



---

**Iowa Department of Education**

***Student Achievement, Accountability and  
Professional Development Annual Report***

---

***Iowa Department of Education***  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319

January, 2014

State of Iowa  
**Department of Education**  
Grimes State Office Building  
400 E 14<sup>th</sup> St  
Des Moines IA 50319-0146

***State Board of Education***

Rosie Hussey, President, Clear Lake  
Charles C. Edwards, Jr., Vice President, Des Moines  
Diane Crookham-Johnson, Oskaloosa  
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines  
Michael L. Knedler, Council Bluffs  
Valorie J. Kruse, Sioux City  
Mike May, Spirit Lake  
Max Phillips, Woodward  
LaMetta Wynn, Clinton  
Edgar Thornton, Student Member, Iowa City

**Administration**

Brad A. Buck, Director and Executive Officer  
of the State Board of Education

**Division of Learning and Results**

David Tilly, Deputy Director

**Bureau of Educator Quality**

Byron Darnall, Chief  
Matt Ludwig, Consultant

**Bureau of Standards and Curriculum**

Lea Davidson, Chief  
Rita Martens, Lead Consultant

**Division of Communication & Information Services**

Jay Pennington, Chief  
Tom Deeter, Lead Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, sex, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the Iowa Code sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d and 2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, et seq.), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688), Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.). If you have questions or complaints related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, 400 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146, telephone number: 515-281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, Citigroup Center, 500 W. Madison Street, Suite 1475, Chicago, IL 60661-4544, telephone number: 312-730-1560, FAX number: 312-730-1576, TDD number: 877-521-2172, email: [OCR.Chicago@ed.gov](mailto:OCR.Chicago@ed.gov).

Legislation passed during the 2001 Iowa legislative session established the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program, Iowa Code Section 284.12(1). This legislation requires the Iowa Department of Education (DE) to annually report the statewide progress on the following: student achievement scores in mathematics and reading at the fourth and eighth grade levels on a district-by-district basis; evaluator training program; team-based variable pay for student achievement; and changes and improvements in the evaluation of teachers under the Iowa Teaching Standards. The report is being made available to the chairpersons and ranking members of the Senate and House committees on education, the legislative education accountability and oversight committee, the deans of the colleges of education at approved practitioner preparation institutions in this state, the State Board of Education, the Governor, and school districts.

**Student Achievement Scores in Reading and Mathematics at the Fourth and Eighth Grade Levels on a District-by-District Basis 2011-12 and 2012-13  
Biennium Adequate Yearly Progress Report Percentage of Students Proficient  
(Iowa School Districts)**

<b>District</b>	<b>Grade 4 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Grade 8 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 8 Math</b>
AGWSR CSD	91.1	89.3	58.8	80.9
Adair-Casey CSD	76.9	79.5	51.2	70.7
Adel DeSoto Minburn CSD	88.2	82.8	78.3	82.8
Akron Westfield CSD	84.1	85.5	70.7	74.7
Albert City-Truesdale CSD	88.0	84.0		
Albia CSD	71.1	66.3	67.1	78.9
Alburnett CSD	79.5	79.5	59.3	75.6
Alden CSD	81.1	83.8		
Algona CSD	74.9	77.8	62.7	74.7
Allamakee CSD	80.4	79.1	72.4	83.0
Alta CSD	64.9	67.6		
Ames CSD	84.0	86.8	82.7	90.1
Anamosa CSD	81.9	87.2	67.9	77.6
Andrew CSD	65.7	68.6	63.3	70.0
Ankeny CSD	89.8	92.8	82.3	91.4
Anthon-Oto CSD	53.8	53.8	46.7	51.1
Aplington-Parkersburg CSD	79.5	76.8	65.9	72.6
Armstrong-Ringsted CSD	88.0	84.0	78.9	68.4
Ar-We-Va CSD	81.3	87.5	66.7	90.9
Atlantic CSD	76.3	82.1	64.6	73.0
Audubon CSD	73.4	87.5	64.7	88.2
Aurelia CSD	55.6	58.3	63.2	63.2
A-H-S-T CSD	77.5	74.6	70.7	83.8
Ballard CSD	82.5	81.7	70.3	76.0
Battle Creek-Ida Grove CSD	82.5	82.5		
Baxter CSD	79.3	75.9	59.1	74.2
BCLUW CSD	85.5	90.8	75.8	86.8

<b>District</b>	<b>Grade 4 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Grade 8 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 8 Math</b>
Bedford CSD	70.7	81.0	77.2	81.0
Belle Plaine CSD	63.8	65.0	66.2	80.9
Bellevue CSD	77.5	94.4	52.9	75.3
Belmond-Klemme CSD	81.7	88.2	55.3	74.8
Bennett CSD	94.7	73.7		
Benton CSD	76.9	85.8	73.0	76.6
Bettendorf CSD	81.6	90.3	71.3	78.2
Bondurant-Farrar CSD	83.5	86.7	76.7	85.1
Boone CSD	82.8	81.6	64.0	70.3
Boyden-Hull CSD	85.9	89.1	77.0	83.9
Boyer Valley CSD	80.3	80.3	61.0	64.4
Brooklyn-Guernsey-Malcom CSD	77.0	91.8	50.6	83.1
Burlington CSD	72.9	80.2	61.8	64.0
CAL CSD	44.1	52.9	51.9	70.4
Calamus-Wheatland CSD	79.7	75.7	69.7	76.3
CAM CSD	62.7	76.3	58.5	88.7
Camanche CSD	70.7	73.3	70.1	75.8
Cardinal CSD	60.9	76.6	61.8	71.1
Carlisle CSD	81.3	90.4	69.3	81.5
Carroll CSD	83.3	83.8	80.4	83.1
Cedar Falls CSD	74.4	82.8	75.3	82.6
Cedar Rapids CSD	69.9	77.8	67.0	73.4
Center Point-Urbana CSD	76.6	85.3	73.8	86.2
Centerville CSD	80.9	83.7	59.1	68.5
Central City CSD	74.5	85.5	79.2	88.9
Central Clinton CSD	82.8	83.9	70.1	73.4
Central CSD	69.4	90.3	61.9	71.4
Central Decatur CSD	65.3	81.1	59.8	57.0
Central Lee CSD	77.7	83.5	71.8	81.0
Central Lyon CSD	90.4	85.6	85.7	86.9
Central Springs CSD	90.2	90.2	60.3	82.8
Chariton CSD	71.6	80.9	61.7	78.1
Charles City CSD	71.7	71.7	68.9	77.1
Charter Oak-Ute CSD	61.9	66.7	56.3	65.3
Cherokee CSD	76.1	75.4	72.1	83.7
Clarinda CSD	83.3	86.8	54.5	69.2
Clarion-Goldfield CSD	78.3	77.2	71.3	84.4
Clarke CSD	72.6	82.7	63.1	73.3
Clarksville CSD	67.4	74.4	70.5	70.5
Clay Central-Everyly CSD	84.8	87.9	67.4	76.7

