

# Annual Update

LCAP Year Reviewed: **2018-2019**

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the LEA's goals from the prior year LCAP. Duplicate the table as needed.

## Goal 1

WESD students will have increased access to successfully differentiated instruction in the key subject areas of Math and ELA that will improve their academic performance.

State and/or Local Priorities addressed by this goal:

State Priorities: 1. Basic Services 2. Implementation of State Standards 3. Parental Involvement 4. Pupil Achievement

Local Priorities: [Add Local Priorities Here]

## Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metrics	Baseline	2018-19	Actual
1. Implementation of differentiation	80% of assignments, grades 2-8	75% of assignments	1. 75 % of assignments were reported by teachers to be differentiated.  2. 56% of teachers reporting using depth and complexity icons regularly.  3. 87% of all students scored at or above standard in ELA 51.51% of students with disabilities score at or above standard in ELA 50% of students who are economically disadvantaged scored at or above standard in ELA  4. 84.41% of all students score at or above standard in Math 51.51% of students with disabilities scored at or above standard in Math
2. Implementation of depth and complexity All students will use icons for at least 3 instructional activities	Established 2017-18 53% of teachers use icons regularly	60% of teachers use icons regularly	
3. ELA achievement: Students scoring in		90% of all students	

Metrics	Baseline	2018-19	Actual
the top two bands of CAASPP-ELA	86% of all students 42% of students with disabilities 38% Economically disadvantaged students	46% of students with disabilities 42% of economically disadvantaged	42.85% of students who are economically disadvantaged scored at or above standard in Math  5. 95.8% attendance rate  6. 6.3% chronic absentees  7. Current year suspension rate is 0  8. Current year expulsion rate is 0
4. Math achievement: Students scoring in the top two bands of CAASPP-Math	83% of all students 42% of students with disabilities 27% of economically disadvantaged	87% of all students 46% of students with disabilities 31% of economically disadvantaged	
5. Attendance rate	Currently 96%	Greater or equal to 96%	
6. Chronic absenteeism	Currently 6.4%	Less or equal to 6%	
7. Suspension rate	Currently 0	Less or equal to 1%	
8. Expulsion rate	Currently 0	Less or equal to 1%	

## Actions / Services

Duplicate the Actions/Services from the prior year LCAP and complete a copy of the following table for each. Duplicate the table as needed.

## Action 1

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. Provide professional development for teachers in Depth and complexity and the integration of icons.</p> <p>2. Provide for teachers to attend Teachers College: Readers and Writers Institutes</p> <p>3. Provide coaching to classroom teachers in support of the implementation of Readers and Writers Workshop Units of Study</p> <p>4. Review use of cluster grouping and the use of extension activities in mathematics/ Social Studies and Science as a compliment to depth and complexity application to current content</p> <p>5. Provide coaching to classroom teachers in support of implementation of differentiation/GATE. And review use of coaching time for Differentiation/Gate</p> <p>6. Explore best practices and available resources for dually identified English learner/special education students</p> <p>7. Review materials library and time for training and collaboration</p> <p>8. Explore best practice in use of interest surveys</p>	<p>1. One training was provided to all staff on depth and complexity on March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019.</p> <p>2. Four teachers will attend Teacher's College Workshop training in the summer of 2019.</p> <p>3. A workshop coach worked with TK-5<sup>th</sup> grade teachers for five full days over the course of the 19-20 school year.</p> <p>4. Cluster grouping in 3<sup>rd</sup>,4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade was reviewed for "doability" with such small numbers. The review revealed the desire and attempt to carefully place our most able math students together whenever possible.</p> <p>5. The differentiation coach worked with teachers TK-8 in a variety of capacities in 2019-20. Her work included attendance at SST meetings, direct service to students, modeling lessons, coaching individual teachers and creating replacement curriculum.</p> <p>6. WESD worked with Stanford for the second year studying dually identified ELs.</p> <p>7. Classroom and school library inventory was studied. It was determined that classroom libraries will included materials</p>	<p><u>Amount</u> 1,4,5. 10,000 2. \$18,000 3,5. \$9,000 6-8. None</p> <p><u>Source</u> 1,4,5 Consultant, Base LCFF 2. PD, Base LCFF 3,5. Coach, Base LCFF 6-8. None</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u> 1,4,5. Object 5000 2. PD, Object 1000, 3000 3,5. Coach, Object 1000,3000 6-8. None</p>	<p><u>Amount</u> 1,4,5. \$8,000 2. \$15,180 3,5. \$9,000 6-8. None</p> <p><u>Source</u> 1,4,5 Consultant, Base LCFF 2. PD, Base LCFF 3,5. Coach, Base LCFF 6-8. None</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u> 1,4,5. Object 5000 2. PD, Object 1000, 3000 3,5. Coach, Object 1000,3000 6-8. None</p>

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
	<p>to support the Writers and Readers Units of Study while the school library will house independent and professional resources.</p> <p>8. Interest surveys were implemented in all 3-5<sup>th</sup> grade classes this year.</p>		

## Action 2

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. A program focused on open-ended instructional experiences as well as cluster/ability grouping, where appropriate, is available to all students</p> <p>2. All students receive instruction that provides for appropriate challenge</p> <p>3. 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> grade students have the opportunity to be clustered in highly able math groups and the opportunity to compact out of units when they show mastery in the pre-assessment</p> <p>a. Students will provide feedback of access to cluster and ability grouping</p> <p>b. Assessment in mathematics by unit for differentiation purposes will be evaluated</p> <p>c. K, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade students will receive opportunities to show mastery and be given challenge options in math</p>	<p>1. See above</p> <p>2. All students receive instruction that is appropriate for their learning level.</p> <p>3. 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade classes are set to include clusters of highly able math students. Students in 4<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> grade provided feedback about differentiation through the annual survey. K-2 students have opportunities to complete math at their level of mastery.</p> <p>4. 100% delivery of Readers and Writers Units of Study in TK-5<sup>th</sup> grade and 100% of Writers in MS.</p> <p>5. Via design thinking and open ended lessons.</p> <p>6. SST meetings are regularly used for extension as well as support.</p> <p>7. Interest surveys were used in 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade this year.</p>	<p><u>Amount</u> 1,2,3,6,7. No additional costs 4,5. Differentiation Consultant \$10,000</p> <p><u>Source</u> 1,2,3,6,7. No additional costs 4,5. Base LCFF</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u> 1,2,3,6,7. No additional costs 4,5. Object 5811</p>	<p><u>Amount</u> 1,2,3,6,7. No additional costs 4,5. Differentiation Consultant \$15,000</p> <p><u>Source</u> 1,2,3,6,7. No additional costs 4,5. Base LCFF</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u> 1,2,3,6,7. No additional costs 4,5. Object 5811</p>

Planned  
Actions/Services

Actual  
Actions/Services

Budgeted  
Expenditures

Estimated Actual  
Expenditures

4. Differentiation for English Language Arts is made via use of Readers and Writers Workshop Units of Study

5. Differentiation in Social Studies and Science is made via use of project-based learning, choice activities and open-ended problem solving. Review will be completed annually.

