



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, 2012

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

State Board of Education

Rosie Hussey, President, Clear Lake
Charles C. Edwards, Jr., Vice President, Des Moines
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines
Eric Goranson, Des Moines
Michael Knedler, Council Bluffs
Valorie J. Kruse, Sioux City
Ana Lopez, Pella
Max Phillips, Woodward
LaMetta Wynn, Clinton
Brandon Bolte, Student Member, Ankeny

Administration

Dr. Jason Glass, Director and Executive Officer
of the State Board of Education
Gail M. Sullivan, Chief of Staff

Division of Learning and Results
Kevin Fangman, Deputy Director

Bureau of Teaching and Learning Services
Mary Beth Schroeder-Fracek, Administrative Consultant
Rita Martens, Lead Consultant

Bureau of Accreditation and Improvement Services
Matt Ludwig, Consultant

Division of School Support and Information
Tom Deeter, Lead Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, 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 14th St, 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 60661-7204

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
2009-10 & 2010-11 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	83.3	91.7	70.2	70.2
Adel DeSoto Minburn CSD	85.9	83.5	85.5	90.0
AGWSR CSD	79.2	84.4	74.7	81.6
A-H-S-T CSD	81.5	81.5	84.5	95.8
Akron Westfield CSD	88.3	83.3	91.2	89.7
Albert City-Truesdale CSD	80.0	90.0	to Sioux Central	
Albia CSD	83.3	80.6	76.0	70.2
Alburnett CSD	89.9	89.7	76.6	77.5
Alden CSD	84.6	81.6	to Iowa Falls	
Algona CSD	86.5	83.3	78.8	77.0
Allamakee CSD	82.9	79.1	89.0	85.4
Allison-Bristow CSD	87.5	87.5	83.9	86.2
Alta CSD	72.9	80.0	86.8	81.1
Ames CSD	89.1	89.5	84.3	84.3
Anamosa CSD	80.9	83.4	71.8	85.9
Andrew CSD	61.5	64.1	76.7	83.3
Anita CSD	86.2	96.6	to C and M	
Ankeny CSD	89.9	90.0	84.8	87.1
Anthon-Oto CSD	76.0	72.0	68.6	72.0
Aplington-Parkersburg CSD	78.5	78.5	70.6	70.6
Armstrong-Ringsted CSD	77.8	86.1	79.6	79.6
Ar-We-Va CSD	97.0	87.9	74.2	90.3
Atlantic CSD	81.2	84.1	74.5	79.5
Audubon CSD	82.8	90.6	71.9	86.5
Aurelia CSD	81.8	81.8	78.8	72.7
Ballard CSD	85.6	87.8	86.4	88.1
Battle Creek-Ida Grove CSD	83.3	86.9	to Odebolt-Arthur	
Baxter CSD	83.9	83.9	78.9	82.5

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
BCLUW CSD	86.6	86.6	88.0	83.5
Bedford CSD	84.6	89.4	82.5	84.1
Belle Plaine CSD	84.1	86.6	66.7	68.2
Bellevue CSD	81.0	89.3	72.2	71.1
Belmond-Klemme CSD	81.2	87.1	67.0	70.5
Bennett CSD	95.5	95.5	to Durant	
Benton CSD	81.5	81.5	83.4	77.3
Bettendorf CSD	87.1	87.1	83.6	82.9
Bondurant-Farrar CSD	85.9	83.9	81.9	78.9
Boone CSD	86.9	87.9	66.9	73.3
Boyden-Hull CSD	89.3	86.9	75.8	81.3
Boyer Valley CSD	70.8	70.8	67.9	82.1
Brooklyn-Guernsey-Malcom CSD	81.7	87.3	65.0	73.8
Burlington CSD	81.2	81.2	70.0	65.4
C and M CSD	56.7	53.3	75.0	76.9
CAL CSD	78.1	68.8	71.4	75.0
Calamus-Wheatland CSD	86.1	94.9	73.0	74.3
Camanche CSD	76.7	80.7	73.4	68.8
Cardinal CSD	77.8	73.6	75.0	62.5
Carlisle CSD	82.4	86.6	81.9	89.3
Carroll CSD	88.3	83.1	85.7	87.9
Cedar Falls CSD	87.3	89.4	80.9	83.8
Cedar Rapids CSD	77.0	78.3	74.0	77.5
Center Point-Urbana CSD	80.0	81.9	81.3	89.8
Centerville CSD	76.3	82.8	75.0	70.8
Central City CSD	84.2	78.9	80.3	95.1
Central Clinton CSD	86.8	86.3	71.0	78.7
Central CSD	80.3	90.0	79.4	76.2
Central Decatur CSD	78.0	76.8	81.7	69.9
Central Lee CSD	83.7	87.7	80.4	82.6
Central Lyon CSD	91.6	91.6	77.3	86.2
Chariton CSD	89.9	84.8	70.0	76.2
Charles City CSD	80.0	79.0	71.1	75.4
Charter Oak-Ute CSD	77.8	77.8	62.2	71.1
Cherokee CSD	81.4	82.6	75.4	70.6
Clarinda CSD	78.6	68.7	78.9	78.9
Clarion-Goldfield CSD	80.7	85.8	85.6	83.5
Clarke CSD	79.1	80.8	73.1	82.5
Clarksville CSD	74.0	80.0	71.1	64.4
Clay Central-Everly CSD	78.7	83.3	75.6	77.8