<b>District</b>	<b>Grade 4 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Grade 8 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 8 Math</b>
Clayton Ridge CSD	77.8	81.9	73.8	76.3
Clear Creek Amana CSD	80.9	82.2	64.8	78.4
Clearfield CSD	N < 10	N < 10		
Clear Lake CSD	79.5	86.1	62.0	61.4
Clinton CSD	77.9	78.0	58.8	60.7
Colfax-Mingo CSD	78.5	83.2	61.8	81.6
College CSD	78.0	80.8	72.0	80.9
Collins-Maxwell CSD	75.8	74.2	58.6	67.2
Colo-Nesco CSD	83.6	87.3	59.7	74.2
Columbus CSD	51.4	55.2	35.0	49.5
Coon Rapids-Bayard CSD	76.6	74.5	55.2	63.8
Corning CSD	76.5	82.4	66.7	84.1
Corwith-Wesley CSD			70.0	90.0
Council Bluffs CSD	66.4	65.0	58.8	58.8
Creston CSD	64.9	62.3	74.0	79.8
Dallas Center-Grimes CSD	85.2	87.9	84.5	90.0
Danville CSD	71.8	80.0	65.1	68.6
Davenport CSD	64.8	67.8	54.8	64.3
Davis County CSD	76.9	78.3	64.0	83.6
Decorah CSD	82.6	87.0	84.8	95.1
Delwood CSD	93.5	100.0		
Denison CSD	65.2	81.1	62.8	75.1
Denver CSD	78.9	86.2	77.2	87.7
Des Moines Independent CSD	59.8	60.3	48.0	57.3
Diagonal CSD	85.7	85.7	62.5	75.0
Dike-New Hartford CSD	83.9	81.3	65.0	85.8
Dows CSD	87.5	93.8		
Dubuque CSD	72.6	76.9	63.5	75.4
Dunkerton CSD	78.7	82.0	44.7	65.8
Durant CSD	73.4	69.6	66.7	76.9
Eagle Grove CSD	70.1	84.1	60.2	68.5
Earlham CSD	83.0	75.5	75.5	75.5
East Buchanan CSD	77.9	79.1	72.0	78.7
East Central CSD	75.0	70.8		
East Greene CSD	54.1	64.9	55.6	72.2
East Marshall CSD	75.5	74.7	63.9	82.8
East Mills CSD	82.0	85.2	55.4	86.2
East Sac County CSD	82.1	78.3	68.4	74.3
East Union CSD	74.6	66.7	65.7	71.4
Eastern Allamakee CSD	67.9	76.8	63.6	83.6

<b>District</b>	<b>Grade 4 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Grade 8 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 8 Math</b>
Eddyville-Blakesburg CSD	66.4	70.7	53.3	71.0
Edgewood-Colesburg CSD	72.5	66.7	52.7	56.8
Eldora-New Providence CSD	79.0	77.8		
Emmetsburg CSD	67.6	68.6	65.3	73.7
English Valleys CSD	75.5	87.8	69.2	72.3
Essex CSD	83.3	83.3	82.1	82.1
Estherville Lincoln Central CSD	69.1	66.5	52.2	72.5
Exira CSD	63.5	69.2	59.2	87.8
Fairfield CSD	77.7	78.7	66.5	84.5
Farragut CSD	47.8	43.5		
Forest City CSD	84.9	84.2	80.0	80.6
Fort Dodge CSD	63.0	68.8	50.4	57.9
Fort Madison CSD	77.1	80.6	69.0	
Fredericksburg CSD	68.6	74.3	66.4	82.4
Fremont CSD	58.3	50.0		
Fremont-Mills CSD	74.6	86.6	51.7	70.7
Galva-Holstein CSD	83.0	92.5		
Garner-Hayfield CSD	66.1	81.7	68.5	80.8
George-Little Rock CSD	85.7	76.8	59.2	66.2
Gilbert CSD	94.1	91.9	88.7	95.4
Gilmore City-Bradgate CSD	64.3	57.1	60.0	70.0
Gladbrook-Reinbeck CSD	74.2	69.7	79.5	72.6
Glenwood CSD	82.6	86.9	74.5	74.8
Glidden-Ralston CSD	85.4	82.9	64.8	66.7
GMG CSD	82.8	82.8	49.1	78.2
Graettinger-Terril CSD	73.9	65.2	61.9	76.2
Grinnell-Newburg CSD	88.2	93.4	76.9	87.1
Griswold CSD	75.0	85.9	66.2	77.9
Grundy Center CSD	79.8	86.5	76.9	92.3
Guthrie Center CSD	84.5	91.5	60.0	73.8
H-L-V CSD	76.6	87.2	58.7	67.4
Hamburg CSD	55.6	66.7	54.5	69.7
Hampton-Dumont CSD	65.7	82.8	69.9	74.1
Harlan CSD	77.0	82.1	78.4	86.4
Harmony CSD	78.4	64.9	56.7	51.6
Harris-Lake Park CSD	92.3	98.1	71.4	81.0
Hartley-Melvin-Sanborn CSD	72.2	79.7	63.1	84.5
Highland CSD	66.3	76.5	58.5	72.3
Hinton CSD	79.3	82.6	75.0	85.0
Howard-Winneshiek CSD	69.6	71.9	63.9	78.9

<b>District</b>	<b>Grade 4 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Grade 8 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 8 Math</b>
Hubbard-Radcliffe CSD	62.8	74.4	72.0	81.6
Hudson CSD	79.0	77.0	73.4	86.2
Humboldt CSD	87.8	89.8	70.3	84.9
IKM-Manning CSD	68.2	68.2	78.7	88.0
Independence CSD	77.0	86.8	57.5	73.7
Indianola CSD	79.6	74.2	80.2	84.4
Interstate 35 CSD	76.9	79.8	68.5	65.8
Iowa City CSD	74.4	77.2	73.2	79.9
Iowa Falls CSD	78.2	74.3	73.5	72.4
Iowa Valley CSD	79.7	91.1	54.5	74.2
Janesville Consolidated SD	71.8	71.8	83.9	83.9
Jefferson-Scranton CSD	88.8	82.5	74.4	83.2
Jesup CSD	73.6	81.3	61.7	60.0
Johnston CSD	89.7	91.2	85.2	91.4
Keokuk CSD	74.0	83.7	59.1	65.6
Keota CSD	80.4	80.4	75.8	81.8
Kingsley-Pierson CSD	83.3	75.0	56.6	65.8
Knoxville CSD	76.3	80.1	65.4	81.8
Lake Mills CSD	76.7	79.6	54.4	64.4
Lamoni CSD	65.4	71.2	62.1	75.9
Laurens-Marathon CSD	52.8	72.2	50.0	55.0
Lawton-Bronson CSD	83.8	73.8	70.1	83.5
Le Mars CSD	79.3	80.0	69.3	83.4
Lenox CSD	83.3	91.7	55.7	77.0
Lewis Central CSD	65.0	66.6	59.9	64.6
Linn-Mar CSD	85.0	89.3	78.1	85.9
Lisbon CSD	84.9	69.9	61.6	80.8
Logan-Magnolia CSD	87.4	94.3	78.6	75.0
Lone Tree CSD	79.1	80.6	64.2	77.3
Louisa-Muscatine CSD	72.5	77.1	60.3	59.5
LuVerne CSD	81.3	75.0		
Lynnvile-Sully CSD	85.2	85.2	86.6	92.5
Madrid CSD	87.4	89.3	67.6	67.9
Manson Northwest Webster CSD	84.1	96.3	74.4	85.6
Maple Valley CSD	72.9	52.5	51.2	63.4
Maquoketa CSD	65.4	69.1	54.1	71.7
Maquoketa Valley CSD	85.9	91.3	77.7	78.6
Marcus-Meriden-Cleghorn CSD	78.4	82.4	58.5	79.6
Marion Independent SD	79.4	72.9	72.5	81.3
Marshalltown CSD	58.6	74.1	47.1	63.1