6. A SST process is used to support students for specialized and personalized learning remediation and challenge as well as social/emotional support  
The SST process will be reviewed to allow proper access for all students.

7. 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade students explore their individual identified interests through an interest survey

## Action 3

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. A TK-8<sup>th</sup> grade student interest survey given to help guide instructional experiences based on interest in some classes</p> <p>2. Students given opportunity to provide input on program processes and structures via student council and student survey</p> <p>3. Through surveys of students, staff and parents, measure progress in the use of differentiation strategies, teacher professional development and student access to the SST process and high ability clusters and grouping</p> <p>4. SSC/LCAP Advisory gather feedback annually regarding direction of differentiated instruction and access to all levels of instruction</p> <p>5. Survey results are used to make adjustments to goals</p> <p>6. Research and development on interest driven, innovation/design activities</p> <p>7. Depth and complexity use to expand to larger number of students</p>	<p>1. Interest surveys were given in 3-5<sup>th</sup> grade.</p> <p>2. Student survey was administered in March/April.</p> <p>3. All three surveys were administered in March/April.</p> <p>4. Differentiation is a topic on all three surveys.</p> <p>5. Survey results are used to craft three year goals.</p> <p>6. Design programs continue to evolve with direction from survey feedback.</p> <p>7. With 56% of TK-5 staff using depth and complexity icons use has expanded from the previous year.</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1-5. \$0 no additional costs</p> <p>6. Design Committee Stipend \$5,000; Design Committee Leads \$7500</p> <p>7. Differentiation Consultant-outlined in Goal 1. Action 2.4 above</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>6 LCFF Base Grant</p> <p>7. Differentiation Consultant-outlined in Goal 1. Action 2.4 above</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <p>6. Object 1112,3000</p> <p>7. Differentiation Consultant-outlined in Goal 1. Action 2.4 above</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1-5. \$0 no additional costs</p> <p>6. Design Committee Stipend \$1040; Design Committee Leads \$7500</p> <p>7. Differentiation Consultant-outlined in Goal 1. Action 2.4 above</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>6 LCFF Base Grant</p> <p>7. Differentiation Consultant-outlined in Goal 1. Action 2.4 above</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <p>6. Object 1112,3000</p> <p>7. Differentiation Consultant-outlined in Goal 1. Action 2.4 above</p>

## Analysis

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the LEA's goals from the prior year LCAP. Duplicate the table as needed. Use actual annual measurable outcome data, including performance data from the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, as applicable.

Describe the overall implementation of the actions/services to achieve the articulated goal.

Increased performance of two key subgroup populations in ELA and Math was achieved with added academic oversight throughout the school year. Planned training for depth and complexity helped increase use of depth and complexity icons in a number of grade levels. Differentiation on mathematics via cluster grouping continues as previously spelled out. Teachers continue to have training opportunities for readers and writers workshop via attendance at TC institutes and with the support of our on site coach. Increased use of interest surveys was seen this year.

Describe the overall effectiveness of the actions/services to achieve the articulated goal as measured by the LEA

Continued access to differentiation training provides consistent if not increased use of differentiation strategies. Increased focus on academic intervention results in increase performance in ELA and Math for students with disabilities from 42 to 46% in ELA and 42-46% in Math as well as for our economically disadvantaged students from 38-42% in ELA and 27-31% in Math.

Explain material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures.

There are no major differences between budget and actual expenditures.

Describe any changes made to this goal, expected outcomes, metrics, or actions and services to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis and analysis of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, as applicable. Identify where those changes can be found in the LCAP.

Progress was made in almost all goal areas. However, continued achievement gaps in ELA and Math for students with disabilities and low socioeconomic status require increased attention. Those actions can be found in Goal 5.

## Goal 2

### English Language Development

All WESD English learner (EL) students will receive supports as outlined in their ILPs

State and/or Local Priorities addressed by this goal:

State Priorities: 2. Implementation of State Standards 3. Parental Involvement 4. Pupil Achievement 7. Course Access

Local Priorities: Strategic Plan

### Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metrics	Baseline	2018-19	Actual
1. ELA achievement: Students scoring in the top two bands of CAASPP-ELA	86% of all students 38% of English learners 67% of RFEP students 22 students are classified as current ELs based on CELDT scores 11 students were R'FED in 2016-17	90% of all students 42% of English learners 71% of RFEP students  2% increase in EL and RFEP performance on CAASPP ELA	1. 90% of all students 28% of English learners 73.34% of RFEP
2. Math achievement: Students scoring in the top two bands of CAASPP-Math	83% of all students 15% of English learners 67% of RFEP students	87% of all students 19% of English learners 71% of RFEP students	2. 87% of all students 45.45% of English learners 73.34% of RFEP
3. English learner progress – CELDT/ELPAC 2% of EL's improving performance at least one level annually	ELPAC assessment goals to be set summer 2018 54% of EL's made one level growth	58% of EL's made one level growth	3. ELPAC assessment goals to be set 4. ELPAC summatives being given now, reclassification not to be completed until summer 5. 80% of new Tinsely families attended the orientation.
4. English learner reclassification rate	33% of ELs were reclassified as fluent	37% of ELs were reclassified as fluent	



Metrics	Baseline	2018-19	Actual
5. Parent engagement: outreach efforts % of parents of new Tinsley students attending orientation and parent education events throughout the year	60% of Tinsley parents attend annual orientation	50% of Tinsley parents attend annual orientation	
			6.

## Actions / Services

Duplicate the Actions/Services from the prior year LCAP and complete a copy of the following table for each. Duplicate the table as needed.