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Clayton Ridge CSD	78.6	78.6	70.9	69.8
Clear Creek Amana CSD	81.6	78.2	83.5	80.6
Clear Lake CSD	75.7	82.7	74.5	78.8
Clearfield CSD	N < 10	N < 10	to Diagonal, Lenox, Mt. Ayr	
Clinton CSD	77.5	82.1	68.5	67.9
Colfax-Mingo CSD	76.8	82.8	59.8	62.5
College CSD	85.5	86.4	79.2	81.3
Collins-Maxwell CSD	74.6	77.8	84.1	85.7
Colo-Nesco CSD	89.1	87.3	82.4	81.1
Columbus CSD	57.9	66.7	58.7	59.5
Coon Rapids-Bayard CSD	69.5	88.1	71.7	76.7
Corning CSD	78.7	85.2	69.2	73.8
Corwith-Wesley CSD	to LuVerne		74.1	85.2
Council Bluffs CSD	76.7	77.0	67.0	67.0
Creston CSD	72.5	71.8	73.8	76.7
Dallas Center-Grimes CSD	90.5	92.6	86.9	89.6
Danville CSD	82.4	75.7	68.4	84.8
Davenport CSD	73.1	74.9	63.6	62.5
Davis County CSD	83.1	81.2	71.0	73.9
Decorah CSD	90.1	87.7	89.1	91.9
Delwood CSD	87.5	95.8	to Maquoketa	
Denison CSD	72.0	71.6	74.1	77.0
Denver CSD	87.4	90.5	90.2	92.4
Des Moines Independent CSD	66.7	67.3	60.5	64.3
Diagonal CSD	73.3	80.0	50.0	91.7
Dike-New Hartford CSD	85.3	85.3	74.3	87.6
Dows CSD	91.7	91.7	to Clarion-Goldfield	
Dubuque CSD	80.3	82.6	75.3	78.4
Dunkerton CSD	92.3	81.5	59.4	68.3
Durant CSD	76.8	87.0	79.3	74.8
Eagle Grove CSD	81.3	83.3	77.2	71.1
Earlham CSD	86.1	77.2	83.3	79.2
East Buchanan CSD	80.2	76.7	76.1	86.6
East Central CSD	84.3	90.2	67.3	67.3
East Greene CSD	63.9	55.6	75.0	86.1
East Marshall CSD	73.6	80.0	74.1	83.7
East Union CSD	81.2	78.3	64.3	78.0
Eastern Allamakee CSD	77.4	84.9	77.4	88.7
Eddyville-Blakesburg CSD	75.2	79.8	70.8	72.7
Edgewood-Colesburg CSD	81.1	82.4	57.8	62.2

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Eldora-New Providence CSD	73.2	74.4	to Hubbard-Radcliff	
Elk Horn-Kimballton CSD	96.2	92.3	67.6	75.7
Emmetsburg CSD	81.0	81.0	67.3	73.8
English Valleys CSD	81.0	86.2	72.3	75.9
Essex CSD	86.8	81.6	65.1	69.8
Estherville Lincoln Central CSD	82.8	81.6	67.5	67.9
Exira CSD	81.8	77.3	58.3	75.0
Fairfield CSD	83.3	80.0	75.6	75.9
Farragut CSD	80.6	64.5	60.9	60.9
Forest City CSD	93.6	93.6	82.3	83.6
Fort Dodge CSD	74.6	73.4	63.8	69.5
Fort Madison CSD	83.9	80.7	75.6	76.3
Fredericksburg CSD	81.6	84.6	77.9	82.3
Fremont CSD	65.5	75.9	70.0	70.0
Fremont-Mills CSD	76.1	89.1	67.2	76.5
Galva-Holstein CSD	83.6	82.4	81.3	81.3
Garner-Hayfield CSD	87.8	89.6	69.6	75.7
George-Little Rock CSD	88.4	82.6	77.4	77.4
Gilbert CSD	95.3	95.9	87.0	86.9
Gilmore City-Bradgate CSD	66.7	62.5	58.3	61.1
Gladbrook-Reinbeck CSD	66.7	75.3	79.1	79.1
Glenwood CSD	85.7	84.2	82.4	80.3
Glidden-Ralston CSD	91.1	88.9	83.7	87.8
GMG CSD	89.6	88.1	66.2	77.9
Graettinger-Terril CSD	91.1	93.3	72.5	71.8
Greene CSD	87.8	100.0	to Allison-Bristow	
Grinnell-Newburg CSD	87.3	91.1	82.0	85.1
Griswold CSD	86.3	85.0	83.0	87.5
Grundy Center CSD	88.1	88.1	89.7	94.9
Guthrie Center CSD	80.3	84.5	77.9	80.5
Hamburg CSD	80.0	68.6	59.3	59.3
Hampton-Dumont CSD	81.2	81.1	76.8	74.2
Harlan CSD	88.8	85.6	83.1	83.6
Harmony CSD	85.4	75.0	57.1	65.3
Harris-Lake Park CSD	100.0	100.0	84.8	90.9
Hartley-Melvin-Sanborn CSD	84.7	85.9	69.8	79.2
Highland CSD	66.7	61.3	72.3	62.4
Hinton CSD	75.7	84.3	75.0	76.0
H-L-V CSD	77.6	79.6	73.5	81.6
Howard-Winneshiek CSD	75.3	82.5	75.0	83.8

