

# **Council on Educator Development**

## **Recommendations Regarding Educator Standards and Evaluation**

October 31, 2016



Contents

Introduction ..... 3

Key Components of the Educator Development System Integrated Through All  
Recommendations ..... 5

    Council on Educator Development Recommendation 1: ..... 5

    Council on Educator Development Recommendation 2: ..... 6

    Council on Educator Development Recommendation 3: ..... 6

    Council on Educator Development Recommendation 4: ..... 7

    Council on Educator Development Recommendation 5: ..... 7

    Council on Educator Development Recommendation 6: ..... 8

APPENDIX..... 9

    Appendix 1: The Council on Educator Development Meeting Dates.....10

    Appendix 2: Current and Past Council on Educator Development Membership .....11

    Appendix 3: Council on Educator Development Per 256.29 of Iowa Code .....12

    Appendix 4 – Theory of Action .....14

    Appendix 5 – Iowa Teaching Standards.....15

    Appendix 6 – Iowa Standards for School Leaders.....17

    Appendix 7 – Examples of Learning Progressions for Teaching and Leading .....19

    Appendix 8 – Multiple Measure Resources .....22

    Appendix 9 – Teacher Quality Committee per 284.4(c) .....23

    Bibliography .....24

# Introduction

---

In October 2013, the Council on Educator Development (CED) met for the first time to engage in the study called for in Iowa Code 256.29 (See *Appendix 3.*). Iowa Code 256.29 called for the CED to study the following:

- Current teacher evaluation system and performance review requirements and the current evaluation system requirements;
- Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria plus nationally accepted teaching standards;
- Iowa Standards for School Leaders;
- Process for developing individual professional development plans;
- Evaluator training;
- Peer group reviews; and
- Interrelated facets of the teacher and administrator evaluation systems and performance review requirements.

As a part of the study, CED listened to and reflected on various presentations regarding how to improve and sustain an educator development system that promotes continuous improvement of educators and student learning. Presentations included:

- Kim Huckstadt, a University of Northern Iowa professor for school leadership and former Maquoketa Community School District superintendent – *The Impact of Standards-Based Teacher Evaluation on Instruction and Professional Practices in Iowa*;
- Waukee Community School District leadership team (Terry Hurlburt, Elementary Principal; Kirk Johnson, High School Principal; Ann Hanigan, High School Teacher and Waukee Teacher Association President; Cindi McDonald, Associate Superintendent; Dave Wilkerson, Superintendent) – *The Waukee Evaluation System*;
- Kim Owen, a Regional Administrator at Grant Wood Area Education Agency; Trace Pickering, Cedar Rapids Community School District Associate Principal; and Ian Dye, Lisbon Community School District High School Principal – *Grant Wood Area Education Agency Induction Consortium for New Teachers*;
- Central Decatur Community School District leadership team (Amy Whittington, Elementary Principal and Rudy Evertsen, Secondary Principal) – *TAP Instructional Rubric*;
- Carole Richardson, Educator Quality Program Consultant and Larry Bice, Educator Quality Administrative Consultant – *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions*;
- Charlotte Danielson, an internationally-recognized consultant, author and speaker in the area of teacher effectiveness – *The Danielson Framework for Evaluation*;
- Linda Darling-Hammond a visiting professor at Iowa State University (2015) and a professor emeritus at Stanford University – *Getting Teacher Evaluation Right: What Really Matters for Effectiveness and Improvement*; and
- Matt Ludwig, Educator Quality Leadership Consultant – *Study of Current Evaluation Practices in Iowa*.

CED developed a theory of action (See *Appendix 4.*) to guide the crafting of the draft recommendations that were released to the field (teachers, administrators, and school board members) for public comment via an online survey on October 1, 2015.

In accordance with House File 215, the process for distributing the survey was as follows:

- It was distributed to Iowa teachers, administrators, and school board members.

- Ryan Wise, Director of the Iowa Department of Education, emailed a message and survey link to all Iowa superintendents to share with other administrators and all teachers in their respective districts.
- CED members also used their respective contacts to share the draft recommendations and survey link with colleagues and educational organizations.
- The Iowa Department of Education Communications Team used social media tools and other statewide publications to build the education community's awareness of the draft recommendations and survey link.
- To encourage school member participation in the survey, volunteers distributed the survey and survey link to attendees at the Iowa School Board Convention.
- During a January 2016 meeting, CED reviewed feedback to make revisions to the draft recommendations.
- CED will submit the study findings and final recommendations to the Iowa State Board of Education, the governor, and the general assembly by November 2016.

# Key Components of the Educator Development System Integrated Through All Recommendations

The CED engaged in the study and the shaping of recommendations as outlined in 256.9 of the Iowa Administrative Code. While conducting this work, CED recognized a number of themes that cross all of the recommendations.