<b>District</b>	<b>Grade 4 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Grade 8 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 8 Math</b>
Martensdale-St Marys CSD	87.0	85.5	61.8	76.5
Mason City CSD	71.5	73.4	63.4	63.4
Mediapolis CSD	74.4	88.9	73.7	88.7
Melcher-Dallas CSD	85.0	85.0	56.7	76.7
MFL MarMac CSD	67.7	69.7	64.4	75.4
Midland CSD	76.3	72.9	66.7	77.1
Mid-Prairie CSD	76.4	79.2	75.7	89.5
Missouri Valley CSD	70.5	77.2	57.5	64.2
MOC-Floyd Valley CSD	86.3	85.0	81.1	87.2
Montezuma CSD	83.1	92.3	52.7	81.1
Monticello CSD	74.2	69.7	63.8	75.7
Moravia CSD	75.4	70.2	60.0	80.0
Mormon Trail CSD	61.5	57.7	58.8	50.0
Morning Sun CSD	72.7	81.8		
Moulton-Udell CSD	84.0	84.0	63.9	69.4
Mount Ayr CSD	75.3	88.8	65.3	79.2
Mount Pleasant CSD	73.7	77.0	65.4	78.3
Mount Vernon CSD	87.6	83.9	76.6	86.6
Murray CSD	76.7	72.1	59.5	81.0
Muscatine CSD	77.1	80.3	58.7	61.9
Nashua-Plainfield CSD	80.3	82.9	72.9	92.9
Nevada CSD	85.6	79.8	68.7	77.0
New Hampton CSD	77.5	89.1	64.4	70.5
New London CSD	72.0	89.3	50.6	72.7
Newell-Fonda CSD	87.0	78.3	69.4	80.6
Newton CSD	71.7	73.6	63.6	64.8
Nodaway Valley CSD	77.6	80.6	66.0	77.0
North Butler CSD	88.7	81.7	68.2	88.6
North Cedar CSD	74.8	74.8	53.4	65.5
North Fayette CSD	81.9	82.9	74.5	78.8
North Iowa CSD	74.5	94.1	51.5	60.6
North Kossuth CSD	61.3	77.4		
North Linn CSD	79.8	89.9	66.0	74.5
North Mahaska CSD	82.1	86.6	72.3	78.3
North Polk CSD	82.2	78.5	79.5	84.7
North Scott CSD	86.1	90.6	75.6	83.3
North Tama County CSD	83.6	91.8	64.6	75.9
North Winneshiek CSD	89.3	85.7	65.5	82.8
Northeast CSD	82.6	93.5	78.5	83.1
Northeast Hamilton CSD	76.2	81.0	55.6	74.1



<b>District</b>	<b>Grade 4 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Grade 8 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 8 Math</b>
Northwood-Kensett CSD	69.7	72.5	67.6	71.6
Norwalk CSD	87.8	91.1	78.2	90.3
Odebolt-Arthur CSD	75.9	81.5	73.6	85.5
Oelwein CSD	71.9	75.5	68.0	81.5
Ogden CSD	82.8	86.2	81.1	87.4
Okoboji CSD	89.8	94.9	75.9	79.1
Olin Consolidated SD	75.0	87.5	N < 10	N < 10
Orient-Macksburg CSD	62.5	87.5	60.9	82.6
Osage CSD	90.9	86.0	62.8	77.7
Oskaloosa CSD	59.1	57.9	62.9	72.2
Ottumwa CSD	57.1	72.2	54.2	57.1
Panorama CSD	72.4	81.9	64.2	71.6
Paton-Churdan CSD	88.0	96.0	52.6	73.7
PCM CSD	87.7	85.7	66.4	74.6
Pekin CSD	83.0	91.0	69.7	82.8
Pella CSD	85.2	80.6	80.7	88.7
Perry CSD	51.0	63.6	52.7	51.3
Pleasant Valley CSD	84.7	90.5	75.6	87.5
Pleasantville CSD	84.0	85.1	79.1	86.0
Pocahontas Area CSD	73.4	84.4	66.0	80.0
Pomeroy-Palmer CSD	83.3	83.3	72.1	72.1
Postville CSD	60.5	77.8	41.4	54.3
Prairie Valley CSD	82.4	93.2	66.7	83.3
Prescott CSD	N < 10	N < 10		
Preston CSD	79.6	94.4	71.9	90.6
Red Oak CSD	74.3	81.6	60.5	69.8
Remsen-Union CSD	89.5	81.6	63.2	78.9
Riceville CSD	80.0	93.3	64.7	70.6
River Valley CSD	77.8	79.6	76.0	88.0
Riverside CSD	76.3	80.0	78.2	77.0
Rock Valley CSD	78.0	80.2	75.0	83.3
Rockwell City-Lytton CSD	84.1	88.4	66.7	80.5
Roland-Story CSD	90.7	84.3	78.6	80.2
Rudd-Rockford-Marble Rock CSD	69.2	84.6	57.1	67.1
Ruthven-Ayrshire CSD	73.9	82.6	65.7	82.9
Saydel CSD	67.7	70.9	61.9	58.0
Schaller-Crestland CSD	81.1	89.2	58.8	78.4
Schleswig CSD	75.7	75.7	68.8	70.8
Sentral CSD	90.0	90.0	59.3	70.4
Sergeant Bluff-Luton CSD	89.6	84.8	77.6	81.4

<b>District</b>	<b>Grade 4 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Grade 8 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 8 Math</b>
Seymour CSD	58.1	67.7	58.1	90.3
Sheldon CSD	73.2	81.3	68.6	88.4
Shenandoah CSD	78.7	76.2	64.7	68.6
Sibley-Ocheyedan CSD	65.1	75.5	60.7	68.8
Sidney CSD	82.9	80.5	72.9	84.7
Sigourney CSD	75.3	69.9	74.3	78.6
Sioux Center CSD	80.7	87.9	67.4	82.2
Sioux Central CSD	78.1	71.9	62.8	60.6
Sioux City CSD	67.0	76.1	57.3	56.4
Solon CSD	85.1	86.7	73.2	83.7
South Hamilton CSD	80.5	86.2	70.0	77.8
South O'Brien CSD	85.3	90.7	74.7	80.0
South Page CSD	58.8	76.5	50.0	64.3
South Tama County CSD	65.4	71.3	50.0	58.5
South Winneshiek CSD	75.5	67.9	57.8	78.1
Southeast Polk CSD	81.2	84.4	71.7	71.3
Southeast Warren CSD	83.1	80.0	60.3	74.6
Southeast Webster Grand CSD	85.5	91.9	60.3	55.9
Southern Cal CSD	65.6	71.9		
Spencer CSD	80.1	82.4	73.5	75.6
Spirit Lake CSD	84.9	88.5	75.9	80.9
Springville CSD	63.6	68.2	78.7	88.5
St Ansgar CSD	86.4	87.7	68.0	82.5
Stanton CSD	63.3	93.3	71.1	89.5
Starmont CSD	83.3	87.2	61.4	81.8
Storm Lake CSD	62.9	65.5	58.8	67.7
Stratford CSD	88.2	94.1		
Sumner CSD	73.0	73.0		
Tipton CSD	78.4	81.3	64.4	84.8
Titonka Consolidated SD	61.5	84.6		
Treynor CSD	80.7	73.9	79.8	86.6
Tri-Center CSD	79.8	70.2	75.2	81.2
Tri-County CSD	77.8	88.9	77.1	91.4
Tripoli CSD	71.2	69.7	62.9	74.3
Turkey Valley CSD	83.3	91.7	67.7	88.7
Twin Cedars CSD	65.9	75.0	65.7	62.7
Twin Rivers CSD	N < 10	N < 10		
Underwood CSD	79.0	79.0	74.6	79.2
Union CSD	75.1	70.7	60.1	67.0
United CSD	83.7	81.6		