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Hubbard-Radcliffe CSD	72.1	74.4	74.0	72.4
Hudson CSD	87.6	78.7	75.9	88.4
Humboldt CSD	86.9	91.7	74.0	78.5
IKM CSD	84.8	84.8	80.2	87.7
Independence CSD	84.6	90.4	64.5	68.6
Indianola CSD	87.8	79.9	86.6	87.5
Interstate 35 CSD	78.7	85.0	78.3	71.7
Iowa City CSD	77.0	78.0	74.2	79.2
Iowa Falls CSD	78.9	85.7	78.4	76.2
Iowa Valley CSD	83.9	93.5	66.0	76.7
Janesville Consolidated SD	75.6	78.0	75.0	85.4
Jefferson-Scranton CSD	86.4	87.1	79.0	80.3
Jesup CSD	76.0	74.7	74.2	78.2
Johnston CSD	91.4	91.7	89.4	91.6
Keokuk CSD	78.8	81.2	60.6	60.6
Keota CSD	88.1	85.7	85.0	87.5
Kingsley-Pierson CSD	87.3	74.7	72.4	74.1
Knoxville CSD	84.5	86.1	72.8	80.0
Lake Mills CSD	77.2	88.6	83.1	82.0
Lamoni CSD	72.5	67.5	66.0	77.4
Laurens-Marathon CSD	69.4	69.4	57.8	71.1
Lawton-Bronson CSD	88.0	89.2	77.6	82.9
Le Mars CSD	85.4	81.3	77.0	87.4
Lenox CSD	91.7	88.3	71.7	77.4
Lewis Central CSD	73.8	72.3	63.7	73.4
Lineville-Clio CSD	N < 10	N < 10	N < 10	N < 10
Linn-Mar CSD	90.2	89.1	84.6	86.3
Lisbon CSD	79.5	86.4	79.1	90.1
Logan-Magnolia CSD	89.7	87.9	81.3	87.5
Lone Tree CSD	86.8	89.3	70.6	83.8
Louisa-Muscatine CSD	77.7	85.4	52.1	61.9
LuVerne CSD	80.0	76.0	to Corwith-Wesley	
Lynnvile-Sully CSD	84.6	84.6	75.0	86.1
Madrid CSD	85.7	83.5	68.5	68.5
Malvern CSD	76.3	74.4	to Nishna Valley	
Manning CSD	79.6	64.8	to IKM	
Manson Northwest Webster CSD	76.8	78.0	79.4	83.5
Maple Valley CSD	70.5	68.2	to Anthon-Oto	
Maquoketa CSD	80.2	77.0	69.1	67.3
Maquoketa Valley CSD	89.7	93.8	77.8	81.8

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Marcus-Meriden-Cleghorn CSD	90.9	95.5	76.6	82.3
Marion Independent SD	85.7	89.5	79.8	84.6
Marshalltown CSD	65.9	70.6	63.9	67.2
Martensdale-St Marys CSD	83.3	85.9	72.4	75.0
Mason City CSD	80.2	82.1	72.0	69.2
Mediapolis CSD	87.9	93.5	82.8	82.8
Melcher-Dallas CSD	90.0	85.0	67.6	76.5
MFL MarMac CSD	81.7	89.5	67.6	67.6
Midland CSD	78.5	71.9	65.5	74.5
Mid-Prairie CSD	83.8	85.6	73.3	81.2
Missouri Valley CSD	86.0	89.3	75.9	75.9
MOC-Floyd Valley CSD	89.4	89.4	88.5	86.9
Montezuma CSD	76.4	76.4	75.3	83.6
Monticello CSD	80.0	85.9	76.0	86.0
Moravia CSD	75.5	75.0	84.1	72.7
Mormon Trail CSD	69.7	50.0	71.9	78.6
Morning Sun CSD	85.3	82.4	to Wapello, Winfield Mt. Union, Mediapolis	
Moulton-Udell CSD	90.9	100.0	60.9	78.3
Mount Ayr CSD	90.0	88.9	68.2	79.5
Mount Pleasant CSD	85.5	87.5	73.8	77.6
Mount Vernon CSD	87.1	83.1	86.3	81.4
Murray CSD	87.8	89.8	55.6	60.0
Muscatine CSD	88.3	86.6	72.9	76.4
Nashua-Plainfield CSD	84.4	95.8	81.0	86.7
Nevada CSD	84.8	79.7	79.9	78.8
New Hampton CSD	83.5	82.7	80.9	76.5
New London CSD	72.5	76.8	77.1	88.4
Newell-Fonda CSD	78.0	72.9	76.8	83.3
Newton CSD	79.8	78.4	79.5	78.5
Nishna Valley CSD	86.4	77.3	74.2	80.6
Nodaway Valley CSD	84.4	77.1	78.8	72.1
Nora Springs-Rock Falls CSD	88.1	83.3	74.6	76.2
North Cedar CSD	81.2	86.3	76.7	76.7
North Central CSD	90.3	93.5	to Nora Springs-Rock Falls	
North Fayette CSD	89.0	89.9	79.8	81.6
North Iowa CSD	67.8	72.9	64.8	71.8
North Kossuth CSD	76.5	82.4	to Sentral	
North Linn CSD	86.3	88.4	76.0	84.4
North Mahaska CSD	73.4	78.5	71.8	74.4

