TEMPLATE B

[SCHOOL DISTRICT/PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL NAME]
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN AND ANNUAL REPORTING
2017 – 2018

Mission:

[The mission statement specifies the LEA's purpose. It concisely identifies what the LEA does, why, and for whom. A mission statement identifies the unique purposes promoted and served by the LEA.]

Vision:

[An Outcome-Based Vision statement is an inspiring picture of a preferred future. The Vision Statement provides the reader with a clear description of how LEA sees the future should their goals and objectives be achieved.]

[Continuous Improvement Measures in blue are required "Statewide Continuous Improvement Measures" Performance Measures in purple are required college and career advising and mentoring plan effectiveness metrics and may be reported in the continuous improvement plan or as an appendix to the plan. Improvement/Performance Measures are placed under example goals, all goals and performance targets are set by the LEA.]

Goal	Continuous Improvement/Performance Measures	SY 2015-16 (Yr 1)	SY 2016-17 (Yr 2)	Improvement / Change (Yr 2 – Yr 1)	Benchmark / Performance Target
[Goal Statement - Goal is a planning element that describes the broad condition or outcome that the LEA is trying to achieve. Goals are the general ends toward which LEA's direct their efforts. A goal addresses issues by stating policy intention.]	*[Key performance indications/performance measures of how the performance will be monitored - Performance measures are a quantifiable assessment of the progress the LEA is making in achieving the goal. Performance measures must be quantifiable indicators of progress.]*			*[Year over year improvement for those indicators that requirement improvement reporting]*	*[Annual Performance Target set by the LEA]*
All students will be college and career ready	% of students meeting the college ready benchmark on the college entrance exam (SAT/ACT)	35%	37%	2 percentage points	60% (10% annual improvement)
	# of students meeting the college ready benchmark on the college entrance exam (SAT/ACT)	500	550	50	605 (10% increase)
	% of students participating in one or more advanced opportunity	55%	85%		95% (10% annual improvement)
	% of career-technical track high school students graduating with an industry recognized certification	32%	36%	4 percentage points	60%
	% of career-technical track high school students who passed the CTE-recognized workplace readiness exam	89%	92%	2 percentage points	93%
	# of high school students graduating with an associate's degree or a career technical certificate	20	40		80

	4-year cohort graduation rate	87%	88%		90%
	% of learning plans review annually in grade 9	100%	100%		100%
	% of learning plans review annually in grade 10	100%	100%		100%
	% of learning plans review annually in grade 11	100%	100%		100%
	% of learning plans review annually in grade 12	100%	100%		100%
	# of students who go on to some form of postsecondary education within one year of graduation from high school	156	200		250
	% of students who go on to some form of postsecondary education within one year of graduation from high school	36%	40%		60%
	# of students who go on to some form of postsecondary education within two years of graduation from high school	300	350		500
	% of students who go on to some form of postsecondary education within two years of graduation from high school	45%	50%		80%
All students will be prepared to transition from middle school / Jr. high to high school	% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the 8th grade math ISAT	39%	40%	1 percentage point	45%
	# of students who scored proficient or advanced on the 8th grade math ISAT	183	187	4	191
	% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the 8th grade ELA ISAT	56%	59%	3 percentage points	64%
	# of students who scored proficient or advanced on the 8th grade ELA ISAT	263	276	13	272
All students will be prepared to will be prepared to transition from grade 6 to grade 7	% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the 6th grade math ISAT	40%	40%	0 percentage points	42%
	# of students who scored proficient or advanced on the 6th grade math ISAT	188	187	-1	178 (based on smaller cohort)
	% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the 6th grade ELA ISAT	55%	59%	4 percentage points	64%
	# of students who scored proficient or advanced on the 6th grade ELA ISAT	258	276	18	277
All students will demonstrate the reading readiness needed to	% of students who scored proficient on the 3rd grade statewide reading assessment	69%	69%	0 percentage points	74%

transition to the next grade					
	# of students who scored proficient on the 3rd grade statewide reading assessment	317	315	-2	335
	% of students who scored proficient on the 2nd grade statewide reading assessment	74%	72%	-2 percentage points	75%
	# of students who scored proficient on the 2nd grade statewide reading assessment	342	332	-10	345
	% of students who scored proficient on the 1st grade statewide reading assessment	59%	66%	7 percentage points	71%
	# of students who scored proficient on the 1st grade statewide reading assessment	276	308	32	329
	% of students who scored proficient on the kindergarten statewide reading assessment	82%	87%	5 percentage points	91%
	# of students who scored proficient on the kindergarten statewide reading assessment	385	410	25	431
Increase student and parent engagement at all grade levels through increased attendance	Student attendance rates as a percentage	85%	95%		99%
	Parent participation at parent/teacher conferences	87%	89%		93%
Increase teacher engagement	Number of hours of job embedded professional development	20	40		80
	Number of subject level multi-grade teacher teams	5	6		10
	Number of hours available for mentor teachers to mentor or observe/team teach	30	40		60
	% of new teachers (within first 3 years) assigned a mentor / participated in district mentor program	45%	60%		100%