- The system must be implemented with fidelity. Implementation with fidelity is critical. Fidelity within the system will require the use of common vocabulary and tools that describe the best practices for teaching and leadership. It will also require a consistent use of multiple measures that provide meaningful feedback and closely connect the evaluation process to ongoing professional development at the individual, building, and district levels.
- The implementation of the system must be monitored for accountability purposes. CED notes the importance of using district data and information to monitor, support, and improve the system. Districts must be held accountable for implementing the entire educator development system with fidelity. Current legislation supports the role of a teacher quality committee in monitoring implementation. (*See Appendix.*)
- The system must be differentiated in an effort to address the needs of all the certified educators (teachers, teacher leaders, counselors, nurses, athletic coaches, administrators, etc.) influenced by these recommendations. The system must support statewide initiatives and programs (e.g., Teacher Leadership and Compensation, Iowa Core, Multi-tiered Systems of Support). The recommendations must be viewed as an opportunity to enhance these statewide initiatives and not replace or compete with them.
- The system must clearly define effective educator practice. CED knows that the system must articulate what effective teaching and leadership looks like and what educators must be able to do to demonstrate proficiency. Key foundations of any quality evaluation and support system must provide to educators the opportunity to see models and reflect on their own professional practice.
- The system must articulate all roles within the educator development system. CED is aware of the importance of clearly articulating the responsibilities of all educators in the system (e.g., teachers, teacher leaders, and evaluators) in an effort to enhance the functionality of the educator development system.
- The system must be supported with adequate resources. In order to successfully implement and monitor the system, adequate personnel, time, and money will be required.

[Council on Educator Development Recommendation 1](#): Continue to support collaborative and reflective practices that include constructive feedback.

## DEFINITIONS:

- Collaboration – Interaction within and across educator teams, departments, peer groups, and other stakeholders with the goal of improving professional practice and student learning.
- Reflective practice – Ongoing process whereby teachers and administrators think about their own professional practice and actively reflect on current practices and plans for growth.

- Constructive feedback – Specific, ongoing, timely, and user-friendly feedback given in support of improving professional practice.

**KEY POINTS:**

- The educators focus on examining effective teaching and leadership practices that positively impact instruction and student learning.
- The educators take initiative to grow and develop with colleagues through interactions that enhance practice and support student learning.
- The educators participate in a system of improvement that incorporates continuous feedback loops focused on improving instructional and/or leadership practices allowing for the development and ownership of those practices.

[Council on Educator Development Recommendation 2:](#) Formally certify and support evaluators to ensure fidelity of implementation of the improved statewide educator development system by changing the current evaluator system.

The system will include:

1. Differentiating training of evaluators based on the type of educator being evaluated and the experience level of the evaluator.
2. Developing and adopting learning progressions based on the Iowa Standards for School Leaders (ISSL) for formative performance feedback annually and a summative evaluation every three years.
3. Engaging all administrators new to the school leadership role in a peer mentoring program.

**DEFINITION:**

- The current Iowa Evaluator Training Requirements Iowa's current system are defined in 284.10 (<https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/2015/284.pdf>).

**KEY POINTS:**

- Assemble a cohort of stakeholders to recommend updates to the qualified evaluator training requirements.
- Enhance and maintain networks of professional development and mentoring for administrators, in order to build the human and social capital within the system and support administrators.
- Develop, execute, and maintain a research and development component tied to the administrator effectiveness system with the purpose of evaluating the system and making improvements.

[Council on Educator Development Recommendation 3:](#) Continue to rely on the use of multiple measures, including to but not limited to, an array of indicators of student learning outcomes related to a targeted goal(s). (See Appendix 8.)

## DEFINITIONS:

- Multiple measures – A variety of data points (i.e. lesson plans, professional development work, student work samples, parent communication, assessment data, etc.) from multiple sources (i.e. teacher, student, administrator, parents, community, etc.) to evidence professional growth and/or proficiency.
- Indicators of student learning outcomes – Evidence identifying what the learner knows and is able to do (i.e. student work, portfolio, statewide assessments, formative assessments, etc.)

## KEY POINTS:

- Multiple measures should be collaboratively decided between the educator and his/her direct supervisor and are supported by ongoing conversation and coaching.
- Within the educator development process all teachers and administrators should create annual individual professional development plans with goals tied to student learning needs within their building and district.
- As part of this process, teachers and administrators should demonstrate their professional growth and proficiency through multiple measures.
- Student achievement and student learning goals should be connected to the Iowa Teaching Standards, as well as the Iowa Standards for School Leaders.
- Many different kinds of student learning data should be used as evidence of growth and proficiency in combination with other relevant data and artifacts.

[Council on Educator Development Recommendation 4:](#) Continue the use of a balanced evaluation system that includes annual accountability in the form of the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) and a comprehensive three-year review for all teachers. CED recommends the same system for all administrators.

- The current educator development system for teachers and administrators are not aligned.
- Best practice would indicate that both the teacher and administrator development systems be based on a growth model which includes goal setting, coaching and reflective practice.

[Council on Educator Development Recommendation 5:](#) Continue to use and refine the Iowa Teaching Standards (ITS) and Iowa Standards for School Leaders (ISSL). (See Appendices 5 & 6.)

## DEFINITION:

- Current Iowa Teaching Standards (ITS) and Iowa Standards for School Leaders (ISSL) align with the definition of teacher and school leader effectiveness in Iowa Code 284.3, Iowa Administrative Code 281—83.4 and 281—83.10.