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
North Polk CSD	87.8	82.9	87.9	87.3
North Scott CSD	89.2	90.1	80.5	81.6
North Tama County CSD	79.4	91.2	71.3	81.3
North Winneshiek CSD	88.9	77.8	79.3	89.7
Northeast CSD	85.9	91.8	85.7	96.2
Northeast Hamilton CSD	73.5	91.2	75.6	85.4
Northwood-Kensett CSD	81.3	79.7	82.8	91.4
Norwalk CSD	83.1	86.4	80.4	85.9
Odebolt-Arthur CSD	87.5	84.4	72.8	81.0
Oelwein CSD	75.7	79.3	74.6	78.2
Ogden CSD	92.6	88.3	85.2	82.4
Okoboji CSD	91.2	89.6	86.4	84.7
Olin Consolidated SD	85.0	80.0	50.0	44.4
Orient-Macksburg CSD	79.2	83.3	65.0	80.0
Osage CSD	82.5	83.3	84.5	87.3
Oskaloosa CSD	74.9	77.6	72.5	79.4
Ottumwa CSD	74.0	72.7	65.3	69.5
Panorama CSD	88.1	84.2	90.0	85.5
Paton-Churdan CSD	84.6	92.3	85.7	85.7
PCM CSD	86.6	85.2	76.1	70.1
Pekin CSD	95.8	95.8	74.7	81.1
Pella CSD	92.4	92.4	88.8	84.7
Perry CSD	68.9	71.0	75.9	68.7
Pleasant Valley CSD	90.8	90.8	82.5	88.3
Pleasantville CSD	90.6	82.1	64.4	76.7
Pocahontas Area CSD	87.7	85.7	to Pomeroy-Palmer	
Pomeroy-Palmer CSD	86.4	72.7	79.4	74.5
Postville CSD	68.2	76.9	75.4	75.4
Prairie Valley CSD	84.5	90.5	66.7	75.6
Prescott CSD	N < 10	N < 10	to Orient-Macksburg, Lenox	
Preston CSD	90.6	94.3	78.3	82.6
Red Oak CSD	66.2	70.9	70.1	73.9
Remsen-Union CSD	85.0	80.0	85.2	81.5
Riceville CSD	68.4	84.2	61.7	70.2
River Valley CSD	81.4	71.2	80.9	78.7
Riverside CSD	72.5	71.0	78.7	82.0
Rock Valley CSD	86.9	84.5	78.2	81.2
Rockwell City-Lytton CSD	88.8	87.5	80.4	75.4
Rockwell-Swaledale CSD	77.0	82.0	66.4	74.1
Roland-Story CSD	90.1	84.5	87.2	83.0

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Rudd-Rockford-Marble Rock CSD	72.0	79.3	77.3	92.4
Ruthven-Ayrshire CSD	72.7	81.8	51.7	75.9
Sac CSD	85.1	82.1	76.4	79.9
Saydel CSD	76.8	69.6	72.3	67.7
Schaller-Crestland CSD	63.6	59.1	72.4	76.5
Schleswig CSD	88.9	77.8	65.2	63.0
Sentral CSD	85.7	90.5	69.0	75.9
Sergeant Bluff-Luton CSD	94.0	92.6	83.4	82.0
Seymour CSD	71.9	90.6	77.8	85.2
Sheldon CSD	85.4	88.2	80.4	88.8
Shenandoah CSD	85.0	79.5	71.5	81.6
Sibley-Ocheyedan CSD	80.8	76.9	81.7	88.5
Sidney CSD	80.0	67.4	66.7	79.5
Sigourney CSD	74.7	78.2	73.2	73.2
Sioux Center CSD	89.8	83.1	82.8	94.5
Sioux Central CSD	72.6	76.7	72.5	68.2
Sioux City CSD	71.8	72.2	67.8	66.0
Solon CSD	87.8	86.2	79.2	84.5
South Hamilton CSD	87.9	86.9	84.8	81.3
South O'Brien CSD	75.7	78.6	82.0	91.0
South Page CSD	73.3	60.0	52.2	60.9
South Tama County CSD	73.0	81.0	65.8	59.2
South Winneshiek CSD	82.5	84.2	79.7	89.8
Southeast Polk CSD	84.3	89.1	75.4	74.7
Southeast Warren CSD	90.5	93.2	75.7	82.4
Southeast Webster Grand CSD	85.5	81.6	71.4	70.0
Southern Cal CSD	80.4	83.9	71.0	76.8
Spencer CSD	83.3	78.3	79.7	80.9
Spirit Lake CSD	90.4	91.0	84.6	87.9
Springville CSD	76.9	75.0	73.3	76.7
St Ansgar CSD	84.1	89.9	70.3	79.0
Stanton CSD	85.7	74.3	65.5	75.9
Starmont CSD	91.3	91.3	75.3	74.0
Storm Lake CSD	71.7	63.9	57.5	60.3
Stratford CSD	90.5	90.5	to Webster City	
Sumner CSD	80.3	80.3	to Fredericksburg	
Tipton CSD	84.7	88.0	75.4	78.7
Titonka Consolidated SD	56.3	71.9	69.7	75.8
Treynor CSD	89.1	91.1	87.5	88.5
Tri-Center CSD	85.7	84.8	67.9	75.2

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Tri-County CSD	82.9	85.7	55.3	68.1
Tripoli CSD	79.4	82.4	79.7	66.1
Turkey Valley CSD	82.9	95.1	79.5	90.4
Twin Cedars CSD	80.9	89.4	84.6	84.4
Underwood CSD	87.7	90.4	83.7	79.8
Union CSD	88.4	85.5	75.9	81.9
United CSD	81.3	84.4	to Boone, Ames	
Urbandale CSD	85.2	87.4	81.6	85.1
Valley CSD	73.3	69.3	73.7	77.6
Van Buren CSD	83.3	78.0	68.6	74.3
Van Meter CSD	89.0	89.0	80.4	81.4
Ventura CSD	82.2	80.0	81.5	74.1
Villisca CSD	60.5	73.7	54.9	62.7
Vinton-Shellsburg CSD	84.4	83.5	73.0	83.7
Waco CSD	75.0	77.9	69.8	77.8
Wall Lake View Auburn CSD	82.8	78.1	to Sac	
Walnut CSD	70.6	64.7	78.3	69.6
Wapello CSD	79.6	76.7	70.1	75.7
Wapsie Valley CSD	81.1	78.4	68.4	76.5
Washington CSD	68.0	73.3	70.3	81.6
Waterloo CSD	62.6	63.6	63.0	62.6
Waukee CSD	90.6	90.4	87.1	86.9
Waverly-Shell Rock CSD	92.0	92.0	86.1	89.8
Wayne CSD	89.0	91.8	74.7	77.3
Webster City CSD	82.4	81.8	80.2	84.1
West Bend-Mallard CSD	88.4	93.0	81.6	89.5
West Branch CSD	83.0	83.0	68.3	71.5
West Burlington Ind SD	73.7	80.0	68.2	64.5
West Central CSD	91.4	85.7	88.6	93.2
West Central Valley CSD	83.3	74.5	77.7	77.7
West Delaware County CSD	80.1	85.1	81.6	87.6
West Des Moines CSD	84.9	86.0	84.1	85.6
West Hancock CSD	79.7	71.0	69.3	77.3
West Harrison CSD	89.8	84.7	75.6	73.1
West Liberty CSD	61.5	66.3	64.1	78.6
West Lyon CSD	88.9	85.2	87.8	82.7
West Marshall CSD	84.1	92.1	77.5	82.5
West Monona CSD	76.7	75.3	91.1	82.3
West Sioux CSD	72.8	81.5	75.0	70.8
Western Dubuque CSD	81.9	87.3	73.9	84.3