<b>District</b>	<b>Grade 4 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Grade 8 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 8 Math</b>
Urbandale CSD	82.6	83.7	71.0	77.5
Valley CSD	63.5	82.7	68.4	86.0
Van Buren CSD	82.6	77.9	58.9	70.0
Van Meter CSD	74.4	81.1	80.7	86.4
Ventura CSD	89.3	78.6	50.0	56.7
Villisca CSD	63.9	80.6	57.4	76.6
Vinton-Shellsburg CSD	87.0	81.5	63.2	88.3
Waco CSD	76.7	80.0	54.8	67.2
Walnut CSD	90.5	90.5	43.8	75.0
Wapello CSD	68.5	60.9	53.3	63.8
Wapsie Valley CSD	74.5	82.7	61.8	79.4
Washington CSD	61.5	70.0	59.5	81.0
Waterloo CSD	57.2	63.4	52.9	53.8
Waukee CSD	85.0	89.3	81.9	89.0
Waverly-Shell Rock CSD	90.0	87.4	79.1	88.8
Wayne CSD	78.7	86.7	76.4	80.0
Webster City CSD	74.6	84.8	64.6	83.6
West Bend-Mallard CSD	76.6	85.1	74.5	70.2
West Branch CSD	71.2	82.2	73.1	87.5
West Burlington Ind SD	70.8	79.2	63.4	68.8
West Central CSD	66.7	74.1	57.1	85.7
West Central Valley CSD	79.0	81.5	68.7	79.4
West Delaware County CSD	83.3	85.4	70.7	78.9
West Des Moines CSD	80.8	87.1	78.9	84.2
West Fork CSD	80.7	83.1	59.6	67.0
West Hancock CSD	72.5	76.9	70.2	82.1
West Harrison CSD	59.6	74.5	58.3	72.9
West Liberty CSD	69.3	74.2	67.3	84.3
West Lyon CSD	89.1	84.0	67.3	82.2
West Marshall CSD	76.5	91.7	73.5	88.5
West Monona CSD	64.8	64.0	62.4	72.9
West Sioux CSD	65.3	81.6	58.0	79.7
Western Dubuque CSD	78.3	88.1	68.8	89.4
Westwood CSD	75.9	84.5	55.4	66.3
Whiting CSD	81.5	92.6	64.3	85.7
Williamsburg CSD	78.9	82.5	70.5	90.2
Wilton CSD	81.4	82.4	59.7	77.3
Winfield-Mt Union CSD	90.7	87.0	68.1	72.5
Winterset CSD	83.3	88.3	73.0	85.7
Woodbine CSD	81.0	84.5	57.4	68.1

<b>District</b>	<b>Grade 4 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Grade 8 Reading</b>	<b>Grade 8 Math</b>
Woodbury Central CSD	<b>83.8</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>68.6</b>	<b>70.9</b>
Woodward-Granger CSD	<b>88.3</b>	<b>83.5</b>	<b>67.3</b>	<b>76.6</b>
State of Iowa	<b>74.9</b>	<b>78.5</b>	<b>66.2</b>	<b>74.6</b>

## Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program

### What is the Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program (IEATP)?

During the 2002 legislative session, IEATP was mandated for any educator who wanted to obtain the new evaluator license, renew his/her administrative endorsement or the corresponding general administrative endorsement. The legislation required the implementation and use of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria for teachers in 2002 and Iowa Standards for School Leaders (ISSL) in 2007 while engaging in the evaluation process and the daily efforts of educators in Iowa school districts, buildings, and classrooms. The materials and training for IEATP were developed in a cooperative effort amongst the Iowa Department of Education (DE), the Board of Educational Examiners (BoEE), the area education agencies (AEA), the institutions of higher education (IHE), the School Administrators of Iowa (SAI), Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB), and other educational agencies aimed at improving teaching and learning through quality educational leadership.

As the training program evolved, the DE and its partners worked with state and national experts to develop and implement a standards-based evaluation system, define and incorporate model descriptors to support the criteria, and develop and pilot a comprehensive evaluation instrument. The experts included Dr. Tom McGreal, Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois; Dr. Beverly Showers, Professional Development Consultant; Dr. Charlotte Danielson, Outcomes Associates; Dr. Vickie Trent, University of Northern Iowa; and other national and statewide educational professionals. The evaluation system framework, model descriptors, and the comprehensive evaluation system can be found on the DE website ([www.iowa.gov/educate/](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/)). The evolution of this earlier work, the partnerships amongst the various educational agencies/organizations, and the commitment to a quality educational system led to the development and implementation of Evaluator Approval Level I (2002), Evaluator Approval Level II – Evaluation of Teachers or Administrators (2007), and Evaluator Approval Level III (2011).

### IEATP Level I and II

Following the 2002 legislative session, *IEATP Level I* was introduced across the state to IHEs, AEAs, LEAs, and other educational agencies/organizations. A statewide application process for potential trainers was conducted and 65 trainers from across the state were selected. Training began in the fall of 2002 and was delivered in five regions across the state. The outcomes for Level I training expected the participants to:

- Explain Iowa Teacher Quality Legislation;
- Learn the Iowa Teacher Standards and Iowa Standards for School Administrators;
- Interpret how the Iowa evaluation requirements are met in their district;
- Define Objective, Reflective, Interpretive, and Decisional (ORID) questions;
- Practice teacher observation techniques;
- Prepare and apply ORID questioning techniques in conferencing; and
- Demonstrate their learning by applying knowledge of the 8 Teaching Standards and applying ORID questioning in summarizing a teacher observation during a post observation conference.

By June 2006, over 2,300 participants had satisfactorily completed the level I training. The costs of the training were paid for through registration fees.

In the fall of 2008, the DE and SAI introduced an online *IEATP Level I* for experienced administrators new to Iowa. SAI hosted the online training site and provided an “instructor of record” to support the participating administrators.

The content for the two renewal courses - *IEATP Level II: Evaluation of Teachers* and *IEATP Level II: Evaluation of Administrators* was also developed through collaborative efforts with the DE, SAI, AEAs, the Wallace Foundation Leadership Grant, and other educational agencies.

Evaluator Approval Renewal trainings are designed to focus on the evaluation of teachers using the Iowa Teaching Standards and the evaluation of administrators were using the Iowa Standards for School Leaders. Trainers, approximately 76 professionals, were trained during the spring of 2007. Twenty-eight trainers delivered the training to administrators in their home district. This provided a valuable opportunity for the districts to incorporate their training with the district's local evaluation process and procedures. Five higher education professors and the executive director of the BoEE also received this training to provide knowledge to enhance their work with Iowa administrators. These two renewal courses are offered through the AEAs. The costs of the renewal trainings were paid for through registration fees.