## KEY POINTS:

- ITS and ISSL and indicators are written in observable and measurable terms that can be used within a learning progression system.

- ITS and ISSL define quality instruction/leadership and the practices of highly effective teachers/school leaders.
- As new standards are developed or become available, they should be evaluated by a representative group and considered as a recommendation for adoption.

[Council on Educator Development Recommendation 6](#): Implement learning progressions aligned to the Iowa Teaching Standards (ITS) and Iowa Standards for School Leaders (ISSL) to define best practices. (See Appendix 7.)

#### DEFINITION:

- Learning Progressions – *“The progressions are a support tool to promote and improve teacher effectiveness and growth. They describe the increasing complexity and sophistication of teaching practice for each Model Core Teaching Standard across developmental levels so teacher candidates, practicing teachers and other educators can see what increasingly effective practice looks like to show desired change over time.”* (A Resource for Ongoing Teacher Development, 2013. p.10)

#### KEY POINTS:

- Learning progressions should be implemented in each district to enhance current ITS and ISSL.
- Multiple research-based learning progressions are already being used in a number of districts across Iowa. Each of these progression models is largely aligned to ITS and ISSL and no one model is superior to the other. Each district should use a collaborative process between teachers and administrators to determine the best learning progression for that district. The Iowa Department of Education should use a collaborative process to provide an approved list of research-based options for learning progressions.
- Progressions are most powerful when used to guide formative experiences and should **not** be used as a scoring scheme or rating scale for high stakes summative judgments.
- The focus of these progressions should **always** be on professional practice and how to improve the professional practice.
- The progressions should guide educators with a focus on growth to impact student learning.



# APPENDIX

---

## Appendix 1: The Council on Educator Development Meeting Dates

October 4, 2013	November 7, 2014	June 10, 2015
November 26, 2013	December 19, 2014	September 3, 2015
January 9, 2014	January 16, 2015	February 10, 2016
February 13, 2014	February 13, 2015	March 11, 2016
April 15, 2014	March 13, 2015	April 26, 2016
May 27, 2014	April 10, 2015	May 31, 2016
September 17, 2014	May 15, 2015	

***For additional information regarding the meeting agendas and minutes, please refer to the following link: <https://www.educateiowa.gov/council-educator-development>***

## Appendix 2: Current and Past Council on Educator Development Membership

Elaine Baughman, Special Education Teacher, Harlan Community School District, Harlan  
Brad Buck, Superintendent, Cedar Rapids Community School District, Cedar Rapids  
Tom Buckmiller, Professor, Drake University, Des Moines  
Linda Carroll, Chief, Iowa Department of Education, Des Moines  
Eriece Colbert, Teacher, Cedar Rapids Community School District, Cedar Rapids  
J. D. Cryer, Field Experience Coordinator, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls  
Carol Farver, Retired Principal, Newton Community School District, Newton  
David Fox, Principal, Waverly-Shellrock Community School District, Waverly  
Roberta Hass, Teacher, MFL Mar Mac Community School District, Monona  
Roark Horn, Executive Director, School Administrators of Iowa, Clive  
Joel Illian, Deputy Director, Professional Educators of Iowa, Windsor Heights  
Joe Judge, Teacher, Albia Community School District, Albia  
Kevin Koester, State Representative, Ankeny\*  
Tim Kraayenbrink, State Senator, Fort Dodge\*  
Michelle Lettington, Director of Elementary Schools, Des Moines Public Schools, Des Moines  
Josie Lewis, Policy/Legal Services Director, Iowa Association of School Boards, Des Moines  
Patty Link, Parent Representative, Des Moines  
Herman Quirnbach, State Senator, Ames\*  
Darren Reade, Teacher, Monticello Community School District, Monticello  
Derek Schulte, Teacher, Southeast Polk Community School District, Pleasant Hill  
Jon Sheldahl, Chief Administrator, Great Prairie Area Education Agency, Ottumwa  
Bev Smith, Associate Superintendent for Human Resources and Equity, Waterloo  
Billy Strickler, Elementary Teacher, Fairfield Community School District, Fairfield  
Joanne Tubbs, Licensure Consultant, Iowa Board of Educational Examiners, Des Moines  
Dave Versteeg, Superintendent, Montezuma Community School District, Montezuma  
Tammy Wawro, President, Iowa State Education Association, Des Moines  
Cindy Winckler, State Representative, Davenport\*  
Matt Ludwig, Iowa Department of Education, Des Moines\*

**\*Non-voting Members**

### **PAST MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL ON EDUCATOR DEVELOPMENT**

Byron Darnall, Former Chief of Educator Quality, Iowa Department of Education  
Dan Smith, Former Director of School Administrators of Iowa, Clive  
Patti Roush, Former Principal, Denison CSD  
Stephen Miller, Iowa Association of School Boards  
Amy Sinclair, State Senator, Wayne\*  
Ron Jorgensen, State Representative, Sioux City\*  
Jimmy Casas, Former Principal, Bettendorf CSD