District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Westwood CSD	80.3	84.8	63.5	75.7
Whiting CSD	87.9	87.9	64.5	66.7
Williamsburg CSD	94.2	89.1	79.1	82.3
Wilton CSD	82.8	87.1	68.5	87.4
Winfield-Mt Union CSD	73.7	78.9	66.2	78.9
Winterset CSD	84.0	79.7	83.5	85.1
Woodbine CSD	74.5	78.4	77.6	75.9
Woodbury Central CSD	83.0	86.4	79.6	79.6
Woodward-Granger CSD	83.9	80.6	71.1	75.6

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, UNI; 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/) located in the Educator and/or Administrator Quality links. 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.
- 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 is hosting the online training site and providing 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 were designed to focus on the evaluation of teachers using the Iowa Teaching Standards and the evaluation of administrators 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 Iowa Board of Educational Examiners (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 training were paid for through registration fees.

The *IEATP Level II: Evaluation of Teachers* is 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;
- Skills in the use of effective strategies for formative conferencing and the use of coaching strategies.

The *IEAPT Level II: Evaluation of Administrators* is 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.

Currently, administrators are 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. Individuals may choose to take both to complete their required four hours for license and evaluator renewal. Administrators have been 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 – Teacher* or *iEvaluate – Administrator*. This training will continue to focus on the Iowa Teaching Standards, the Iowa Standards for School Leaders, effective evaluation skill sets, the individual professional development plan, ethics, etc. If an educator is in a preparation program at an Iowa college/university, the necessary training will continue to be a part of the coursework; however, 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 DE had been working collaboratively to analyze data regarding evaluation, reading and reflecting on research, seeking best practices in evaluation that improves teaching and learning, and designing 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*** – 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*.

Level III & Beyond

As the DE and its partners work to build an educator quality plan that is comprehensive and consistent, various aspects – like standards, the evaluation process/training, mentoring and induction, etc. – will be reviewed and enhanced to construct a quality educational system in Iowa schools.

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 four 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, UCLA/CRESST with Margaret Heritage, 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 highly 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 of academic major 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) partner 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.

Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute

The annual statewide Mentoring and Induction Institute was held in Cedar Falls, Iowa, June 20-21, 2011. Co-sponsors with the Department of Education included the University of Northern Iowa and the Iowa State Education Association. The Institute addressed effective teaching practices to support beginning educators from the pre-

service experience to the classroom. Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond, the Charles Ducommun Professor of Education and co-director of the School Redesign Network, Stanford University, was the keynote speaker via live satellite remote. In addition, the 2010 National Teacher of the Year, Sarah Brown Wessling, Johnston, Iowa secondary teacher, spoke on effective teaching and her experiences in the field as well as the spokesperson and role model for effective teaching on the national level.

A panel on effective teaching provided insights in practices, issues, and potential future directions in Iowa and the national and international levels from a variety of experts in the field. The panel members were Dan Smith, Executive Director of School Administrators of Iowa, Mary Jane Cobb, Executive Director of the Iowa State Education Association, Jason Glass, Director of the Iowa Department of Education, Linda Fandel, Special Assistant to Governor Terry Branstad, and Molly Boyle, 2011 Iowa Teacher of the Year.

The Mentoring and Induction Institute conferred the annual Mildred Middleton Crystal Key Awards for Outstanding Mentoring and for Outstanding Leadership in a Mentoring and Induction Program. The awards are provided by ISEA and will be presented by ISEA President Chris Bern. Over 250 teachers, principals, and higher education professors are attended the 2011 Institute.

The 2011 Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute was financially supported by the federally funded Teacher Quality Partnership grant.

Mentoring and Induction Statewide (MITS) Steering Committee

This committee (MITS) meets several times a year and is comprised of representatives of the Iowa Department of Education (DE), AEAs, higher education, local school districts, and ISEA. The MITS Committee gives guidance and direction to the DE on program issues and plans and coordinates the annual Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute. Three members of the steering committee were able to attend the New Teacher Symposium in 2011 with funding from the federal Teacher Quality Partnership grant. The symposium is a significant opportunity to network with national experts in the field of mentoring and induction. The symposium, sponsored by the New Teacher Center, is attended by over 3,000 educators from the United States and several countries from around the world. Resources and information acquired at the symposium are consistently used to enhance the quality of the Iowa Mentoring and Induction Program and have directly impacted educational opportunities provided at the annual mentoring and induction institute.

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. During the 2010-2011 school year, over 50 districts in Iowa piloted *Journey to Excellence: Iowa Training Model for Mentors of Beginning Educators*. A full week of training for districts and AEAs was held in June, 2011 with attendance 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, 91.0 percent of 2009-2010 teachers returned to teach in 2010-2011. This was an increase of 4.7 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 91.8 percent for 2009-2010 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 2009-2010 first and second year teachers that returned to teach the next year was 91.4 percent, an increase of 3.9 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, 85.1 percent of the first year teachers in 2008-2009 were still teaching in the 2010-2011 school year. This was an increase of 7.5 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 2008-2009 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 86.2 percent of first and second year teachers combined in 2008-2009 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

School District and AEA First and Second Year Teacher Retention 2000-01 to 2009-10

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

Note: Includes teachers in public schools and AEAs.

