



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, 2013

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
Diane Crookham-Johnson, Oskaloosa
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines
Michael Knedler, Council Bluffs
Valorie J. Kruse, Sioux City
Mike May, Spirit Lake
Max Phillips, Woodward
LaMetta Wynn, Clinton
McKenzie Baker, Student Member, Forest City

Administration

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

Division of Learning and Results

David Tilly, Deputy Director

Bureau of Educator Quality

Mary Beth Schroeder-Fracek, Administrative Consultant
Matt Ludwig, Consultant

Bureau of Standards and Curriculum

Rita Martens, Lead Consultant

Division of Communication & Information Services

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
2010-11 & 2011-12 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	76.0	84.0	53.3	66.7
Adel DeSoto Minburn CSD	85.4	82.5	84.1	87.6
AGWSR CSD	90.2	88.5	70.1	83.1
A-H-S-T CSD	82.6	84.1	73.5	85.5
Akron Westfield CSD	88.7	83.1	78.8	86.4
Albert City-Truesdale CSD	93.3	93.3	to Sioux Central	
Albia CSD	77.4	66.7	75.7	72.3
Alburnett CSD	90.2	90.2	64.0	74.8
Alden CSD	83.7	78.6	to Iowa Falls	
Algona CSD	77.0	77.2	75.4	78.2
Allamakee CSD	85.2	83.6	78.0	81.6
Allison-Bristow CSD	Reorganized into North Butler			
Alta CSD	66.7	73.1	To Aurelia	
Ames CSD	86.0	88.5	84.8	87.5
Anamosa CSD	86.3	87.5	77.8	89.8
Andrew CSD	71.8	71.8	83.3	83.3
Anita CSD	Reorganized into CAM			
Ankeny CSD	91.2	92.1	83.0	90.8
Anthon-Oto CSD	59.3	59.3	54.5	63.6
Aplington-Parkersburg CSD	74.3	78.0	71.1	78.1
Armstrong-Ringsted CSD	87.8	85.4	75.0	75.0
Ar-We-Va CSD	96.4	92.9	62.1	82.8
Atlantic CSD	79.6	84.4	75.0	81.7
Audubon CSD	79.3	84.5	71.6	89.5
Aurelia CSD	64.5	77.4	70.0	73.3
Ballard CSD	88.7	87.0	83.0	83.4

Battle Creek-Ida Grove CSD	80.6	78.5	to Odebolt-Arthur	
Baxter CSD	77.0	75.4	71.7	83.3
District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
BCLUW CSD	92.8	91.6	81.8	83.9
Bedford CSD	78.1	87.7	85.5	86.8
Belle Plaine CSD	75.9	78.2	60.0	73.3
Bellevue CSD	78.6	93.2	60.2	67.7
Belmond-Klemme CSD	87.2	92.3	61.8	77.5
Bennett CSD	89.5	73.7	to Durant/Tipton	
Benton CSD	83.5	86.0	76.8	73.7
Bettendorf CSD	84.4	89.5	76.3	82.2
Bondurant-Farrar CSD	84.1	82.6	82.7	82.2
Boone CSD	86.8	84.0	60.1	66.1
Boyden-Hull CSD	87.6	89.9	77.9	80.0
Boyer Valley CSD	77.6	72.4	69.4	71.0
Brooklyn-Guernsey-Malcom CSD	79.7	88.6	52.1	77.1
Burlington CSD	74.2	79.7	65.7	63.5
C and M CSD	Reorganized into CAM			
CAM CSD	55.8	74.4	61.5	82.7
CAL CSD	67.6	67.6	63.0	77.8
Calamus-Wheatland CSD	80.5	91.5	65.8	71.1
Camanche CSD	72.5	77.5	77.2	76.6
Cardinal CSD	68.6	75.6	70.2	69.0
Carlisle CSD	82.3	87.8	77.0	86.3
Carroll CSD	89.9	87.4	87.7	89.5
Cedar Falls CSD	78.7	85.4	80.2	84.6
Cedar Rapids CSD	73.0	78.3	70.5	75.2
Center Point-Urbana CSD	78.7	85.1	78.8	87.0
Centerville CSD	78.6	83.4	69.5	73.3
Central City CSD	79.7	81.4	81.6	94.7
Central Clinton CSD	85.6	84.1	67.5	76.5
Central CSD	77.3	92.3	74.2	80.3
Central Decatur CSD	84.9	91.7	73.5	63.3
Central Lee CSD	83.1	85.4	76.8	81.9
Central Lyon CSD	91.4	84.9	83.3	89.6
Central Springs CSD	69.2	78.6	92.2	92.2
Chariton CSD	85.1	88.7	68.4	79.4
Charles City CSD	75.8	75.8	75.8	75.8
Charter Oak-Ute CSD	69.4	61.1	54.3	71.4
Cherokee CSD	84.3	82.8	70.2	80.2
Clarinda CSD	82.2	78.0	70.4	70.4