### Action 1

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
1. EL students have access to CCSS aligned courses and curriculum  2. EL students are given clear performance goals for meeting/exceeding standards  3. IFEP and RFEP progress monitoring with student and families includes a mid-year check on ILP progress  4. ELD specialist and reading specialist ensure EL students receive ore intermittent support to instructional goals and be provided regular opportunities to show progress  5. Opportunities are structured for collaboration between classroom teachers and EL Specialist  6. Continue piloting performance prototypes	1. 100% of EL students have access to CCSS aligned courses and curriculum.  2. 100% of EL students have an ILP with clear performance goals associated.  3. IFEP and RFEP students receive progress monitoring via twice yearly conferencing.  4. Trimester report cards include progress reports from the reading specialist for students who receive this support.  5. Articulation between general education and service providers takes place each August prior to students arriving.	<u>Amount</u> 1,2,3,5. No Cost 4. \$74,460; 88,142 6. Sequoia Committee \$5,000 7 DELAC committee stipend \$5,000	<u>Amount</u> 1,2,3,5. No Cost 4. \$63,700; \$111,986 6. Sequoia Committee \$0 (Stanford pays) 7 DELAC committee stipend \$1,500

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>for EL support garnered from Sequoia collaborative research</p> <p>7. Analyze ELPAC data to determine instructional interventions for ELs</p>	<p>6. EL Sequoia collaborative research is in the second year and we are on round two of prototypes to support dually identified EL/Special education students.</p> <p>7. Initial ELPAC data was reviewed for current year placement and support. Summative ELPAC data will be used this summer for placement, services and reclassification.</p>	<p><u>Source</u></p> <p>4. ELD Specialist 60%, Supplemental LCFF; Reading Specialist Supplemental LCFF 6, 7. Committee Stipends Base LCFF</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u> 4. Object 1100, 3000 6,7. Object 1112, 3000</p>	<p><u>Source</u></p> <p>4. ELD Specialist 60%, Supplemental LCFF; Reading Specialist Supplemental LCFF 6, 7. Committee Stipends Base LCFF</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u> 4. Object 1100, 3000 6,7. Object 1112, 3000</p>

## Action 2

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. IFEP and RFEP student progress monitoring will include weekly resource support in math and ELA</p> <p>2. Explore how growth mindset can support EL students and staff</p> <p>3. ELD specialist provides teacher consultation including supplying lists of grade level academic vocabulary and concrete strategies to support academic vocabulary development in the general education classroom</p> <p>4. El support provider meets monthly with grade-level teams for consultation and work</p>	<p>1. Middle school students who are RFEP'd receive study skills support daily.</p> <p>2. Stanford/Sequoia research project is studying mindset and how it impact our work with ELs.</p> <p>3. This support is happening only sporadically.</p> <p>4. This is not happening.</p> <p>5. EL programs are monitored via annual surveys from all constituencies as well as a deeper dive with the outreach and DELAC committees.</p> <p>6. DELAC provides input for annual goals.</p> <p>7. DELAC reviews progress toward goals.</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1-7. Cost covered in action 1 above 8,10. \$15,000 9. \$60,000 Transportation; \$20,000 translation and Para support on the bus</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1-7. Cost covered in action 1 above 8,10. \$5,541 9. \$66,475 Transportation; \$5,411 support, \$1,540 translation and \$0 Para support on the bus</p>

Planned  
Actions/Services

Actual  
Actions/Services

Budgeted  
Expenditures

Estimated Actual  
Expenditures

with students using the UC Berkeley/Berkeley Unified SD vocabulary lists and strategies

5. EL program feedback gathered via student, staff and parent surveys as well as through program review by DELAC and SSC

6. DELAC with input from students staff and other parents establishes annual outcomes

7. DELAC reviews progress made toward goals

8. Outreach to parents of EL students includes pre-year orientation and parent education events throughout the year. Expand outreach for those new to the district to include pre-academic activities, games and resources to support readiness.

9. Translation services provided to support parent participation. Transportation provided to Tinsley students to ensure attendance is maintained per Goal 1.

10. Sequoia EL research project outcomes to include program improvements.

8. Orientation for Tinsely families happens both before in the spring prior and again right before school starts. Two outreach events happened in EPA this. Increased efforts at transition to HS has resulted in five students being accepted to private schools for HS. Double the number of Tinsely students participated in the rise against hunger event.
9. Translation services continue to be provided for all engagement activities. Transportation beyond the regular school day is coordinated by Outreach.
10. Program improvements include articulation in August and improved process work via DELAC.

Source

8,10. Committee Stipends and events and program improvements; Base LCFF

9. \$20,000 50% Part Time Tinsley/Outreach/Translation support (Including support on the bus); Supplemental LCFF; \$60,000 Transportation Base LCFF

Budget Reference

8,10. Object 1104, 5899, 3000

9. Object 5862

Source

8,10. Committee Stipends and events and program improvements; Base LCFF

9. \$5,411 Tinsley/Outreach/ \$1,540 Translation support Supplemental LCFF; \$66,475 Transportation Base LCFF

Budget Reference

8,10. Object 1104, 5899, 3000

9. Object 5862

## Action 3

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. Provide opportunities for dually identified students to participate in SST for differentiation opportunities.</p> <p>2. Review push in/pull out time use and performance indicators via student, staff and parent survey and ELD team meeting review.</p> <p>3. DELAC reviews access for ELS to all aspects of the WESD program.</p> <p>4. Measure outcomes using instructional materials and outreach opportunities.</p> <p>5. Enhance instructional materials and outreach opportunities to better meet the needs of students in the Beginning and Early Intermediate ranges. (Priority #4)</p> <p>6. Review curriculum for academic vocabulary focus</p>	<p>1. This has not happened.</p> <p>2. Service delivery was reviewed in great detail for the current year. Adjustments were made to placement and service delivery.</p> <p>3. DELAC reviews access for ELS annually.</p> <p>4. Increased access to leveled reading materials recommended by outreach and DELAC committee. Materials show a broader representation of characters and experience.</p> <p>5. No newcomers this year.</p> <p>6. This has not happened outside of Stanford/Sequoia research with one teacher.</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1-2. None</p> <p>3. DELAC cost covered above in goal 2 action 2</p> <p>4, 6. None</p> <p>5. Materials</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>5. Materials \$2366 Title III; \$7634 Base LCFF</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <p>5. Object 4310</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1-2. None</p> <p>3. DELAC cost covered above in goal 2 action 2</p> <p>4, 6. None</p> <p>5. Materials</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>5. Materials \$2496 Title III; \$7634 Base LCFF</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <p>5. Object 4310</p>

## Analysis

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the LEA's goals from the prior year LCAP. Duplicate the table as needed. Use actual annual measurable outcome data, including performance data from the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, as applicable.