**Table 1:
Iowa Public School and AEA First Year Teacher Retention 2000-01 to 2010-11**

Base School Year	Number Teachers Base School Year	Teachers Returning in 2001-2002	Teachers Returning in 2002-2003	Teachers Returning in 2003-2004	Teachers Returning in 2004-2005	Teachers Returning in 2005-2006	Teachers Returning in 2006-2007	Teachers Returning in 2007-2008	Teachers Returning in 2008-2009	Teachers Returning in 2009-2010	Teachers Returning in 2010-2011
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%)
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%)
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%)
2003-2004	1452				1307 (90.0%)	1209 (83.3%)	1144 (78.8%)	1088 (74.9%)	1007 (69.4%)	986 (67.9%)	952 (65.6%)
2004-2005	1536					1411 (91.9%)	1279 (83.3%)	1209 (78.7%)	1121 (73.0%)	1068 (69.5%)	946 (61.6%)
2005-2006	1611						1465 (90.9%)	1339 (83.1%)	1223 (76.0%)	1191 (73.9%)	1138 (70.6%)
2006-2007	1694							1546 (91.3%)	1417 (83.6%)	1332 (78.6%)	1260 (74.4%)
2007-2008	1796								1674 (93.2%)	1558 (86.7%)	1483 (82.6%)
2008-2009	1555									1433 (92.2%)	1323 (85.1%)
2009-2010	1277										1162 (91.0%)
2010-2011	1316										

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 2010-11**

Base School Year	Number Teachers Base School Year	Teachers Returning in 2001-2002	Teachers Returning in 2002-2003	Teachers Returning in 2003-2004	Teachers Returning in 2004-2005	Teachers Returning in 2005-2006	Teachers Returning in 2006-2007	Teachers Returning in 2007-2008	Teachers Returning in 2008-2009	Teachers Returning in 2009-2010	Teachers Returning in 2010-2011
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%)
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%)
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%)
2003-2004	1315				1176 (89.4%)	1105 (84.0%)	1038 (78.9%)	974 (74.1%)	926 (70.4%)	905 (68.8%)	862 (65.6%)
2004-2005	1472					1337 (90.8%)	1247 (84.7%)	1175 (79.8%)	1089 (74.0%)	1064 (72.3%)	1018 (69.2%)
2005-2006	1616						1447 (89.5%)	1357 (84.0%)	1243 (77.0%)	1193 (73.8%)	1150 (71.2%)
2006-2007	1647							1488 (90.3%)	1337 (81.2%)	1292 (78.4%)	1230 (74.7%)
2007-2008	1724								1569 (91.0%)	1473 (85.4%)	1402 (81.3%)
2008-2009	1706									1570 (92.0%)	1487 (87.2%)
2009-2010	1559										1431 (91.8%)
2010-2011	1317										

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 2010-11

Base School Year	Number Teachers Base School Year	Teachers Returning in 2001-2002	Teachers Returning in 2002-2003	Teachers Returning in 2003-2004	Teachers Returning in 2004-2005	Teachers Returning in 2005-2006	Teachers Returning in 2006-2007	Teachers Returning in 2007-2008	Teachers Returning in 2008-2009	Teachers Returning in 2009-2010	Teachers Returning in 2010-2011
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%)
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%)
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%)
2003-2004	2767				2483 (89.7%)	2314 (83.6%)	2182 (78.9%)	2062 (74.5%)	1933 (69.9%)	1891 (68.3%)	1814 (65.6%)
2004-2005	3008					2748 (91.4%)	2526 (84.0%)	2384 (79.3%)	2210 (73.5%)	2132 (70.9%)	1964 (65.3%)
2005-2006	3227						2912 (90.2%)	2696 (83.5%)	2466 (76.4%)	2384 (73.9%)	2288 (70.9%)
2006-2007	3341							3034 (90.8%)	2754 (82.4%)	2624 (78.5%)	2490 (74.5%)
2007-2008	3520								3243 (92.1%)	3031 (86.1%)	2885 (82.0%)
2008-2009	3261									3003 (92.1%)	2810 (86.2%)
2009-2010	2836										2593 (91.4%)
2010-2011	2633										

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

Professional Development

Priorities:

The DE's efforts during 2010-2011 to improve the professional development systems have emphasized the following priorities:

1. Developing the capacity of school leaders and AEA personnel in Iowa to lead and support professional development at the district and building level.
2. Assisting local districts in accessing research-based instructional content through the Iowa Teacher Development Academies.
3. Providing technical assistance to implement the requirements of the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Act (2007)
4. Supporting the professional development needed to implement the Iowa Core Curriculum

Actions:

Priority 1: Developing the capacity of school leaders and AEA personnel in Iowa to lead and support professional development at the district and building level.