**\*Non-voting Members**

## Appendix 3: Council on Educator Development Per 256.29 of Iowa Code

256.29 Council on educator development established.

1. A council on educator development is established to conduct a study and make recommendations regarding the following:
  - a. A statewide teacher evaluation system and performance review requirements.
  - b. A statewide administrator evaluation system.
2. The goal of the study shall be to determine the efficacy of the current systems in providing practitioners with clear and actionable feedback to enhance their practice and advance student learning. The council shall receive input from teachers, administrators, and evaluators regarding educators' personal experiences with evaluations.
3. The study shall review the following:
  - a. The current teacher evaluation system and performance review requirements and the current administrator evaluation system requirements.
  - b. The Iowa teaching standards.
  - c. Criteria used to further define the Iowa teaching standards.
  - d. The Iowa standards for school administrators.
  - e. Nationally accepted teaching standards.
  - f. The process for developing individual teacher and individual administrator professional development plans.
  - g. Evaluator training.
  - h. The peer group reviews conducted pursuant to chapter 284.
  - i. The interrelated facets of the teacher and administrator evaluation systems and performance review requirements.
4. Any evaluation system recommended by the council shall be designed, at a minimum, so that the system is or does all of the following:
  - a. Is meaningful, providing all teachers and administrators with clear and actionable feedback.
  - b. Is comprehensive and based on multiple indicators designed to enhance an educator's practice.
  - c. Provides for ongoing, nonevaluation feedback and regular, comprehensive, and fair evaluations.
  - d. Is developed and implemented with input from teachers and administrators, respecting their own evaluation systems; and is developed and implemented in partnership with organizations representing teachers, administrators, and school board members at the state and local school district levels.
  - e. Is based on clear standards for what teachers and administrators should know and be able to do.
  - f. Is adequately funded, staffed, and fully developed and validated, and includes training for all teachers and administrators concerning the new systems before the systems are used to make any high-stakes employment decisions.
  - g. Is applicable to teachers and administrators in all content areas.
5. In developing recommendations for any evaluation system, the council shall consider, at a minimum, all of the following:
  - a. Any proposed revisions to systems, standards, or training reviewed pursuant to subsection 3.
  - b. The fair and balanced use of student outcome measures, comprised of multiple, reliable indicators of student growth and learning that are appropriate to the curriculum and the students being taught. These measures may include but are not limited to gauges of higher order skills such as student research papers, science investigations, technology products, and art projects; teacher-defined objectives for individual student growth; student learning objectives developed jointly by a teacher and principal or evaluator; district, school, or teacher-created assessments; and high-quality standardized tests that provide valid, reliable, timely, and meaningful information regarding student learning and growth.

- c. Multiple indicators to provide evidence of practice, including but not limited to classroom observations; proof of practice such as lesson plans, curriculum plans, and instructional notes; teacher and administrator interviews, respecting their own evaluation systems; self-assessment; and evidence of professional contributions and collaboration.
  - d. Student and parent surveys.
  - e. A multitiered evaluation system that differentiates at least three levels of teacher and administrator performance.
6. The council shall be comprised of at least seventeen voting members appointed by the director by October 1, 2013, as follows:
    - a. Eight members representing education stakeholders who shall be subject to the evaluation systems being recommended.
    - b. One member representing the department.
    - c. One member representing the area education agencies.
    - d. One member representing the Iowa state education association.
    - e. One member representing the school administrators of Iowa.
    - f. One member representing the Iowa association of school boards.
    - g. One member representing the urban education network.
    - h. One member representing the largest approved practitioner preparation institution in the state.
    - i. One member representing Iowa's approved administrator preparation programs.
    - j. One member representing parents of Iowa elementary or secondary students.
  7. Four members of the general assembly shall serve as ex officio, nonvoting members of the council, with one member to be appointed by each of the following: the majority leader of the senate, the minority leader of the senate, the speaker of the house of representatives, and the minority leader of the house of representatives. A legislative member serves for a term as provided in section 69.16B and is eligible for per diem and expenses as provided in section 2.10.
  8. To the extent possible, the council shall have balanced representation with regard to teachers and administrators. Teachers and administrators from elementary and secondary education shall be included in the membership, as well as school and area education agency personnel who are evaluated under the teacher evaluation system but who are not classroom teachers.
  9. The member representing the area education agencies shall convene the initial meeting. The council shall elect a chairperson from among its members for a term of one year. Administrative support and staffing for the council shall be provided by the department. The voting members of the council shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties and shall receive a per diem as specified in section 7E.6.
  10. The council shall provide for the wide distribution of a preliminary draft of its recommendations for evaluation systems and performance review requirements to teachers, administrators, and school board members throughout the state by October 1, 2015, and shall provide a mechanism and opportunity for practitioners and school board members to submit feedback to the council. Such feedback shall be reviewed by the council prior to making final recommendations.
  11. The council shall submit its findings and recommendations to the state board of education, the governor, and the general assembly by November 15, 2016.