Describe the overall implementation of the actions/services to achieve the articulated goal.

General oversight of the EL program has improved. DELAC and Outreach initiatives have been robust and have moved the conversation about equal access forward with some very clear outcomes that benefit students and families. Specific work on program delivery has been less successful.

Describe the overall effectiveness of the actions/services to achieve the articulated goal as measured by the LEA.

The effectiveness of outreach, engagement and program monitoring has been significant. Student access and participation in all aspects of the WESD program has increased including double the number of students included in the Rise Against Hunger Event, three Tinsely students being accepted to private high schools and increased academic performance as listed in goal one. Parent participation has increased and more members of the overall WESD community have engaged in supporting our ELs and Tinsely students. We had the largest percentage of parents attend the annual orientation and significant attendance at the two EPA outreach events held this year.

Explain material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures.

The part time reading specialist position that also supported EL and 3-5 was not restaffed. Those dollars returned to the general fund. Instructional materials for RWW were purchased. Other expenditures include the DELAC and Outreach stipends.

Describe any changes made to this goal, expected outcomes, metrics, or actions and services to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis and analysis of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, as applicable. Identify where those changes can be found in the LCAP.

No changes were made once the LCAP was approved for the 18-19 school year. Changes for the next year will be reflected in the goals section.

## Goal 3

WESD Middle School students will receive instruction in a newly designed Middle School program, providing opportunities for in-depth study in key subject areas.

State and/or Local Priorities addressed by this goal:

State Priorities: 1. Basic Services 2. Implementation of State Standards 4. Pupil Achievement 6. School Climate 7. Course Access

Local Priorities: Strategic Plan

## Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metrics	Baseline	2018-19	Actual
1. ELA Achievement: MS students scoring in the top two bands of CAASPP-ELA	6 <sup>th</sup> Grade 74% 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade 94% 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade 90%	6 <sup>th</sup> Grade 81% 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade 98% 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade 90%	1. 6 <sup>th</sup> 85.71 7 <sup>th</sup> 89.58 8 <sup>th</sup> 91.66
2. Math Achievement: MS students scoring in the top two bands of CAASPP-Math	6 <sup>th</sup> Grade 74% 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade 94% 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade 76%	6 <sup>th</sup> Grade 78% 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade 98% 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade 80%	2. 6 <sup>th</sup> 74.29 7 <sup>th</sup> 87.50 8 <sup>th</sup> 75
3. Middle School Dropout Rate	0%	≤ 1%	3. 0
4. 8School Climate Survey: MS campus is viewed as both physically and emotionally safe	90% students and parents	At or above 93%	4. 96% of MS students feel safe on campus 97% of 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> grade students feel safe on campus

## Actions / Services

Duplicate the Actions/Services from the prior year LCAP and complete a copy of the following table for each. Duplicate the table as needed.

## Action 1

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will continue to receive annual professional development in design theory and integration.</li> <li>All students in all three middle school grades will experience 100% implementation of integrated instructional experiences that draw on design thinking protocol.</li> <li>Students will use design practices to develop their ability to understand others, analyze challenges, and reflect on their work.</li> <li>All 8<sup>th</sup> grade students will use design thinking protocol to complete a cross-curricular exit project.</li> <li>All 7<sup>th</sup> grade students will use design thinking protocol to complete an environment focused, cross curricular project.</li> <li>6<sup>th</sup> grade will establish a design thinking based project.</li> <li>Students will receive feedback regarding their progress toward design thinking outcomes.</li> <li>Parents and teachers will provide feedback on design integration at the middle school level.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All teachers received design thinking training for three sessions this year.</li> <li>100% of middle school students participated in an integrated design thinking project this year.</li> <li>All aspects of the design thinking protocol were included in the integrated projects at each grade level.</li> <li>All 8<sup>th</sup> grade students are completing a design thinking exit project.</li> <li>All 7<sup>th</sup> graders are completing a design thinking centered environmental integrated project.</li> <li>All 6<sup>th</sup> graders are completing a locally inspiring design thinking integrated project.</li> <li>All projects in all three grade levels are assessed against a project rubric.</li> <li>Parent communication takes place regarding design thinking projects via middle school communications and grade reports found in powerschool.</li> <li>Three open ended design challenges were offered in December of this year.</li> <li>Outreach to other middle schools included two tours, one for the ministry of education in Taiwan</li> </ol>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$10,000</li> <li>2-7. As outlined in Goal 1 Action 3</li> <li>8-11. As outlined in Goal 1 Action 3</li> </ol> <p><u>Source</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PD Design: Base LCFF</li> <li>2-11. As outlined in Goal 1 Action 3</li> </ol> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object 5250</li> <li>2-11. As outlined in Goal 1 Action 3</li> </ol>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$6,000</li> <li>2-7. As outlined in Goal 1 Action 3</li> <li>8-11. As outlined in Goal 1 Action 3</li> </ol> <p><u>Source</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PD Design: Base LCFF</li> <li>2-11. As outlined in Goal 1 Action 3</li> </ol> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object 5250</li> <li>2-11. As outlined in Goal 1 Action 3</li> </ol>

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>9. Additional open ended design challenges to be offered.</p> <p>10. Exploration of design outreach to other middle schools.</p> <p>11. Draft design instructional outcomes.</p>	<p>and one for a K-8 school in San Jose.</p> <p>11. Instructional outcomes have been established for skill building lessons at each grade level.</p>		