Clarion-Goldfield CSD	82.2	84.0	79.3	87.2
Clarke CSD	78.2	80.6	69.2	75.0
District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Clarksville CSD	65.3	67.3	79.5	79.5
Clay Central-Everly CSD	75.0	81.1	73.8	73.8
Clayton Ridge CSD	81.2	82.6	77.8	77.8
Clear Creek Amana CSD	81.4	83.3	74.9	80.3
Clearfield CSD	N < 10	N < 10	to Diagonal, Lenox, Mt. Ayr	
Clear Lake CSD	74.4	82.5	67.3	66.8
Clinton CSD	79.6	81.4	65.4	63.5
Colfax-Mingo CSD	74.5	83.6	61.7	74.5
College CSD	84.5	82.7	73.1	79.4
Collins-Maxwell CSD	76.5	73.5	67.2	77.6
Colo-Nesco CSD	83.9	91.1	71.0	72.6
Columbus CSD	55.8	57.7	54.0	56.6
Coon Rapids-Bayard CSD	76.9	88.5	60.0	66.7
Corning CSD	69.4	73.5	64.5	75.8
Corwith-Wesley CSD	to LuVerne		64.0	80.0
Council Bluffs CSD	73.0	70.6	65.0	65.8
Creston CSD	60.8	61.8	72.6	73.7
Dallas Center-Grimes CSD	89.4	91.1	84.6	92.5
Danville CSD	78.0	78.0	66.3	71.9
Davenport CSD	70.5	73.8	60.1	62.5
Davis County CSD	80.1	78.3	67.3	76.5
Decorah CSD	84.6	87.1	86.9	93.7
Delwood CSD	96.6	96.6	to Maquoketa	
Denison CSD	68.0	74.1	69.2	76.7
Denver CSD	79.2	84.2	85.3	91.2
Des Moines Independent CSD	64.3	64.2	55.1	59.9
Diagonal CSD	91.7	83.3	57.1	85.7
Dike-New Hartford CSD	85.8	84.0	71.4	87.6
Dows CSD	85.7	100.0	to Clarion-Goldfield	
Dubuque CSD	77.8	82.2	69.1	77.1
Dunkerton CSD	90.1	83.1	58.6	70.0
Durant CSD	77.0	83.8	75.9	78.7
Eagle Grove CSD	71.7	84.9	68.8	69.6
Earlham CSD	79.6	70.4	77.9	82.1
East Buchanan CSD	78.2	74.4	72.5	88.4
East Central CSD	85.3	82.4	73.9	78.3
East Greene CSD	50.0	50.0	63.6	81.8
East Marshall CSD	77.9	79.8	68.6	85.6

