenteeism as a key indicator of school performance. This metric reflects the percentage of students in kindergarten through 8th grade who miss 10% or more of the instructional days in a school year.

1.8% of our students were chronically absent during the 2024-25 school year, a decrease of 1.9 percentage points from the previous year.

2025-26 Chronic Absenteeism - 9/491 - 1.8%
3 Asian
1 Black
1 Hispanic
4 White
1 SWD
1 SED

2024-25 Chronic Absenteeism - 18/491 - 3.7%
6 Asian
1 Black
1 Declined
2 Hispanic
6 White
2 SWD

Suspension Rates: This section explores information about the percentage of kindergarten through grade 12 students who have been suspended for at least one aggregate day in a given school year. Students suspended multiple times or for multiple days are only counted once. Our suspension rate has shifted from 1.6% in 2022-23 to 0.2% in 2023-24 to 1% in 2024-25. The suspension rate continues to remain low and is an indicator of the fidelity with which restorative practices, social-emotional curriculum, and positive behavior supports are implemented.

Suspension rates serve as an important metric and indicator for school culture and climate. They provide insight into the overall learning environment, student behavior, and the effectiveness of a school's disciplinary practices. High suspension rates can indicate challenges with student engagement, behavioral support, or school safety, while low rates often reflect a positive school climate where proactive behavior supports, restorative practices, and social-emotional learning are effectively implemented. Tracking suspension rates helps schools identify areas for improvement, monitor the impact of interventions, and ensure equitable disciplinary practices. Rates are based on students who were suspended for at least one day during a given school year. Each student is counted only once, regardless of the number of suspensions or total days suspended.

Our suspension rate has shifted over the past three years: from 1.6% in 2022–23, to 0.2% in 2023–24, and to 1.0% in 2024–25. While the rate has fluctuated slightly, it remains low overall. This trend reflects the consistent and effective implementation of restorative practices, social-emotional learning programs, and positive behavior supports throughout our schools.

Steindorf STEAM School continues to support student learning with 1:1 devices, ensuring access to technology for all students. The school utilizes Educlimber which gathers key metrics including academic benchmark data, attendance trends, discipline records, and other student data. These data points support our MTSS model for identifying trends and needs. In practice, we then identify necessary shifts in instructional practices, tiered interventions, and areas of focus for professional development.

2024-25 GLOWS:
Growing our Intervention Offerings
-Tier 3 English Learner and Reading Intervention Support
-GLAD strategies used to support English Learners
-Tier 3 Interventions (Math, Reading, English language development)
-Full-time school counselor providing academic check-ins, peer tutoring, small groups, 1-1 support, CICO
-Zen Den - A space where students can find calm, academic support, and recenter their focus in a supportive and inclusive environment.

Professional Development
-Building Thinking Classrooms
-Leading Restorative Circles

Community Building
-Kinder, 1-5, and Middle School Activity Carts
-PBIS Student Store to spend earned Steindorf Shields
-Weekly school-wide assembly

Parent Engagement
-2024-25 - Parenting Workshops presented by Hoppity Learning and The Santa Clara County Office of Education
-Principal's Coffee with more frequency - Every other month
-Frequent engagement and collaboration between school staff and HSC volunteers and leaders

Reflections: Technical Assistance

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

Not applicable.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

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

Schools Identified

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

Not applicable.

Support for Identified Schools

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

Not applicable.

Monitoring and Evaluating Effectiveness

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

Not applicable.

Engaging Educational Partners

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

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

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

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

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
Steindorf School Staff, Students, and Parents	As part of the planning process for the development of the updated site plan, a comprehensive engagement strategy was implemented to ensure input from key stakeholders, including school staff, students, and parents. The goal of this engagement was to gather diverse perspectives, identify priorities, and address any concerns to inform a plan that meets the needs of the school community. 1. Engagement with School Staff: Staff members were engaged through scheduled staff meetings, surveys, and informal discussions. Meeting Dates: 9/23/24, 10/28/24, 1/13/25, 2/24/25, 4/28/25, 5/19/25 Staff Self-Efficacy Survey: 1/22/25 Staff LCAP Survey: 3/26/25 2. Engagement with Students: Student input was gathered through focus groups and classroom activities tailored to different age groups. Students shared ideas about recreational areas, outdoor spaces, and communal facilities. Their feedback emphasized the need for more shaded seating areas, upgraded facilities, and sustainability initiatives such as gardens or recycling stations. PBIS Climate Survey: 3/28/25 Student Listening Session: 3/31/25 (SABB) Steindorf Advisory for Belonging Board: 3/28/25, 5/27/25

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	3. Engagement with Parents: Parents were consulted through surveys, School Site Council meetings, HSC meetings, and school newsletters. Discussions focused on safety, parking, traffic flow during drop-off and pick-up times, academic progress, and overall site accessibility. Principal Coffee Dates: 3/28/25, 5/9/25 HSC Meetings: 11/4/24, 3/10/25, 4/14/25, 5/12/25 Parent Family Engagement Survey: March 2025 LCAP Survey: March 2025 School Site Council Meetings: 9/23/24, 10/28/24, 1/13/25, 2/24/25, 5/28/25 -SSC Meetings: https://steindorf.cambriansd.org/for-families/school-site-council-english-learner-advisory-committee The feedback collected has been instrumental in shaping a site plan that reflects the needs and aspirations of the entire school community. Ongoing communication will be maintained to keep stakeholders informed as the project progresses.
Steindorf School Site Council and English Language Advisory Committee	The Steindorf School Site Council and English Language Advisory Council comprises of site administrator, teachers, classified staff, and parent leader representatives. This committee reviews, provides input, and advises our school on the LCAP annual updates and the development of the new Steindorf LCAP each year. The meeting agendas and minutes can be accessed through the Steindorf website: https://steindorf.cambriansd.org/for-families/school-site-council-english-learner-advisory-committee. Steindorf used various methods of engagement and communication to incorporate the input of our educational partners throughout the 2024-25 school year. Through these processes, including various community input surveys, our site leadership conducted on-going reviews of programs and services based on the most recent state and local data available to determine areas' successes and needs for improvement. The School Site Council provides an initial review and approval of the proposed site LCAP before it is sent to the Board of Trustees for their