## Action 2

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. The Design Committee with design consultant will establish draft instructional annual outcomes.</p> <p>2. All students, include English Learners, Low income and Foster Youth, benefit from a well-coordinated, coherent MS program.</p> <p>3. Teachers will work toward greater coherence among and across subject areas and in the assignment of homework and communication of student progress.</p> <p>4. CCSS is 100% integrated and design connections with CCSSs are leveraged.</p>	<p>1. Instructional outcomes were established for skill building lessons at K-5.</p> <p>2. All students experience all aspects of the comprehensive MS program.</p> <p>3. Teacher office hours and collaboration help with the coordination of test days and work load.</p> <p>4. CCSS is 100% implemented.</p> <p>5. Community members support student work via science fair coaching, design project development and skill lesson presentation.</p> <p>6. The Woodside community is invited to celebrate our successes</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1. \$5000 2-3. None 4. \$10,000 5-9. None</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>1. SSC, Design Committee Stipends, Base LCFF 2-3. None 4. Design Instructional Materials, Lottery 5-9. None</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1. \$8540 2-3. None 4. \$8,063 5-9. None</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>1. SSC, Design Committee Stipends, Base LCFF 2-3. None 4. Design Instructional Materials, Lottery 5-9. None</p>



Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>5. Students benefit from connections and support with community institutions and members.</p> <p>6. We continue to communicate the Woodside Middle School advantage to the larger educational community.</p> <p>7. We maintain social media accounts to celebrate and communicate MS program successes and maintain alumni Facebook page.</p> <p>8. Parental feedback continues to be considered via SSC/LCAP committee and survey process.</p> <p>9. Leverage greater community resources to support Middle School programs such as design challenges and Science Fair.</p>	<p>via an open invitation to Open House, Operetta and May Day.</p> <p>7. MS maintains an instagram account.</p> <p>8. Parent feedback is gathered through the annual survey which is crafted by the SSC/LCAP advisory.</p> <p>9. Community volunteers judge science fair projects and consult on design projects.</p>	<p>Budget Reference</p> <p>1. Object 1104, 3000</p> <p>2-3. None</p> <p>4. Object 4310</p> <p>5-9. None</p>	<p>Budget Reference</p> <p>1. Object 1104, 3000</p> <p>2-3. None</p> <p>4. Object 4310</p> <p>5-9. None</p>

### Action 3

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. All students receive CCSS aligned instruction in ELA, math and science.</p> <p>2. MS ELA teachers will implement on Reading Units of Study- dystopian fiction at 7<sup>th</sup> grade.</p> <p>3. MS Science teachers will integrate NGSS with existing science resources.</p> <p>4. Advisory, a research-based SEL program designed for the specific developmental needs of adolescents, will be provided.</p> <p>5. Students struggling to perform at grade level, with particular attention paid to Tinsley students, will be supported by the MS staff review process and SST.</p> <p>6. Social Studies teachers will review new standards blueprints and materials for adoption.</p>	<p>1. All students have access to CCSS aligned instruction and materials in all key subject areas.</p> <p>2. One reading unit of study is being implemented in each grade level this year.</p> <p>3. NGSS is completely implmenented in 6-8 via the Stemscores curriculum.</p> <p>4. Advisory continues to be provided to all MS students.</p> <p>5. The SST and administrative oversight process focuses on all students scoring below grade level.</p> <p>6. SS blueprints have not been reviewed.</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1. None</p> <p>2. \$10,000</p> <p>3. \$20,000</p> <p>4.\$10,000</p> <p>5.None</p> <p>6. None</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>1. None</p> <p>2. Units of Study, Lottery</p> <p>3. NGSS Science Lottery</p> <p>4. SEL, Local Donations</p> <p>5. None</p> <p>6 None</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <p>1.None</p> <p>2. Object 4310</p> <p>3. Object 4310</p> <p>4. Object 1100, 5811</p> <p>5. None</p> <p>6. None</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1. None</p> <p>2. \$13,942</p> <p>3. \$20,992</p> <p>4.\$25,984</p> <p>5.None</p> <p>6. None</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>1. None</p> <p>2. Units of Study, Lottery</p> <p>3. NGSS Science Lottery</p> <p>4. SEL, Local Donations</p> <p>5. None</p> <p>6 None</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <p>1.None</p> <p>2. Object 4310</p> <p>3. Object 4310</p> <p>4. Object 1100, 5811</p> <p>5. None</p> <p>6. None</p>

# Analysis

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the LEA's goals from the prior year LCAP. Duplicate the table as needed. Use actual annual measurable outcome data, including performance data from the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, as applicable.

Describe the overall implementation of the actions/services to achieve the articulated goal.

MS actions/services implemented in 2018-19 include:

- ongoing training in design theory and integration
- constituent feedback collected from staff, students and parents regarding design thinking program
- one reading unit of study in each grade level has been implemented
- implementation of NGSS in all three grade levels

Implementation of goals took place through our normal structures. Units of Study is supported by on-site training and purchasing of appropriate materials through the PTA grant process, the design team delivers training and support for each grade level project, and the parent, teacher and staff surveys collect feedback about all key initiative which are also our LCAP goal areas.

Describe the overall effectiveness of the actions/services to achieve the articulated goal as measured by the LEA.

Ongoing, annual collection of survey data and constituent analysis provides valuable information for the adjustment or affirmation of goals. All but one goal was achieved and no significant changes were made after analysis. The review of Social Studies blue print was not achieved and will be added to the out year goals.

Explain material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures.

The actual expenditures are higher than budgeted expenditures. This is related to these primary areas. . In total there is a \$10K variance for Design in goal 3 Action 1 because the budget was duplicated. The \$10K in design stipends for the committee and the lead teachers was a duplicated budget item in Goal 2. Action 4 and the actuals are now outlined in Goal 4. Action 1.2 only and Goal 4 Action 1.6

Goal 3 Action 2.4 and Action 3.1 & Action 3.2 all relate to instructional materials and supplies. The budgeted amount included \$10K for NGSS science materials and \$10K for Readers Writers Workshop units of study. These were not purchased and are budgeted to be purchased in 18-19. The funds were instead used for a total exceeding \$40K to purchase other instructional materials including consumable workbooks and supplemental materials.

Goal 3 Action 3.4 referenced the SEL Committee to provide advisory support and this was implemented as planned but the committee stipends were \$10K rather than \$15K anticipated.

Describe any changes made to this goal, expected outcomes, metrics, or actions and services to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis and analysis of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, as applicable. Identify where those changes can be found in the LCAP.

No substantial changes made. The work outlined was largely achieved.

## Goal 4

WESD students will have increased access to design thinking integrated curriculum and stand alone curriculum.

All WESD students will be fully versed in design thinking theory and protocol as a tool for problem solving. All WESD students will use design thinking protocol to problem solve and enhance every day instructional experiences.