East Mills CSD	72.7	75.0	64.9	89.2
East Sac County CSD	80.9	76.4	78.9	74.6
District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
East Union CSD	70.9	72.7	62.7	72.0
Eastern Allamakee CSD	72.3	80.0	67.3	83.7
Eddyville-Blakesburg CSD	75.2	78.1	59.4	70.3
Edgewood-Colesburg CSD	76.8	73.9	55.6	61.7
Eldora-New Providence CSD	69.6	70.9	to Hubbard-Radcliff	
Elk Horn-Kimballton CSD	To Exira			
Emmetsburg CSD	73.9	71.7	73.3	78.9
English Valleys CSD	79.4	89.7	69.7	76.3
Essex CSD	93.3	83.3	76.7	86.7
Estherville Lincoln Central CSD	78.1	76.4	61.1	72.4
Exira CSD	71.1	81.6	37.5	66.7
Fairfield CSD	81.8	76.4	68.1	79.2
Farragut CSD	67.9	50.0	To Hamburg	
Forest City CSD	88.8	87.0	85.5	85.6
Fort Dodge CSD	66.8	68.5	57.7	61.8
Fort Madison CSD	83.2	79.1	73.3	74.3
Fredericksburg CSD	78.0	85.4	70.7	79.3
Fremont CSD	To Eddyville-Blakesburg			
Fremont-Mills CSD	77.4	91.9	58.6	70.4
Galva-Holstein CSD	86.4	88.1	To Schaller-Crestland	
Garner-Hayfield CSD	81.9	87.9	65.4	80.3
George-Little Rock CSD	89.2	76.9	55.9	66.2
Gilbert CSD	94.7	94.7	88.1	94.3
Gilmore City-Bradgate CSD	78.3	73.9	50.0	53.6
Gladbrook-Reinbeck CSD	69.2	70.1	89.0	75.8
Glenwood CSD	84.8	88.1	76.8	79.5
Glidden-Ralston CSD	92.0	94.0	74.0	82.0
GMG CSD	80.0	82.9	60.7	80.4
Graettinger-Terril CSD	82.7	78.8	70.0	74.4
Greene CSD	Reorganized into North Butler			
Grinnell-Newburg CSD	88.7	95.4	79.4	84.9
Griswold CSD	79.1	88.1	82.4	93.2
Grundy Center CSD	89.7	92.8	83.3	97.4
Guthrie Center CSD	87.1	95.2	66.2	76.9
Hamburg CSD	72.2	72.2	65.5	55.2
Hampton-Dumont CSD	76.0	85.0	71.3	75.6
Harlan CSD	84.0	87.2	81.1	86.9
Harmony CSD	76.7	65.1	56.3	64.6

Harris-Lake Park CSD	97.4	100.0	76.7	90.0
Hartley-Melvin-Sanborn CSD	84.3	89.9	60.2	83.7
District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Highland CSD	68.8	69.9	64.9	68.1
Hinton CSD	76.3	81.5	72.9	81.3
H-L-V CSD	83.7	93.9	65.9	75.0
Howard-Winneshiek CSD	72.0	77.3	73.0	85.0
Hubbard-Radcliffe CSD	78.6	81.0	76.9	83.5
Hudson CSD	81.4	76.7	72.8	86.0
Humboldt CSD	89.2	92.4	70.7	79.8
IKM-Manning CSD	85.7	77.8	82.6	87.2
Independence CSD	82.1	90.8	57.8	69.6
Indianola CSD	85.7	75.3	82.2	84.5
Interstate 35 CSD	76.6	79.8	74.6	75.4
Iowa City CSD	74.3	76.4	74.4	80.2
Iowa Falls CSD	78.9	76.9	75.4	71.3
Iowa Valley CSD	76.2	91.7	63.4	79.3
Janesville Consolidated SD	73.2	78.0	78.0	85.4
Jefferson-Scranton CSD	84.2	85.0	73.0	80.3
Jesup CSD	77.1	80.4	63.8	65.4
Johnston CSD	91.9	92.2	87.0	91.9
Keokuk CSD	75.7	83.0	63.4	63.7
Keota CSD	85.7	81.0	87.5	85.0
Kingsley-Pierson CSD	89.3	82.1	71.0	69.6
Knoxville CSD	81.8	82.1	70.6	84.3
Lake Mills CSD	82.4	78.8	72.3	77.7
Lamoni CSD	65.9	68.3	61.5	79.5
Laurens-Marathon CSD	66.7	71.4	54.3	65.2
Lawton-Bronson CSD	91.4	87.7	68.6	81.4
Le Mars CSD	81.3	80.6	74.2	86.8
Lenox CSD	91.4	96.6	65.6	70.5
Lewis Central CSD	67.5	71.5	62.4	70.5
Lineville-Clio CSD	Reorganized into Wayne			
Linn-Mar CSD	88.3	88.3	81.9	85.7
Lisbon CSD	81.7	78.0	71.3	86.3
Logan-Magnolia CSD	88.7	90.7	80.0	80.0
Lone Tree CSD	87.5	87.3	67.1	82.9
Louisa-Muscatine CSD	68.5	77.8	53.2	56.3
LuVerne CSD	88.2	76.5	to Corwith-Wesley	
Lynnville-Sully CSD	86.7	83.3	77.8	87.3
Madrid CSD	88.4	87.2	64.7	67.6