[School districts/Charters schools should pick performance measures and benchmarks based on an analysis of their student populations and local priorities in addition to those measures/indicators required in IDAPA 08.02.01.801. The goals and benchmarks listed in the template are for example purposes only. School districts should set their own benchmarks that are aspirational while still based on available resources and local needs. Benchmarks or performance targets set for each performance measure need to be for, at a minimum, the next fiscal year. Unless otherwise indicated benchmarks will be assumed to be for the next fiscal year.]

Analyses of Demographic Data

Analyses of demographic data from school district.

	2016-2017	2017-2018
Male	70%	68%
Female	30%	32%
White	88%	89%

Black/African American	1%	2%
Asian	1%	2%
Native American	1%	2%
Hispanic/Latino	1%	2%
Free/Reduced Lunch Program	25%	32%
Received Special Education (IEP Students)	8%	7%

[REFERENCE PAGE]
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Section 33-320, Idaho Code, in part states:

"CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND TRAINING. (1) Each school district and public charter school in Idaho shall develop an annual plan that is part of a continuous focus on improving the student performance of the district or public charter school.

(2) (a) The board of trustees and the superintendent shall collaborate on the plan and engage students, parents, educators and the community as appropriate. The board of directors and the administrator of a public charter school shall collaborate on the plan and engage students, parents, educators and the community as appropriate.

(b) The annual continuous improvement plan shall:

(i) Be data driven, specifically in student outcomes, and shall include, but not be limited to, analyses of demographic data, student achievement and growth data, graduation rates, and college and career readiness;

(ii) Set clear and measurable targets based on student outcomes;

(iii) Include a clearly developed and articulated vision and mission;

(iv) Include key indicators for monitoring performance;

(v) Include, at a minimum, the statewide student readiness and student improvement metrics; and

(vi) Include a report of progress toward the previous year's improvement goals…"

The statewide student readiness and student improvement metrics are specified in IDAPA 08.02.01.801, subsection 04.

In addition to the Continuous Improvement Plant requirements specified in Section 33-320, Idaho, Section 33-1212A, Idaho Code (College and Career Advising and Mentoring) and Section 33-1616, Idaho (Literacy Intervention) include requirements that are tied to the annual Continuous Improvement Plan reporting requirements. School Districts and Charter Schools may meet these requirements through the submittal and reporting of a consolidated plan and annual report that meets all of the requirements or each plan and report may be submitted as separate documents.

Appendices: (Optional, may be submitted as separate plans)

Appendix A: Literacy Intervention Plan: See Templates **1** and **2** on the School District / Charter School Planning and Training page of our website
Statutory requirements are specified in Section 33-1616, Idaho Code.
Administrative Code may be found in IDAPA 08.02.01.801, subsection 05, Annual Literacy Intervention Plan.

Appendix B: College and Career Advising and Mentoring Plan: See Templates **3** and **4** on the School District / Charter School Planning and Training page of our website
Statutory requirements are specified in Section 33-1212A, Idaho Code.
Administrative Code: IDAPA 08.02.01.801, subsection 06. College and Career Advising and Mentoring Plan.

The annual Continuous Improvement Plan must be reviewed, updated, and posted to the School District or Charter School website ***no later*** *than October 1 each year*. Literacy Intervention (literacy plan) and College and Career Advising and Mentoring (advising plan) plans must be submitted to the Office of the State Board of Education by October 1. If you incorporate your

literacy and advising plans into your Continuous Improvement Plan the consolidated plan must be submitted to the Office of the State Board of Education by the October 1 deadline.

In addition to the Continuous Improvement Plan requirements outlined above, Section 33-320, Idaho Code requires the board of trustees of each school district or the board of directors for each public charter school to continuously monitor progress toward the goals identified in the plan by utilizing relevant data to measure growth and to include consideration of the progress in evaluations of the district superintendent or administrator of a public charter school.

Up to $6,600 is available for each school district or charter school, on a reimbursement basis, to be used toward training for school districts superintendents and boards of trustees and public charter school administrators and boards of directors for training in continuous improvement processes and planning, strategic planning, finance, administrator evaluations, ethics and governance.