State and/or Local Priorities addressed by this goal:

State Priorities: 3. Parental Involvement 4. Pupil Engagement

Local Priorities: Strategic Plan

### Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metrics	Baseline	2018-19	Actual
1. Experiences: All students will have design thinking integrated instructional experiences in order to fully utilize design thinking strategies to problem solve	1. 3 integrated lessons per grade level with one year long integrated project in 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> grades	1. 8-12 skill building lessons 2. 1 integrated project per grade level	75% of assignments
2. Community Partnership via parent survey	Baseline established in 2017-18 at 29% participation rate	40% participation in parent survey	60% of teachers use icons regularly
1. 100% of students had both an integrated design project and skill building lessons. 2. The annual parent survey collects feedback about the design program. Survey results are shared with the SSC/LCAP advisory, Staff, Board and Design Team for action item selection. 3. Survey results are used along with board chat data collection to guide action items for out years.			

Metrics	Baseline	2018-19	Actual
3. Program development and stakeholder feedback	Baseline established in 2017-18 for student and staff survey participation Student: 76% Staff 62% participation	<b>Target:</b> Established now  <b>Actual:</b> Student: 81% Staff: 67% participation	90% of all students 46% of students with disabilities 42% of economically disadvantaged

## Actions / Services

Duplicate the Actions/Services from the prior year LCAP and complete a copy of the following table for each. Duplicate the table as needed.

### Action 1

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. All staff will continue to receive design training at during the summer and school year via design consultant, and attendance at Nueva institutes.</p> <p>2. The Design Committee will continue to provide training at least twice a year.</p> <p>3. Attendance at Nueva Innovation and/or D School Summer Institutes is made available to all teachers.</p> <p>4. Expand training for higher-level program development and integration into the classroom experience.</p> <p>5. Explore and secure more specialized training provided by D School or Nueva Staff.</p>	<p>1. All staff are offered the chance to attend design training at Nueva at the summer institute.</p> <p>2. The design committee provided three design trainings this year.</p> <p>3. See above.</p> <p>4. A design coach was enlisted for the first half of the year to steer work of the design committee.</p> <p>5. See above.</p> <p>6. Teacher design leads per grade span was implemented for the second year.</p> <p>7. Design lab calendar and materials plans are managed by grade span leads along with Design instructors.</p>	<p><u>Amount</u> 1,3, 4,5. \$10,000 2, 6. \$12,500 covered above in Goal 3 Action 1 7. \$30,000 8-9. None</p>	<p><u>Amount</u> 1,3, 4,5. \$9,000 2, 6. \$14,540 covered above in Goal 3 Action 1 7. \$8,063 8-9. None</p>

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>6. Each grade span (Tk-2, 3-5, MS) will pilot a teacher leader in design who will assist grade-level teams find natural design integration opportunities.</p> <p>7. Establish a job sharing and an equipment/materials matrix for classroom teachers and the design team.</p> <p>8. Consider opening our program's best practices to the greater educational community.</p> <p>9. Collect community input regarding expert designer value add.</p>	<p>8. WESD hosted two tours this year; one from the ministry of education in Taiwan and one from K-8 steam school in San Jose, CA.</p> <p>9. Community design resources were collected via a Wildcat Weekly invitation.</p>	<p><u>Source</u> 1,3,4,5. Professional Development, Base LCFF 2,6,8,9. Instructional Lead &amp; Design Committee, Base LCFF 7. Equipment Instructional materials, Lottery, local donations</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u> 1,3,4,5. Object 5250 2,6,8,9. PD, Object 1104, 3000 7. Object 4310</p>	<p><u>Source</u> 1,3,4,5. Professional Development, Base LCFF 2,6,8,9. Instructional Lead &amp; Design Committee, Base LCFF 7. Equipment Instructional materials, Lottery, local donations</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u> 1,3,4,5. Object 5250 2,6,8,9. PD, Object 1104, 3000 7. Object 4310</p>

## Action 2

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. Parents will continue to be involved in setting program direction through feedback gathering and will be invited to participate in the guest designer program.</p> <p>2. The Design Committee will consider ways to enlist community members in the offering of open-ended design challenges.</p>	<p>1. The design program is assessed annually through all constituent surveys and staff and board forums.</p> <p>2. Committee support was provided in the crafting of three design challenges shared in December.</p> <p>3. See above.</p>	<p><u>Amount</u> 1-3. Design Committee same as above in Goal 3 Action 1</p>	<p><u>Amount</u> 1-3. Design Committee same as above in Goal 3 Action 1</p>

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
3. The Design Committee will consider community outreach to other school systems to share best practices such as assessment.		<div> <u>Source</u>            1-3. Design Committee same as above in Goal 3 Action 1         </div> <div> <u>Budget Reference</u>            1-3. Design Committee same as above in Goal 3 Action 1         </div>	<div> <u>Source</u>            1-3. Design Committee same as above in Goal 3 Action 1         </div> <div> <u>Budget Reference</u>            1-3. Design Committee same as above in Goal 3 Action 1         </div>

## Action 3

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
1. The Design Committee and SSC/LCAP Advisory will establish annual outcomes.  2. Committee meeting minutes and outreach activity agendas will measure access to all design activities for all students with particular attention paid to Tinsley students.  3. The Design Committee, in conjunction with the MS team, established a 6 <sup>th</sup> grade design project.  4. The Design Committee will explore ways to incorporate more opportunities to have open-ended design challenges.	1. The design committee will use all feedback to determine annual goals. 2. All data gathered measures full access to design programs initiatives. 3. The sixth grade project is in it's first full year of implementation this year. 4. Three design challenges were offered this year.	<div> <u>Amount</u>            1. Design Committee Same as above in Goal 3 Action 1         </div> <div> <u>Source</u>            1 -4. Design Committee Same as above in Goal 3 Action 1         </div>	<div> <u>Amount</u>            1. Design Committee Same as above in Goal 3 Action 1         </div> <div> <u>Source</u>            1 -4. Design Committee Same as above in Goal 3 Action 1         </div>

		<u>Budget Reference</u> 1-4. Design Committee Same as above in Goal 3 Action 1	<u>Budget Reference</u> 1-4. Design Committee Same as above in Goal 3 Action 1
--	--	--	--

# Analysis

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the LEA’s goals from the prior year LCAP. Duplicate the table as needed. Use actual annual measurable outcome data, including performance data from the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, as applicable.