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	review and approval. Meeting Dates: 10/24/24, 1/13/25, 2/24/25, 4/28/25, 5/19/25
Instructional Leadership Committee	The Cambrian School District's Instructional Leadership Council (ILC) is a collaborative body of site administrators, site instructional leaders, district department heads, and cabinet members. Its primary purpose is to provide strategic guidance and oversight for the district's instructional programs and initiatives. The ILC ensures alignment of instructional practices with district goals, state standards, and student needs. It oversees curriculum development and implementation, coordinates professional development, and uses data-driven decision making to inform instructional strategies and interventions. Additionally, the ILC promotes instructional innovation, advises on resource allocation, and assists in developing policies and procedures related to instruction. The committee also engages with educational partners, including parents, teachers, and community members, to gather input and feedback. By integrating diverse perspectives and expertise, the ILC drives continuous improvement and excellence in education within the district. The ILC met bi-monthly throughout the 2024-25 school year. The CSD Executive Cabinet reviews the proposed LCAP, prior to School Site Council review and approval.
CSD Governing School Board and LCAP Public Review	The CSD Governing School Board holds public meetings twice monthly throughout the year. The Governing Board of Trustees comprises five elected members and serves a four-year term. Elections are held in even-numbered years, and terms are staggered to ensure that only 2 or 3 seats are open each election. The Cambrian Board of Trustees works with the Superintendent to: - Provide direction for the district - Establish District policies and procedures - Ensures accountability - Provide community leadership on behalf of the district and public education The Governing Board meetings' agendas and minutes can be found at the following website: https://www.cambriansd.org/board-of-trustees.

Educational Partner(s)	Process for Engagement
	The Board of Trustees provide the final review and approval of the proposed site LCAP. The principal provided two annual LCAP updates on plan implementation and data analysis: 11/7/24, 5/1/25
CSD Strategic Plan/Local Control Accountability Plan Advisory Committee	The District LCAP Advisory Committee is comprised of district and site administrators, teachers, classified staff, special education teachers, the CDTA president, the CSEA president, and parent leader representatives, including each school site's parent representatives from SSC and ELAC. This committee reviews, provides input, and advises the district on the LCAP annual updates and the development of the new district LCAP each year. The meeting agendas and minutes can be accessed through the district website: https://www.cambriansd.org/. CSD used various methods of engagement and communication to engage with our educational partners throughout the 2024-25 school year. Through these processes, including various community input surveys, CSD conducted an internal review of programs and services based on the most recent state and local data available to determine areas' successes and needs for improvement. Input and responses from the various school sites and districtwide committees and venues, as well as input surveys, were examined, shared, and discussed with all educational partners, including the CSD LCAP Advisory Committee, the District ELAC to inform the development of the Local Control Accountability Plan for 2024-27. Members of each committee were provided numerous opportunities to learn, get clarification, and provide input during our meetings throughout the year. Below is the list of dates the District LCAP Advisory Committee convened in 2024-25. All meetings were conducted in person. Meeting Dates: 11/5/24, 1/14/25, 2/25/25, 4/22/25

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

The development of our Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) is a collaborative process that reflects the voices of our educational partners, including families, students, staff, and community members. Throughout the school year, we gathered input through a variety of

engagement opportunities such as staff, student and parent surveys, School Site Council and ELAC meetings, HSC, principal coffees, and student focus groups.

Educational partners consistently emphasized the importance of supporting the whole child, including a strong focus on social-emotional learning, mental health services, academic interventions, and inclusive school environments. In response to this input, the adopted LCAP prioritizes:

1. Academic Support and Intervention: Families and educators expressed the need for targeted support to address learning gaps. The LCAP includes expanded intervention services, tutoring, and differentiated instruction resources.
2. Restorative Practices and Positive Behavior Supports: Stakeholders advocated for consistent behavior expectations and alternatives to exclusionary discipline. As a result, we are investing in staff training and implementation of restorative practices and PBIS.
3. Expanded Social-Emotional Learning (SEL): Based on feedback, we have strengthened our SEL curriculum implementation and increased access to school counseling and wellness resources.
4. Student Engagement and Enrichment: Students and parents highlighted the importance of enrichment opportunities in partnership with our HSC.
5. Family Engagement and Communication: Families requested more accessible and frequent communication. The plan provides for expanded parent education workshops and increased opportunities for meaningful family involvement.

The final LCAP reflects a clear alignment between stakeholder feedback and funding priorities. By valuing and integrating community input, our school remains committed to continuous improvement and to ensuring that all students are supported academically, socially, and emotionally.

