January 2015

Legislative Report

Student Achievement, Accountability, and Professional Development

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

State of Iowa
Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
400 E. 14th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146

State Board of Education

Charles C. Edwards, Jr., President, Des Moines
Michael L. Knedler, Vice President, Council Bluffs
Brooke Axiotis, Des Moines
Michael Bearden, Gladbrook
Diane Crookham-Johnson, Oskaloosa
Angela English, Dyersville
Rosie Hussey, Clear Lake
Mike May, Spirit Lake
Mary Ellen Miller, Wayne County
Hannah Rens, Student Member, Sioux City

Administration

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

Division of Learning and Results

W. David Tilly, Deputy Director

Bureau of Educator Quality

Mary Delagardelle, Interim Bureau Chief
Matt Ludwig, Consultant
Marietta Rives, Consultant

Bureau of Standards and Curriculum

Rita Martens, Lead Consultant
Brad Niebling, Consultant

Bureau of Information and Analysis

Jay Pennington, Bureau Chief
Tom Deeter, Lead Consultant

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

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 2012-13 and 2013-14 Biennium Adequate Yearly Progress Report Percentage of Students Proficient (Iowa School Districts)

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Adair-Casey CSD	**90.48**	**92.86**	**70.59**	**85.29**
Adel DeSoto Minburn CSD	**88.27**	**83.67**	**84.38**	**86.61**
AGWSR CSD	**83.33**	**84.85**	**73.97**	**84.93**
A-H-S-T CSD	**70.15**	**74.63**	**74.76**	**86.41**
Akron Westfield CSD	**82.81**	**89.06**	**72.97**	**74.32**
Albert City-Truesdale CSD	**90.91**	**86.36**		
Albia CSD	**68.32**	**75.16**	**69.18**	**77.40**
Alburnett CSD	**81.71**	**84.15**	**75.61**	**76.83**
Alden CSD	**81.58**	**86.84**		
Algona CSD	**74.68**	**81.01**	**72.93**	**81.22**
Allamakee CSD	**79.75**	**78.53**	**76.70**	**84.66**
Alta CSD	**67.69**	**69.23**		
Ames CSD	**84.86**	**87.21**	**84.73**	**91.82**
Anamosa CSD	**75.89**	**82.98**	**62.65**	**71.69**
Andrew CSD	**68.42**	**68.42**	**56.67**	**56.67**
Ankeny CSD	**88.01**	**90.94**	**86.93**	**93.59**
Aplington-Parkersburg CSD	**88.35**	**82.52**	**69.40**	**73.88**
Ar-We-Va CSD	**72.73**	**78.79**	**82.86**	**94.29**
Atlantic CSD	**73.06**	**81.87**	**71.36**	**77.93**
Audubon CSD	**79.71**	**84.06**	**72.31**	**90.77**
Aurelia CSD	**63.64**	**54.55**	**74.19**	**69.89**
Ballard CSD	**79.56**	**80.00**	**70.70**	**75.00**
Battle Creek-Ida Grove CSD	**77.42**	**86.02**		
Baxter CSD	**88.00**	**86.00**	**65.15**	**75.76**
BCLUW CSD	**77.50**	**87.50**	**81.61**	**90.80**

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Bedford CSD	**67.86**	**83.93**	**74.24**	**80.30**
Belle Plaine CSD	**71.26**	**63.22**	**73.24**	**83.10**
Bellevue CSD	**87.32**	**94.37**	**71.79**	**78.21**
Belmond-Klemme CSD	**81.20**	**90.60**	**66.37**	**76.99**
Bennett CSD	**90.91**	**81.82**		
Benton CSD	**76.96**	**86.18**	**79.31**	**79.31**
Bettendorf CSD	**82.51**	**91.00**	**76.81**	**77.29**
Bondurant-Farrar CSD	**84.44**	**85.78**	**82.61**	**84.54**
Boone CSD	**84.96**	**86.99**	**73.51**	**76.49**
Boyden-Hull CSD	**85.11**	**81.91**	**78.41**	**89.77**
Boyer Valley CSD	**69.84**	**77.78**	**68.33**	**76.67**
Brooklyn-Guernsey-Malcom CSD	**83.64**	**89.09**	**69.12**	**82.35**
Burlington CSD	**74.96**	**79.54**	**65.19**	**65.19**
CAL CSD	**51.43**	**51.43**	**68.57**	**54.29**
Calamus-Wheatland CSD	**81.25**	**75.00**	**83.58**	**89.55**
CAM CSD	**73.85**	**80.00**	**78.87**	**78.87**
Camanche CSD	**73.15**	**76.51**	**68.15**	**68.15**
Cardinal CSD	**55.38**	**67.69**	**54.67**	**56.00**
Carlisle CSD	**82.72**	**88.89**	**75.36**	**82.14**
Carroll CSD	**83.18**	**83.64**	**77.73**	**82.10**
Cedar Falls CSD	**78.57**	**85.30**	**77.32**	**85.39**
Cedar Rapids CSD	**71.29**	**77.43**	**68.69**	**70.69**
Center Point-Urbana CSD	**79.19**	**85.07**	**75.25**	**89.39**
Centerville CSD	**83.59**	**86.67**	**64.52**	**69.35**
Central City CSD	**77.19**	**84.21**	**82.35**	**88.24**
Central Clinton CSD	**80.56**	**87.78**	**73.30**	**78.16**
Central CSD	**72.88**	**88.14**	**64.62**	**61.54**
Central Decatur CSD	**67.33**	**81.19**	**63.95**	**61.63**
Central Lee CSD	**78.26**	**87.68**	**74.48**	**75.86**
Central Lyon CSD	**89.80**	**88.78**	**71.95**	**78.05**
Central Springs CSD	**90.91**	**91.92**	**71.43**	**82.65**
Chariton CSD	**72.22**	**77.16**	**63.18**	**66.67**
Charles City CSD	**70.95**	**69.27**	**77.64**	**78.06**
Charter Oak-Ute CSD	**58.14**	**74.42**	**62.75**	**62.75**
Cherokee CSD	**77.04**	**77.04**	**78.91**	**86.72**
Clarinda CSD	**75.83**	**83.33**	**67.46**	**83.33**
Clarion-Goldfield CSD	**80.77**	**84.62**	**68.75**	**81.94**
Clarke CSD	**72.25**	**82.08**	**62.98**	**77.35**
Clarksville CSD	**83.33**	**92.86**	**54.29**	**54.29**
Clay Central-Everly CSD	**82.22**	**93.33**	**66.67**	**77.08**
Clayton Ridge CSD	**85.71**	**79.22**	**74.07**	**70.37**
Clear Creek Amana CSD	**80.00**	**79.62**	**70.22**	**72.89**
Clear Lake CSD	**83.33**	**89.88**	**69.19**	**72.67**
Clearfield CSD	**N < 10**	**N < 10**		
Clinton CSD	**81.25**	**81.25**	**64.84**	**63.41**
Colfax-Mingo CSD	**81.52**	**78.26**	**73.08**	**85.90**