Describe the overall implementation of the actions/services to achieve the articulated goal.

All the action items were achieved this school year. All students had consistent access to design projects and the lab. The design committee was able to establish an assessment rubric for design skills and experiences. All stakeholder surveys provided valuable feedback to help set direction for the next school year’s implementation of the program including staffing, use of the lab, integration versus design based activity balance and use of guest designers. Differentiated training was provided with a Stanford design consultant.

Describe the overall effectiveness of the actions/services to achieve the articulated goal as measured by the LEA.

All goal areas were implemented well. Stakeholder feedback regarding open ended challenge opportunities was implemented with three events and significant attendance. Parent/expert interest was utilized with at least four guest speaker events taking place on topics such as scale, coding and graphic arts. Teacher feedback resulted in skill building lessons being provided at all grade levels that support integrated projects as well as provide students a chance to learn all the equipment in the design lab.

Explain material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures.

The actual expenditures are higher than budgeted expenditures. This is related to these primary areas. The Design curriculum received one time funding for equipment of \$60K and has spent \$37K the remaining funds will be available in 18-19. Ongoing funding of \$10K to purchase materials to support the various



integrated projects has been added and was outlined in Goal 1 and Goal 4. The design committee references in Goal 4.2 and 4.3 are included in the cost estimates of 4.1.

Describe any changes made to this goal, expected outcomes, metrics, or actions and services to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis and analysis of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, as applicable. Identify where those changes can be found in the LCAP.

The goals continue to be focused on three things: professional development, community outreach, and stakeholder input.

You will see that the goal is set up for three action areas as listed above in the planned action and services section. Metrics have been updated to reflect student performance and other quantified data has been updated.

# Goal 5

WESD students will have increased access to CCSS aligned instructional experiences in key subject matter including Science and History/Social Science.

State and/or Local Priorities addressed by this goal:

State Priorities: 1. Basic Services 2. Implementation of State Standards 3. Parental Involvement 4. Pupil Achievement 7. Course Access

Local Priorities: Strategic Plan

## Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metrics	Baseline	2018-19	Actual
1. Teacher Assignment	100% of classroom teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for	100% of teachers will be appropriately assigned and fully credentialed.	1. 100% of classroom teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed. 2. 96 FIT Score 3. 100% of students have access to CCSS aligned and adopted instructional materials.

Metrics	Baseline	2018-19	Actual
	the pupils they are teaching.		<p>4. NGSS CAASPP data will be available in August/September.</p> <p>5. 100% of students who scored below grade level on ELA and or Math in 2018 have a structured learning plan; ILP, IEP or academic intervention plan.</p>
2. School Facilities	Maintained and in good repair with FIT Score of 98.02%/100%	FIT Score $\geq$ 96%	
3. Instructional Materials	100% of students have access to CCSS aligned and adopted instructional materials.	100% of students have access to CCSS aligned and adopted instructional materials.	
4. Science Achievement: Students scoring in the top two bands of CAASPP-Science	Baseline was be determined in 2017-2018	Baseline data delayed a year. Achievement targets will be determined once baseline is set in 2019-20.	
5. Student Performance Structure: Collection of annual ILP, 504, IEP and SST	Baseline is 100% of students without an IEP, who scored below standard on CAASPP to be identified for an individualized learning plan.	100% of all students, including those with an IEP to be identified for a learning plan	

## Actions / Services

Duplicate the Actions/Services from the prior year LCAP and complete a copy of the following table for each. Duplicate the table as needed.

## Action 1

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. All teachers will be fully credentialed and appropriately assigned.</p> <p>2. Provide a Beginning Teacher Support and Assistance program for newly hired teachers.</p> <p>3. Facilities will support the instructional program and be maintained in good repair by 1.0 FTE maintenance staff and 2.0 FTE custodial staff.</p> <p>4. All students will have access to locally adopted and approved CCSS aligned instructional materials.</p>	<p>1. 100% of teachers are fully credentialed and appropriately assigned.</p> <p>2. All new teacher are provided BTSA support.</p> <p>3. Facilities and custodial support staff remains the same at 1.0 maintenance and 2.0 custodial.</p> <p>4. 100% of students have complete access to CCSS aligned instructional materials.</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1. \$6,017,173</p> <p>2. \$9,500</p> <p>3. \$358,996</p> <p>4. \$40,000</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>1. Highly Credentialed Teachers Base Salary, Base LCFF</p> <p>2. BTSA Stipend, Base LCFF</p> <p>3. Facilities staff, Base LCFF</p> <p>4. Instructional Materials, Lottery</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <p>1. Object 1100, object 3000-3602</p> <p>2. Object 1104</p> <p>3. Object 2240, 3000-3602</p> <p>4. Object 4310</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1. \$6,028,034</p> <p>2. \$4,000</p> <p>3. \$362,692</p> <p>4. \$36,098</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>1. Highly Credentialed Teachers Base Salary, Base LCFF</p> <p>2. BTSA Stipend, Base LCFF</p> <p>3. Facilities staff, Base LCFF</p> <p>4. Instructional Materials, Lottery</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <p>1. Object 1100, object 3000-3602</p> <p>2. Object 1104</p> <p>3. Object 2240, 3000-3602</p> <p>4. Object 4310</p>

## Action 2

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All students will have full access to NGSS aligned instructional materials.</li> <li>2. New NGSS materials were chosen for the Middle School.</li> <li>3. TK-5 science will be supported by NGSS aligned FOSS Kits, Zspace technology/ curriculum and design thinking activities.</li> <li>4. Through the SSC and Board reports, parents were asked to provide input on the proposed science materials.</li> <li>5. Continue setting Performance standards for NGSS.</li> <li>6. Continue to Analyze coordination between state mandated assessments and local assessments.</li> <li>7. NGSS MS materials will be introduced.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 100% of students have full access to NGSS aligned instructional materials; Stem Scopes, Zspace and Foss.</li> <li>2. Stemscores was chosen for the MS and has been fully implemented.</li> <li>3. TK-5 uses NGSS aligned Foss and zspace as well as integrated design opportunities.</li> <li>4. Parent input was sought through annual surveys and board chats.</li> <li>5. Performance standards will be established when NGSS CAASPP scores are shared in early fall.</li> <li>6. Coordination of local assessments and CAASPP will take place when scores are available in the fall.</li> <li>7. NGSS MS materials have been fully implemented.</li> </ol>	<div> <u>Amount</u>            1,2,7. Outlined above in Goal 3 Action 3            3. \$17,000 (ZSpace &amp; Foss Kits)            4-6. None         </div> <div> <u>Source</u>            1,2,3,7. Outlined above in Goal 3 Action 3            4-6. None         </div> <div> <u>Budget Reference</u>            1,2,3,7. Outlined above in Goal 3 Action 3            4-6. None         </div>	<div> <u>Amount</u>            1,2,7. Outlined above in Goal 3 Action 3            3. \$13,878 (ZSpace &amp; Foss Kits)            4-6. None         </div> <div> <u>Source</u>            1,2,3,7. Outlined above in Goal 3 Action 3            4-6. None         </div> <div> <u>Budget Reference</u>            1,2,3,7. Outlined above in Goal 3 Action 3            4-6. None         </div>