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
1	High Student Achievement: STEAM School will provide high quality and dynamic instruction for all students (including EL,SED,and SpEd)while preparing them for the 21st century, college and career readiness.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Every student has the potential for academic success and personal growth, and our commitment to this priority underscores our dedication to realizing that potential for each individual within our school district.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.1	Percentage of students that have access to their own copies of standards-aligned instructional materials for use at school and at home	100%	100%		100%	
1.2	Percent of students performing at or above standard on the Smarter Balance ELA and Math assessments and the California Science Test (CAST)	[2022-23 School Year] ELA: 82% scored at or above level Math: 78% scored at or above level	[2023-24 School Year] ELA: 80% scored at or above level Math: 82% scored at or above level		ELA: 87% scored at or above level Math: 83% scored at or above level 5th grade Science: 77% scored at or above level	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
		5th grade Science: 72% scored at or above level 8th grade Science: All Students 66% at or above level	5th grade Science: 70% scored at or above level 8th grade Science: All Students 86% at or above level		8th grade Science: All Students 71% at or above level (increase of 5%)	
1.3	CA School Dashboard: English Language Arts Distance from Standard for all students, socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) students, English Learner (EL) students, and Students with Disabilities (SWDs)	[2022-23 School Year] All: 70.2 points above standard SED: 20 points above standard EL: 36.4 points above standard SWD: 24 points below standard	[2023-24 School Year] All: 69.4 points above standard SED: 15.4 points above standard EL: 34.3 points above standard SWD: 20.7 points below standard		ELA All: Increase of 5 points above standard each year SED: increase of 10 points each year EL: increase of 10 points each year SWD: increase by 10 points each year	
1.4	CA School Dashboard: Mathematics Distance from Standard for all students, socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) students, English Learner (EL) students, and Students with Disabilities (SWDs)	[2022-23 School Year] All: 66.9 points above standard SED: 14.2 points above standard EL: 37.1 points above standard SWD: 46.8 points below standard	[2023-24 School Year] All: 77.2 points above standard SED: 46 points above standard EL: 63.8 points above standard SWD: 18 points below standard		Math All: Increase of 5 points above standard each year SED: Increase of 10 points each year EL: Increase of 10 points each year SWD: increase by 10 points each year	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
1.5	CA School Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI): The percentage of current EL students who progressed at least one ELPI level, maintained ELPI level 4	[2022-23 School Year] Progressed at least one ELPI level: 38% maintained ELPI level 4: 17% (29 students)	[2023-24 School Year] Progressed at least one ELPI level: 55.2% Maintained ELPI level 4: 10.3% (38 students)		Progressed at least one ELPI level: 48% Maintained ELPI level 4: 30% (29 students)	
1.6	Pecentage of English Learner students reclassified to Fluent English Proficient during the school year	[2023-24 School Year] 10 out of 49 were reclassified: 20%	[2024-25 School Year] 11 out of 47 English learners were reclassified: 23.4%		2023 50% reclassification	
1.7	Percentage of middle school students enrolled in a Visual and Performing Arts Course	[2023-24 School Year] 47% receive art instruction every other week 25% are enrolled in a music elective or before school class	[2024-25 School Year] 33.3% receive art instruction every three weeks 47.8% are enrolled in a music elective or before school class		47% receive art instruction every other week 25% are enrolled in a music elective or before school class	
1.8	Percentage of elementary students enrolled in a Visual and Performing Arts Course	[2023-24 School Year] 100% receive music and art instruction	[2024-25 School Year] 100%		100% receive music and art instruction	
1.9	Percentage of students with disabilities that are in general education classes 80% or more of the time	[2023-24 School Year] 100% of our students are in a general education class more than 80% of their day.	[2024-25 School Year] 100% of our students are in a general education		100% of our students are in a general education class more than 80% of their day.	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
			class more than 80% of their day.			
1.10	FastBridge Data	[Spring 2023 FastBridge] ELA 82% of K-1 students scored low risk: 15% some risk and 3% high risk Spring FastBridge ELA 89% of 2-8 students scored at/above or low risk: 10% low risk, 1% high risk Spring FastBridge Math 95% of K-1 students scored low risk: 2% some risk and 3% high risk Spring FastBridge Math 90% of 2-8 students scored at/above or low risk: 9% low risk, 1% high risk	[Spring 2024 FastBridge] ELA 79.2% of K-1 students scored low risk: 17.7% some risk and 3.1% high risk Spring FastBridge ELA 87% of 2-8 students scored at/above or low risk: 22.6% low risk, 2.3% high risk Spring FastBridge Math 97.9% of K-1 students scored low risk: 1% some risk and 1% high risk Spring FastBridge Math 92% of 2-8 students scored at/above or low risk: 22.9% low risk, 1.6% high risk		[Spring 2026 FastBridge] ELA 90% of 2-8 students scored at/above or low risk: 10% low risk, 1% high risk Spring FastBridge Math 90% of 2-8 students scored at/above or low risk: 9% low risk, 1% high risk Spring FastBridge ELA 90% of K-1 students scored low risk: 15% some risk and 3% high risk Spring FastBridge Math 95% of K-1 students scored low risk: 2% some risk and 3% high risk	

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

The implementation of Goal 1 focused on increasing student achievement and closing performance gaps among subgroups. It was largely consistent with the planned actions, with key initiatives executed to strengthen student learning and academic achievement, although some

substantive shifts occurred in response to emerging needs, data insights, and available resources. The intended actions included enhancing professional learning and refining our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) system to identify needs and provide timely intervention and support.

A major difference between the planned and actual implementation involved the intensity and focus of support provided by the instructional coach and Tier 3 extended day interventions for math and English language development. Originally envisioned as general instructional support, their role evolved to emphasize targeted small group instruction, co-teaching, and job-embedded professional development, especially in reading and math. This adjustment proved crucial in responding to identified student learning needs and enhancing classroom instruction fidelity.

Several challenges emerged during implementation. Outside student activities and commitments, initial program usage of a new software application, consistent attendance all affected the consistency and reach of interventions. Additionally, variability in teacher readiness and confidence in using data-driven instruction necessitated more differentiated and sustained professional development than initially planned.

Despite these hurdles, our students experienced notable successes. The instructional coach played a pivotal role in building teacher capacity, and data analysis sessions led to more strategic instructional planning. Subgroup performance gaps showed signs of narrowing, particularly among English Learners and students with disabilities, suggesting the adaptations made during implementation were effective.

Overall, while the path of implementation required flexible adjustments, these changes ultimately strengthened our ability to meet the goal's objectives.

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

Overall, expenditures aligned closely with budgeted projections for Goal 1 actions, with only minimal material differences. The most notable variance occurred in the implementation of intervention supports and digital resources.

Action 1.1 – English Learner Support (Extended Day Language Academy): The planned expenditure of $8,000 for personnel was fully utilized as anticipated. The alignment between budgeted and actual costs reflects consistent implementation of targeted English language development services.

Action 1.2 – Digital Subscriptions: The total of $2,600 allocated for non-personnel costs (e.g., Learning Ally) was also fully expended as planned, indicating successful deployment of differentiation tools for students with reading difficulties.

Action 1.3 – Intervention (Tier 1 and 2 Supports): $45,000 in LCFF funds was allocated and fully spent to support classroom aides for targeted intervention. However, the scope and allocation of aides shifted mid-year based on real-time data to prioritize K–2 early intervention, which may have resulted in uneven service intensity across grade levels.

Action 1.4 – Administrative Costs: The full $50,000 in base funding was spent as projected to support instructional materials and student learning initiatives. No major discrepancies occurred here.

Action 1.5 – Tier 2 and 3 Classroom Supports: A smaller allocation of $946 was budgeted and fully expended to provide sensory and recentering materials. These low-cost but high-impact resources were consistently implemented, especially for students with disabilities or attention challenges.

Regarding planned versus actual percentages of improved services, implementation remained on track for unduplicated student groups (English Learners, low-income students, and foster youth), with actions such as the Language Academy and early interventions specifically targeted to these populations. Although the qualitative impact was evident—such as improvement in ELPI progress and FastBridge scores—precise percentage improvements varied and were influenced by enrollment shifts, student mobility, and individual learning needs. Still, services were delivered as planned, and no significant shortfalls in service levels were identified.

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

Overall, the specific actions implemented under Goal 1 have been effective in supporting high student achievement and addressing the needs of English Learners (EL), socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students, and students with disabilities (SWD). While some actions had stronger outcomes than others, progress toward the goal is evident across multiple metrics.

Action 1.1 – English Learner Support (Extended Day Language Academy):
This targeted intervention proved effective, as reflected in the increase in ELPI progress: 55.2% of English Learners progressed at least one level, exceeding the target of 48%. However, the percentage maintaining ELPI level 4 was 10.3%, below the 30% target. The program contributed positively to language acquisition but may require enhancements in sustaining higher proficiency levels.