## Appendix 4 – Theory of Action

### **Council on Educator Development Theory of Action:**

**IF** Iowa educators (including all certified teachers and administrators) meaningfully participate in a cohesive, consistent, fair and reliable educator development system;

**IF** the Iowa educator development system outlines clear and comprehensive professional standards, criteria and learning progressions that define best practices and that specify clearly differentiated levels of performance;

**IF** the Iowa educator development system expects rigorous goal setting and action by Iowa educators directly tied to learning needs;

**IF** the Iowa educator development system defines highly effective instruction and engages educators in formal evaluation – as well as non-evaluative coaching and self-reflection;

**IF** the Iowa educator development system provides the necessary supports that will continuously improve the knowledge and skills of highly effective educators;

**IF** the Iowa educator development system supports collaborative practice that focuses on improving learning for students and educators;

**AND** Iowa educators are part of an ongoing comprehensive evaluation system that is applicable to educators at all levels and/or content areas;

**AND** the comprehensive evaluation system incorporates a fair and balanced use of multiple measures, including an array of indicators of student learning outcomes related to a targeted goal(s);

**AND** there is a coherent vision for continuous school improvement with alignment among the local schools and districts, the Department of Education, AEAs, professional associations, and the institutions of higher education;

**AND** if the Iowa educator development system assures that highly effective evaluators continually engage in consistent and quality professional learning aligned to the required components of the system;

**AND** the Iowa educator development system is implemented with fidelity;

**THEN** the effectiveness and collective capacity of Iowa educators will be maximized;

### **SO THEN**

Student learning will increase.

## Appendix 5 – Iowa Teaching Standards

### **Standard 1: Demonstrates ability to enhance academic performance and support for and implementation of the school district's student achievement goals.**

#### **The teacher:**

- a. Provides multiple forms of evidence of student learning and growth to students, families, and staff.
- b. Implements strategies supporting student, building, and district goals.
- c. Uses student performance data as a guide for decision making.
- d. Accepts and demonstrates responsibility for creating a classroom culture that supports the learning of every student.
- e. Creates an environment of mutual respect, rapport, and fairness.
- f. Participates in and contributes to a school culture that focuses on improved student learning.
- g. Communicates with students, families, colleagues, and communities effectively and accurately.

### **Standard 2: Demonstrates competence in content knowledge appropriate to the teaching position.**

#### **The teacher:**

- a. Understands and uses key concepts, underlying themes, relationships, and different perspectives related to the content area.
- b. Uses knowledge of student development to make learning experiences in the content area meaningful and accessible for every student.
- c. Relates ideas and information within and across content areas.
- d. Understands and uses instructional strategies that are appropriate to the content area.

### **Standard 3: Demonstrates competence in planning and preparing for instruction.**

#### **The teacher:**

- a. Uses student achievement data, local standards, and the district curriculum in planning for instruction.
- b. Sets and communicates high expectations for social, behavioral, and academic success of all students.
- c. Uses student's developmental needs, backgrounds, and interests in planning for instruction.
- d. Selects strategies to engage all students in learning.
- e. Uses available resources, including technologies, in the development and sequencing of instruction.

### **Standard 4: Uses strategies to deliver instruction that meets the multiple learning needs of students.**

#### **The teacher:**

- a. Aligns classroom instruction with local standards and district curriculum.
- b. Uses research-based instructional strategies that address the full range of cognitive levels.
- c. Demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness in adjusting instruction to meet student needs.
- d. Engages students in varied experiences that meet diverse needs and promote social, emotional, and academic growth.
- e. Connects students' prior knowledge, life experiences, and interests in the instructional process.
- f. Uses available resources, including technologies, in the delivery of instruction.

### **Standard 5: Uses a variety of methods to monitor student learning.**

#### **The teacher:**

- a. Aligns classroom assessment with instruction.
- b. Communicates assessment criteria and standards to all students and parents.
- c. Understands and uses the results of multiple assessments to guide planning and instruction.
- d. Guides students in goal setting and assessment their own learning.
- e. Provides substantive, timely, and constructive feedback to students and parents.
- f. Works with other staff and building and district leadership in analysis of student progress.

### **Standard 6: Demonstrates competence in classroom management.**

#### **The teacher:**

- a. Creates a learning community that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement, and self-regulation for every student.
- b. Establishes, communicates, models, and maintains standards of responsible student behavior.
- c. Develops and implements classroom procedures and routines that support high expectations for student learning.
- d. Uses instructional time effectively to maximize student achievement.
- e. Creates a safe and purposeful learning environment

**Standard 7: Engages in professional growth.**

**The teacher:**

- a. Demonstrates habits and skills of continuous inquiry and learning.
- b. Works collaboratively to improve professional practice and student learning.
- c. Applies research, knowledge, and skills from professional development opportunities to improve practice.
- d. Establishes and implements professional development plans based upon the teacher's needs aligned to the Iowa Teaching Standards and district/building student achievement goals.
- e. Provides an analysis of student learning and growth based on teacher created tests and authentic measures as well as any standardized and district-wide tests.

**Standard 8: Fulfills professional responsibilities established by the school district.**

**The teacher:**

- a. Adheres to board policies, district procedures, and contractual obligations.
- b. Demonstrates professional and ethical conduct as defined by state law and district policy.
- c. Contributes to efforts to achieve district and building goals.
- d. Demonstrates an understanding of and respect for all learners and staff.
- e. Collaborates with student, families, colleagues, and communities to enhance student learning.