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
College CSD	**73.10**	**81.69**	**81.90**	**83.62**
Collins-Maxwell CSD	**83.64**	**78.18**	**69.57**	**71.01**
Colo-Nesco CSD	**87.30**	**87.30**	**73.13**	**77.61**
Columbus CSD	**54.90**	**58.82**	**46.00**	**50.00**
Coon Rapids-Bayard CSD	**84.31**	**68.63**	**73.02**	**74.60**
Corning CSD	**77.19**	**87.72**	**66.67**	**81.82**
Corwith-Wesley CSD			**75.00**	**85.00**
Council Bluffs CSD	**64.55**	**68.21**	**63.82**	**59.60**
Creston CSD	**68.09**	**64.89**	**79.12**	**85.16**
Dallas Center-Grimes CSD	**84.90**	**87.75**	**84.75**	**86.16**
Danville CSD	**70.51**	**87.18**	**72.37**	**80.26**
Davenport CSD	**64.12**	**66.52**	**57.42**	**64.37**
Davis County CSD	**79.74**	**81.05**	**60.61**	**83.64**
Decorah CSD	**83.94**	**88.07**	**87.38**	**93.20**
Delwood CSD	**88.57**	**100.00**		
Denison CSD	**68.57**	**76.73**	**72.29**	**74.70**
Denver CSD	**84.82**	**91.07**	**77.88**	**91.35**
Des Moines Ind CSD	**61.78**	**62.65**	**53.30**	**58.23**
Diagonal CSD	**83.33**	**91.67**	**66.67**	**83.33**
Dike-New Hartford CSD	**82.14**	**75.89**	**71.54**	**85.37**
Dows CSD	**N < 10**	**N < 10**		
Dubuque CSD	**73.36**	**77.37**	**66.55**	**74.23**
Dunkerton CSD	**81.36**	**79.66**	**54.29**	**58.57**
Durant CSD	**75.56**	**75.56**	**63.64**	**62.63**
Eagle Grove CSD	**76.42**	**85.85**	**72.38**	**73.33**
Earlham CSD	**88.64**	**89.77**	**79.61**	**76.70**
East Buchanan CSD	**83.95**	**85.19**	**79.55**	**73.86**
East Greene CSD	**58.33**	**79.17**		
East Marshall CSD	**80.34**	**83.76**	**70.07**	**84.67**
East Mills CSD	**93.10**	**87.93**	**60.00**	**85.45**
East Sac County CSD	**83.04**	**80.36**	**67.65**	**73.53**
East Union CSD	**73.97**	**73.97**	**72.97**	**71.62**
Eastern Allamakee CSD	**78.43**	**76.47**	**68.52**	**87.04**
Easton Valley CSD	**78.38**	**91.89**	**75.00**	**78.13**
Eddyville-Blakesbg-Fremont CSD	**61.65**	**75.19**	**63.03**	**74.79**
Edgewood-Colesburg CSD	**74.68**	**78.48**	**64.94**	**61.04**
Eldora-New Providence CSD	**83.91**	**80.46**		
Emmetsburg CSD	**62.75**	**75.49**	**67.31**	**69.23**
English Valleys CSD	**76.79**	**78.57**	**74.14**	**68.97**
Essex CSD	**84.62**	**88.46**	**78.05**	**80.49**
Estherville Lincoln Central SD	**69.04**	**61.93**	**61.70**	**72.34**
Exira CSD	**73.47**	**69.39**	**60.94**	**82.81**
Fairfield CSD	**75.00**	**82.08**	**71.49**	**84.68**
Farragut CSD	**41.67**	**58.33**		
Forest City CSD	**85.82**	**80.85**	**83.43**	**81.14**
Fort Dodge CSD	**68.13**	**68.34**	**55.56**	**59.19**