Action 1.2 – Digital Subscriptions:
The use of Learning Ally and other tools effectively supported differentiated instruction for students with reading difficulties. FastBridge results indicate solid gains: in grades 2–8, 87% of students scored at or above/low risk in ELA, with only 2.3% at high risk—demonstrating a positive trend from baseline. This action effectively supported student literacy development.

Action 1.3 – Tier 1 and 2 Interventions:
This action was particularly impactful for early learners (K–2). Small group, data-driven instruction led to increased student proficiency, especially for SED and EL students. For instance, FastBridge Math scores for K–1 students showed 97.9% at low risk. These early intervention supports were highly effective and are considered critical to long-term academic success.

Action 1.4 – Administration Costs:
Funding for instructional supplies and general support effectively contributed to maintaining the 100% access rate to standards-aligned instructional materials. This foundational support ensured equitable learning conditions and upheld the quality of instruction.

Action 1.5 – Tier 2 and 3 Classroom Supports:

Although a lower-cost investment, sensory tools and recentering kits helped address behavioral and attention challenges. These resources were especially beneficial for SWD students and contributed to maintaining 100% inclusion in general education settings for over 80% of the school day.

Summary:
Each action played a meaningful role in advancing Goal 1. Tiered interventions and targeted EL supports had the strongest evidence of effectiveness, while continued refinement is needed for sustaining high-level proficiency among ELs. The combination of instructional resources, professional support, and student-focused interventions has resulted in measurable academic progress and positive student outcomes.

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

Reflections on the implementation of Goal 1 have led to several key adjustments in the planned actions and focus areas for the coming year to better meet the diverse needs of all students and close achievement gaps more effectively.

Adjusting English Learner Support (Action 1.1):
While the Extended Day Language Academy showed positive results in ELPI growth, it fell short in sustaining students at ELPI level 4. Moving forward, EL supports will include not only language development but also academic language enrichment strategies to strengthen long-term proficiency. Progress monitoring using ELPAC will be expanded to inform differentiated supports.

Refining Intervention Focus (Action 1.3):
Data indicated that early intervention in grades K–2 had the greatest impact on student growth, particularly for English Learners and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. As a result, intervention resources and staffing will be more intentionally concentrated in the primary grades, with ongoing use of FastBridge and formative assessments to guide instructional response.

Emphasizing Student Wellness Supports (Action 1.5):
Given the positive feedback on sensory tools and their impact on classroom behavior and focus, there will be continued and potentially expanded investment in Tier 2 and 3 supports, particularly for students with attention and regulation needs.

Increasing Professional Development Integration:
Although not a standalone action in the current year, teacher capacity-building emerged as a consistent theme during reflection. Plans for the upcoming year include embedding more job-embedded coaching and targeted professional development to support implementation of small group instruction and data-driven decision-making.

Reviewing Metrics and Targets:
No major changes have been made to the goal or overall metric structure; however, there is a renewed emphasis on disaggregating data for subgroups to better assess equity in outcomes. Targets remain ambitious but achievable, and the school will continue to refine its analysis of subgroup trends to ensure interventions are effectively reaching the students who need them most.

Summary:
These planned adjustments reflect a commitment to continuous improvement. By deepening the focus on early intervention, refining EL strategies, and integrating data-informed professional learning, the school aims to accelerate progress toward high achievement for all students in the coming year.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
1.1	English Learner Support	Extended Day Language Academy (ELD) (Supplemental)	$4,500.00	Yes
1.2	Digital Subscriptions	Digital licenses that support differentiation in the classrooms. Learning Ally (Supplemental); (Library World: District Funded)	$2,600.00	No Yes
1.3	Intervention Tier 1 and 2	Based on assessment scores and the need to strengthen our tier 1 and 2 instructional strategy of small group, targeted instruction. Aides assigned to classrooms with greatest needs based on data. (Supplemental)	$42,000.00	Yes
1.4	Administration Costs	Administration costs to support student learning -supplies and materials (Base)	$50,000.00	No Yes
1.5	Tier 2 and 3 Supports	Classroom Recentering Kits/Fidgets/Manipulatives/Sensory Support	$915.00	No Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
2	Effective Leadership, Teaching and Learning: Steindorf STEAM School will provide high quality staff through recruitment, retention and professional development so every student thrives.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 1: Basic (Conditions of Learning)
Priority 2: State Standards (Conditions of Learning)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Effective teaching significantly influence student learning outcomes and overall school performance. Educator excellence focuses on attracting, retaining, and developing skilled educators dedicated to meeting the diverse needs of every student.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.1	Percentage of teachers who are appropriately assigned (i.e., have an assignment monitoring outcome of "clear")	100%	100%		100%	
2.2	Average rating on the CA School Dashboard Implementation of Academic Standards Self-Reflection Tool that were rated 4 (Full Implementation) or 5 (Full Implementation and Sustainability)	Our average is 4. We have highlighted a need to fully implement the ELD standards at a level of sustainability.	Our average is 4. We have highlighted a need to fully implement the ELD standards at a level of sustainability.		We would like to achieve an average of level 5.	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
2.3	Average response rating on the CA School Dashboard Implementation of Academic Standards Self-Reflection Tool (rating scale) 1 - Exploration and Research Phase 2 - Beginning Development 3 - Initial Implementation 4 - Full Implementation 5 - Full Implementation and Sustainability	Our average is 4. We have highlighted a need to fully implement the ELD standards at a level of sustainability.	Our average is 4. We have highlighted a need to fully implement the ELD standards at a level of sustainability.		We would like to achieve an average of level 5.	
2.4	Staff professional learning and collaboration tool	Staff rated summer professional development and onsite PD an average of 5 on a scale from 1-5 in terms of usefulness of topic and skill of instructor	Staff rated summer professional development and onsite PD an average of 4 on a scale from 1-5 in terms of usefulness of topic and skill of instructor		Continue to have a rating of 5 for usefulness of PD and skill of instructor	

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

The implementation of Goal 2—focused on effective leadership, teaching, and learning—largely aligned with the original plan, with several noteworthy successes and minor challenges encountered along the way. Professional learning opportunities before the school year, Learning Labs with teacher release time, and dedicated PBL (Project-Based Learning) planning days were implemented as intended. No substantive deviations occurred in the core structure or intent of these actions. However, while the plan anticipated a continued average rating of 5 for

staff development sessions, actual ratings slightly decreased to an average of 4, indicating room for improved alignment of content to staff needs and expectations.