Planned  
Actions/Services

Actual  
Actions/Services

Budgeted  
Expenditures

Estimated Actual  
Expenditures

### Action 3

Planned  
Actions/Services

Actual  
Actions/Services

Budgeted  
Expenditures

Estimated Actual  
Expenditures

1. Woodside Instructional Objectives will outline the instructional program in Reading and Writing for all students at each grade level.
2. Outcomes will be measured by evaluation of local and State assessment goals.

1. No further work has been done on instructional objectives in the 2018-19 year.
2. Assessment of those objectives will need to be postponed.

Amount

1. None
2. None

Amount

1. None
2. None

### Action 4

Planned  
Actions/Services

Actual  
Actions/Services

Budgeted  
Expenditures

Estimated Actual  
Expenditures

1. Student Services team will ensure full access to NGSS for students with disabilities.
2. Parental involvement will monitor access to design/science integration.

1. 100% of students have full access to NGSS. Students with an IEP or ILP are supported via student services team to ensure full access.
2. SSC/LCAP advisory monitors the program quality of science/design.

Amount

1. None
2. None

Amount

1. None
2. None

## Action 5

Planned Actions/Services	Actual Actions/Services	Budgeted Expenditures	Estimated Actual Expenditures
<p>1. Articulation of student performance in key areas will be conducted annually and be the focus of one Board retreat. Administration to meet with every family and intervention plans were established</p> <p>2. Wrap around services will continue to be made available for any student of need including all students with disabilities and should our student population change to include foster or homeless youth. These service plans ensure 100% access to required course content and curriculum.</p> <p>3. Record keeping on intervention meeting outcomes and program monitoring is consistent.</p> <p>4. Long term analysis of EL performance in Stanford/Sequoia EL research.</p>	<p>1. The annual board retreat included a review of student placement and performance in ELA, Math and world languages at Woodsdie HS for the last four years.</p> <p>2. Wrap around services include designation of a point person, team review of student data and an intervention plan. This service is provided to any student who has identified needs and or is not meeting academic standards.</p> <p>3. The SST process is the center of the record keeping for academic intervention.</p> <p>4. We are in our second year of Stanford/Sequoia EL research. We continue to focus our work on long term ELs who typically also qualify for an IEP.</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1. Administration 7.5% of time spent for weekly IEP meetings \$37,500</p> <p>2-3. None</p> <p>4. Sequoia EL Research outlined above in Goal 2 Action 2</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>1. Base LCFF</p> <p>2-3 None</p> <p>4. Sequoia EL Research outlined above in Goal 2 Action 2</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <p>1. Object 1000-3699</p> <p>2-3 None</p> <p>4. Sequoia EL Research outlined above in Goal 2 Action 2</p>	<p><u>Amount</u></p> <p>1. Administration 7.5% of time spent for weekly IEP meetings \$12,436</p> <p>2-3. None</p> <p>4. Sequoia EL Research outlined above in Goal 2 Action 2</p> <p><u>Source</u></p> <p>1. Base LCFF</p> <p>2-3 None</p> <p>4. Sequoia EL Research outlined above in Goal 2 Action 2</p> <p><u>Budget Reference</u></p> <p>1. Object 1000-3699</p> <p>2-3 None</p> <p>4. Sequoia EL Research outlined above in Goal 2 Action 2</p>

# Analysis

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the LEA's goals from the prior year LCAP. Duplicate the table as needed. Use actual annual measurable outcome data, including performance data from the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, as applicable.

Describe the overall implementation of the actions/services to achieve the articulated goal.

Action/services to be implemented include:

- continued access to CCSS aligned materials, fully credentialed teachers, appropriate school facilities
- community partnership in collection of feedback regarding key programs, and enlisting community involvement in design
- The development of instructional objectives in key content areas has not taken place this year
- wrap around services for those scoring below grade level

Describe the overall effectiveness of the actions/services to achieve the articulated goal as measured by the LEA.

All actions/services were completed with the exception of instructional objective project. Wrap around services for all students not meeting standard on CAASPP in ELA and Math were highlighted through administrator goals and board/superintendent focus. As listed in goal one analysis, both sub groups reported on saw increases in performance. Our EL numbers are not high enough to be report on CAASPP but local analysis shows that EL s saw growth in the percentage RFEP'd from the previous year from 33-37% in the current year. Growth on ELPAC cannot be reported on until next year.

Explain material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures.

The major variance is from the additional costs for credentialed teachers. This increase includes a 2.5% salary increase as well as the GASB 68 benefits additional expenses exceeding \$500K that were not included in the budgeted expenses. Another variance was \$86K in maintenance costs for staffing. This includes a 2.5% increase that was not included in the budgeted expense. This also includes \$30K in overtime expense for summer work to prepare the classrooms after the summer camp was complete. Finally the \$80K variance in instructional materials was budgeted as a duplicate in Goal 5 Action 1.4 and Action 2.1 These were duplicated budgeted amounts from those outlined in Goal 4 and the actuals were included in goal 4.

Describe any changes made to this goal, expected outcomes, metrics, or actions and services to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis and analysis of the LCFF Evaluation Rubrics, as applicable. Identify where those changes can be found in the LCAP.

No significant changes have been made to this goal or expected outcomes except that we have not done any work on the development of instructional objectives.

We do not currently have any foster or homeless students. The work associated with this goal and this action specifically will be broad enough in scope and nature to cover potential needs of foster or homeless youth should the need arise.