*The Iowa Teaching Standards appear in Iowa Code section 284.3 and were initially adopted by the State Board of Education on 5/10/02 and again on 5/13/10.*



## Appendix 6 – Iowa Standards for School Leaders

**Standard #1: An educational leader promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community. (Shared Vision)**

**The administrator:**

- a. In collaboration with others, uses appropriate data to establish rigorous, concrete goals in the context of student achievement and instructional programs.
- b. Uses research and/or best practices in improving the educational program.
- c. Articulates and promotes high expectations for teaching and learning.
- d. Aligns and implements the educational programs, plans, actions, and resources with the district's vision and goals.
- e. Provides leadership for major initiatives and change efforts.
- f. Communicates effectively to various stakeholders regarding progress with school improvement plan goals.

**Standard #2: An educational leader promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional development. (Culture of Learning)**

**The administrator:**

- a. Provides leadership for assessing, developing and improving climate and culture.
- b. Systematically and fairly recognizes and celebrates accomplishments of staff and students.
- c. Provides leadership, encouragement, opportunities and structure for staff to continually design more effective teaching and learning experiences for all students.
- d. Monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of curriculum, instruction and assessment.
- e. Evaluates staff and provides ongoing coaching for improvement.
- f. Ensures staff members have professional development that directly enhances their performance and improves student learning.
- g. Uses current research and theory about effective schools and leadership to develop and revise his/her professional growth plan.
- h. Promotes collaboration with all stakeholders.
- i. Is easily accessible and approachable to all stakeholders.
- j. Is highly visible and engaged in the school community.
- k. Articulates the desired school culture and shows evidence about how it is reinforced.

**Standard #3: An educational leader promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations and resources for a safe, efficient and effective learning environment. (Management)**

**The administrator:**

- a. Complies with state and federal mandates and local board policies.
- b. Recruits, selects, inducts, and retains staff to support quality instruction.
- c. Addresses current and potential issues in a timely manner.
- d. Manages fiscal and physical resources responsibly, efficiently, and effectively.
- e. Protects instructional time by designing and managing operational procedures to maximize learning.
- f. Communicates effectively with both internal and external audiences about the operations of the school.

**Standard #4: An educational leader promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs and mobilizing community resources. (Family and Community)**

**The administrator:**

- a. Engages family and community by promoting shared responsibility for student learning and support of the education system.
- b. Promotes and supports a structure for family and community involvement in the education system.
- c. Facilitates the connections of students and families to the health and social services that support a focus on learning.
- d. Collaboratively establishes a culture that welcomes and honors families and community and seeks ways to engage them in student learning.

**Standard #5: An educational leader promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner. (Ethics)**

**The administrator:**

- a. Demonstrates ethical and professional behavior.
- b. Demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance.
- c. Fosters and maintains caring professional relationships with staff.
- d. Demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to diversity in the school community.
- e. Is respectful of divergent opinions.

**Standard #6: An educational leader promotes the success of all students by understanding the profile of the community and responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context. (Societal Context)**

**The administrator:**

- a. Collaborates with service providers and other decision-makers to improve teaching and learning.
- b. Advocates for the welfare of all members of the learning community.
- c. Designs and implements appropriate strategies to reach desired goals.

*The Iowa Standards for School Leaders appear in Iowa Administrative Code 281---83.10 and were enacted in 2007.*

## Appendix 7 – Examples of Learning Progressions for Teaching and Leading

Key assumptions underlying the recommendation to use and refine the Iowa Teaching Standards and the Iowa Standards for School Leaders with the use of learning progressions includes:

- Teaching and leading are complex. They are learned and developed over time and should not be viewed as linear.
- Growth occurs through reflection, experience, feedback, or professional learning. It is dependent on context, particularly levels of support.
- The focus of learning progressions is on practice not the individual.
- Clear and comprehensive professional standards, criteria and learning progressions that define best practices and that specify clearly differentiated levels of performance will increase the effectiveness and collective capacity of Iowa educators.

*The following learning progression examples are possible models that could be used at the school and district level.*