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Fort Madison CSD	**75.46**	**73.61**	**72.97**	**73.36**
Fredericksburg CSD	**77.78**	**75.00**	**73.83**	**85.05**
Fremont-Mills CSD	**80.39**	**90.20**	**50.00**	**68.97**
Galva-Holstein CSD	**87.04**	**94.44**		
Garner-Hayfield CSD	**71.17**	**81.98**		
George-Little Rock CSD	**83.33**	**79.63**	**73.13**	**73.13**
Gilbert CSD	**91.01**	**91.01**	**91.00**	**95.00**
Gilmore City-Bradgate CSD	**N < 10**	**N < 10**	**N < 10**	**N < 10**
Gladbrook-Reinbeck CSD	**78.13**	**75.00**	**72.00**	**80.00**
Glenwood CSD	**84.86**	**84.46**	**78.49**	**76.23**
Glidden-Ralston CSD	**84.62**	**79.49**	**76.09**	**60.87**
GMG CSD	**85.94**	**87.50**	**62.12**	**84.85**
Graettinger-Terril CSD	**68.29**	**63.41**	**66.67**	**86.11**
Grinnell-Newburg CSD	**90.65**	**91.12**	**80.91**	**88.80**
Griswold CSD	**70.27**	**79.73**	**65.88**	**72.94**
Grundy Center CSD	**74.49**	**80.61**	**80.90**	**88.76**
Guthrie Center CSD	**81.48**	**87.65**	**75.00**	**83.33**
Hamburg CSD	**65.63**	**68.75**	**62.16**	**78.38**
Hampton-Dumont CSD	**75.00**	**87.50**	**77.42**	**79.84**
Harlan CSD	**71.16**	**79.53**	**83.06**	**81.82**
Harmony CSD	**73.53**	**79.41**	**84.00**	**72.00**
Harris-Lake Park CSD	**87.93**	**96.55**	**79.07**	**81.40**
Hartley-Melvin-Sanborn CSD	**71.43**	**77.92**	**64.63**	**73.17**
Highland CSD	**62.89**	**79.38**	**65.74**	**72.22**
Hinton CSD	**84.11**	**83.18**	**81.00**	**79.00**
H-L-V CSD	**78.57**	**85.71**	**58.14**	**67.44**
Howard-Winneshiek CSD	**68.35**	**73.38**	**64.08**	**75.24**
Hubbard-Radcliffe CSD	**71.05**	**81.58**	**75.40**	**77.78**
Hudson CSD	**77.98**	**81.65**	**81.18**	**90.59**
Humboldt CSD	**86.01**	**87.41**	**78.50**	**88.50**
IKM-Manning CSD	**67.39**	**72.83**	**73.27**	**84.16**
Independence CSD	**79.17**	**86.31**	**66.49**	**81.15**
Indianola CSD	**81.67**	**82.29**	**84.10**	**84.29**
Interstate 35 CSD	**79.81**	**80.77**	**73.77**	**69.67**
Iowa City CSD	**76.12**	**77.02**	**74.69**	**77.37**
Iowa Falls CSD	**79.56**	**76.64**	**75.61**	**70.73**
Iowa Valley CSD	**88.06**	**88.06**	**64.41**	**74.58**
Janesville Consolidated SD	**81.25**	**83.33**	**77.27**	**77.27**
Jefferson-Scranton CSD	**83.21**	**82.48**	**83.23**	**85.16**
Jesup CSD	**77.46**	**84.51**	**78.18**	**75.45**
Johnston CSD	**90.57**	**92.54**	**87.57**	**92.76**
Keokuk CSD	**78.20**	**82.46**	**63.98**	**63.60**
Keota CSD	**76.92**	**87.18**	**69.23**	**76.92**
Kingsley-Pierson CSD	**77.78**	**74.60**	**53.52**	**67.61**
Knoxville CSD	**77.78**	**84.44**	**74.35**	**82.17**
Lake Mills CSD	**77.11**	**85.54**	**65.22**	**69.57**

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Lamoni CSD	**68.97**	**79.31**	**58.54**	**53.66**
Laurens-Marathon CSD	**60.71**	**71.43**	**50.00**	**53.33**
Lawton-Bronson CSD	**82.76**	**80.46**	**73.91**	**80.43**
Le Mars CSD	**82.11**	**84.91**	**75.00**	**88.03**
Lenox CSD	**84.75**	**93.22**	**67.69**	**83.08**
Lewis Central CSD	**70.02**	**68.11**	**64.90**	**65.59**
Linn-Mar CSD	**84.44**	**91.20**	**79.94**	**82.13**
Lisbon CSD	**87.06**	**70.59**	**70.11**	**80.46**
Logan-Magnolia CSD	**86.67**	**97.33**	**78.22**	**74.26**
Lone Tree CSD	**67.95**	**66.67**	**69.01**	**76.06**
Louisa-Muscatine CSD	**80.00**	**80.00**	**73.15**	**67.59**
LuVerne CSD	**90.48**	**90.48**		
Lynnville-Sully CSD	**79.10**	**83.58**	**92.65**	**95.59**
Madrid CSD	**85.86**	**88.89**	**79.59**	**79.59**
Manson Northwest Webster CSD	**75.27**	**86.02**	**65.85**	**85.37**
Maple Valley-Anthon Oto CSD	**72.31**	**67.69**	**64.04**	**66.29**
Maquoketa CSD	**70.75**	**76.87**	**59.11**	**69.33**
Maquoketa Valley CSD	**84.85**	**92.93**	**75.25**	**75.25**
Marcus-Meriden-Cleghorn CSD	**79.63**	**81.48**	**52.83**	**69.81**
Marion Ind SD	**79.55**	**78.44**	**76.63**	**81.79**
Marshalltown CSD	**58.45**	**72.20**	**55.22**	**64.53**
Martensdale-St Marys CSD	**78.08**	**78.08**	**66.67**	**74.07**
Mason City CSD	**71.85**	**74.61**	**67.77**	**65.63**
Mediapolis CSD	**83.33**	**82.22**	**76.61**	**88.71**
Melcher-Dallas CSD	**84.78**	**82.61**	**55.88**	**76.47**
MFL MarMac CSD	**60.36**	**63.96**	**73.40**	**79.79**
Midland CSD	**73.77**	**63.93**	**61.54**	**73.08**
Mid-Prairie CSD	**75.77**	**78.35**	**81.97**	**86.89**
Missouri Valley CSD	**73.98**	**75.61**	**65.25**	**65.25**
MOC-Floyd Valley CSD	**86.29**	**84.00**	**81.03**	**84.62**
Montezuma CSD	**83.08**	**81.54**	**64.37**	**82.76**
Monticello CSD	**78.95**	**72.37**	**67.95**	**79.49**
Moravia CSD	**75.93**	**62.96**	**69.81**	**81.13**
Mormon Trail CSD	**60.00**	**70.00**	**68.97**	**58.62**
Morning Sun CSD	**77.14**	**88.57**		
Moulton-Udell CSD	**86.21**	**75.86**	**71.43**	**64.29**
Mount Ayr CSD	**76.83**	**84.15**	**74.07**	**82.72**
Mount Pleasant CSD	**74.40**	**80.40**	**74.15**	**81.63**
Mount Vernon CSD	**87.86**	**90.75**	**77.83**	**86.70**
Murray CSD	**76.60**	**78.72**	**78.00**	**88.00**
Muscatine CSD	**74.32**	**78.46**	**61.70**	**58.64**
Nashua-Plainfield CSD	**75.29**	**88.24**	**73.42**	**87.34**
Nevada CSD	**86.96**	**79.23**	**69.52**	**72.38**
New Hampton CSD	**78.63**	**84.62**	**73.50**	**78.63**
New London CSD	**79.71**	**88.41**	**66.67**	**81.16**
Newell-Fonda CSD	**82.26**	**75.81**	**72.97**	**82.43**