The *IEATP Level II: Evaluation of Teachers* was designed for principals and other educational leaders who are responsible for the evaluation of teachers' skill attainment and enhancement. The training is focused on:

- Effective leadership practices in evaluation;
- Knowledge and understanding of best practice in writing an individual career development plan and writing intensive assistance plans; and
- Skills in the use of effective strategies for formative conferencing and the use of coaching strategies.

The *IEATP Level II: Evaluation of Administrators* was designed for superintendents and other educational leaders responsible for the evaluation of administrators' skill attainment and enhancement. Fifty trainers were trained to teach the renewal course to evaluate administrators. Eleven higher education professors and the executive director of the BoEE took part in the training to enhance their knowledge as they work with future and current Iowa administrators. The training is focused on:

- Application of the Iowa Standards for School Leaders;
- Recognition of effective principal behaviors that increase student achievement, including use of data, alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and first- and second-order change;
- Research and the application of effective superintendent behaviors that increase student achievement;
- Coaching skills to enhance principals' skills as instructional leaders; and
- Models of principal evaluation processes, including design and the use of an individual career development plan for principals.

Administrators were required to complete either *Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Administrators* OR *Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Teachers* for renewal. Administrators were encouraged to take the course most pertinent in his/her current job description.

As of January 2011, the DE chose to end the face-to face training for anyone needing an administrator/evaluator license and now provides the training through an online course, *iEvaluate*. The training focuses on the following:

- Developing a philosophy of educator evaluation'
- Standards - Iowa Teaching Standards, the Iowa Standards for School Leaders, Professional Learning Standards, Ethics Standards, etc.;
- Effective evaluation skill sets – collecting evidence, observation techniques, coaching, etc.; and
- Conducting pre-observation, post-observation, and the individual professional development plan conferences.

The online training is supported in cooperation with *AEA PD Online* with the instructors approved by the DE.

It should be noted that an educator in a preparation program at an Iowa college/university, is provide the necessary training as part of their coursework. If the educator is new to Iowa, he/she will need to complete the newly developed online training that is appropriate to his/her current position.

### **IEATP Level III**

During the 2009-2010 school year, an Evaluator Advisory Committee, represented by LEAs, AEAs, IHEs, SAI, IASB, BoEE, and the DE, worked collaboratively to analyze data regarding evaluation, read and reflect on research, study best practices in evaluation that improve teaching and learning, and design Evaluator Approval Level III. In 2011, the DE unveiled Evaluator Approval Level III for those professionals who will need to renew their administrator/evaluator license and have successfully completed Evaluator Approval Level I and II prior to January 2011.

The training for Evaluator Approval Level III looks somewhat different than the previous training for Evaluator Approval Levels I and II. Each administrator/evaluator will successfully complete one common learning module - *Assessing Academic Rigor (AAR)* – for two required renewal credits. The additional two credits required to renew an administrative/evaluator license may be earned by successfully completing course work aligned to their district/building goals or completing *Fierce Conversations* training.

In late October 2012, AAR trainers were asked to respond to four questions in order to gather information about the implementation of the AAR training:

- How many AAR trainings have you conducted or co-conducted?
- Approximately, how many participants are there in the trainings you have conducted? (You can answer this as range.)
- Identify at least three things that have worked well in the training.
- Identify at least three things that need to improve or be changed in the training.

Key findings about the AAR training from the professionals leading the modules in each of the AEAs included:

- The opportunity to co-lead AAR training during the planning, training, and debriefing was valuable. Trainers brought various techniques and backgrounds to the training. (The initial recommendation from the EAAC was that the training would be two trainers.)
- Connections to the Iowa Core through the unit examples, and personal experiences from participants added to the sense of urgency around the importance of implementing AAR practices in the knowledge and skills of teachers.
- Discussions were noted as a valuable component to the training session. It allowed participants to build an understanding of rigor, construct knowledge about the revised Bloom's Taxonomy (RBT), focus coaching conversations using the RBT with administrators and teachers for evaluation purposes, and develop an understanding of the importance of aligning intended, enacted, and assessed curriculum.
- The RBT matrix is being adapted by some trainers to only include the cognitive dimension. It was noted that adding the knowledge dimension was challenging to participants.
- The sample units from the Iowa Core were cumbersome and the actual key did not match; therefore, some trainers were making revisions to fit the context of the training.
- A number of trainers find little value in the Day 4 training (The Dashboard). They mentioned that they basically eliminated that portion of the training because it was not helpful or because participants were unable to make the connection on how to use it back in their districts.

- Trainers need an opportunity to meet regularly to share information, ask questions regarding various scenarios encountered in the training, build their knowledge and skills in the delivery and implementation of the AAR materials, propose edits and revisions to the materials, etc.

DE leadership is using the data and information from the survey to make improvements to the AAR modules and enrich the experience of Iowa educators who conduct evaluations with the intent of improving teaching and learning in Iowa schools.

### **Moving forward**

Currently the Council for Educator Development is in the process of revisiting the teaching and leadership standards and the educator evaluation system. A recommendation from the council must be provided to the DE Director, the Governor, and the Legislature in 2015. To assist evaluators in maintaining their evaluator license, former DE Director Glass and BoEE Director Magee announced in February 2013 that educators needing to renew their evaluator license that they have two options for renewal – complete iEvaluate or AAR. Additional information regarding the renewal process may be found on the DE or BoEE website.



## **The Iowa Mentoring and Induction Program**

Every new educator in Iowa enters into a two-year induction program that addresses the educator's personal and professional needs and trains him or her on Iowa's eight teaching standards. A mentor is assigned to each educator – not to evaluate for employment purposes, but to observe, critique, and provide support and advice on effective teaching practices. In 2007, school psychologists, nurses, social workers, and speech and language pathologists with a teaching license who are new to the profession were approved to participate in the mentoring and induction program.

Mentors must have at least three years of teaching experience and demonstrated skills in classroom training and coaching. They receive training on district expectations, based on Iowa's eight teaching standards. Mentoring programs can be designed by the district or the AEA, which provide school improvement services for the local education community. The mentor must follow this program while focusing on the educator's individual needs. One hundred percent of the public school districts and all AEAs in Iowa have a mentoring and induction plan that has been approved by the DE.

After the two-year induction program, the new educator receives a standard license in most cases. The state fully funds induction for the required two years. If an educator does not meet the requirements after the two years, a third year in the induction program can be granted by the district, but must be funded by the district. If the educator does not successfully complete the program after the third year, that educator cannot receive a license and cannot continue to teach in the state. According to a state-by-state assessment of all states by the *New Teacher Center*, Iowa is one of four states in the nation to have an outstanding mentoring and induction program based on policy and supporting state appropriations.

### **Teacher Quality Partnership Grant**

The federal Teacher Quality Partnership grant was awarded to and is administered by the Iowa Department of Education in March of 2010 in the amount of \$9,035,380 for five years. The work of the grant is directed by the department's administrative consultant who oversees the work of the state's mentoring and induction program. Grant partners include: University of Northern Iowa, small rural high-needs schools in Iowa, and the Stanford University School Redesign Network with Ray Pecheone and Linda Darling Hammond, and the University of Iowa Center for Evaluation and Assessment.