Example – Charlotte Danielson

<b>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</b>			
<b>1a – Demonstrating knowledge of Content &amp; Pedagogy</b>			
<p><b>Unsatisfactory – Level 1</b> In planning and practice, the teacher makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students. The teacher displays little understanding of prerequisite knowledge important to student learning of the content. The teacher displays little or no understanding of the range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content.</p>	<p><b>Basic – Level 2</b> The teacher is familiar with important concepts in the discipline but displays a lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another. The teacher indicates some awareness of prerequisite learning, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete. The teacher’s plans and practice reflect a limited range of pedagogical approaches to the discipline or to the students.</p>	<p><b>Proficient – Level 3</b> The teacher displays solid knowledge of important concepts in the discipline and how these relate to one another. The teacher demonstrates accurate understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics. The teacher’s plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the subject.</p>	<p><b>Distinguished – Level 4</b> The teacher displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate both to one another and to other disciplines. The teacher demonstrates understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts and understands the link to necessary cognitive structures that ensure student understanding. The teacher’s plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline and the ability to anticipate student misconceptions.</p>
<p><b>Critical Attributes</b> The teacher makes content errors. The teacher does not consider prerequisite relationships when planning. The teacher’s plans use inappropriate strategies for the discipline.</p>	<p><b>Critical Attributes</b> The teacher’s understanding of the discipline is rudimentary. The teacher’s knowledge of prerequisite relationships is inaccurate or incomplete. Lesson and unit plans use limited instructional strategies, and some are not suitable to the content.</p>	<p><b>Critical Attributes</b> The teacher can identify important concepts of the discipline and their relationships to one another. The teacher provides clear explanations of the content. The teacher answer students’ questions accurately and provides feedback that furthers their learning. Instructional strategies in unit and lesson plans are entirely suitable to the content.</p>	<p><b>Critical Attributes</b> The teacher cites intra- and interdisciplinary content relationships. The teacher’s plans demonstrate awareness of possible student misconceptions and how they can be addressed. The teacher’s plans reflect recent developments in content-related pedagogy.</p>

Example – Marzano Research Laboratory (Robert J. Marzano)

**Domain 2: Planning and Preparing – Planning and Preparing for Lessons and Units**

Element 2: Planning and preparing for lessons within a unit that progress toward a deep understanding and transfer of content.

The teacher organizes lessons within units to progress toward a deep understanding of content.

<b>Planning Evidence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans illustrate how learning will move from an understanding of foundational content to application of information in authentic ways.</li> <li>Plans incorporate student choice and initiative.</li> <li>Plans provide for extension of learning.</li> </ul>		<b>Teacher Evidence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When asked, the teacher can describe how lessons within the unit progress toward deep understanding and transfer of content.</li> <li>When asked, the teacher can describe how students will make choices and take initiative.</li> <li>When asked, the teacher can describe how learning will be extended.</li> </ul>		
<b>Innovating (4)</b>	<b>Applying (3)</b>	<b>Developing (2)</b>	<b>Beginning (1)</b>	<b>Not Using (0)</b>
The teacher is a recognized leader in helping others with this activity.	The teacher organizes lessons within a unit so that students move from understanding to applying the content through authentic tasks.	The teacher organizes lessons within a unit so that students move from surface to deeper understanding of content, but does not require students to apply the content in authentic ways.	The teacher attempts to perform this activity but does not actually complete or follow through with these attempts.	The teacher makes no attempt to perform this activity.

Example: Iowa State Education Association (ISEA)

**Standard 2: Demonstrates competence in content knowledge appropriate to the teaching position.**

Criterion A – The teacher understands and uses key concepts, underlying themes, relationships, and different perspectives related to the content area.

*Element – Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy: Knowledge of Content*

<b>Unsatisfactory</b> ----->	----->	----->	----->
Teacher makes content errors or does not correct the content errors students make.	Teacher displays basic content knowledge but cannot articulate connections with other parts of the discipline or with other disciplines.	Teacher displays solid content knowledge and makes connections between the content and other parts of the discipline and other disciplines.	Teacher displays extensive content knowledge, with evidence of continuing pursuit of such knowledge.

The ISEA framework does not include titles for the performance levels but chooses to use arrows to symbolize growth.

Example: TAP – The System for Teacher and Student Achievement

**Indicator: Instruction**

Element: Teacher Content Knowledge

<b>Exemplary</b> Teacher displays extensive content knowledge of all the subjects she or he teaches. Teacher regularly implements a variety of subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge. The teacher regularly highlights key concepts and ideas and uses them as bases to connect other powerful ideas. Limited content is taught in sufficient depth to allow for the development of understanding.	<b>Proficient</b> Teacher displays accurate content knowledge of all the subjects he or she teaches. Teacher sometimes implements subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge. The teacher sometimes highlights key concepts and ideas and uses them as bases to connect other powerful ideas.	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> Teacher displays under-developed content knowledge in several subject areas. Teacher rarely implements subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge. Teacher does not understand key concepts and ideas in the discipline and therefore presents content in an unconnected way.
---	--	--

Example: InTASC – Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0

**Standard – Content Knowledge:** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

*Indicator 1: The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.*

1	2	3
<p>The teacher accurately and effectively communicates concepts, processes and knowledge in the discipline, and uses vocabulary and academic language that is clear, correct and appropriate for learners. The teacher draws upon his/her initial knowledge of common misconceptions in the content area, and consults with colleagues on how to anticipate learner’s need for explanations and experiences that create accurate understanding in the content area.</p>	<p>And... The teacher seeks out ways to expand or deepen his/her content knowledge and ways of representing it for learners, presenting diverse perspectives to engage learners in understanding, questioning, and analyzing ideas. By analyzing group discourse and learner work, the teacher discovers additional learner misconceptions and uses the processes, vocabulary, and strategic tools of the discipline to build accurate and deep understanding. S/he seeks out or develops resources to fill gaps in learner understanding.</p>	<p>And... The teacher collaborates with others to expand her/his content knowledge in order to keep up with changes in the discipline. The teacher evaluates and modifies instructional resources and curriculum materials for their comprehensiveness, accuracy for representing particular concepts in the discipline and appropriateness for his/her learners.</p>