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Newton CSD	**73.88**	**77.57**	**71.14**	**68.35**
Nodaway Valley CSD	**75.25**	**80.20**	**70.59**	**71.76**
North Butler CSD	**85.19**	**87.65**	**75.00**	**90.48**
North Cedar CSD	**70.00**	**74.00**	**60.50**	**67.23**
North Fayette CSD	**84.69**	**86.73**	**63.79**	**74.14**
North Iowa CSD	**86.96**	**95.65**	**63.08**	**75.38**
North Kossuth CSD	**59.46**	**67.57**	**80.00**	**70.00**
North Linn CSD	**78.90**	**88.07**	**74.73**	**78.02**
North Mahaska CSD	**87.88**	**90.91**	**66.00**	**74.00**
North Polk CSD	**84.06**	**84.06**	**88.11**	**84.86**
North Scott CSD	**84.42**	**88.94**	**82.54**	**83.22**
North Tama County CSD	**84.85**	**87.88**	**79.10**	**73.13**
North Winneshiek CSD	**92.59**	**85.19**	**69.57**	**69.57**
Northeast CSD	**84.15**	**91.46**	**81.25**	**90.28**
Northeast Hamilton CSD	**86.96**	**78.26**	**50.00**	**66.67**
Northwood-Kensett CSD	**70.59**	**83.82**	**73.97**	**79.45**
Norwalk CSD	**87.00**	**91.64**	**81.60**	**90.40**
Odebolt-Arthur CSD	**74.42**	**81.40**	**78.38**	**82.88**
Oelwein CSD	**72.22**	**74.31**	**65.22**	**75.78**
Ogden CSD	**84.88**	**87.21**	**87.76**	**89.80**
Okoboji CSD	**91.24**	**92.70**	**76.36**	**79.09**
Olin Consolidated SD	**70.83**	**79.17**		
Orient-Macksburg CSD	**55.00**	**65.00**	**52.17**	**69.57**
Osage CSD	**90.68**	**88.14**	**66.45**	**86.18**
Oskaloosa CSD	**63.83**	**64.13**	**61.74**	**64.35**
Ottumwa CSD	**62.74**	**75.56**	**61.68**	**66.61**
Panorama CSD	**66.09**	**80.87**	**81.55**	**84.47**
Paton-Churdan CSD	**91.30**	**95.65**	**47.83**	**56.52**
PCM CSD	**85.61**	**81.29**	**75.54**	**79.86**
Pekin CSD	**90.53**	**90.53**	**74.55**	**77.27**
Pella CSD	**90.51**	**83.54**	**81.14**	**89.82**
Perry CSD	**52.16**	**65.09**	**59.22**	**59.61**
Pleasant Valley CSD	**88.30**	**92.87**	**82.50**	**86.83**
Pleasantville CSD	**80.95**	**85.71**	**73.58**	**78.30**
Pocahontas Area CSD	**71.05**	**85.53**	**68.04**	**79.38**
Postville CSD	**47.67**	**76.74**	**47.95**	**60.27**
Prairie Valley CSD	**79.73**	**91.89**	**65.26**	**78.95**
Prescott CSD	**N < 10**	**N < 10**		
Red Oak CSD	**71.70**	**84.91**	**65.64**	**71.17**
Remsen-Union CSD	**90.48**	**85.71**	**77.78**	**83.33**
Riceville CSD	**82.00**	**92.00**	**69.05**	**61.90**
River Valley CSD	**74.14**	**77.59**	**69.64**	**76.79**
Riverside CSD	**69.01**	**74.65**	**84.29**	**75.71**
Rock Valley CSD	**71.88**	**73.96**	**82.61**	**89.13**
Rockwell City-Lytton CSD	**79.35**	**81.52**	**72.22**	**83.33**
Roland-Story CSD	**90.58**	**86.96**	**75.69**	**78.47**

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Rudd-Rockford-Marble Rock CSD	**72.73**	**78.18**	**56.79**	**71.60**
Ruthven-Ayrshire CSD	**84.00**	**88.00**	**64.29**	**85.71**
Saydel CSD	**61.49**	**72.30**	**65.00**	**57.78**
Schaller-Crestland CSD	**82.61**	**84.78**	**56.12**	**75.51**
Schleswig CSD	**75.00**	**75.00**	**78.13**	**75.00**
Sentral CSD	**76.47**	**67.65**		
Sergeant Bluff-Luton S D	**88.94**	**83.83**	**83.03**	**79.36**
Seymour CSD	**70.59**	**73.53**	**60.71**	**92.86**
Sheldon CSD	**76.92**	**85.38**	**70.50**	**89.93**
Shenandoah CSD	**75.91**	**72.26**	**77.37**	**75.18**
Sibley-Ocheyedan CSD	**76.58**	**81.98**	**76.58**	**77.48**
Sidney CSD	**83.78**	**81.08**	**69.35**	**87.10**
Sigourney CSD	**77.63**	**77.63**	**75.34**	**78.08**
Sioux Center CSD	**81.34**	**91.79**	**73.86**	**81.05**
Sioux Central CSD	**68.75**	**75.00**	**72.45**	**74.49**
Sioux City CSD	**70.74**	**76.35**	**66.59**	**60.57**
Solon CSD	**85.94**	**90.63**	**79.78**	**87.43**
South Hamilton CSD	**78.26**	**88.04**	**84.47**	**79.61**
South O Brien CSD	**76.39**	**90.28**	**74.39**	**80.49**
South Page CSD	**44.44**	**83.33**	**77.78**	**66.67**
South Tama County CSD	**67.00**	**73.50**	**61.05**	**64.21**
South Winneshiek CSD	**80.70**	**75.44**	**75.41**	**83.61**
Southeast Polk CSD	**80.30**	**83.85**	**74.89**	**74.44**
Southeast Warren CSD	**82.46**	**85.96**	**67.90**	**71.60**
Southeast Webster Grand CSD	**80.00**	**86.15**	**70.83**	**62.50**
Spencer CSD	**79.05**	**83.00**	**73.09**	**79.64**
Spirit Lake CSD	**77.78**	**89.68**	**80.63**	**80.63**
Springville CSD	**67.24**	**77.59**	**68.97**	**77.59**
St Ansgar CSD	**91.36**	**88.89**	**72.04**	**87.10**
Stanton CSD	**78.57**	**96.43**	**61.11**	**83.33**
Starmont CSD	**79.07**	**90.70**	**66.00**	**81.00**
Storm Lake CSD	**58.90**	**66.78**	**61.26**	**64.43**
Stratford CSD	**77.78**	**94.44**		
Sumner CSD	**73.97**	**82.19**		
Tipton CSD	**78.83**	**79.56**	**68.94**	**86.36**
Titonka Consolidated SD	**N < 10**	**N < 10**		
Treynor CSD	**83.74**	**79.67**	**87.96**	**87.96**
Tri-Center CSD	**82.73**	**74.55**	**80.95**	**81.90**
Tri-County CSD	**82.61**	**91.30**	**76.19**	**83.33**
Tripoli CSD	**73.21**	**80.36**	**73.85**	**70.77**
Turkey Valley CSD	**93.55**	**96.77**	**78.26**	**92.75**
Twin Cedars CSD	**72.50**	**77.50**	**70.59**	**62.75**
Twin Rivers CSD	**N < 10**	**N < 10**		
Underwood CSD	**82.88**	**82.88**	**75.41**	**81.15**
Union CSD	**76.16**	**79.65**	**64.43**	**71.65**
United CSD	**92.68**	**85.37**		