Malvern CSD	Reorganized into East Mills			
Manning CSD	Reorganized into IKM-Manning			
District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Manson Northwest Webster CSD	84.7	86.1	73.3	82.2
Maple Valley CSD	78.3	60.9	to Anthon-Oto	
Maquoketa CSD	74.9	73.2	63.5	70.3
Maquoketa Valley CSD	94.4	91.1	80.0	84.2
Marcus-Meriden-Cleghorn CSD	90.9	93.2	75.0	82.1
Marion Independent SD	85.8	81.7	78.8	82.6
Marshalltown CSD	61.2	73.9	56.4	63.7
Martensdale-St Marys CSD	89.1	87.5	74.7	84.0
Mason City CSD	77.1	79.3	68.2	64.8
Mediapolis CSD	81.6	90.8	74.8	84.0
Melcher-Dallas CSD	83.8	86.5	62.5	71.9
MFL MarMac CSD	85.0	86.1	69.4	76.9
Midland CSD	77.4	78.7	68.5	72.2
Mid-Prairie CSD	82.8	83.3	71.3	87.4
Missouri Valley CSD	80.8	88.6	70.2	71.9
MOC-Floyd Valley CSD	91.0	91.0	86.9	88.0
Montezuma CSD	76.1	82.1	67.2	83.6
Monticello CSD	75.2	76.9	78.7	86.7
Moravia CSD	75.4	67.9	66.0	72.3
Mormon Trail CSD	80.8	63.6	64.7	56.3
Morning Sun CSD	71.9	75.0	to Wapello, Winfield Mt. Union, Mediapolis	
Moulton-Udell CSD	85.0	100.0	67.9	78.6
Mount Ayr CSD	78.9	92.2	69.1	75.3
Mount Pleasant CSD	80.4	84.4	69.0	79.7
Mount Vernon CSD	85.9	80.0	84.9	84.4
Murray CSD	85.7	81.0	50.0	63.0
Muscatine CSD	84.6	83.1	62.9	67.8
Nashua-Plainfield CSD	86.7	89.3	79.1	86.8
Nevada CSD	86.5	83.1	74.1	80.1
New Hampton CSD	83.2	88.8	71.5	75.4
New London CSD	69.7	84.2	59.7	78.9
Newell-Fonda CSD	75.0	70.8	70.3	75.0
Newton CSD	77.1	76.9	69.6	70.3
Nishna Valley CSD	Reorganized into East Mills			
Nodaway Valley CSD	85.1	82.2	72.4	73.5
Nora Springs-Rock Falls CSD	Reorganized into Central Springs			
North Butler CSD	87.0	87.0	75.8	86.8

North Cedar CSD	82.9	84.6	68.6	68.6
North Central CSD	Reorganized into Central Springs			
District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
North Fayette CSD	80.9	83.6	83.0	81.3
North Iowa CSD	70.8	83.1	57.4	57.4
North Kossuth CSD	71.4	82.1	To Sentral	
North Linn CSD	85.4	87.4	75.0	81.3
North Mahaska CSD	71.6	71.6	71.6	71.6
North Polk CSD	88.2	81.7	82.4	85.9
North Scott CSD	88.7	91.4	79.0	86.5
North Tama County CSD	78.6	97.1	60.2	80.6
North Winneshiek CSD	85.3	82.4	77.4	96.8
Northeast CSD	85.2	94.3	81.4	89.8
Northeast Hamilton CSD	71.4	78.6	80.0	90.0
Northwood-Kensett CSD	78.2	70.9	70.3	75.0
Norwalk CSD	85.3	88.1	80.3	90.0
Odebolt-Arthur CSD	75.0	75.0	77.7	87.7
Oelwein CSD	78.2	79.6	72.0	80.1
Ogden CSD	85.1	86.1	86.6	89.7
Okoboji CSD	94.2	91.7	82.4	79.0
Olin Consolidated SD	85.0	85.0	46.7	66.7
Orient-Macksburg CSD	76.2	81.0	73.7	94.7
Osage CSD	86.3	82.3	73.5	80.9
Oskaloosa CSD	70.3	71.5	69.3	78.6
Ottumwa CSD	65.1	69.9	58.8	64.2
Panorama CSD	82.7	84.7	75.0	75.0
Paton-Churdan CSD	88.5	92.3	73.9	91.3
PCM CSD	88.4	84.5	68.7	71.2
Pekin CSD	86.4	97.7	73.5	88.8
Pella CSD	87.8	85.8	84.9	83.7
Perry CSD	63.6	66.9	64.6	62.0
Pleasant Valley CSD	86.9	90.1	77.9	87.7
Pleasantville CSD	87.0	86.0	72.4	84.2
Pocahontas Area CSD	81.4	79.7	to Pomeroy-Palmer	
Pomeroy-Palmer CSD	85.2	70.4	74.1	71.6
Postville CSD	63.9	80.3	56.9	64.6
Prairie Valley CSD	79.0	87.7	67.4	83.0
Prescott CSD	N < 10	N < 10	to Orient-Macksburg, Corning	
Preston CSD	88.9	100.0	79.2	90.6
Red Oak CSD	67.8	69.1	68.5	71.9
Remsen-Union CSD	83.3	77.8	71.2	82.7