The DE delivered several learning opportunities and technical assistance events to help educators learn how to lead quality professional development at the district and building level. Participants included superintendents, principals, central office administrators, professional development leadership team members, college and university representatives, and AEA staff. Capacity building efforts focused on the leadership actions needed to direct school improvement initiatives and implement professional development focused on accomplishing gains in student achievement. Examples:

- AEA Chief Administrators, DE consultants, a LEA superintendent from each AEA, and other various educational organizations continue to work with Dr. Richard Elmore and a team from the Harvard Graduate School of Education to build the capacity of school leaders to build and sustain the district school improvement efforts with the support of a network of school leaders. Each AEA's Superintendent Network is meeting monthly to build its knowledge and skill in instructional rounds and participating in an instructional rounds visit of a participating school district. The network is also a part of evaluation project where the teams are collecting samples of "theory of actions," "problems of practice", notes from the visits, follow-up plans, etc. in an effort to enhance the school improvement efforts of the district.
- In addition to training events, the DE provided technical assistance and on-going support to the development of a statewide coordinated system of administrator development for student achievement. Iowa Department of Education personnel contributed to the Iowa Leadership Academy Design Team as this group formed a comprehensive approach to preparing school leaders. An example of the outcomes of this group's efforts includes The Iowa Leadership Academy held on June 2010 in West Des Moines, Iowa. It provided professional development for school principals that focused on addressing supporting the leadership efforts of the Iowa Core, concept-based learning, leading and supporting instructional change, and developing an individual professional development plan linked to district, building, and individual goals.
- Iowa was represented on the Advisory Board of the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ) through June of 2010. After that time, the individual who represented Iowa on this board retired from state government and is no longer active with the organization. A team of state agency staff attended the NCCTQ *What Works* national conference on teacher effectiveness in 2010. The center has served as a national resource to which the [regional comprehensive centers](#), states, and other education stakeholders often turn for strengthening the quality of teaching especially in high-poverty, low-performing, and hard-to-staff schools. Through the work on the Advisory Board and conference attendance, Iowa has had access to guidance in improving teacher quality systems. Some of the resources include:

Online resources:

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality website—www.tqsource.org
Databases and interactive data tools

Print and electronic products:

Research synthesis series
TQ [Research and Policy Update](#) electronic newsletter
White papers
Biennial report

Meetings and networks:

Issue forums relating to specific teacher quality topics
What Works Annual Conference
Webcasts and Web dialogue

Technical assistance resources:

Information clearinghouse
Consultation
Needs sensing

Priority 2: Assisting local districts in accessing research-based instructional content through the Iowa Teacher Development Academies (ITDA)

The ITDAs aim at increasing teacher skills and student achievement through intensive professional development. The ITDAs feature research-based content and are designed to support local school districts and AEAs in offering professional development based on the Iowa Professional Development Model. The academies include:

Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW): More than 100 schools are using Authentic Intellectual Work to help them improve instruction to effectively deliver the content prescribed by the Iowa Core. AIW is defined by three criteria: *construction of knowledge* through *disciplined inquiry* to produce discourse, products, and performance that have *value beyond school*. The AIW framework establishes criteria for teaching that

- Maximize expectations of intellectual challenge for all students,
- Increase student interest in academic work,
- Support teachers in teaching for in-depth understanding rather than superficial coverage of material, and
- Provide a common conception of student intellectual work that promotes professional community among teachers of different grade levels and subjects.

The Iowa Department of Education conducted an evaluation of the initiative in 2010–11 comprised of the analysis of four data sets from the project:

- focus group interviews of 27 administrators in AIW schools
- case studies of four AIW high schools in their fourth year of implementation
- a review of original and revised tasks from high school AIW teachers in the four core content areas
- a comparison of achievement results on state tests for students in AIW schools and students in like non-AIW schools

The evaluation affirms what the research base behind the initiative had shown.

Student Achievement

The evaluation reviewed Iowa testing data from 15 schools engaged in AIW as their primary professional development for one full year prior to the date of testing, and compared those data to a set of schools matched on the following characteristics: enrollment, race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, percentage of English language learners, and students with IEPs. Data were compared for grades 3 through 8 and grade 11.

Schools that implemented AIW have significantly higher scores in mathematics for all grades (3–8 and 11) on the ITBS/ITED. The difference in average mathematics scores between AIW and non-AIW schools varies from 5.72 scale scores for grade 3 to 14.08 scale scores for grade 11. In reading, schools that implemented AIW have significantly higher scores for grades 4, 5, 6, 8, and 11 on the ITBS/ITED. The difference in average reading scores between AIW and non-AIW schools varies from 5.22 scale scores for grade 11 to 8.003 scale scores for grade 5.

Impact on Instruction

Focus groups and the case studies both described the changing nature of instruction: from the teacher-as-deliverer of facts to teacher-as-facilitator of student knowledge and skill development that is meaningful and valuable.

Teachers examine their practice through the AIW lens, individually and collectively asking themselves questions such as, “Will this lesson provoke students’ higher order thinking and substantive conversation?” or “Does this unit lead students to apply and understand knowledge in contexts beyond school?” or “Will this assessment task require students to show an in-depth understanding of an important concept?”

Impact on Assessment

The review of tasks both pre- and post-AIW review and revision showed that high school teachers who were participating in AIW were able to develop assessment tasks that scored significantly higher in the standards for authenticity in the subject areas of mathematics, science, social studies. Several research studies have confirmed that assessment tasks that score high in the standards for authenticity result in higher levels of student learning, as demonstrated both by authentic measures and standardized tests.

Change in Professional Culture

Administrators referred to the level of collaboration among teachers as “unprecedented.” Using common protocols and criteria, teachers of different disciplines examine their practice. All teachers, even those who are reluctant or resistant to change, find value in making their instruction better. One administrator said that teachers not in AIW “are banging on the door, ready to get going.” Another principal described the pressure he gets from teachers whenever he schedules a different focus for professional development. “Teachers are frustrated because they feel like they’re cheating on AIW when we do something else. I’ve been talking to them for three years now about what professional development is and isn’t, and they’ve been listening. So now they say, ‘C’mon, why are we doing something else? You keep talking about a sustained focus.’ They turn it back on me because this benefits their kids, and that’s what teachers truly care about.”

Leadership

AIW has improved the collaborative spirit between administrators and teachers, according to those interviewed in focus groups and case studies. Because administrators are part of the learning team, they find themselves giving teachers more relevant feedback. As one principal said, “We’re all professional educators working toward the same goal.” Also, AIW provides teachers with more leadership opportunities.