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Urbandale CSD	**80.92**	**84.59**	**76.75**	**77.68**
Valley CSD	**66.67**	**91.67**	**74.60**	**84.13**
Van Buren CSD	**78.21**	**79.49**	**67.78**	**70.00**
Van Meter CSD	**80.95**	**86.90**	**89.00**	**89.00**
Ventura CSD	**92.59**	**85.19**	**67.31**	**70.19**
Villisca CSD	**70.97**	**93.55**	**53.85**	**71.79**
Vinton-Shellsbrg CSD	**88.06**	**85.57**	**70.69**	**86.64**
Waco CSD	**73.08**	**69.23**	**61.67**	**71.67**
Walnut CSD	**84.21**	**73.68**	**N < 10**	**N < 10**
Wapello CSD	**63.64**	**68.18**	**55.56**	**70.37**
Wapsie Valley CSD	**80.36**	**89.29**	**64.08**	**72.82**
Washington CSD	**68.42**	**74.74**	**62.07**	**75.86**
Waterloo CSD	**60.94**	**64.36**	**59.09**	**58.86**
Waukee CSD	**85.49**	**91.36**	**85.16**	**88.94**
Waverly-Shell Rock CSD	**86.19**	**91.04**	**82.21**	**87.90**
Wayne CSD	**82.19**	**80.82**	**75.32**	**77.92**
Webster City CSD	**81.22**	**87.82**	**68.83**	**87.01**
West Bend-Mallard CSD	**76.60**	**87.23**	**58.14**	**62.79**
West Branch CSD	**68.38**	**76.07**	**78.38**	**86.49**
West Burlington Ind SD	**80.00**	**85.00**	**65.42**	**71.03**
West Central CSD	**70.59**	**76.47**	**71.43**	**88.57**
West Central Valley CSD	**86.73**	**89.38**	**78.38**	**82.88**
West Delaware County CSD	**77.03**	**77.51**	**80.84**	**85.51**
West Des Moines CSD	**81.04**	**87.09**	**84.86**	**86.86**
West Fork CSD	**82.56**	**84.88**	**65.66**	**67.68**
West Hancock CSD	**64.44**	**74.44**	**72.37**	**82.89**
West Harrison CSD	**66.67**	**86.67**	**71.70**	**84.91**
West Liberty CSD	**63.47**	**65.27**	**63.89**	**80.00**
West Lyon CSD	**89.39**	**83.33**	**77.31**	**82.35**
West Marshall CSD	**74.64**	**92.03**	**86.15**	**93.08**
West Monona CSD	**70.65**	**64.13**	**70.51**	**70.51**
West Sioux CSD	**55.10**	**81.63**	**68.92**	**71.62**
Western Dubuque CSD	**77.45**	**88.59**	**72.65**	**89.35**
Westwood CSD	**89.29**	**92.86**	**60.00**	**68.24**
Whiting CSD	**82.86**	**91.43**	**74.19**	**93.55**
Williamsburg CSD	**77.14**	**74.29**	**70.63**	**84.62**
Wilton CSD	**83.64**	**87.27**	**65.14**	**76.15**
Winfield-Mt Union CSD	**95.92**	**91.84**	**61.04**	**70.13**
Winterset CSD	**83.80**	**90.28**	**78.45**	**90.09**
Woodbine CSD	**79.10**	**85.07**	**55.56**	**73.33**
Woodbury Central CSD	**87.01**	**89.61**	**75.90**	**69.88**
Woodward-Granger CSD	**83.50**	**85.44**	**78.00**	**83.00**

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/). 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.

Mentoring and Induction Model

In past years, 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 one-to-one mentoring and induction program at the local and regional levels. *Journey to Excellence* was designed to prepare and support mentors as they assist beginning teachers' transition from the university to classroom practice.

In 2012, and as a result of grant funding, a new model of mentoring and induction was introduced to Iowa schools. The Induction Consortium model is based on the research of the New Teacher Center and focuses on a different approach to supporting new teacher development. Fully released teachers are chosen to mentor up to 15 new teachers across multiple districts/buildings and provide weekly job embedded instructional support (60-90 minutes each week). These full release mentors and new teachers are part of a larger system that includes ongoing professional learning and communities of practice for new teachers, mentors, building/district administrators, and district induction program leaders.

Using best teaching practices, all mentors in Iowa are trained in one of the models for their role of supporting and guiding beginning teachers, to accelerate new teacher practice, increase retention, build teacher leadership, and improve student-learning outcomes. Interactive and in-depth, these trainings also offers opportunities for mentors to reflect on their own practice as they provide guidance to beginning teachers about teaching related to the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

Teacher Quality Partnership Grant

The federal Teacher Quality Partnership grant was awarded to and has been administered by the Iowa Department of Education since March of 2010 in the amount of $9,035,380 for five years. The work of the grant is directed by the department's 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.

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.

Moving Forward

With the initial implementation of the Teacher Leadership and Compensation program came a renewed interest in Iowa's approach to supporting beginning teachers and their mentors. In late 2014, a statewide advisory consisting of Area Education Agency representatives, school district and building administrators, Department of Education and association staff was convened to provide guidance on a more systemic approach to mentoring and induction that can support a variety of models.