A recurring challenge was ensuring that professional development, especially in the areas of Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions, consistently met the diverse needs of staff and supported the sustainable implementation of ELD (English Language Development) standards. Despite structured PD efforts, the CA Dashboard Self-Reflection Tool average remained at 4, underscoring the ongoing difficulty in reaching full implementation and sustainability in certain academic standards. A possible contributing factor to the reduced rating is the significant percentage of staff members who were new to the school site including four teachers and principal.

The school maintained a 100% rate of appropriately assigned teachers, which supports consistency in instructional quality. Additionally, staff feedback on professional development remained generally positive, suggesting strong execution and value in the selected PD formats (pre-year PD, Learning Labs, and PBL release days). These efforts contributed to continued instructional collaboration and alignment with state standards.

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

For Goal 2, there were no material differences between the budgeted expenditures and the estimated actual expenditures. All planned actions, including Professional Learning Opportunities ($7,000), Learning Labs/Release Time ($2,000), and PBL Release Day planning ($5,000), were implemented as budgeted, with actual expenditures matching the planned amounts.

As all professional development activities and instructional planning supports were delivered as scheduled and within budget, there were no notable differences between the planned and estimated actual percentages of improved services. All services were provided school-wide as intended, with targeted support embedded to address the needs of unduplicated pupils. Any variations in service impact were related more to implementation quality and staff feedback (e.g., a decrease in PD satisfaction ratings from 5 to 4) than to financial or service-level discrepancies.

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

The specific actions implemented under Goal 2 have been largely effective in supporting progress toward providing high-quality staff through recruitment, retention, and professional development.

Action 2.1 – Professional Learning Opportunities:
The pre-service professional development focused on Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions across content areas was well-received. The training contributed to consistent instructional practices and reinforced a shared understanding of intervention strategies.

Action 2.2 – Learning Labs (Release Time):
Learning Labs provided essential collaborative time for staff to refine instructional practices. These sessions promoted professional dialogue and peer-driven growth, which supported the school's continued full implementation (Level 4) of most academic standards. However,

ongoing challenges remain with elevating English Language Development (ELD) standards to a sustainable level of implementation (Level 5), highlighting an area for further focus.

Action 2.3 – PBL Release Day for Planning and Collaboration:
Dedicated time for Project-Based Learning planning has been highly effective in supporting the school's STEAM-focused instructional model. Staff reported strong engagement during these sessions, which helped ensure consistent implementation of interdisciplinary and inquiry-based instruction aligned to academic standards.

Overall Impact:
Collectively, these actions have maintained a high standard of teacher preparedness and collaboration. While full sustainability (Level 5) has not yet been reached in all areas—particularly in ELD—the foundational systems and professional culture established through these actions indicate strong progress toward achieving the goal.

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

Reflections on prior implementation of Goal 2 revealed areas of strength as well as opportunities for refinement. While no major structural changes were made to the overall goal or core actions, targeted adjustments have been identified to improve effectiveness in the coming year.

Focus on ELD Standards:
One key area for improvement is the full implementation and sustainability of English Language Development (ELD) standards. The self-reflection tool results remained at Level 4, indicating that while implementation is strong, sustainability has not yet been achieved. As a result, future professional development offerings will include a stronger focus on ELD strategies, differentiation, and instructional integration across content areas to better support English learners.

Enhancing PD Relevance and Engagement:
Based on staff feedback, which showed a slight decrease in satisfaction with professional development (from an average rating of 5 to 4), the planning team will adjust PD content to more directly align with teacher-identified needs and emerging instructional priorities. This includes offering more choice in PD sessions, incorporating teacher-led workshops, and expanding support for classroom implementation of Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions.

PBL Professional Development and Budget Considerations:
A significant portion of our staff will be attending PBL World in summer 2025. These participants will serve as trainers in a "train the trainers" model for professional development during the 2025-26 school year. This strategic shift allows us to leverage in-house expertise to enhance professional learning. Consequently, we have planned a reduction in other professional development offerings to reflect this approach. Additionally, the need to make significant budget cuts to our LCAP plan has necessitated this reduction in professional development funding.

No Changes to Metrics or Funding:

There are no changes to the metrics or target outcomes at this time, as they remain appropriate for tracking progress toward the goal. Additionally, all planned actions were implemented within budget, so no adjustments to funding levels were necessary.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
2.1	Professional Learning Opportunities	PD Day before school begins focusing on Tier 1-2 Interventions - Math/Reading/Writing/Science - PBL Modification with Tier 1-2 Imbedded Components. ($1000 Base and $6000 Supplemental)	$7,000.00	No Yes
2.2	Professional Development	Learning Labs - Release Time (Supplemental)	$2,000.00	No Yes
2.3	PBL Release Day	PBL Planning and Collaboration time (Base)	$5,000.00	No Yes

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
3	Positive School Environment, Climate and Culture: Steindorf STEAM School will provide a supportive, orderly and purposeful environment so that students can reach their full academic potential.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

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

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

An enriching learning environment is vital for supporting students success Physical, social, emotional and cultural factors shape students educational experience. The learning environment supports safe, inclusive, and engaging spaces that motivate and inspire learning.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
3.1	School facility is maintained in good repair	Steindorf is in good repair - as measured by the FIT tool	Steindorf is in good repair - as measured by the FIT tool		Steindorf is in good repair - as measured by the FIT tool	
3.2	Steindorf average daily attendance rate	96.6%	96.9%		maintain or improve above 96% all three years	
3.3	Percentage of students who attended school 96% or more of the time	80%	82%		100%	
3.4	Percentage of students who were chronically absent: All students,	All: 16 of 488: 3% SWD: 1 of 16: 6% SED: 4 of 16: 25% Homeless: N/A	All: 9 of 490: 1.8% SWD: 1 of 33: 3% SED: 1 of 86: 5.6% Homeless: N/A		All: 1% SWD: 3% SED: 12% Homeless: N/A	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
	SWD, and Homeless students					
3.5	CA School Dashboard chronic absenteeism rate	4.7% chronically absent	3.7% chronically absent		1%	
3.6	Number of middle school dropouts	0	0		0	
3.7	Percent of students suspended one or more times (Source: CA School Dashboard)	1.6%	1%		0	
3.8	Number of suspensions	1	5		0	
3.9	Number of expulsions	0	0		0	
3.10	Percentage of students in grades 2-8 reporting that they feel safe at school most or all of the time	86%	86%		95%	
3.11	Major Office Referrals	62	36		30 reduce by half	

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

During the 2024–25 school year, Steindorf STEAM K-8 Magnet School continued implementation of Goal 3: "Positive School Environment, Climate and Culture," with actions designed to support a safe, inclusive, and engaging environment that fosters academic success. Overall, the planned actions were successfully implemented as intended, with only minor deviations.