Riceville CSD	75.7	94.6	61.9	73.8
River Valley CSD	84.0	84.0	86.4	88.9
District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Riverside CSD	74.1	77.8	74.7	78.8
Rock Valley CSD	84.9	82.8	74.8	78.3
Rockwell City-Lytton CSD	91.7	87.5	71.2	73.6
Rockwell-Swaledale CSD	Reorganized into West Fork			
Roland-Story CSD	91.9	82.4	85.6	84.2
Rudd-Rockford-Marble Rock CSD	71.4	88.9	65.7	83.6
Ruthven-Ayrshire CSD	73.1	84.6	60.6	81.8
Sac CSD	Reorganized into East Sac County			
Saydel CSD	71.9	70.2	70.9	64.9
Schaller-Crestland CSD	73.5	73.5	71.4	78.6
Schleswig CSD	81.1	81.1	59.3	64.8
Sentral CSD	87.0	91.3	63.2	73.7
Sergeant Bluff-Luton CSD	94.9	93.5	82.8	85.8
Seymour CSD	68.8	78.1	69.0	89.7
Sheldon CSD	83.2	86.6	75.0	88.3
Shenandoah CSD	84.6	79.7	63.1	73.9
Sibley-Ocheyedan CSD	67.4	77.2	65.1	72.5
Sidney CSD	82.0	78.0	80.0	82.5
Sigourney CSD	78.9	75.0	73.9	79.7
Sioux Center CSD	79.3	81.6	75.9	90.5
Sioux Central CSD	81.0	73.0	69.8	69.1
Sioux City CSD	69.3	73.7	63.0	63.4
Solon CSD	87.7	88.2	72.5	82.6
South Hamilton CSD	87.5	88.6	76.6	79.8
South O'Brien CSD	85.5	87.0	82.5	88.8
South Page CSD	69.2	61.5	30.0	45.0
South Tama County CSD	72.7	77.0	58.2	59.3
South Winneshiek CSD	78.6	80.4	61.5	81.5
Southeast Polk CSD	86.2	89.3	73.4	71.9
Southeast Warren CSD	88.7	85.7	75.8	83.9
Southeast Webster Grand CSD	86.1	80.6	63.2	64.7
Southern Cal CSD	70.2	75.4	to Rockwell City - Lytton	
Spencer CSD	85.2	80.4	79.5	78.3
Spirit Lake CSD	92.3	88.5	80.5	86.8
Springville CSD	71.1	65.8	76.3	83.1
St Ansgar CSD	85.5	89.6	66.3	80.4
Stanton CSD	75.7	81.1	73.1	92.3
Starmont CSD	83.8	89.7	73.8	81.3

Storm Lake CSD	69.4	64.0	61.5	65.0
Stratford CSD	90.0	90.0	to Webster City	
District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
Sumner CSD	74.4	69.5	to Fredericksburg	
Tipton CSD	84.7	87.0	68.3	82.5
Titonka Consolidated SD	52.6	73.7	To Algona	
Treynor CSD	87.9	83.2	83.5	89.9
Tri-Center CSD	84.2	80.2	74.0	77.0
Tri-County CSD	80.8	88.5	59.4	78.1
Tripoli CSD	77.6	71.6	73.4	73.4
Turkey Valley CSD	81.0	90.5	76.1	93.0
Twin Cedars CSD	75.5	79.6	78.6	76.4
Twin Rivers CSD	80.0	80.0	To Humboldt	
Underwood CSD	85.1	86.0	83.8	82.9
Union CSD	80.7	74.9	71.0	72.6
United CSD	84.2	86.8	to Boone, Ames	
Urbandale CSD	85.1	88.5	74.3	79.6
Valley CSD	54.0	64.0	74.3	85.7
Van Buren CSD	82.4	75.8	67.4	82.4
Van Meter CSD	82.2	84.4	76.3	80.4
Ventura CSD	85.7	82.1	66.0	63.8
Villisca CSD	66.7	74.4	51.9	66.7
Vinton-Shellsburg CSD	86.2	85.2	68.1	87.3
Waco CSD	75.4	76.8	70.0	81.7
Wall Lake View Auburn CSD	Reorganized to East Sac County			
Walnut CSD	77.3	77.3	50.0	65.0
Wapello CSD	75.9	74.1	67.0	68.1
Wapsie Valley CSD	75.7	81.7	70.1	82.8
Washington CSD	66.8	78.6	67.6	83.2
Waterloo CSD	59.0	61.9	57.0	54.7
Waukee CSD	88.7	89.1	84.7	89.2
Waverly-Shell Rock CSD	88.7	85.2	82.6	90.1
Wayne CSD	87.0	94.2	76.8	78.6
Webster City CSD	73.9	79.8	73.3	87.6
West Bend-Mallard CSD	88.1	92.9	88.4	86.0
West Branch CSD	80.0	85.5	75.0	81.3
West Burlington Ind SD	68.8	78.5	61.8	63.6
West Central CSD	93.3	90.0	64.6	87.5
West Central Valley CSD	78.6	77.7	74.5	78.8
West Delaware County CSD	85.5	87.2	75.7	82.7
West Des Moines CSD	83.6	86.7	80.2	83.9

West Fork CSD	86.8	84.2	67.3	55.8
West Hancock CSD	81.5	79.0	68.8	77.5
District	Grade 4 Reading	Grade 4 Math	Grade 8 Reading	Grade 8 Math
West Harrison CSD	74.0	72.0	79.3	79.3
West Liberty CSD	71.6	73.3	70.8	84.7
West Lyon CSD	85.1	80.7	73.4	78.7
West Marshall CSD	85.2	92.2	79.6	92.6
West Monona CSD	75.3	70.1	73.3	76.7
West Sioux CSD	75.8	78.9	73.7	80.3
Western Dubuque CSD	82.4	88.6	73.4	90.3
Westwood CSD	76.5	79.4	67.1	78.1
Whiting CSD	77.8	85.2	61.5	73.1
Williamsburg CSD	91.3	89.6	75.5	86.7
Wilton CSD	83.1	85.4	67.6	83.8
Winfield-Mt Union CSD	81.1	81.1	65.2	76.9
Winterset CSD	81.9	81.9	78.2	85.9
Woden-Crystal Lake	N < 10	N < 10	To Forest City	
Woodbine CSD	83.6	83.6	80.4	73.9
Woodbury Central CSD	88.5	94.3	72.9	83.5
Woodward-Granger CSD	91.8	83.5	66.4	73.6

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 hosted the online training site and provided an “instructor of record” to support the participating administrators.

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

Evaluator Approval Renewal trainings 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 AEA's. The costs of the renewal training were paid for through registration fees.

The *IEAPT 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.

Administrators were required to complete either *Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Administrators* OR *Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Teachers* for renewal. 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 (AAR)** – for two required renewal credits. The additional two credits required to renew an administrative/evaluator license may be earned by successfully completing course work aligned to their district/building goals or completing *Fierce Conversations*.

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

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

Here are some key findings about the AAR training from the professionals leading the modules in each of the AEAs:

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

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

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, and the Stanford University School Redesign Network with Ray Pecheone and Linda Darling Hammond, and the University of Iowa Center for Evaluation and Assessment.

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

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

out in direct support of the state's educational reform efforts to improve teaching and learning and developing more effective teachers from the pre-service through career levels.

Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute

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

Mentoring and Induction Model

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

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

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

New Teacher Retention in Iowa

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

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

The percent of first year teachers still teaching in public schools and AEAs two years after their first year also increased. For example, of the 1836 first year teachers in the base year 2000-2001, 1425 or 77.6 percent were in the classroom in 2002-2003. On the other hand, 85.4 percent of the first year teachers in 2009-2010 were still teaching in the 2011-2012 school year. This was an increase of 7.8 percentage points (Table 1). Table 2 shows that 82.0 percent of second year teachers in 2000-2001 were teaching two years later and 87.2 percent of second year teachers in 2009-2010 were teaching two years later. As shown in Table 3, 79.8 percent of first and second year teachers combined in 2000-2001 were teaching two years later and 86.3 percent of first and second year teachers combined in 2009-2010 were teaching two years later.

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

Table 1:
Iowa Public School and AEA First Year Teacher Retention 2000-01 to 2011-12

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

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 2011-12

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

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 2011-12

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

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 2011-2012 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, LEA superintendents 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 enhance 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 instructional rounds visit of a participating school district. The network is also part of an evaluation project to assess the impact of the networks on teaching and learning. In addition, a number of local in-district networks have started to form and are using the materials and resources from the statewide networks to gather data and examine the impact of their school improvement strategies on teaching and learning.
- The Iowa Professional Learning Providers, a statewide group providing PD to educate leaders, developed a proposal to support implementation and evaluation of an executive coaching model for developing principal leadership. This model will focus on the leadership and support necessary for developing cultures of collaborative inquiry that can improve teaching and learning within Iowa schools and districts. The DE, AEAs, professional associations, regional educational labs, and American Institute for Research have been involved in the development of this proposal. Funds are currently being sought to support this program.
- The Iowa Leadership Partnership is continuing to meet and provide guidance around the development of educational leadership within the state. This group includes a broad base of stakeholders from education and non-educating backgrounds.
- The DE updated and consolidated the evaluator approval courses resulting in a new online course focused on connecting teacher and administrator evaluations to the improvement of teaching and learning. In addition, a cadre of trainers provided a level III course on assessing academic rigor as part of the requirements for evaluating educators. This course builds the capacity of leaders to ensure rigorous school content and the alignment of teaching, learning, assessment is present in all schools.

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)

In September 2007, the Iowa Department of Education (DE) began the Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW) project of professional development with high school administrator and teacher teams to enhance the intellectual quality of student work in Iowa schools. AIW is a research-based framework focusing, not on specific teaching techniques, but on intellectual demands that teachers present to students to prepare them to successfully respond to the challenges of the modern world, post-secondary education, and the workplace.

Authentic Intellectual Work Definition and Indicators

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 and rigor 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.

Criteria and Standards for Authentic Pedagogy and Student Work

Criteria for Authentic Intellectual Work	Instruction	Assessment Tasks	Student Work
Construction of Knowledge	Higher order thinking	Construction of Knowledge	Construction of Knowledge
Disciplined Inquiry	Deep Knowledge and Student Understanding Substantive Conversation	Elaborated Communication	Elaborated Communication
Value Beyond School	Value Beyond School	Value Beyond School	

These criteria and standards were derived from research conducted by Fred M. Newmann and colleagues at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and elsewhere from 1990 to 2003. Through a number of studies, researchers found that the achievement of students who experienced high levels of authentic instruction and assessment exceeded the achievement of their peers who received lower levels (the studies are summarized in Newmann, King and Carmichael, 2007). The findings were consistent in grades 3 through 12; in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies; in schools from urban, suburban, and rural settings; and with diverse groups of students.

Using this research as a foundation, Newmann, Dana Carmichael, and Bruce King assisted the DE in designing a professional development project that focused on improving teachers' ability to design instruction and assessments to increase student authentic intellectual work. Schools apply voluntarily to the project and teams of teachers and administrators participate in:

- beginning-of-the-year kick-off institutes to introduce teachers and administrators to AIW criteria and standards,
- regular on-site team meetings to critique and improve teachers' assignments, assessments, and lessons,

- periodic on-site coaching by external coaches trained in AIW, and
- mid-year institutes where teams from different schools continue their professional development through subject area and grade alike workshops.

The rapid growth of the AIW program, stemming largely from “word of mouth advertising” from one teacher and administrator to another, is one indicator that Iowa educators value this approach to professional development. During its initial year, teams from nine schools included 76 teachers who participated in the program. During 2008-09 an additional 165 teachers joined their peers in implementing AIW at those nine schools, and teams from eleven other high schools and one middle school began professional development in AIW, bringing the total number of teachers participating to 336. Expansion in schools already practicing AIW, into other schools within those districts, and the addition of ten new schools brought the total of teachers participating in AIW during the 2009-10 school year to 1102. In 2010-2011, 22 more schools joined the AIW statewide initiative, with more than 2000 teachers participating in AIW professional development. In 2011-2012, 35 new schools and districts joined the project. With 122 schools (including expansion schools within a district already doing AIW) having participated by fall 2012, this makes AIW the largest Department supported professional development initiative in the state.

An important aspect of the project is to build the state’s internal capacity to support and sustain AIW professional development in the schools. Each year, consultants from several AEAs and the DE become new AIW coaches through summer institutes and ongoing mentoring. At present, 13 AEA and DE consultants serve as AIW coaches, and 9 new coaches began their year of training in summer 2011. The intent is to develop a cadre of coaches within the AEA system to provide this service to schools and districts. In 2011-2012, the DE also began supporting the development of 24 AIW teachers and administrators as local, school-based and district-based AIW coaches.

In addition, an impact study of change in student achievement was completed in 2011, providing evidence of positive results on both teaching and learning in AIW schools at all levels.

Initial Evaluation Design and Summary of Results

To this point, project resources have concentrated on program development, but an initial evaluation was undertaken through four studies with the following objectives and methods:

- To understand the professional development process within schools, case studies of implementation of the AIW framework in four schools have been completed.
- To understand administrators’ reactions to the program, two focus group discussions were held with administrators and curriculum directors and the results summarized.
- To understand the extent teachers’ intellectual demands were affected by professional development emphasizing feedback from colleagues on the quality of their assignments (tasks) for students, an analysis compared their tasks before and after receiving feedback.
- To understand whether participation in the AIW project is associated with higher achievement on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and Iowa Test of Educational Development, test scores in AIW schools were compared with scores of students in matched schools not in the program.

The evaluation to date indicates consistent positive results for teachers and students, as well as challenges that need further work. The results are elaborated for each of the studies in the full report that can be found at http://educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1767&catid=449&Itemid=2544#evaluation.

Impact on Teachers’ Practice

Focus groups and case studies describe the changing nature of instruction from the teacher-as-deliverer of facts to teacher-as-facilitator of student thinking, in-depth understanding, and skill development that is meaningful and valuable. 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. The review of teachers’ tasks show that high school teachers who participate in AIW professional development are able to implement assessment tasks that scored significantly higher in the standards for authenticity. Effect sizes ranged from medium in science and social studies to large in mathematics.

Change in Professional Culture and Leadership

Administrators referred to the level of collaboration among teachers as “unprecedented.” Using common protocols and criteria, teams of teachers within and across disciplines meet to improve their practice. Teachers examine their

practice through the lens of the AIW framework, individually and collectively asking 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?” AIW teachers value the opportunities AIW professional development provides to make their instruction better. AIW schools also experience more sustained focus for their PD. 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. Also, AIW provides teachers with more leadership opportunities.

Student Achievement

Students in AIW schools across grade levels and subjects (reading, mathematics, science, social studies) usually scored higher on the ITBS/ITED than students in non-AIW schools and had higher percentages of students scoring proficient (i.e. the 41st percentile and above). For grades 4, 8, and 11 – the grades for which Iowa schools must report annually, AIW students scored significantly higher in 8 of the twelve comparisons (3 grades x 4 subjects) and AIW had higher percentages proficient in all 12 comparisons. The percentile advantage to AIW students was 5 points or higher in 8 of the 12 comparisons. The results across all grades 3-11 were similar. Of the four subjects, AIW students posted the most consistently higher scores in mathematics and showed consistently smaller differences in social studies.

Cognitively Guided Instruction: To those familiar with the elementary mathematics section of the Iowa Core, 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.

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

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.

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 be 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 Curriculum Alignment Toolkit (I-CAT), has been 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. During the 2011-12 school year, more than 6000 teachers in 146 districts used I-CAT to determine the degree of alignment between what they teach and the content of the Iowa Core. This year a new feature was added to I-CAT: cognitive complexity. Through our work with alignment, we have learned that there are three dimensions that must be included in accurately measuring alignment: content/topic, cognitive complexity, and emphasis. This new feature will allow Iowa schools to ensure that they are teaching the appropriate content with an appropriate level of rigor. A report summarizing the cognitive complexity of the Iowa Core Standards in Literacy and Mathematics can be found at

http://www.educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2111&Itemid=4603#reports.

Training in the use of this tool continues through the Iowa Core Network. All Network members receive ongoing training in using I-CAT and interpreting the results to ensure that each district's locally developed curriculum features the required content at the appropriate level of rigor of the Iowa Core for all students.

Content Leadership Teams: The Department is also collaborating with the AEAs in developing a series of professional development opportunities called "Investigating the Iowa Core: Mathematics and Literacy" and "Deeper Investigations: Literacy and Mathematics". The purpose for the Investigations is to teach administrators and teachers how to navigate the standards documents, learning the structure and content, and developing a deeper understanding of the changes in instruction and content these new standards require. Training of these professional development modules is being delivered throughout the state to teams of teachers and administrators. Each AEA is responsible for delivery at the local level.