The individuals of this advisory committee will work collaboratively to study current research and to develop a framework to accelerate beginning teachers' entry into the profession and to monitor and maintain their career development. This group is also taking steps to reinstitute the Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute that will again provide a high quality professional development opportunity for beginning teachers, their mentors and district facilitators who support mentoring and induction programs.

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. For the 2013-14 school year 91.1 percent of the 2012-13 teachers returned to teach. This was an increase of 4.8 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 92.5 percent for 2013-14 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 91.7 percent, an increase of 4.2 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, 84.8 percent of the first year teachers in 2011-2012 were still teaching in the 2013-2014 school year. This was an increase of 7.2 percentage points (Table 1). Table 2 shows that 82.0 percent of second year teachers in 2000-2001 were teaching two years later and 87.1 percent of second year teachers in 2011-2012 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 86.1 percent of first and second year teachers combined in 2011-2012 were teaching two years later.

Also, note that there has been considerable variability in the number of first and second year teachers over the course of the last 14 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 and has continued to increase through both the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 years.

Table 1: -- Iowa Public School and AEA First Year Teacher Retention 2000-01 to 2013-14

		Number and Percent of Teachers Returning in												
Base School Year	**Number Teachers Base School Year**	**2001-2002**	**2002-2003**	**2003-2004**	**2004-2005**	**2005-2006**	**2006-2007**	**2007-2008**	**2008-2009**	**2009-2010**	**2010-2011**	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
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%)	936 (51.0%)
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%)	867 (53.4%)
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%)	713 (53.3%)
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%)	887 (61.1%)
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%)	861 (56.1%)
2005-2006	1611						1465 (90.9%)	1339 (83.1%)	1223 (76.0%)	1191 (73.9%)	1138 (70.6%)	1086 (67.4%)	1055 (65.5%)	1029 (63.9%)
2006-2007	1694							1546 (91.3%)	1417 (83.6%)	1332 (78.6%)	1260 (74.4%)	1201 (70.9%)	1154 (68.1%)	1102 (65.1%)
2007-2008	1796								1674 (93.2%)	1558 (86.7%)	1483 (82.6%)	1395 (77.7%)	1331 (74.1%)	1258 (70.0%)
2008-2009	1555									1433 (92.2%)	1323 (85.1%)	1251 (80.5%)	1213 (78.0%)	1151 (74.0%)
2009-2010	1277										1162 (91.0%)	1091 (85.4%)	1033 (80.9%)	972 (76.1%)
2010-2011	1316											1210 (91.9%)	1137 (86.4%)	1079 (82.0%)
2011-2012	1383												1251 (90.5%)	1174 (84.8%)
2012-2013	1797													1637 (91.1%)
2013-2014	1677													

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 2013-14

		Number and Percent of Teachers Returning in												
Base School Year	**Number Teachers Base School Year**	**2001-2002**	**2002-2003**	**2003-2004**	**2004-2005**	**2005-2006**	**2006-2007**	**2007-2008**	**2008-2009**	**2009-2010**	**2010-2011**	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
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%)	1007 (54.7%)
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%)	1105 (56.6%)
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%)	958 (59.3%)
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%)	797 (60.6%)
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%)	944 (64.1%)
2005-2006	1616						1447 (89.5%)	1357 (84.0%)	1243 (77.0%)	1193 (73.8%)	1150 (71.2%)	1121 (69.4%)	1084 (67.1%)	1042 (64.5%)
2006-2007	1647							1488 (90.3%)	1337 (81.2%)	1292 (78.4%)	1230 (74.7%)	1174 (71.3%)	1141 (69.3%)	1117 (67.8%)
2007-2008	1724								1569 (91.0%)	1473 (85.4%)	1402 (81.3%)	1331 (77.2%)	1283 (74.4%)	1225 (71.1%)
2008-2009	1706									1570 (92.0%)	1487 (87.2%)	1393 (81.7%)	1339 (78.5%)	1259 (73.8%)
2009-2010	1559										1431 (91.8%)	1345 (86.3%)	1306 (83.8%)	1238 (79.4%)
2010-2011	1317											1221 (92.7%)	1150 (87.3%)	1082 (82.2%)
2011-2012	1583												1469 (92.8%)	1379 (87.1%)
2012-2013	1551													1434 (92.5%)
2013-2014	1864													

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

		Number and Percent of Teachers Returning in												
Base School Year	**Number Teachers Base School Year**	**2001-2002**	**2002-2003**	**2003-2004**	**2004-2005**	**2005-2006**	**2006-2007**	**2007-2008**	**2008-2009**	**2009-2010**	**2010-2011**	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
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%)	1943 (52.9%)
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%)	1972 (55.2%)
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%)	1671 (57.5%)
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%)	1684 (60.9%)
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%)	1805 (60.0%)
2005-2006	3227						2912 (90.2%)	2696 (83.5%)	2466 (76.4%)	2384 (73.9%)	2288 (70.9%)	2207 (68.4%)	2139 (66.3%)	2071 (64.2%)
2006-2007	3341							3034 (90.8%)	2754 (82.4%)	2624 (78.5%)	2490 (74.5%)	2375 (71.1%)	2295 (68.7%)	2219 (66.4%)
2007-2008	3520								3243 (92.1%)	3031 (86.1%)	2885 (82.0%)	2726 (77.4%)	2614 (74.3%)	2483 (70.5%)
2008-2009	3261									3003 (92.1%)	2810 (86.2%)	2644 (81.1%)	2552 (78.3%)	2410 (73.9%)
2009-2010	2836										2593 (91.4%)	2436 (85.9%)	2339 (82.5%)	2210 (77.9%)
2010-2011	2633											2431 (92.3%)	2287 (86.9%)	2161 (82.1%)
2011-2012	2966												2720 (91.7%)	2553 (86.1%)
2012-2013	3348													3071 (91.7%)
2013-2014	3541													

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

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

Multi-Tiered System of Supports

In 2013-2014, approximately 89 Phase One schools, representing 10 percent of Iowa youth from preschool to grade 6, began implementation of Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). This included:

(1) Implementation of Individual Growth and Development Indicators (IGDIs) and Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST), Iowa's state supported universal screening for prekindergarten, and kindergarten through sixth grade students, respectively;
(2) Implementation of FAST progress monitoring assessments and interventions to support learning for students who are not at benchmark, K-3;
(3) Access and use of Iowa TIER, Iowa's data system that allows easy access to student universal screening and progress monitoring assessment administration and results;
(4) Access to monthly coaching webinars to provide just-in-time implementation support; and
(5) Implementation of collaborative inquiry within leadership teams.