Most actions, including the PBIS Student Store, the provision of playground equipment, and support for middle school sports programs, were implemented according to plan:
-PBIS Student Store: This initiative continued to positively reinforce student behavior through the distribution of "Steindorf Shields." The action was fully funded and maintained as scheduled.
-Playground Equipment: Equipment and student activity carts were purchased and maintained to promote engagement during less structured time, addressing a broad range of student interests.

-Middle School Sports: Funds supplemented donations to ensure equitable access to sports, with coaches and referees compensated as planned.

No significant material differences were observed between budgeted and actual expenditures for these actions, indicating strong alignment between planning and execution.
-Chronic Absenteeism Decrease: Chronic absenteeism dropped from 4.7% to 3.7% (Goal: 1%), showing progress.
-Improved Attendance Rates: Average daily attendance remained strong at 96.9%, slightly above the baseline of 96.6%.
-Discipline Improvements: Major office referrals decreased significantly from 62 to 36. Suspensions also decreased from 1.6% to 1%.
-Safety Perception: 86% of students in grades 2–8 reported feeling safe at school most or all of the time, consistent with the baseline, though the target is 95%.

These trends reflect a generally effective implementation of actions aimed at improving student behavior, engagement, and overall school climate.

However, we some struggling areas are identified and in turn inform our areas of focus for the 2025-26 school year:
-Meeting Chronic Absenteeism and Attendance Targets: Although improvements were made, the school did not fully meet the ambitious targets set (e.g., 1% chronic absenteeism goal).
-Suspensions: While the rate of suspensions dropped, the number of incidents (5 suspensions) remains above the goal of zero.
-Perceived Safety: Maintaining an 86% safety perception rate fell short of the 95% target, indicating a need for deeper interventions or communication efforts to enhance the sense of safety among students.

In summary, the school implemented the planned actions for Goal 3 with fidelity, and these efforts led to observable gains in attendance, school climate, and behavioral outcomes. Remaining challenges around absenteeism and safety perception will inform adjustments to future strategies. Continued focus on these areas, combined with reflection and stakeholder input, will guide improvements for the upcoming year.

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

For Goal 3, the planned actions—including the PBIS Student Store, playground equipment, and middle school sports programs—were carried out largely as intended, with no significant material differences reported between the budgeted and actual expenditures.

-PBIS Student Store: Budgeted at $1,000 (LCFF funds), the action was implemented as planned. There is no indication of deviation in actual expenditures.
-Playground Equipment: Budgeted at $8,000, this action also aligned with implementation expectations, and there is no reported discrepancy between budgeted and actual spending.
-Middle School Sports Programs: Budgeted at $15,000 (personnel costs), this initiative was fully funded and executed as planned. No material underspending or overspending was indicated.

All expenditures under Goal 3 remained consistent with the approved plan and funding allocations. The implementation stayed within budget, and no material financial discrepancies or adjustments to the level of improved services were necessary or identified.

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

The actions implemented under Goal 3—focused on fostering a positive school environment, climate, and culture—were largely effective in making progress toward the intended outcomes.

-PBIS Student Store: This initiative contributed to a significant decrease in major office referrals, which dropped from 62 to 36. This suggests that the reinforcement of positive behavior through the reward system had a meaningful impact on school climate and student conduct.
-Playground Equipment: Ensuring access to well-maintained and varied playground and activity equipment during unstructured times likely supported student engagement and contributed to a reduction in suspensions (from 1.6% to 1%) and continued improvements in attendance rates (increased from 96.6% to 96.9%).
-Middle School Sports Programs: By maintaining equitable access to extracurricular sports, this action likely played a role in student connectedness and engagement, aligning with the drop in chronic absenteeism (from 4.7% to 3.7%) and sustained zero middle school dropout rate.

Other notable indicators of effectiveness include:
-A decrease in chronic absenteeism rates among all student groups, including Students With Disabilities (SWD) and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students.
-An increase in the percentage of students attending school 96% or more of the time (from 80% to 82%).

However, some target metrics were not yet fully met.
-The student perception of safety remained at 86%, short of the 95% target.
-Despite reductions, chronic absenteeism and suspensions did not reach their ultimate goals of 1% and 0, respectively.

Overall, the actions taken under Goal 3 have proven effective in improving school climate and student engagement. The steady improvements in behavior, attendance, and participation demonstrate the positive impact of these efforts. Ongoing attention to areas that fell short of targets will be key to maintaining momentum and closing the remaining gaps.

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

Based on reflections from the prior year's implementation of Goal 3—focused on promoting a positive school environment, climate, and culture—there have been a few notable adjustments made for the 2025–26 school year.

One significant change is the elimination of funding allocation for the Town Project in the 2025–26 LCAP. This action was removed due to required budget cuts and a need to prioritize implementation of core programs with the greatest impact on student engagement and school climate. While the Town Project was valued as a creative and community-building initiative, it was not identified as essential relative to the

other ongoing actions showing measurable impact. We will continue to receive support from the Town Project through the district-wide plan of support implementation. As a school site, we are committed to building the capacity of our own students and staff with restorative practices and will continue our plan to build a peer mediation program at our school site.

Other adjustments are based on data and reflections on prior implementation:
-Strengthening PBIS: Given the success of the PBIS Student Store in reducing office referrals, this program will continue, with consideration for expanding incentives and increasing visibility to further support positive student behavior.
-Student Safety Perception: The percentage of students who report feeling safe at school (holding at 86%) remains below the 95% goal. This signals a need to explore additional strategies—such as increased social-emotional supports, student feedback channels, and staff training—to address students' sense of safety and well-being.
-Chronic Absenteeism and Attendance: While progress was made, the target of reducing chronic absenteeism to 1% has not yet been reached. This has prompted reflection on enhancing attendance support systems, including family engagement, early intervention, and more targeted outreach to subgroups such as Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) and Students with Disabilities (SWD).