Example – Marzano Center: Teacher & Leader Evaluation (District Leader Evaluation)

**Domain II: Continuous Support for Improvement of Instruction**

(1) The district leader provides a clear vision regarding the district instructional model and how to guide personnel and schools in operationalizing the model

Innovating	Applying	Developing	Beginning	Not Using
<p>The district leader ensures adjustments are made or new strategies are created so all personnel know and support the instructional model.</p>	<p>The district leader provides a clear vision regarding the district instructional model and how to guide personnel and schools in operationalizing the model AND monitors the extent to which personnel know and support the instructional model</p>	<p>The district leader provides a clear vision regarding the district instructional model and how to guide personnel and schools in operationalizing the model.</p>	<p>The district leader attempts to provide a clear vision regarding the district instructional model but does not complete the task or does so partially.</p>	<p>The district leader does not attempt to provide a clear vision regarding the district instructional model.</p>

## Appendix 8 – Multiple Measure Resources

The following resources, along with two face-to-face meetings with Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond, were used in shaping the recommendation regarding multiple measures:

Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *Use evidence of student learning appropriately*. In *Getting teacher evaluation right: What really matters for effectiveness and improvement* (pp. 70-98). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Creating a comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.  
<https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/creating-comprehensive-system-evaluating-and-supporting-effective-teaching.pdf>

## Appendix 9 – Teacher Quality Committee per 284.4(c)

c. Create a teacher quality committee. The committee shall have equal representation of administrators and teachers. The teacher members shall be appointed by the certified employee organization if one exists, and if not, by the school district's or agency's administration. The administrator members shall be appointed by the school board. However, if a school district can demonstrate that an existing professional development, curriculum, or student improvement committee has significant stakeholder involvement and a leadership role in the school district, the appointing authorities may mutually agree to assign to the existing committee the responsibilities set forth in this paragraph "c", to appoint members of the existing committee to the teacher quality committee, or to authorize the existing committee to serve in an advisory capacity to the teacher quality committee. The committee shall do all of the following:

(1) Monitor the implementation of the requirements of statutes and administrative code provisions relating to this chapter, including requirements that affect any agreement negotiated pursuant to chapter 20.

(2) Monitor the evaluation requirements of this chapter to ensure evaluations are conducted in a fair and consistent manner throughout the school district or agency. In addition to any negotiated evaluation procedures, develop model evidence for the Iowa teaching standards and criteria. The model evidence will minimize paperwork and focus on teacher improvement. The model evidence will determine which standards and criteria can be met with observation and which evidence meets multiple standards and criteria.

(3) Determine, following the adoption of the Iowa professional development model by the state board of education, the use and distribution of the professional development funds calculated and paid to the school district or agency as provided in section 257.9, subsection 10, or section 257.10, subsection 10, based upon school district or agency, attendance center, and individual teacher and professional development plans.

(4) Monitor the professional development in each attendance center to ensure that the professional development meets school district or agency, attendance center, and individual professional development plans.

(5) Ensure the agreement negotiated pursuant to chapter 20 determines the compensation for teachers on the committee for work responsibilities required beyond the normal work day.

d. Adopt school district, attendance center, and teacher professional development plans in accordance with this chapter.

e. Adopt a teacher evaluation plan that, at minimum, requires a performance review of teachers in the district at least once every three years based upon the Iowa teaching standards and individual professional development plans, and requires administrators to complete evaluator training in accordance with section 284.10.

f. Adopt teacher career paths based upon demonstrated knowledge and skills in accordance with this chapter.

## Bibliography

- CCSSO's Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2013). *InTASC: Model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers 1.0*. Washington D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from [http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2013/2013\\_INTASC\\_Learning\\_Progressions\\_for\\_Teachers.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2013/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf)
- Danielson, C. (2014). *The framework for teaching: Evaluation instrument*. San Francisco: Teachscape. Retrieved from <https://www.danielsongroup.org/framework/>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Creating a comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Retrieved from <https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/creating-comprehensive-system-evaluating-and-supporting-effective-teaching.pdf>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *Use evidence of student learning appropriately*. In *Getting teacher evaluation right: What really matters for effectiveness and improvement* (pp. 70-98). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Krueger, D., & Wilkinson, D. (2010). *A framework for understanding the Iowa teaching standards and criteria*. Des Moines, IA: Iowa State Education Association.
- Marzano, R.J. (2013). *The Marzano teacher evaluation model*. Englewood, CO: Marzano Research Laboratory. Retrieved from [www.marzanoresearch.com](http://www.marzanoresearch.com)
- Marzano, R.J., Carbaugh, B. & Toth, M. (2013). *Marzano district leader evaluation model: Including scales, evidences and learning map*. Palm Beach Garden, FL: Learning Sciences Marzano Center for Teacher and Leader Evaluation. Retrieved from [www.MarzanoCenter.com](http://www.MarzanoCenter.com)
- NIET. (2012). *Career teacher handbook: TAP instructional rubric*. Santa Monica, CA: National Institute for Excellence in Teaching.