The mission of the Iowa Teacher Quality Partnership Grant is to increase the learning and achievement of Iowa PK-12 students by continuously developing more effective teachers from pre-service through the entire teaching career. The grant will achieve this mission by 1) defining emerging attributes of effective teaching and integrating those attributes into both pre-service programs and professional development for beginning teachers and 2) examining and integrating a diverse set of teacher and student artifacts to document content knowledge within their major area of student and effective teaching featuring teacher work samples supported by an integrated technology platform. The purpose is to enhance and support the professional development of prospective and current teachers in Iowa, *especially beginning teachers*.

In order to enhance the quality of beginning teachers entering the profession, the Iowa proposal provides a series of measurable and sustainable objectives that will achieve three major project goals: 1) emerging attributes of effective teaching will be examined, identified and defined in preparation for integration into a partner institution of higher education pre-service program and into partner local education agency professional development, 2) pre-service faculty will integrate the attributes of effective teaching into pre-service programs, which will be documented through prospective teacher-created digital artifacts to be placed into an integrated technology platform and 3) local education agencies will integrate the attributes of effective teaching into professional development, which also will be documented through teacher-created artifacts to be placed into an integrated technology platform. The work of the Teacher Quality Partnership grant is carried

out in direct support of the state's educational reform efforts to improve teaching and learning and developing more effective teachers from the pre-service through career levels. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the TQP grant was expanded to reflect the new teacher leadership and compensation reform direction of the state. The Department received approval from the U.S. Department of Education to implement this expansion.

### **Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute**

This event was not held in 2012 due to the pending direction of education in Iowa that would have impacted the focus of the Institute. In the future, and depending on decisions made in the Iowa legislature, the Institute will again provide a high quality professional development opportunity for educators appropriate to their needs.

### **Mentoring and Induction Model**

The Iowa Department of Education program administrator of Iowa's Mentoring and Induction Program co-chaired with ISEA an effort that resulted in a model for districts and AEAs to follow in developing a high quality mentoring and induction program at the local and regional levels. A full week of training for districts and AEAs was held in previous years, but not in 2012 due to the pending changes in education in Iowa. Typically the attendance is comprised of educators from school districts, area education agencies, Teacher Quality Partnership grant partner schools, and several higher education teacher preparation institutions in Iowa.

*Journey to Excellence* is designed to prepare and support mentors as they assist beginning teachers' transition from the university to classroom practice. Six days of training are held over two years for the mentor, four days the first year and two days the second year. In addition, the mentor and beginning educator attend one day in August, the Introduction to *Journey to Excellence*.

Using best teaching practices, mentors are trained for their role of supporting and guiding beginning teachers. Interactive and in-depth, the training also offers opportunities for mentors to reflect on their own practice as they provide guidance to beginning teachers. Mentors leave with a set of materials and skills designed to effectively structure conversations about teaching practice related to the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

### **New Teacher Retention in Iowa**

The retention of new teachers in public schools and Area Education Agencies (AEAs) in Iowa has increased since the Teacher Quality Legislation was implemented. Mentoring and induction was first offered in 2001-2002.

Prior to the implementation of the teacher quality legislation, 86.3 percent of 2000-2001 first year teachers returned to teach the next year. However, 91.9 percent of 2010-2011 teachers returned to teach in 2011-2012. This was an increase of 5.6 percentage points (Table 1). The percent of second year teachers that returned to teach a third year increased from 88.8 percent for 2000-2001 second year teachers to 92.7 percent for 2010-2011 second year teachers (Table 2). The percent of 2000-2001 first and second year teachers that returned to teach the next year was 87.5 percent and the percent of 2010-2011 first and second year teachers that returned to teach the next year was 92.3 percent, an increase of 4.8 percentage points (Table 3).

The percent of first year teachers still teaching in public schools and AEAs two years after their first year also increased. For example, of the 1836 first year teachers in the base year 2000-2001, 1425 or 77.6 percent were in the classroom in 2002-2003. On the other hand, 85.4 percent of the first year teachers in 2009-2010 were still teaching in the 2011-2012 school year. This was an increase of 7.8 percentage points (Table 1). Table 2 shows that 82.0 percent of second year teachers in 2000-2001 were teaching two years later and 87.2 percent of second year teachers in 2009-2010 were teaching two years later. As shown in Table 3, 79.8 percent of first and second

year teachers combined in 2000-2001 were teaching two years later and 86.3 percent of first and second year teachers combined in 2009-2010 were teaching two years later.

Also note that there has been considerable variability in the number of first and second year teachers during the last eight years. The number of first and second year teachers was greatest in 2000-2001 and decreased for the next three years. During the next four years the number of first and second year teachers slowly increased. The number of first and second year teachers decreased slightly in 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011. The number then increased again in 2011-2012.

**Table 1:  
Iowa Public School and AEA First Year Teacher Retention 2000-01 to 2012-13**

Base School Year	Number Teachers Base School Year	Number and Percent of Teachers Returning in											
		2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
2000-2001	1836	1585 (86.3%)	1425 (77.6%)	1342 (73.1%)	1274 (69.4%)	1225 (66.7%)	1185 (64.5%)	1141 (62.1%)	1088 (59.3%)	1071 (58.3%)	1019 (55.5%)	988 (53.8%)	959 (52.2%)
2001-2002	1623		1413 (87.1%)	1288 (79.4%)	1217 (75.0%)	1158 (71.3%)	1093 (67.3%)	1063 (65.5%)	999 (61.6%)	970 (59.8%)	935 (57.6%)	907 (55.9%)	885 (54.5%)
2002-2003	1290			1143 (88.6%)	1042 (80.8%)	982 (76.1%)	931 (72.2%)	878 (68.1%)	833 (64.6%)	813 (63.0%)	769 (59.6%)	758 (58.8%)	735 (57.0%)
2003-2004	1452				1307 (90.0%)	1209 (83.3%)	1144 (78.8%)	1088 (74.9%)	1007 (69.4%)	986 (67.9%)	952 (65.6%)	919 (63.3%)	896 (61.7%)
2004-2005	1536					1411 (91.9%)	1279 (83.3%)	1209 (78.7%)	1121 (73.0%)	1068 (69.5%)	946 (61.6%)	914 (59.5%)	890 (57.9%)
2005-2006	1611						1465 (90.9%)	1339 (83.1%)	1223 (76.0%)	1191 (73.9%)	1138 (70.6%)	1086 (67.4%)	1055 (65.5%)
2006-2007	1694							1546 (91.3%)	1417 (83.6%)	1332 (78.6%)	1260 (74.4%)	1201 (70.9%)	1154 (68.1%)
2007-2008	1796								1674 (93.2%)	1558 (86.7%)	1483 (82.6%)	1395 (77.7%)	1331 (74.1%)
2008-2009	1555									1433 (92.2%)	1323 (85.1%)	1251 (80.5%)	1213 (78.0%)
2009-2010	1277										1162 (91.0%)	1091 (85.4%)	1033 (80.9%)
2010-2011	1316											1210 (91.9%)	1137 (86.4%)
2011-2012	1383												1251 (90.5%)
2012-2013	1797												

Source: Iowa Department of Education, Bureau of Planning, Research and Evaluation Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS) Staff Files.