Student Benefits

The quality of classroom discussions has been at a much deeper and more thoughtful level. Expectations for students have been increased and curriculum is now more closely connected to students’ lives, making lessons more challenging and, simultaneously, more meaningful. Because students are more engaged, they are more persistent in problem solving. According to an administrator who was a member of a focus group, “Students in a physics class were trying to figure out a new way to have something work. They would come in before school, stay after school, and bring their friends in before school and after school to see if this experiment would work. That persistence to solving a complex task is what emerges through AIW.”

Cognitively Guided Instruction: To those familiar with the elementary mathematics section of the Iowa Core Curriculum (ICC), it is immediately obvious that **Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI)** is an integral piece in implementing the necessary changes in elementary mathematics classrooms that can bring improved student achievement for Iowa. The Standards for Mathematical Practice (ICC) are foundational pieces of the professional development offered in the CGI Iowa Teacher Development Academies (ITDA). The domains of *Operations and Algebraic Thinking*, *Number and Operations in Base Ten*, and *Number and Operations – Fractions*, included in the K-5 Standards for Mathematics Content (ICC) are directly connected to the CGI research base.

Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) is a professional development program based on an integrated program of research focused on (a) the development of students’ mathematical thinking; (b) instruction that influences that development; (c) teachers knowledge and beliefs that influence their instructional practices; and (d) the way that teachers’ knowledge, beliefs, and practices are influenced by their understanding of students’ mathematical thinking. The Iowa Department of Education has been coordinating ITDAs for CGI since 2005.

The ITDAs have been facilitated by Dr. Linda Levi, Annie Keith, and Carla Nordness. Dr. Linda Levi is Director of CGI Initiatives for the Teachers Development Group in North Linn, Oregon. The Teacher Development Group is a non-profit organization dedicated to increasing all students' mathematical understanding and achievement through meaningful, effective professional development. Annie Keith is a Madison (WI) public school teacher and original teacher-participant in the CGI research project. Carla Nordness, a Madison (WI) public school teacher, participated in the CGI research project.

These ITDAs have focused on developing a cadre of skilled elementary mathematics teachers and AEA mathematics consultants who are also prepared to lead CGI professional development for local school districts across the state. LEA principals are active participants in the academies so that they can better support the teachers in their districts. There are 65 trainers located across the state who are prepared to deliver CGI professional development. Districts in seven AEAs have CGI teachers who are either currently engaged in CGI professional development or have completed the 3-year professional development sequence. The Iowa Department of Education should focus efforts on increasing the number of Iowa CGI trainers. This will be accomplished by supporting additional CGI leadership Teacher Development Academies.

Priority 3: Providing technical assistance to implement the requirements of the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Act (2007)

On-going technical assistance has been provided directly to AEAs and LEAs through the frequently asked question (FAQ) process, conference calls, and presentations as requested. Over 100 questions have been fielded to clarify the implementation of changes to the Teacher Quality Act. These are posted to the DE web site.

The revision of the Iowa Professional Development Model (IPDM) Technical Guide has been completed and the document is posted in its entirety under the Educator Quality link on the Department of Education's website. The Guide is also posted in separate sections that offer quick links to useful steps and tools for use by Iowa's educational leaders. The new IPDM Technical Guide includes guidance on legislative changes including requirements related to the teacher quality committees, the Iowa Core Curriculum and professional development plans.

Priority 4: Supporting the professional development needed to implement the Iowa Core Curriculum

The IPDM provides the framework to assist AEAs and local districts as they design professional development to implement the Iowa Core Curriculum. This year the DE continuously developed and refined technical assistance and materials to implement the Iowa Core Curriculum following the Iowa Standards for Professional Development.

Iowa Core Network: Aug. 25, Sept. 15, Oct. 20, Nov. 17, Dec. 15, Jan. 19; Feb. 16, April 19, May 17, and June 21.

Target Audience: AEA Network. The Network is made up of practitioners who have been organized to deliver the training and facilitation needed by schools to conduct the actions critical to the successful implementation of the Core. This group of trainers/facilitators will play a collaborative role in helping school leaders implement professional development for educators to improve their instructional practices that are aligned with the Core.

Content: Network efforts this year have focused on three areas: providing support for the development and improvement of district and school Iowa Core Implementation Plans, providing support for professional development, and supporting districts in improving the alignment of local curriculum to the standards of the Iowa Core.

Network members will facilitate a series of collaborative peer reviews which will be held regionally throughout the state this spring. The purpose of the peer review was for each participating school or district to provide and receive feedback on the Iowa Core Implementation Plan. Personnel from at least two schools or districts met and exchanged plans, and through a collaborative process, presented their plan and received feedback from each other. Sixty-eight percent of the public school districts participated in the process and 95 percent of those that participated indicated that they felt the process was helpful.

The Iowa Core Network has also developed an Iowa Core Statewide Resources moodle site to serve as a repository of resources for all Iowa educators to use in successfully implementing the Iowa Core. Included on the

site are research briefs and literature reviews, professional development protocols, video segments, discussion guides, and organized learning sequences. Information and resources including podcast, video tutorials, on-line modules and additional collaborative learning team professional development learning sequences and agendas will continue to added to the site as they are developed. Many of these resources were developed with the support of the National Staff Development Council, Iowa Public Television, and numerous Iowa K-16 administrators and teachers. District-based collaborative learning teams consisting of teachers and administrators will use these materials to deepen their understanding of their Iowa Core and to identify ways to improve instruction.

An online database, known as the Iowa Core Alignment Toolkit (I-CAT) is also used to help teachers and administrators reflect on what their students have an opportunity to learn from the Iowa Core over the course of a school year. The Network has been provided the necessary to training to assist districts in effectively using this tool to insure that the locally developed curriculum includes all of the required standards of the Iowa Core.