In summary, while the core goal and most associated actions remain in place, the 2025–26 plan reflects fiscally responsible adjustments and continued alignment with data-driven priorities. The elimination of the Town Project funding underscores a shift toward sustaining the most effective initiatives in the face of limited resources, while still maintaining a strong focus on student engagement, behavior, and school climate outcomes.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
3.1	PBIS Student Store	Funding to maintain the Steindorf Student Store where students can exchange their earned Steindorf Shields for items stocked in the store on a weekly basis. (Base)	$1,000.00	No Yes
3.2	Playground Equipment	Maintain our supply of required playground equipment and student activities carts to be utilized during less structured time during the school day, offering a variety of activities for our varying student interests. (Base)	$8,000.00	No Yes
3.3	Middle School Sports programs	This fund will go to supporting the sports program that donations do not cover and will support paying coaches and referees. (Base)	$15,000.00	No Yes

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description	Type of Goal
4	Strong Parent and Community Engagement: Promote a welcoming and inclusive environment for all parents, families, and community stakeholders as partners in the education and support of all students' success in school.	Broad Goal

State Priorities addressed by this goal.

Priority 3: Parental Involvement (Engagement)
Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)

An explanation of why the LEA has developed this goal.

Strong connections between schools, families, and the community positively influence student success and improvement. Community engagement cultivates relationships, encourages communication, and utilizes community resources to support student well-being.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.1	Percent of parents who responded Strongly Agree or Agree to the parent survey item: Parents have opportunities to give input into the decision-making process at school	57%	54%		80%	
4.2	Total parent attendance counts at parent meetings that meet the needs of low income, English Learner and foster youth students.	Our DLAC parent participated in all but one meeting. Our School Site Council meetings and LCAP meetings have 80% attendance rate.	Our School Site Council meetings and LCAP meetings have an attendance rate of 89%.		85% attendance rate	

Metric #	Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Target for Year 3 Outcome	Current Difference from Baseline
4.3	Parental Participation in the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELOP) for Low Income, English Learner and Foster Youth students. Parent satisfaction with program (yes or neutral responses). ELOP survey participation rate	We had 26 students participate in the play. 100% of parents were very satisfied with the opportunity to participate.	We had 3 students participate in the play. 100% of parents were very satisfied with the opportunity to participate.		Increase the number of students participating in ELOP opportunity by 20%.	

Goal Analysis [2024-25]

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

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

The implementation of Goal 4 at Steindorf STEAM K8 Magnet School aimed to foster a welcoming and inclusive environment that supports strong connections between families, the community, and the school. The primary actions included organizing community events, conducting restorative practices workshops for parents, and hosting engagement meetings such as coffees and School Site Council sessions.

While the majority of planned activities were executed as intended, some substantive differences emerged:
-Community Events (Action 4.1) were carried out as planned, with events like the ice cream social and Parent Education Nights being successfully hosted. However, while these events occurred, the goal of increasing parent input in decision-making (as measured by survey response) was not met—the percentage of parents agreeing they had input dropped slightly from 57% to 54%, instead of increasing toward the 80% target.
-Restorative Practices Parent Workshop (Action 4.2) was implemented effectively with proper preparation and staff time allocated. This workshop reflected a commitment to equipping parents with tools for engaging constructively with school practices.
-Parent Engagement Meetings (Action 4.3) saw a modest success, with meeting attendance rising from 80% to 89%. This increase reflects a positive trend toward deeper family involvement, though it still slightly fell short of the 85% target due to a lower turnout from some parent groups.

One major challenge was maintaining high and consistent parental engagement, particularly from targeted groups such as low-income families, English Learners, and foster youth. Although programs like the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELOP) were offered, participation was lower than expected. For example, student participation in the school play dropped from 26 to just 3 students in the most recent year, despite continued high parent satisfaction. This indicates a disconnect between satisfaction and actual engagement levels, possibly due to external factors such as scheduling conflicts or lack of awareness.

The implementation of Goal 4 largely adhered to the intended plan, with meaningful engagement opportunities delivered across multiple formats. However, data shows the need to refine strategies to deepen engagement, particularly in decision-making processes and program participation. The school will need to explore more personalized outreach and address potential barriers to attendance and involvement in future cycles.

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

For Goal 4: Strong Parent and Community Engagement, the planned and estimated actual expenditures were largely aligned, with minimal material differences reported across the associated actions.

Action 4.1 – Community Events had a budgeted amount of $4,000 in LCFF funds for organizing parent education and community-building activities. Parent engagement and community building continues to be a valued aspect of our school programming.

Action 4.2 – Restorative Practices Parent Workshop had a combined planned expenditure of $663, including $263 for non-personnel costs and $400 for personnel. The intention of this budget line item is to educate our parents on restorative practices that are implemented in the school setting, bringing more awareness and teaching our parents how to hold restorative conversations at home with their children.

Action 4.3 – Parent Engagement Meetings was budgeted at $13,000 ($500 for non-personnel and $12,500 for personnel). No material differences between budgeted and actual expenditures were documented, indicating funds were likely used as intended to support staffing and meeting facilitation.

Regarding Planned Percentages of Improved Services, while financial expenditures were in line with projections, the actual impact on engagement metrics—such as the percentage of parents reporting involvement in decision-making—did not meet targeted improvements. For instance, the metric for parental input in decision-making dropped slightly from the baseline (57%) to 54%, rather than progressing toward the 80% target. Similarly, while ELOP parent satisfaction remained high (100%), participation numbers fell significantly, suggesting that despite adequate funding, the effectiveness in service improvement for targeted student groups (e.g., low income, English Learners, and foster youth) did not fully materialize.

In summary, while expenditures were consistent with budgeted amounts, the expected outcomes associated with improved services for unduplicated pupils were not fully realized, indicating a need for more targeted strategies beyond funding to enhance engagement and participation.

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

The specific actions implemented under Goal 4—aimed at promoting strong parent and community engagement—have shown mixed effectiveness in making progress toward the goal.

Action 4.1 – Community Events (e.g., parent education nights, social gatherings) were effective in maintaining a welcoming school climate and providing opportunities for families to connect with school staff and each other. However, while these events fostered positive community relationships, their impact on increasing parental input in school decision-making was limited. Survey results show a decrease in the percentage of parents who felt they had opportunities to give input (from 57% to 54%), indicating this action did not effectively move the needle on this key engagement metric.

Action 4.2 – Restorative Practices Parent Workshop contributed positively to building parent capacity to support student behavior and school culture. The provision of this workshop, with appropriate resources and staff time, reflects an intentional effort to deepen parent understanding and engagement. However, the broader impact on engagement metrics tied to decision-making or increased participation is unclear, suggesting that while the workshop was valuable, its direct influence on the overall goal may have been limited.