**Table 2:**  
**Iowa Public School and AEA Second Year Teacher Retention 2000-01 to 2012-13**

Base School Year	Number Teachers Base School Year	Number and Percent of Teachers Returning in											
		2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
2000-2001	1840	1633 (88.8%)	1508 (82.0%)	1430 (77.7%)	1351 (73.4%)	1290 (70.1%)	1245 (67.7%)	1212 (65.9%)	1162 (63.2%)	1125 (61.1%)	1098 (59.7%)	1062 (57.7%)	1042 (56.6%)
2001-2002	1952		1721 (88.2%)	1602 (82.1%)	1508 (77.3%)	1461 (74.9%)	1401 (71.8%)	1346 (69.0%)	1279 (65.5%)	1253 (64.2%)	1202 (61.6%)	1163 (59.6%)	1133 (58.0%)
2002-2003	1616			1450 (89.7%)	1355 (83.8%)	1282 (79.3%)	1210 (74.9%)	1166 (72.2%)	1095 (67.8%)	1069 (66.2%)	1037 (64.2%)	1002 (62.0%)	980 (60.6%)
2003-2004	1315				1176 (89.4%)	1105 (84.0%)	1038 (78.9%)	974 (74.1%)	926 (70.4%)	905 (68.8%)	862 (65.6%)	845 (64.3%)	818 (62.2%)
2004-2005	1472					1337 (90.8%)	1247 (84.7%)	1175 (79.8%)	1089 (74.0%)	1064 (72.3%)	1018 (69.2%)	983 (66.8%)	960 (65.2%)
2005-2006	1616						1447 (89.5%)	1357 (84.0%)	1243 (77.0%)	1193 (73.8%)	1150 (71.2%)	1121 (69.4%)	1084 (67.1%)
2006-2007	1647							1488 (90.3%)	1337 (81.2%)	1292 (78.4%)	1230 (74.7%)	1174 (71.3%)	1141 (69.3%)
2007-2008	1724								1569 (91.0%)	1473 (85.4%)	1402 (81.3%)	1331 (77.2%)	1283 (74.4%)
2008-2009	1706									1570 (92.0%)	1487 (87.2%)	1393 (81.7%)	1339 (78.5%)
2009-2010	1559										1431 (91.8%)	1345 (86.3%)	1306 (83.8%)
2010-2011	1317											1221 (92.7%)	1150 (87.3%)
2011-2012	1583												1469 (92.8%)
2012-2013	1551												

Source: Iowa Department of Education, Bureau of Planning, Research and Evaluation Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS) Staff Files.

**Table 3:**  
**Iowa Public School and AEA First and Second Year Teacher Retention 2000-01 to 2012-13**

Base School Year	Number Teachers Base School Year	Number and Percent of Teachers Returning in											
		2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
2000-2001	3676	3218 (87.5%)	2933 (79.8%)	2772 (75.4%)	2625 (71.4%)	2515 (68.4%)	2430 (66.1%)	2353 (64.0%)	2250 (61.2%)	2196 (59.7%)	2117 (57.6%)	2050 (55.8%)	2001 (54.4%)
2001-2002	3575		3134 (87.7%)	2890 (80.9%)	2725 (76.2%)	2619 (73.3%)	2494 (69.8%)	2409 (67.4%)	2278 (63.7%)	2223 (62.2%)	2137 (59.8%)	2070 (57.9%)	2018 (56.4%)
2002-2003	2906			2593 (89.2%)	2397 (82.5%)	2264 (77.9%)	2141 (73.7%)	2044 (70.3%)	1928 (66.3%)	1882 (64.8%)	1806 (62.1%)	1760 (60.6%)	1715 (59.0%)
2003-2004	2767				2483 (89.7%)	2314 (83.6%)	2182 (78.9%)	2062 (74.5%)	1933 (69.9%)	1891 (68.3%)	1814 (65.6%)	1764 (63.8%)	1714 (61.9%)
2004-2005	3008					2748 (91.4%)	2526 (84.0%)	2384 (79.3%)	2210 (73.5%)	2132 (70.9%)	1964 (65.3%)	1897 (63.1%)	1850 (61.5%)
2005-2006	3227						2912 (90.2%)	2696 (83.5%)	2466 (76.4%)	2384 (73.9%)	2288 (70.9%)	2207 (68.4%)	2139 (66.3%)
2006-2007	3341							3034 (90.8%)	2754 (82.4%)	2624 (78.5%)	2490 (74.5%)	2375 (71.1%)	2295 (68.7%)
2007-2008	3520								3243 (92.1%)	3031 (86.1%)	2885 (82.0%)	2726 (77.4%)	2614 (74.3%)
2008-2009	3261									3003 (92.1%)	2810 (86.2%)	2644 (81.1%)	2552 (78.3%)
2009-2010	2836										2593 (91.4%)	2436 (85.9%)	2339 (82.5%)
2010-2011	2633											2431 (92.3%)	2287 (86.9%)
2011-2012	2966												2720 (91.7%)
2012-2013	3348												

Source: Iowa Department of Education, Bureau of Planning, Research and Evaluation Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS) Staff Files..

## Professional Development

**Fiscal Year 13 Teacher Development Academy funds were used to support the following professional learning efforts: Authentic Intellectual Work, Cognitively Guided Instruction, English Language Learners, Fine Arts Iowa Core, and Multi-Tiered System of Supports. This report includes a brief summary of each of each.**

### **Authentic Intellectual Work**

Teacher Development Funds have been used to support school teams implementing Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW). These funds pay for teachers to work in teams after school and on weekends and during the summer months. The funds are also used to defray the cost of substitutes when teachers meet during the school day. It also supports teachers and administrators in attending professional learning events like AIW summer academies and coaching institutes.

AIW, which has grown exponentially across the state, engages teachers and administrators in professional learning communities to improve student achievement, increase student engagement, and build a school wide professional culture focused on improving instruction and assessment. This initiative, which began in 2007, is built on the framework of AIW. Authentic Intellectual Work gives teachers the tools to distinguish between schoolwork that mirrors the more complex accomplishments of skilled adults and, unfortunately, the more common work one often finds students doing in schools.

The distinctive characteristics of the AIW framework are summarized as *construction of knowledge* through the use of *disciplined inquiry* to produce discourse, products, or performances that have *value beyond school*.

There is substantial evidence from a Department of Education Evaluation of AIW in Iowa that the culture changed and student achievement increased in the AIW schools. Using data gathered from its 2010-2011 statewide assessment, the Department examined the performance of students in grades 3 through 11 in schools in which all teachers engaged in Authentic Intellectual Work as their primary professional development for at least one year prior to the date of testing and matched their student results with the testing results of students in comparison schools, matched as closely as possible on enrollment, race, socioeconomic status, English language learning, and disability. In comparisons across nine grades and four subjects – a total of 36 comparisons – students in schools implementing Authentic Intellectual Work scored significantly higher in 26 comparisons, with higher percentages of students proficient in 32 comparisons. Results are presented in the Side Bar 1. In reading, mathematics, science, and social studies, the students in the AIW schools outperformed their peers in the non-AIW schools.

Department researchers questioned if these findings could be explained by selection bias rather than the professional development offered by the AIW program. So a review of assessment data from three years prior to program inception was conducted. That data showed that the AIW and control schools did not differ substantially on student achievement in reading and mathematics. If selection bias did not explain the 2010-2011 achievement differences, a stronger case can be made that the differences were due to the AIW.

Despite its demonstrated potential to enhance student achievement in Iowa, former director Jason Glass made the decision to cut state-level funding for AIW. At this time, there is no plan to continue providing support to schools currently engaging in AIW; nor is the state going to be sponsoring any additional schools to join the initiative.

### **Cognitively Guided Instruction**

Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) is a teacher professional development program based on research by university professors and elementary school teachers from across the country. The primary goal of CGI professional development is to increase teachers' knowledge of how children think about mathematics. Over twenty years of CGI research across diverse populations of students, shows that participating in CGI professional development:

- Improves students' achievement on problem-solving and early algebraic tasks without loss of achievement on traditional arithmetic tasks

- Increases students' engagement in problem-solving and communicating their mathematical ideas
- Helps teachers listen to students' mathematical ideas and use knowledge of students' thinking to plan instruction based on the needs of the individuals in their class
- Increases teachers' knowledge of mathematics and children's mathematical thinking

What teachers learn during CGI professional development enhances how they implement any mathematics curriculum. They learn to

- Analyze story problems and number sentences to determine the mathematical demands and recognize student responses in terms of cognitive development
- Assess their students' thinking and design problems that will develop students' understanding of important concepts and skills
- Facilitate discussions that provide a window into children's thinking, strengthen children's ability to reason about arithmetic, and build children's capacity for algebraic reasoning
- Engage children in early algebra tasks that enhance the children's learning of arithmetic while also providing a foundation for the future learning of formal algebra

This professional development is offered to teams of elementary teachers including regular classroom as well as special education teachers. Building administrators are encouraged to be members of the teams. Iowa currently has about 50 CGI Leaders who are identified as trainers for this initiative. There are currently 19 districts identified to receive CGI PD in 2014. CGI is aligned with the content and strategies of Iowa Core Mathematics Standards at the primary level.

Iowa hosted the National CGI Conference in July of 2013. This brought 400 educators together in Des Moines for a three day opportunity to learn from CGI national and state level leaders.

### **English Language Learners**

The ELL TDA FY 13 funding was utilized to assist in the support of the Iowa Culture and Language Conference (ICLC), hosted November 11-13 in Coralville, Iowa. The mission of the ICLC is to advocate for culturally and/or linguistically diverse students and their families, educators, and service providers.

The 2013 ICLC was the 28<sup>th</sup> annual conference and was sponsored by the following entities:

- Iowa Department of Education
- Grant Wood AEA
- Heartland AEA
- Midwest Equity Assistance Center
- Northwest AEA

The 2013 ICLC was a 3-day event, with one day of pre-conference full-day workshops and two days of keynote and breakout sessions. The conference registered and served over 800 participants. The participants were a diverse group of teachers, administrators, pre-service candidates, higher education faculty, community service providers, and non-certified educational staff members.

2013 Conference Strands included:

- Administrative
- Early Childhood
- K-12
- Paraprofessionals
- Technology
- Assessment
- General Interest
- Publisher
- Culture
- Higher Education
- Refugees and Immigrants

Examples of Conference breakout sessions included, but were not limited to, the following topics:  
ELL Classroom Assessment



Advancing Reading and Writing Skills of Intermediate ELLs  
Teaching ELLs in Content Area Classrooms  
Mathematics for ELLs  
Literacy and Vocabulary Development  
Academic Language Development through Technology Integration  
Response to Intervention  
ELL Education Policy  
Culturally Responsive Instruction  
Refugee Concerns  
Updates from the U.S. Department of Education

### **Fine Arts in Iowa Core Professional Development**

Fine Arts in Iowa Core Professional Development Days were presented to Iowa Teachers to provide 1) the history of the fine arts in the Iowa Core process, 2) research that supports fine arts education and the alignment with 21<sup>st</sup> Century Universal Constructs, and 3) direct professional development experiences for arts educators with exemplar lessons and assessments used in Iowa classrooms presented by practicing Iowa teachers.

The Fine Arts/Iowa Core professional development days were developed and presented by collaboration with the Iowa Department of Education, Area Education Agencies, and lead team writers representing the Iowa Alliance for Arts Education, Iowa Communications Association, Iowa Orff Chapters, Kodaly Educators of Iowa, Iowa Music Education Association, Iowa Bandmasters of Iowa, Iowa String Teachers Association, Iowa Choral Directors Association, and Art Educators of Iowa.

The Iowa Department of Education worked with arts educators around the state for 3 years to write fine arts skills and concepts alignment documents to the Iowa Core. The documents are in their final draft stage and will be posted on the Department of Education website by the end of January 2014. The documents are written in the disciplines of General Music K-8, Intermediate/Secondary Music (vocal and instrumental), Visual Art K-12, and Drama/Theatre K-12.

The one-day introduction to the Fine Arts alignment to Iowa Core is designed to provide arts education/Iowa Core history, supportive arts research, overview of Iowa Core and time for educators to experience lessons and assessments with the fine arts skills and concepts. This day is designed for arts educators, administrators, and classroom teachers interested in integrating fine arts and universal constructs: critical thinking, complex communication, creativity, collaboration, flexibility and adaptability, and productivity and accountability.

The Department coordinated and contracted compensation for 19 practicing teachers as presenters for the 10 professional development days. The Department covered all the presenters' expenses (19 presenters) and printed copies of materials for the lessons/assessment break-out sessions in the afternoon as provided by the afternoon presenters. It was the intent that the Department offer the fine arts professional development be offered at no cost to participants.

The Area Education Agency secured a plenary room until noon, five breakout rooms for the afternoon, assisted in notifying school districts of the professional development day, and provided a registration process for participants to help determine the number of general music, vocal music, instrumental music, visual art, and theater/drama teachers that participated.

The professional development days were held at each of the AEAs across the state.

### **Multi-Tiered System of Supports**

Ten percent of Iowa's schools are participating in the implementation of Multi-Tiered System of Supports focused on Iowa Core Early Literacy, which includes:

- Access to Iowa TIER, Iowa's database to support administration of universal screening and progress monitoring assessments, and data-based decision-making;
  - Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST) is the state's universal screening assessment and progress monitoring assessment for Kindergarten through Sixth grade students.

- Individual Growth and Development Indicators (IGDIs) is the state's universal screening assessment for preschool four-year old children.
- Training, technical support and coaching on Iowa TIER, FAST, and IGDIs
- Standards for evidence-based early literacy curricula and instructional materials
- Access to and support through the statewide coaching network
- Training and support for:
  - Multi-Tiered System of Supports framework;
  - Leadership and Consensus building;
  - Common continuous improvement process;
  - Evidence-based universal tier;
  - Universal Tier Triage;
  - Standard Treatment Protocol;
  - Diagnostic Assessment;
  - Intensive Interventions and supports;
  - Data- Based Decision-Making.

More than 600 teachers, principals and Area Education Agency coaches have benefited from implementation of MTSS focused on Iowa Core early literacy in the 2013-2014 year – representing 10% of Iowa's schools. Approximately \$150,000 dollars supported Iowa Core early literacy professional development and learning around: Training, technical support and coaching on Iowa TIER, FAST, and IGDIs

- Access to and support through the statewide coaching network
- Training and support for:
  - Multi-Tiered System of Supports framework;
  - Leadership and Consensus building;
  - Common continuous improvement process.