A critical change in implementation occurred in 2013-2014. Funds were appropriated for IAC 281-62, Iowa Code §279.68 – part of the law requirements includes district implementation of universal screening and progress monitoring for students in kindergarten through 3rd grade. Given this requirement, efforts appropriately shifted from 10 percent of schools, to statewide implementation of K-3 assessments.

By 2014, nearly all Iowa's districts benefitted from beginning implementation of MTSS focused on Iowa Core early literacy. Approximately three hundred and five [305] public districts and 43 non-public schools for a total of 634 total schools (public and non-public) implemented FAST universal screening assessments fall, 2014. This translates into approximately 161,297 students tested across public and non-public schools.

In 2014-2015, the focus is on continued support of the initially identified schools, as well as implementation across over 90 percent of schools. For Phase One schools, this means continued access and training on Iowa TIER, IGDIs and FAST, monthly coach webinars, training and support for coaches and leadership teams on collaborative inquiry and related materials, and first access to all training and materials related to MTSS. For all schools, this means access and training to Iowa TIER, IGDIs and FAST, as well as access to MTSS materials.

Approximately $127,550 dollars supported Iowa Core early literacy professional development and learning around:

- 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.

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. CGI professional development was received by 19 districts during 2014. CGI is aligned with the content and strategies of Iowa Core Mathematics Standards at the primary level and therefore, supports the implementation of Iowa Core Mathematics Standards.

Support for the CGI Leaders in our state during 2014 included professional development on the topic of the updated PD materials that our leaders use during their PD with teachers. The other topic for PD was Discourse in the Mathematics Classroom, presented by Megan Franke from UCLA. This topic connected with the Mathematics Practices section of Iowa Core Math Standards.

Social Studies

Prior to FY 2014, no professional development in social studies was offered or delivered to social studies teachers on a statewide level. In FY 2014, the Iowa Department of Education surveyed social studies

teachers to gain a better understanding about the current status of professional development within the content area of social studies. In a well-represented survey, 59 percent of teachers reported zero opportunities to social studies professional development within the last two years. Another 28 percent reported less than two opportunities for professional development in social studies within two years. Because of these data, the Department has implemented a plan to offer professional development to social studies teachers statewide. The Social Studies Leadership Team designed professional development modules during FY 14 around "Building Literacy in Social Studies." Because there are no social studies consultants at the AEA level, social studies teacher leaders from each AEA were trained on these modules. These teacher leaders will then work with their AEA to offer and deliver this professional development to social studies teachers across the state.

In addition, the Department, in partnership with the State Historical Museum of Iowa, put on a Best Practices in Social Studies Institute (June 24-25, 2014) this past summer. This Institute was free and open to all social studies teachers from across the state. Nearly 170 social studies teachers attended from across Iowa. The Department plans to offer this Institute each summer.

English Language Learners

The English Language Learners (ELL) FY 14 funding was utilized to assist in the support of the Deep Data Audit, conducted by the Center for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA) from the University of Iowa. Currently, approximately 20 to 25 Iowa school districts address the needs of approximately 75-85 percent of the English Language Learners in the state. In addition, perhaps an additional 50 to 100 districts have much smaller cohorts of ELLs receiving specialized instruction and services. However, two significant knowledge deficits create barriers to the effectiveness and efficiency of ELL programs. First, all Iowa districts need access to detailed descriptions of the most successful interventions that are working in Iowa. Second, districts need to systematically select and implement key indicators that will guide them as they work to improve their own, or adopt new, interventions in their districts.

To address these needs, the Iowa Department of Education contracted CEA to conduct a program and deep data audit to take place in two stages:

1. To discover what is known about the actual resources, services, and programming that ELLs receive. Currently, we do not know whether districts are creating their own unique approaches to ELL instruction or whether they use similar basic models adapted to their individual districts.
2. To discover outcome indicators currently used to evaluate districts' ELL programming. These could include ELLs' progress toward graduation, successful navigation to higher education and employment, and other indicators of economic and social adjustment as deemed important by the Iowa State Legislature.

In Year 1 (April through June, 2014), CEA developed the methodology for program monitoring and description through pilot case studies of three districts selected from the 20 districts serving the largest numbers of ELLs. Subsequent scale-up studies in future years yielding current information are dependent on need and funding.

Specific Performance and Product Deliverables:

April-June 2014

1. Identified three appropriate, volunteering districts to engage in the study of existing ELL programming and monitoring methods. The purpose was to develop feasible and useful documentation and monitoring procedures to facilitate statewide sharing and improvements. ***The deliverable for this goal was a detailed description of the methods used to contact districts to arrive at an agreement to work together, as well as a written report or section in a report describing and evaluating the quality of the collaboration between individual districts and the CEA.***
2. Investigated district, school, and classroom level monitoring and tracking of ELL programming as experienced by students, their parents, teachers, and any other key sources of information, including that of trained observers and interviewers. ***The deliverable for this goal was a written report describing how districts are monitoring and tracking their own ELL programming. This deliverable was evaluated for accuracy and usefulness by the districts as a way of investigating the quality of methods used to monitor and track ELL programming [see Goal 9].***
3. Review and analysis of existing program documentation, especially any previous school- or district-based program evaluations with accurate program implementation descriptions. ***The deliverable was a written summary of findings.***
4. Developed and/or improved monitoring and tracking instrumentation used to describe the existing, on-going resource allocations, services, and programming as experienced by staff, students, and other key sources of information. ***The methods used to monitor and track ELL resource allocations, services and programming in individual districts was evaluated for quality and usefulness by selected partners in the three volunteering districts.***
5. Compared the observations and experiences with program goals and objectives and conduct a discrepancy analysis. *The purpose of this goal was to give the districts the opportunity to review the analyses and draft reports produced by the CEA and reflect on the accuracy and value of the draft reports in order to evaluate the methodology for future use.* ***The deliverable was a section in the written report suggesting improvements in the methods used for future implementation. [See Goal 9 below.]***
6. Collected information from important stakeholders about the most important ELL program outcomes to measure. Key stakeholders included the following and could be expanded to include others, as suggested by the partnering districts:
    a. Teachers and other educators (including school administrators)
    b. Parents and other community members
    c. Samples of students and former students
    d. Elected officials
    e. Agency staff and other public servants

Outcome measures of interest, suggested by the above stakeholders, included indicators of ELLs':

a. Classroom performance (grades, classroom tests, homework success, attendance, engagement, motivation, and so forth)
b. Social and cultural adjustment (bi- or multi-cultural adjustment)
c. End of year success and promotion
d. Appropriately aligned district tests
e. Appropriately aligned standardized tests
f. Graduation
g. Successful application to higher education, training, and employment
h. Success and accomplishment in higher education, training and employment

The deliverable was a written list of suggested program outcome measures and indicators to be evaluated for future use.

7. Identified the most likely **users** of evaluation data and analyses for improvement purposes and to find out how they need the information prepared so that they can best implement improvements in ELL programming and outcomes. ***The deliverable was a written list of potential users for future evaluation analyses and reports.***
8. Based on experiences during the pilot case studies, a communication plan was prepared to address the manner in which to best to collect and disseminate the information in subsequent cycles of information collection (in subsequent years). ***The deliverable was a written communication plan suitable for future implementation.***
9. ***Based on the three case studies, a detailed, written report was drafted, providing proposed methodology, including finalized Web-based survey instruments, focus-group interviews, document analysis protocols and analysis procedures to guide future work tracking ELL programming in the State of Iowa. In addition, the report included evidence from the pilot case studies used to evaluate the methods and instruments.***

Authentic Intellectual Work

Teacher Development Funds have been used in FY 14 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. In reading, mathematics, science, and social studies, the students in the AIW schools outperformed their peers in the non-AIW schools.

Professional School Counseling Professional Development 2014

Iowa Professional School Counseling Summit: "Tools for Growing Your School Counseling K-12 Program" was held at Honey Creek, Lake Rathburn on August 5-6, 2014. Over 125 professional school counselors, graduate students, representatives from higher education, Iowa School Counseling Association Board members, Iowa College Student Aid Commission participated in the two day training. All presentations were done by these state school counseling leaders. All participants received a copy of *Making Data Work 2nd Rev and ASCA Model 3rd Rev.*

Outcomes for the session included the following:

New and Developing Professional School Counselors will:

1. *Gain* confidence in understanding/ dealing with mental health issues as they affect pre K-12 students.
2. *D*evelop strategies to grow programs that remove barriers to student success and college and career readiness.
3. *Investigate* helpful technology and enhance technological skills for school counseling programs.
4. *Ensure* school counseling use data to alignment with the Iowa/ASCA model for school counseling.

Green Hill Professional School Counselor Fall (October) Workshop: "Meeting the Mental Health Needs of Students Impacted by Trauma and Iowa School Counseling Framework Revisions".

Ellen McGinnis Smith and Jan Kuhl presented all day workshop to approximately 65 professional school counselors on adverse childhood experience study, brain development and resiliency building. The newly revised Iowa School Counseling Framework was also reviewed and professional school counselors received copies of the *ASCA Model 3rd Rev, Making Data Work 2nd Rev* and the Iowa School Counseling Framework.

Fine Arts in Iowa Core Professional Development

Iowa was the first state in the nation to introduce and engage educators in the launch of the National Core Arts Standards website. Invited presenter, Lynn Tuttle is Director of Arts Education at the Arizona Department of Education. Lynn serves as Past-President for the State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education and is one of the leaders of the revision of the National Voluntary Arts Education Standards. Eleven Iowa practicing teachers supported Lynn through discussion, guided instruction in lesson building and implementation in discipline-alike breakout sessions.

The Fine Arts/Iowa Core professional development day was developed and presented in collaboration with the Iowa Department of Education, and eleven 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. Participants included teachers of general music, drama, vocal music, band, orchestra, visual art, curriculum directors and administrators. Approximately

100 teachers attended. Twice as many was anticipated, however the delayed end of the school year due to winter school closings prevented many educators from participating.

The presentation for the first half of the day included the history, writing process, website access, and examples of connection to the Fine Arts alignment to Iowa Core. The afternoon was designed for arts educators, administrators, and classroom teachers to meet by fine arts discipline to discover ways to integrate the fine arts, the universal constructs (critical thinking, complex communication, creativity, collaboration, flexibility and adaptability, and productivity and accountability) and national standards skill development through lesson planning, implementation, and assessment.

The funding allowed the Iowa Department of Education to contract with the national presenter, the leaders of the breakout sessions, and cover printed copies of materials for the lessons/assessment break-out sessions in the afternoon as provided by the afternoon presenters. The funding allowed the Iowa Department of Education to offer the fine arts professional development at no cost to participants.

Course credit options were available through AEA Professional Development Online at participant expense. The planning, development, and reporting of the fine arts professional development was completed by Rosanne Malek, Consultant for Arts Education and Gifted and Talented Programming at the Iowa Department of Education.

Gifted and Talented Professional Development

Instructing Gifted and Advanced Learners in the Language Arts professional development was sponsored by the Iowa Department of Education in partnership with Iowa Talented and Gifted Association and was offered at no cost to participants. Participants included reading teachers, classroom teachers, teachers administrating gifted programs, curriculum directors, building administrators, and area education agency consultants. The sessions were two separate days, with 140 different participants attending each day for a total of 280 participants from across Iowa. The agenda included an introduction to Common Core issues in relation to gifted education, differentiation of curriculum strategies for the gifted as applied to Common Core standards, Common core acceleration, approaches and application of acceleration, remodeling, and integration, and examples and issues with assessments to understand and adapt instruction to advanced learner needs, and guided instruction to lesson planning and implementation.

The invited presenter was Dr. Elizabeth Shaunessy-Dedrick co-author of *A Teachers Guide to Using the Common Core State Standards with Gifted and Advanced Learners in the English Language Arts*. This publication was provided to each participant and used throughout the day to guide the professional development and to use when teachers return to the classroom. School districts and Area Education Agencies have requested a repeat of this professional development for colleagues who could not attend. There are also requests to provide the same format of professional development in the area of mathematics and science for instruction the advanced learner. The planning, development, and reporting of the gifted/advanced learner professional development was completed by Rosanne Malek, Consultant for Arts Education and Gifted and Talented Programming at the Iowa Department of Education.