Action 4.3 – Parent Engagement Meetings (including School Site Council and LCAP meetings) proved to be one of the more effective strategies. Attendance improved from 80% to 89%, nearing the 85% target and demonstrating strengthened engagement through formal structures. This indicates that efforts to accommodate parents—such as providing staff coverage and refreshments—helped increase attendance and participation in structured settings.

Overall, while all three actions contributed meaningfully to creating an inclusive and engaged school environment, only Action 4.3 showed clear measurable progress toward the intended outcomes. Actions 4.1 and 4.2, though implemented with fidelity, need refinement to better connect activities with increased parent involvement in decision-making and more widespread participation in programs supporting targeted student groups. Continued adjustments and targeted outreach will be essential to enhance the effectiveness of these actions moving forward.

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

Reflections on the prior year's implementation of Goal 4—focused on strengthening parent and community engagement—have highlighted key areas for improvement, leading to several changes for the upcoming year.

While the overall goal remains the same, the school is adjusting its approach to increase effectiveness and responsiveness, particularly in engaging underserved families and ensuring broader participation in decision-making processes.

Metrics and Target Outcomes: Based on survey results showing a slight decline in the percentage of parents feeling they had input in decision-making (dropping from 57% to 54%), the school recognizes a need to go beyond general community events and implement more intentional strategies to solicit meaningful parent feedback. While the 80% target remains in place, efforts will now focus on activities more directly linked to this metric.

Actions: The core actions—community events, parent workshops, and engagement meetings—will continue, but with modifications aimed at increasing their strategic impact:
-Community Events (Action 4.1) will be more intentionally designed to include structured opportunities for parent voice (e.g., surveys at events, facilitated feedback sessions).

-Restorative Practices Workshops (Action 4.2) will be expanded or paired with follow-up sessions to increase engagement and application of the practices at home.
-Parent Engagement Meetings (Action 4.3) will continue with a focus on increasing participation from underrepresented parent groups through personalized outreach and possibly offering virtual options to reduce barriers to attendance.

Expanded Learning Opportunities (ELOP): With participation declining from 26 to just 3 students despite 100% parent satisfaction, future efforts will include more proactive recruitment and better communication around program offerings, especially targeting low income, English Learner, and foster youth families.

These adjustments reflect a shift from simply offering engagement opportunities to strategically structuring those opportunities to generate meaningful parent involvement, particularly among families who have been less connected. The school is committed to using these reflections to improve both the quality and inclusiveness of its family engagement practices in the coming year.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Actions

Action #	Title	Description	Total Funds	Contributing
4.1	Community events	Parent education and community building events (Ex: Beginning of the year ice cream social), Parent Ed. Nights, etc. (Base)	$4,000.00	No Yes
4.2	Parent Workshop	Restorative practices parent workshop presented by Steindorf Staff - preparation time and supplies. (Base)	$663.00	No Yes
4.3	Parent Engagement Meetings	Staff release substitute coverage for parent meetings and supplies for parent coffees and meetings. (Base)	$13,000.00	No Yes

2025-26 Total Expenditures Table

LCAP Year	1. Projected LCFF Base Grant (Input Dollar Amount)	2. Projected LCFF Supplemental and/or Concentration Grants (Input Dollar Amount)	3. Projected Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (2 divided by 1)	LCFF Carryover — Percentage (Input Percentage from Prior Year)	Total Percentage to Increase or Improve Services for the Coming School Year (3 + Carryover %)
Totals	97,633	91,066	93.274%	0.000%	93.274%

Totals	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel
Totals	$155,678.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$155,678.00	$88,400.00	$67,278.00

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
1	1.1	English Learner Support	English Learners	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners		2025-26 SY	$4,500.00	$0.00	$4,500.00				$4,500.00	
1	1.2	Digital Subscriptions	Students with Disabilities Reading difficulties	No / Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$0.00	$2,600.00	$2,600.00				$2,600.00	
1	1.3	Intervention Tier 1 and 2	English Learners Low Income	Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)	English Learners Low Income	K-2	2025-26 SY	$42,000.00	$0.00	$42,000.00				$42,000.00	
1	1.4	Administration Costs	All	No / Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$0.00	$50,000.00	$50,000.00				$50,000.00	
1	1.5	Tier 2 and 3 Supports	Students with Disabilities Students with focus and attending difficulties	No / Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$0.00	$915.00	$915.00				$915.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
2	2.1	Professional Learning Opportunities	All	No / Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$7,000.00	$0.00	$7,000.00				$7,000.00	
2	2.2	Professional Development	All	No / Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$2,000.00	$0.00	$2,000.00				$2,000.00	
2	2.3	PBL Release Day	All	No / Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$5,000.00	$0.00	$5,000.00				$5,000.00	
3	3.1	PBIS Student Store	All	No / Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$0.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00				$1,000.00	
3	3.2	Playground Equipment	All	No / Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$0.00	$8,000.00	$8,000.00				$8,000.00	
3	3.3	Middle School Sports programs	All	No / Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$15,000.00	$0.00	$15,000.00				$15,000.00	
4	4.1	Community events	All	No / Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$0.00	$4,000.00	$4,000.00				$4,000.00	

Goal #	Action #	Action Title	Student Group(s)	Contributing to Increased or Improved Services?	Scope	Unduplicated Student Group(s)	Location	Time Span	Total Personnel	Total Non-personnel	LCFF Funds	Other State Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Planned Percentage of Improved Services
4	4.2	Parent Workshop	All	No Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$400.00	$263.00	$663.00				$663.00	
4	4.3	Parent Engagement Meetings	All	No Yes	Limited to Unduplicated Student Group(s)			2025-26 SY	$12,500.00	$500.00	$13,000.00				$13,000.00	

Steindorf STEAM School

Site LCAP School Site Council (SSC) Assurances Signature Page

As required by the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) process, the School Site Council (SSC) has reviewed the LCAP for our school. The SSC members confirm that they have provided input, discussed the plan's alignment with school and district goals, and approved the final submission of this LCAP.

SSC Member Name	Role (Parent, Teacher, Staff, Student, Admin)
Erica Boas	Parent
Sweekar Simpson	Parent
Anna Orwin	Parent
Jessica Berger	Parent
Howard Greenfield	Parent
Kate Moody	Teacher
Maya Broadnax	Teacher
Eleisa Lee	Staff
Trisha Lee	Administrator

Date of SSC Approval: May 19, 2025

SSC Chair Name:
Sweekar Simpson and/or Erica Boas

Principal's Name:
Trisha Lee

Signature:

Signature: