January 7, 2015

Superintendent Jim Stanton
Dunkerton Community School District
509 Canfield
Dunkerton, Iowa 50626-0308

Dear Superintendent Stanton:

Attached is the report of findings for the Comprehensive School Improvement Site Visit conducted at Dunkerton Community School District (CSD) on December 9-10, 2014. The report is based upon a variety of interviews conducted with district staff and stakeholder groups during the indicated dates, and review of documents submitted to the Department and on-site.

The site visit was designed to assess the district’s progress with its Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) section of C-Plan, provide a general assessment of educational practices within the school, make recommendations for improvement, and determine compliance with state accreditation standards and applicable federal program requirements.

Based on the findings from a comprehensive site visit, including a desk audit, on-site document review, and interviews, the Dunkerton CSD maintains State of Iowa accreditation upon resolution of non-compliance issues described in the comprehensive site visit report. The non-compliances revealed as a result of the visit are shared with the superintendent prior to leaving the district at the end of the site visit. The Dunkerton CSD must complete corrective actions according to the timeline noted on the non-compliance web site under the Portal. Documentation of corrections must be made available to the Site Visit Team Leader. Department follow-up will be conducted to verify resolution of all noted non-compliance issues.

The report reflects consensus of the following team members:

**Department of Education Representatives:**
Elizabeth Calhoun, School Improvement Consultant
Dale Gruis, Career and Technical Education Consultant
Bruce Jensen, Special Education Cadre
Susan Selby, Title I Consultant

**Area Education Agency 267 Representatives:**
Jackie Fober, School Social Worker/PBIS Coordinator
Joe Kremer, Assessment Coordinator
Deb Versteeg, Digital Learning and Teaching Coordinator

**Local Education Agency Representatives:**
Eric Eckerman, School Improvement Coordinator, Clarksville CSD
Jeremy Langner, Assistant Principal, Waverly-Shell Rock CSD
Eric Wood, Superintendent, Clarksville CSD
It is our hope this report will provide guidance to enhance student achievement in the school and support continuing conversations among staff and community members about the local education system, how and what students are learning, and how more students can learn at higher levels.

As part of the Dunkerton CSD’s continuous improvement process, the district must review its current C-Plan and provide revisions as needed. Revisions should be based on the district’s needs assessments (including the attached report), student achievement data, stakeholder input, and established priorities. Recertification of the C-Plan must be completed by September 15, 2015. Directions for revision and submission of the C-Plan can be found at: https://portal.ed.iowa.gov/iowalandingpage/Landing.aspx.

The Department would appreciate the district’s feedback regarding its site visit experience. This feedback will inform the Department’s efforts to continuously improve the comprehensive site visit process. A short online survey has been developed and is available here. The survey will take approximately ten minutes to complete. Responses are confidential and shared in aggregate form with members of the Department’s School Improvement Team.

The visiting team again extends its gratitude to you and the Dunkerton CSD staff and patrons in preparing for and showing courtesy during the visit. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Calhoun, School Improvement Consultant
Bureau of School Improvement
Iowa Department of Education

Amy Williamson, Chief
Bureau of School Improvement
Iowa Department of Education

cc: Site Visit Team Members
School Board President
Iowa Department of Education Official File
AEA Office
Pradeep Kotamraju, CTE Director
In an improving district/school, the vision, mission, and goals are clearly communicated in the school and community. Stakeholders understand and share a commitment to the district/school expectations, goals, priorities, assessment procedures, and accountability. The vision guides allocations of time and resources. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Clearly articulated mission is established collaboratively with stakeholder groups representing the diversity of the community.
- Vision, mission, and goals are communicated throughout the system and community.
- The vision and mission of the district/school guide teaching and learning.
- Every five years, the comprehensive needs assessment process, with input from stakeholders, is used to review and revise the beliefs, mission, and/or vision; major educational needs; and student learning goals.
- Academic and academic-related data are analyzed and used to determine prioritized goals.
- Goals guide assessment of student achievement, district/school effectiveness, and the allocation of time and resources.
- The vision, mission, and goals support values of respecting and valuing diversity.

**Noted Strengths:**

1. Multiple interview groups reported Dunkerton Community School District (CSD) developed its new vision and mission statements three years ago in a collaborative effort involving the School Improvement Advisory Committee (SIAC), teachers, administrators, and school board. The mission statement for this district is “Empowering students to be lifelong learners and caring, responsible citizens”. The vision statement is “It is the Dunkerton Community School’s Vision to work in partnership with each family and the community to educate responsible lifelong learners so that each student possesses the skills, knowledge, creativity, sense of self-worth and values, necessary to thrive in and contribute to a diverse and changing world”. The mission and vision statements are visible throughout the school and on the website. One interviewee commented, “Decisions are made regarding what is best for our students.”

2. Interviews with the superintendent, school board, and SIAC indicated the school conducted a needs assessment in September of 2014. Computers were set up during registration, a link was published in the newsletter, and a local newspaper article were methods used to encourage survey responses. Some responses included:
   - “Small community, administrators and teachers who truly care, growing fine arts program, kids can try a variety of activities in order to find what they like or are good at”
   - “Class sizes allow teachers more one on one with the students which is great”
   - “Working together for one goal for the students”
   - “The district is proactive about advancing student education and growth. It recognizes the issues faced ahead and is taking steps necessary to sustain our district”
Recommendations for Improvement:

3. The district recently revised its vision and mission statements. The visiting team recommends the district continue to make and communicate connections between school improvement efforts and the vision and mission.

4. The district recently completed a five-year needs assessment. It was unclear to the visiting team whether this information had been shared with all stakeholder groups (i.e., school board, SIAC, teachers, parents, and staff). The visiting team recommends results be shared and an action plan be created to address concerns. The visiting team further recommends utilizing multiple methods (i.e., email, paper copy, link on the website) of surveying the broader community of all stakeholders including students.

5. The district may want to consider establishing a survey of high school students and a follow-up survey of graduates. Additional data regarding student achievement following the academic preparation at Dunkerton CSD may provide an important source of information and communication/marketing regarding future needs. Contact Joe Kremer, jkremer@aea267.k12.ia.us, Assessment Coordinator at Area Education Agency (AEA) 267 for assistance and support in this area.
Leadership

In an improving district/school, leaders communicate a shared sense of purpose and understanding of the district/school's values. Leaders have a visible presence, provide resources and ensure two-way communication between the educational system and stakeholders. Leaders provide encouragement, recognition, and support for improving student learning and staff performance. Leadership is committed, persistent, proactive, and distributed throughout the system. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Policies and procedures are established to effectively support district/school operations.
- The school board and district/school administrators implement an evaluation system that provides for the professional growth of all personnel.
- Policies and practices are implemented to reduce and eliminate discrimination and harassment and to reflect, respect, and celebrate diversity.
- The role and responsibility of administrative leaders is supported, respected, and understood.
- A clearly defined system and expectations are established for the collection, analysis, and use of data regarding student achievement and progress with the C-Plan.
- The capacity of staff, students, and parents to contribute and lead is built and supported.
- Opportunities for participation are provided for input, feedback, and ownership for student and system success among staff, students, parents, and community.
- Equity in access to learning opportunities and compliance with local, state, and federal legislation is ensured.
- Leaders at all levels understand and manage the change process.

**Noted Strengths:**

6. Multiple groups interviewed spoke of teacher leadership opportunities that exist in the district which included:
   - SIAC
   - Calendar
   - Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
   - Professional Development

7. Interviews with teachers, students, and administrators indicated students have opportunities for building leadership and citizenship skills. Some of these opportunities included:
   - Student Leadership Team
   - Club groups
   - National Honor Society
   - FFA

8. Teachers, parents, school board members, SIAC, CTE advisory, and paraeducators felt administrators are approachable, visible, supportive, and dedicated to the profession. Administrators meet regularly with faculty and participate in professional development activities. Teachers stated administrators and the school board are supportive of professional development needs. The teachers believe the administrators provide leadership to teachers and assistance to students and parents. Staff indicated they are encouraged to take leadership roles. Teachers indicated administrators seek their strengths and positive attributes to positively grow in their profession.

9. The district has designated a member of the special education faculty to serve as special education coordinator. This position has been given responsibility to provide leadership through organizing department meetings, providing information to the other staff...
members, and communicating with the AEA 267 administrator assigned to the district. The special education coordinator will also be a key player as the district undertakes the revision of its district special education plan. During interviews with the special education teachers it was clear that the staff members view this position as providing leadership and resources for the department.

10. Interviews with SIAC indicated the Dunkerton Board of Education and the Dunkerton City Council have been meeting jointly to discuss ways to bolster student enrollment and promote city growth. The visiting team commends the district for its collaborative effort with all stakeholders.

11. As stated in the previous state accreditation site visit report (December 2009), SIAC members reported their perception that the community supports the school administrators. The community, administrators, and teachers all focus on the success of students. Members indicated the strength of the committee is their open discussion of issues with respect for all opinions. The SIAC has been meeting monthly to help prepare for the current site visit. Previously they met monthly to prepare the application for the Teacher Leadership and Compensation (TLC) grant.

Recommendations for Improvement:

12. Interviews indicated the district did not receive their TLC grant during the first round of proposals. The visiting team recognized the time and passion put forth through the efforts of the SIAC. The district is encouraged to continue to apply for the grant and increase the involvement of the school board and administrators in this effort. Contact Kathy Enslin, kenslin@aea267.k12.ia.us, Assistance Chief Administrator/Director of Human Resources at AEA267 for assistance and support in this area.
Collaborative Relationships

In an improving district/school, stakeholders understand and support the mission and goals of the district/school and have meaningful roles in the decision-making process. Collaboration results from a culture of participation, responsibility, and ownership among stakeholders from diverse community groups. Educators in the system develop and nurture a professional culture and collaborative relationships marked by mutual respect and trust inside and outside of the organization. The system works together with balance between district direction and school autonomy. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Instructional staff is provided opportunities for interaction to focus on professional issues.
- Instructional staff constructively analyzes and critiques practices and procedures including content, instruction, and assessment.
- Instructional staff follows established procedures to resolve professional conflicts, solve problems, share information about students, and communicate student information to parents.
- Processes and procedures that invite and respect stakeholder input, support, and interaction are implemented by the district/school.
- Parents are involved as partners in the educational process.
- Positive alliances among school staff, students, parents, and diverse community groups are created and nurtured.

Noted Strengths:

13. Interviews with teachers, school board, and administrators indicated the district commitment to Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) this school year. PLCs appear to create the following:
   - Shared vision
   - Celebrating successes
   - Data analysis
   - Instructional decision making
   - Iowa Core alignment
   - Collective responsibility
   - Communication
   - Focus on learning

14. Interviews with teachers and administrators indicated the district collaborates with Cedar Valley Northeast Consortium (Tripoli, Jesup, Wapsie Valley, Denver, Sumner/Fredericksburg, and Dunkerton CSDs) on a monthly basis. The group is in the planning stages to develop a Regional CTE Academy to be housed in Readlyn in cooperation with Hawkeye Community College.

15. For the past five years, Dunkerton CSD has been part of the Iowa Star North Consortium (Janesville, Tripoli, Clarksville, and Dunkerton CSDs) which meets at least twice a year to provide their staff with the opportunity to collaborate in grade level and content area PLCs. Some of the professional development offered has included:
   - Motivational speakers
   - Iowa Core implementation in the classrooms
   - Deeper Understanding of the Iowa Core
   - Dominance Influencing Steadiness Conscientiousness (DISC) personality assessment

16. Multiple interview groups indicated a strength of the district is collaborations with outside agencies and community organizations. Some of these collaborations are listed below:
   - SIAC
• Iowa Star North Consortium
• School Board
• Cedar Valley Northeast Consortium
• AEA 267
• Boys and Girls Clubs
• Dunkerton Education Foundation
• Hawkeye Community College
• Athletic Boosters
• Fine Arts Boosters
• Parent Teacher Organization
• Volunteers in the classroom
• Fitness center on site
• Outreach to the community
• Curb Appeal Group (i.e., gardening, raking leaves, etc.)
• Toy drive
• Sharing of equipment between city and school
• Economic Development/City/School
• Black Hawk County Health Department
• Black Hawk County Sheriff’s Department
• Local churches
• Dunkerton Principal Advisory Committee (DPAC)

17. Interviews with teachers and administrators indicated the district shares personnel with neighboring districts. Some of the sharing included:
  • FFA with Wapsie Valley CSD
  • Teacher librarian with Wapsie Valley CSD
  • Alternative programs with Oelwein and Waterloo CSDs
  • Special education programming with Bremwood in Waverly

18. Special education teachers and paraeducators interviewees indicated they enjoy a positive and collaborate relationship. While they do not have a structured time for communication, they believed communication occurred as necessary to meet student needs.

19. Special education teachers and general education teachers have been provided common planning time outside of the scheduled PLC time. This provides opportunity to discuss student needs and prepare for shared instruction.

Recommendations for Improvement:

20. The visiting team commends the Dunkerton CSD for the steps they have taken to develop a PLC and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) structure within the district. The district is encouraged to continue to utilize time and resources to further enhance this process so it can become sustainable and a useful vehicle for student improvement. Specific recommendations include identifying tools (i.e., Innovation Configuration Maps) that will enable collaborative teams and administrators to monitor and evaluate the fidelity of implementation of this process. For additional information, please contact Kim Swartz (kswartz@aea267.k12.ia.us), AEA 267, and Assistant Director of Educational Services.
Learning Environment

In an improving district/school, the school environment is conducive to teaching and learning. The environment is safe, orderly, purposeful, and free from threat of physical, social, and emotional harm. Teachers are familiar with students’ cultures and know how to work effectively in a multi-cultural setting. Students are guided to think critically about learning and have opportunities to apply learning to real world situations. Classrooms are integrated with diverse learners (i.e., gender, race, special needs, at-risk, gifted, national origin). Evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Rules and procedures for behavior and consequences are clearly communicated and consistently administered.
- School facilities are physically accessible and school routines enhance student learning.
- Materials, resources, technology, programs, and activities reflecting diversity are available to all students.
- The district/school provides a clean, inviting, welcoming environment.
- A clearly understood crisis management plan is established, communicated, and implemented when necessary.
- Teaching and learning are protected from external disturbances and internal distractions.
- The district/school reflects the contributions and perspectives of diverse groups and preserves the cultural dignity of staff, students, and parents.

Noted Strengths:

21. Interview groups noted the district provides a safe, secure environment. Numerous techniques and procedures to maintain safety were mentioned, including but not limited to the following:

- New entrance to main building
- Cameras in the hallways and buses
- Alert Lockdown Inform Counter Evacuate (ALICE) training
- Building is locked after 8:15 a.m.
- Drop-off and pickup procedures
- Student Leadership Team efforts to promote positive climate and culture (i.e., community meeting, middle and high school assembly, cell phone policy)

22. All interview groups indicated the district MTSS efforts include “Raider Time” at the junior/high school and “Intervention Time” at the elementary. During this time students are selected through teacher identification or student self-selection to receive interventions in academic areas. Also during this time, club time is available for student participation (i.e., Curb Appeal, Leader in Me, Photography, House of Cards, Fantasy Sports, Hobby Lobby, and Geek). The visiting team commends the district for its innovative approach to providing students with extra academic assistance, team building skills, and promoting positive adult to student relationships.

23. The district overview celebrated the success of the district’s recent Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) report. The visiting team noted the progress being made and encourages the district to continue its efforts to improve academic achievement.

24. Multiple interview groups indicated the Student Leadership Team at the high school has contributed to the overall positive culture and climate of the district. Their efforts have included a presentation to middle school/high school students and to the entire Dunkerton CSD. Examples of their presentation included:

- Promotion of appropriate use of technology, cell phones, social media
Pledge to be Positive (signing a red door at entrance of middle/high school wing and principal office)
Lock-in with Tripoli CSD

25. Interviews with parents, administrators, teachers, and team observation indicated the district’s support of early childhood education. The availability of programming onsite included:
- Three year old preschool
- Statewide Voluntary Four Year Old Preschool Program
- Head Start
- Early Childhood Special Education

26. Many district groups and community partners reported a strong communication link among school, home, and the community through the following:
- CTE advisory committee
- SIAC
- School Board
- DPAC
- Newsletter
- Emails
- Phone calls
- Infinite campus (student data management system)

27. Career and Technical Education (CTE) Advisory Committee members discussed the value of soft-skills, in addition to technical skills. CTE Advisory Committee members praised CTE courses for developing student learning situations where real-world soft-skills, such as working as a member of a team, can be acquired.

28. Multiple interview groups indicated since the last state accreditation visit (December 2009), the district has made significant improvements to the facilities. Improvements included:
- Phase I
  - Demolition of old Industrial Technology building
  - Addition to the 2004 addition of Industrial classroom and lab area
  - Addition to the 2004 addition of community/school fitness center
  - Relocated from middle of building and moving of the weight room into the old fitness center for security reasons
- Phase II
  - Addition of a new 7-12 building which included two science and four classrooms, restrooms, office area, computer lab, and library
- Phase III
  - Finish second floor which included seven classrooms, computer lab, and restrooms

The district is commended for its ability to work collaboratively with its community and its vision to help ensure the future needs for students of the district.

Recommendations for Improvement:

29. Interviews indicated students, staff, and parents are unsure of policies and procedures which may be in place for students and staff to report and address bullying and harassment. Students could not describe if all students had received information about identifying conflict versus bullying behaviors. The visiting team recommends the district continue with their student leadership efforts to bring about change in the culture and climate of the school. The visiting team further recommends to continue to make everyone aware of policies and procedures related to bullying and harassment.
30. Dunkerton CSD is utilizing multiple efforts to improve culture and climate throughout the district. Interviews with staff, students, and parents indicated the following would also be helpful suggestions:

- Consistent way to manage discipline issues
- Positive feedback to students and parents/guardians
- Better image for Dunkerton
- All students being included in social groups
- Common language and procedures

The district may want to consider investigating the possibility of utilizing the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) program which includes the option of receiving training in the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. This would help to provide a system to enhance and sustain district efforts. Contact Jackie Fober, jfober@aea267.k12.ia.us, PBIS coordinator and Dawn Jaeger, djaeger@aea267.k12.ia.us, Olweus Bullying Prevention Coordinator at AEA 267 for assistance and support in this area.

31. The district has implemented MTSS through Raider Time and Intervention time. Special education teachers and the special education coordinator reported special education teacher time was being devoted to serving groups of students that may not include students with IEPs. Staff funded through the special education monies are required to be working on special education programming. When instructing students, regardless of the setting, special education teachers should be providing instruction for the benefit of the learners with IEPs. If other learners may benefit from that instruction, they may be included. However, the pace and content of instruction must be designed to benefit the students with IEPs. The visiting team recommends the district examine the ways in which they are using special education teacher time and deploy that time in a way that is focused on special education students.

32. In order to better prepare students for the post-secondary realities of studying, living and working in a diverse and global society, the district is encouraged to examine current practice and find curricular connections that will increase cultural competency. This might begin by determining the current definition of cultural competency held by staff members, then exploring the accepted definition and how it compares with the local interpretation. The district may wish to consider the following:

- Developing a broader view of diversity through a thorough examination of the diversity within the district, such as socio-economic status, college-bound and non-college bound students, where people live, families new to the district, gender, race/ethnicity, language, sexual orientation and identity, religion, athletes and non-athletes, students with disabilities, students who do well and those who do not.
- Developing a planned schedule and purpose for including global/cultural activities, speakers, and resources in all content areas and grade levels. Resources from surrounding communities, organizations, and institutions could be accessed.
- Including cultural competency for consideration by the SIAC to assist in goal development.
- Expanding interest in elementary, middle school, and high school teachers and students developing a relationship with a school in another country, with schools in Iowa, or schools in other parts of the United States that have high populations of racial/ethnic diversity or high populations of low socio-economic diversity to explore aspects of diversity through the use of technology.

The district is encouraged to contact the Midwest Equity Assistance Center for free resources including in-service training, videos, brochures, and lesson plans for staff to enhance knowledge of cultural proficiency and diversity in schools. A review of the resources available can be found at this link: http://www.meac.org/resources.html. Amy Moine, amoine@aea267.k12.ia.us, Director of Professional Learning and Kathy Enslin, kenslin@aea267.k12.ia.us, Assistant Chief Administrator at AEA 267 could be contacted for assistance and support in this area.
In an improving school, curriculum challenges each student to excel, reflects a commitment to equity, and demonstrates an appreciation of diversity. There is an emphasis on principles of high quality instruction, clear expectations for what is taught, and high expectations for student achievement. Educators have a common understanding of quality teaching and learning. Instruction is designed to accommodate a wide range of learners within the classroom. Teachers have knowledge and skills need to effectively implement characteristics of effective instruction. The staff accepts responsibility for the students' learning of the essential curriculum (e.g., Iowa Core). Instructional time is allocated to support student learning. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Educators implement effective instructional practices for each and every student.
- School and classroom tasks and activities are inherently engaging, relevant, and lead to applying knowledge to authentic tasks.
- Content, instruction, assessments, and policy are aligned.
- A shared vision of effective instruction is held by all instructional staff.
- Curriculum and instruction reflect contributions from diverse racial, ethnic, and personal backgrounds.
- Students are provided opportunity and time to learn.
- Teachers are provided with an instructional framework that employs research-based strategies for use with diverse learner characteristics.
- Instructional decisions utilize a process of collecting, analyzing, and summarizing data.

**Noted Strengths:**

33. Parents reported the perception teachers and administrators work together to accommodate the needs of all students. Dunkerton CSD is willing to use its resources to make every child comfortable and safe in their learning environment. Parents expressed teachers are not only tuned in to the academic needs of their children, but also the social and emotional needs. The school values and is committed to meeting the needs of struggling learners, students with special needs, and other interventions. Multiple groups interviewed expressed pride about their commitment to individual student's needs. The staff indicated "We will do whatever it takes for the children to be successful." The following examples were reported by the school:

- Differentiated Instruction in classrooms
- Classrooms composed of all achievement levels
- Continuous learning is promoted
- Small flexible groups used for direct instruction
- Formative assessment is used to direct instruction

34. CTE instructors explained Cedar Valley NE PLC meetings in which they discuss/document integration of Iowa Core standards in teaching and learning. Teachers are learning to implement the Iowa Core content standards into daily instruction.

35. Interviews with the CTE teachers indicated coding is a component of the curriculum through a web design class which provides valuable real world experience for students. Students will be participating in a first annual web design Code Off.
36. Interviews indicated the district has added interactive projectors (short throws) in all classrooms. This is a valuable investment for supporting the use of technology integration throughout the curriculum.

37. CTE instructors had strong knowledge about improving student achievement through integration of academics and providing instruction in all aspects of an industry. Examples included:
- Accounting simulations
- Industrial Technology safety protocols
- Family and Consumer Science student bakery business

**Recommendations for Improvement:**

38. CTE teachers indicated they submit student data to be entered into the DE reporting system; however, they did not acknowledge they had discussed/reviewed CTE student data. CTE instructors, administration, and CTE Advisory members are encouraged to review and analyze their data. Analysis of the data should inform a needs assessment for the utilization of federal Perkins grant dollars.

39. High school students expressed a desire to learn more about college-credit courses which may be available, and increase their ability to acquire college-credit courses while in high school. Consider meeting with students and parents to address these concerns. Perhaps more information on the website to help to ensure all stakeholders are aware of opportunities available.

40. Special education teachers interviewed reported they were unfamiliar with their District Developed Service Delivery Plan (DDSDP). The district needs to revise their plan in the near future involving all of the appropriate stakeholders. This process will allow the special education teachers to engage in discussions regarding various service delivery models.

41. Some CTE Advisory Committee members and parents expressed value in providing work based learning opportunities. CTE advisory committee members were aware of work-based learning available through some high schools, but were unsure of work-based-learning opportunities through Dunkerton HS. Consider making more opportunities available for students to explore and participate in work based learning and include notification to all stakeholders.

42. Based upon the comments of multiple interview groups, the district has taken many positive steps to begin implementing a MTSS. At the current time, MTSS seems to be equated to intervention time only. The interview team encourages the district to build an MTSS process, using the PLC/collaborative structure as a vehicle, to increase emphasis on all aspects of the process to include:
- Robust universal/core instruction
- Universal screening and progress monitoring
- Evidenced-based targeted and intensive instruction/intervention
- Data-based decision making

For additional information, please contact Kym Stein (kstein@aea267.k12.ia.us), AEA 267 School Improvement Consultant, or Joe Kremer, (jkremer@aea267.k12.ia.us), AEA 267 Assessment Coordinator.

43. Multiple interview groups made reference to the concept of Standards-Based Grading practices. It is recommended the district continue to learn more about these practices and work to embed this system-wide. The current PLC/collaboration structure will be conducive to the development of these practices as grade level/content alike educators work to define and develop student learning goals and “I can statements”, share instructional strategies, and develop common classroom assessments and processes to organize student performance data into actionable next steps for instruction. Furthermore, such a standards-based approach will enable educators to better target the
students needing interventions and the specific skills that should be focused on during MTSS intervention time. For additional information contact Julie Davies (jdavies@aea267.k12.ia.us), AEA 267 Director of Educational Services.

44. High school students, teachers, and parents indicated student access to technology is an issue. The district should consider developing a comprehensive technology plan (e.g., a vision, funding and sustainability plan, implementation plan, evaluation plan, community engagement, policy and procedures, professional development, instructional support, and technical support) that will guide the district as it continues to explore options around technology access and integration needs. Continue to collect data (e.g., Clarity survey and walk through data) to inform this plan. Consider forming a stakeholder group to include administrators, teachers, parents, students, SIAC, and school board members to address this need. Contact Deb Versteeg, dversteeg@aea267.k12.ia.us, Digital Teaching and Learning Coordinator, at AEA 267 for assistance and support in this area.

45. As indicated in the district’s previous site visit report (2009) and from multiple interview groups, the Gifted and Talented Program is not implemented with fidelity district-wide. In an effort to meet the needs of all students, it is recommended that the district evaluate its program to ensure that opportunities are being offered district-wide and in a manner that meets the needs of its students and increases academic achievement. Contact Kay Schmalen, kschmalen@aea267.k12.ia.us, Educational Services Consultant for assistance and support.
Professional Development

In an improving district/school, staff is qualified for assignments and engages in ongoing learning opportunities to improve effectiveness. Student achievement and other sources of data are used to set goals for professional development. The district provides professional learning opportunities that include theory, demonstration, practice, and coaching. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Professional development focus is determined through the analysis of student achievement and performance data.
- Professional development is focused and based on research-based strategies.
- Professional development sessions build on one another, are distributed throughout the school year, and are sustained over time.
- Time is provided for teachers to collaborate and apply new content and pedagogical knowledge.
- An established system provides support to monitor and evaluate implementation of professional development and its impact on student learning.
- Formative student data and teacher implementation data are used to adjust professional development and guide instructional decisions.
- All school staff members, instructional and non-instructional, are provided professional development to support job roles and functions.
- Professional development activities contribute to the capacity of all school staff to develop cultural competence and to reflect and respect diversity in classroom and work environments.

Noted Strengths:

46. Interviews with teachers and the principal indicated the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year Dunkerton CSD began using Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST) to access students’ reading abilities in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. A base team of K-3 teachers received training and were certified in its use.

47. Interviews with teachers, principals, and superintendent reported the use of PLCs this past school year. The visiting team commends the district for its commitment to the process by sending staff to national conferences. Seven staff were sent last year and approximately nineteen will be sent next year.

48. Interviews with teachers indicated they are strongly encouraged to participate in out of district learning opportunities. Requests need to be aligned with district goals. Teachers are required to share with the staff their learning opportunity when they return.

49. Interviews indicated the district utilizes the Cedar Valley Northeast and Iowa Star Consortium to collaborate with neighboring districts in professional learning networking efforts.

Recommendations for Improvement:

50. Interviews indicated the district is focused on PLCs, MTSS, SINA, and Iowa Core in regard to professional learning efforts. The visiting team encourages the district continue toward improving and sustaining these efforts especially with the new staff in the district.
The visiting team further encourages shared teacher leadership in developing and implementing professional learning.

Monitoring and Accountability

In an improving district/school, the district/school establishes a comprehensive system that monitors and documents performance of student progress, curriculum, instruction, programs, and initiatives. Results from assessments drive the goal setting and decision-making processes. Leadership supports a system that regularly analyzes student performance and program effectiveness. Instructional decision-making utilizes a process of collecting, analyzing, and summarizing data. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- A system for district-wide student assessments, including multiple measures that are valid and reliable, is implemented.
- Decision-making for the continuous improvement of instruction and student learning using student achievement and teacher implementation data is employed.
- The district's/school's cycle of program evaluation, as noted in the C-Plan is implemented.
- Summative evaluation processes are used to determine whether professional development has resulted in improved student learning.

Noted Strengths:

51. Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS) data and site interviews indicate that appropriate Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) components are being implemented with integrity in the district. Special education teachers are providing service in special education settings and through co-teaching and reverse consultation models.

52. The district reported the following assurances to guarantee poor and minority students are not taught at a higher rate than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers. Examples included:
   - All general education teachers at the high school level are appropriately licensed for teaching assignments.
   - First and second year teachers participate in a mentoring and induction program.

53. The percentage of Dunkerton CSD students in the proficient range of achievement on the 2013-2014 Iowa Assessments is higher than AEA 267 and/or State of Iowa Averages in the following areas:
   - 3rd, 4th, 6th, and 7th grade reading
   - 3rd, 4th, and 6th grade mathematics
   - 4th grade science

See the School Improvement Data Report, figures 8, 9, 11, 12, 20, 21, 23, and 33 for additional information.

Recommendations for Improvement:

54. The percentage of Dunkerton CSD students scoring in the proficient range of achievement on the 2013-2014 Iowa Assessments is lower than AEA 267 and State of Iowa averages in the following areas:
   - 5th, 8th, and 11th grade reading
   - 5th, 7th, 8th, and 11th grade mathematics
   - 3rd, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 11th grade science
See the School Improvement Data Report Appendix 10, 13, 14, 22, 24-26, 32, and 34-38 for additional information.

It would be beneficial to complete an in-depth disaggregated data analysis of non-proficient performers to identify whether common characteristics exist (e.g., similar skill deficit or similar demographics), identify potential barriers to learning, and provide an additional source of data for school improvement planning. Reviewing students' performance on all district-wide assessment instruments (i.e., triangulating data) to determine validity and reliability of results (as well as the validity and reliability of district-developed assessments) is also recommended (e.g., Are there students who are not proficient on the Iowa Assessments, but are on other assessments?)

55. Administrators, SIAC, and teachers spoke of the use of data to set goals and determine professional development plans. However, limited evidence was found of program evaluation utilizing data to demonstrate the impact of programs and initiatives on student learning and student success. Administrators and instructional staff are encouraged to establish procedures and practices to develop and use program evaluation, particularly in district programs such as CTE, at-risk, gifted and talented, professional development, special education, or initiatives (e.g., co-teaching). For each program or initiative, consider setting clear program goals that answer the question, “What do we want as a result of the program, initiative, or support service?” Identify clear, aligned, measurable goals. Establish a process and procedure to follow in monitoring progress (formative) and evaluating program impact (summative). Based on results, determine which program elements to sustain, which program elements need modification to become more effective, and which program elements to abandon or replace. A report format could then be developed to share program information with SIAC, school board, CTE Advisory Committee and other stakeholders. Contact Melissa Hesner, mhesner@aea267.k12.ia.us, Educational Services Consultant, for assistance and support in this area.
Dunkerton Community School District's Compliance Status for Applicable Federal Programs:

Title I
The district has no citations of Title I non-compliance identified during this visit.

Title IIA (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
The district has no citations of Title IIA non-compliance identified during this visit.

Title III (English Language Learners)
The district has no citations of Title III non-compliance identified during this visit.

Title XC (Education of Homeless Children and Youth)
The district has no citations of Title XC non-compliance identified during this visit.
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Figure 1: Whole Grade Sharing
Data Source: Spring BEDS
Definitions: Whole grade sharing occurs when all of the students in any grade in two or more school districts share an educational program for all of a school day under a written agreement.

This district does not whole grade share.

Figure 2: Preschool through 12th Grade Enrollment Trend
Data Source: Fall EASIER/SRI
Definitions: BEDS enrollment is a count of students that are attending in the district on count day each year. Certified enrollment is a count of students residing in the district on count day each year.
Figure 3: Preschool through 12th Grade BEDS Enrollment by Subgroups: All Students, Minority, FRL, ELL, IEP

Data Source: Fall EASI/ER/SRI
Definitions: BEDS enrollment is a count of students that are attending in the district on count day each year. Any student not reported as Caucasian is considered Minority; FRL refers to students receiving free or reduced price lunches; ELL refers to students who are English language learners; IEP refers to students with an individualized education program.

Figure 4: Annual Instructional Minutes

Data Source: Spring BEDS
Definitions: Total number of instructional minutes offered during the school year, including full and partial day minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total Annual Instructional Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Dunkerton High School (1908-0172)</td>
<td>68,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Dunkerton Elementary (1908-0409)</td>
<td>68,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Average</td>
<td>67,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: Average Daily Attendance
Data Source: Spring EASIER/SRI
Definitions: Total number of student days present divided by total number of student days enrolled.

Figure 6: Schools/Districts in Need of Assistance Status
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: SINA/DINA status is based on assessment participation, annual measurable objectives, and other academic indicators. A status of delay is used to indicate that a location has met for a particular indicator, but it is its first year of meeting.
Figure 7: Percent of Kindergarteners Scoring At Benchmark on DIBELS/DIBELS Next Initial/First Sounds Fluency

Data Source: Fall EASIER/SRI
Definitions: Districts are required to assess all kdg students using a literacy assessment by October 1st. If a district uses DIBELS/DIBELS Next for this assessment, scores are reported below.
At benchmark is equivalent to a score greater than 7 on DIBELS and greater than 9 on DIBELS Next.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% At Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>81.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percent of Students in Grade 3 Proficient in Reading

**Data Source:** AYP Assessment File  
**Definitions:** Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 03, DISTRICT</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.29%</td>
<td>76.19%</td>
<td>80.77%</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 03, AEA</td>
<td>73.95%</td>
<td>74.81%</td>
<td>72.17%</td>
<td>74.85%</td>
<td>73.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 03, STATE</td>
<td>75.56%</td>
<td>77.32%</td>
<td>75.89%</td>
<td>75.50%</td>
<td>75.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Students in Grade 4 Proficient in Reading

**Data Source:** AYP Assessment File  
**Definitions:** Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 04, DISTRICT</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>87.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 04, AEA</td>
<td>74.54%</td>
<td>79.54%</td>
<td>69.75%</td>
<td>73.61%</td>
<td>73.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 04, STATE</td>
<td>77.66%</td>
<td>81.58%</td>
<td>73.48%</td>
<td>74.63%</td>
<td>74.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures 10 and 11 provide data on the percentage of students in Grades 5 and 6 proficient in reading, respectively, for the Dunkerton Community School District (1908). The data is sourced from the AYP Assessment File and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. The proficiency definition has changed from a fixed percentile to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.
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Figure 12  Percent of Students in Grade 7 Proficient in Reading
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

Figure 13  Percent of Students in Grade 8 Proficient in Reading
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.
Figure 14: Percent of Students in Grade 11 Proficient in Reading

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

Figure 15: Percent of Students in Grade 3 - 11 Proficient in Reading by Subgroups: All students, Minority, FRL, ELL IEP

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.
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Figure 16: Percent of Students with Disabilities in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Reading

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

Figure 17: Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch Students Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Reading

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.
**Figure 18:** Percent of English Language Learner Students Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Reading

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>AEA</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>42.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>36.56%</td>
<td>43.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>38.73%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>35.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>32.59%</td>
<td>36.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 19:** Percent of Minority (Non-White) Students Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Reading

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>AEA</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>70.58%</td>
<td>53.87%</td>
<td>59.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>54.66%</td>
<td>60.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>64.70%</td>
<td>48.15%</td>
<td>54.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>52.01%</td>
<td>55.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>94.73%</td>
<td>56.54%</td>
<td>59.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SI 2.5 - School Improvement Data Report**

**Dunkerton Community School District (1908)**

**Report Definition**

**Figure 20:** Percent of Students in Grade 3 Proficient in Math

**Data Source:** AYP Assessment File

Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

![Graph showing percent of students in Grade 3 proficient in Math from 2009-2010 to 2013-2014.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 03, DISTRICT</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74.29%</td>
<td>80.49%</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 21:** Percent of Students in Grade 4 Proficient in Math

**Data Source:** AYP Assessment File

Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

![Graph showing percent of students in Grade 4 proficient in Math from 2009-2010 to 2013-2014.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 04, DISTRICT</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82.86%</td>
<td>80.49%</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 22: Percent of Students in Grade 5 Proficient in Math
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

![Graph showing percent of students proficient in Grade 5 Math from 2009-2010 to 2013-2014.]

Figure 23: Percent of Students in Grade 6 Proficient in Math
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

![Graph showing percent of students proficient in Grade 6 Math from 2009-2010 to 2013-2014.]
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Figure 24: Percent of Students in Grade 7 Proficient in Math

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

Figure 25: Percent of Students in Grade 8 Proficient in Math

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.
Figure 26: Percent of Students in Grade 11 Proficient in Math

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

Definitions:
Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11, DISTRICT</td>
<td>69.70%</td>
<td>76.67%</td>
<td>73.68%</td>
<td>77.42%</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11, AEA</td>
<td>76.49%</td>
<td>77.43%</td>
<td>81.38%</td>
<td>80.88%</td>
<td>84.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11, STATE</td>
<td>76.78%</td>
<td>76.41%</td>
<td>81.35%</td>
<td>80.47%</td>
<td>83.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 27: Percent of Students in Grade 3 -8, 11 Proficient in Math by Subgroups: All students, Minority, FRL, ELL IEP

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

Definitions:
Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>75.10%</td>
<td>72.80%</td>
<td>69.80%</td>
<td>68.82%</td>
<td>74.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>75.10%</td>
<td>72.80%</td>
<td>69.80%</td>
<td>68.82%</td>
<td>74.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRL</td>
<td>75.10%</td>
<td>72.80%</td>
<td>69.80%</td>
<td>68.82%</td>
<td>74.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>75.10%</td>
<td>72.80%</td>
<td>69.80%</td>
<td>68.82%</td>
<td>74.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>75.10%</td>
<td>72.80%</td>
<td>69.80%</td>
<td>68.82%</td>
<td>74.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 28: Percent of Students with Disabilities in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Math
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions:
Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students' inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

Table: Percent of Students with Disabilities in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>49.09%</td>
<td>39.28%</td>
<td>31.42%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA</td>
<td>40.41%</td>
<td>42.27%</td>
<td>38.35%</td>
<td>39.82%</td>
<td>43.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>39.91%</td>
<td>41.42%</td>
<td>39.68%</td>
<td>39.55%</td>
<td>41.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29: Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Math
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions:
Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students' inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

Table: Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>63.82%</td>
<td>61.22%</td>
<td>55.55%</td>
<td>58.90%</td>
<td>69.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA</td>
<td>62.64%</td>
<td>63.77%</td>
<td>62.47%</td>
<td>63.94%</td>
<td>67.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>65.17%</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>63.60%</td>
<td>65.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 30: Percent of English Language Learner Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Math
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

![Graph showing percentage of English Language Learner students proficient in Math from 2009-2010 to 2013-2014]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>AEA</th>
<th>STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>No Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>43.42%</td>
<td>45.61%</td>
<td>46.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>48.80%</td>
<td>49.29%</td>
<td>49.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>64.70%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>70.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>54.72%</td>
<td>55.58%</td>
<td>56.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31: Percent of Minority (Non-White) Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Math
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

![Graph showing percentage of minority students proficient in Math from 2009-2010 to 2013-2014]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>AEA</th>
<th>STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>64.70%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>70.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>54.72%</td>
<td>55.58%</td>
<td>56.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>60.33%</td>
<td>60.78%</td>
<td>60.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 32: Percent of Students in Grade 3 Proficient in Science

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade 03, DISTRICT</th>
<th>Grade 03, AEA</th>
<th>Grade 03, STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>82.86%</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>80.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>73.17%</td>
<td>80.06%</td>
<td>81.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>82.08%</td>
<td>82.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>70.91%</td>
<td>77.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>72.72%</td>
<td>77.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 33: Percent of Students in Grade 4 Proficient in Science

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade 04, DISTRICT</th>
<th>Grade 04, AEA</th>
<th>Grade 04, STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>94.29%</td>
<td>82.90%</td>
<td>83.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>69.70%</td>
<td>81.73%</td>
<td>82.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>82.59%</td>
<td>83.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>74.68%</td>
<td>80.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>87.18%</td>
<td>77.66%</td>
<td>81.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 34: Percent of Students in Grade 5 Proficient in Science
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

Figure 35: Percent of Students in Grade 6 Proficient in Science
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.
Figure 36: Percent of Students in Grade 7 Proficient in Science
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade 07, DISTRICT</th>
<th>Grade 07, AEA</th>
<th>Grade 07, STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>74.19%</td>
<td>81.03%</td>
<td>80.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>69.77%</td>
<td>81.19%</td>
<td>82.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
<td>67.33%</td>
<td>69.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>43.24%</td>
<td>67.09%</td>
<td>69.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>76.47%</td>
<td>78.05%</td>
<td>77.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 37: Percent of Students in Grade 8 Proficient in Science
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade 08, DISTRICT</th>
<th>Grade 08, AEA</th>
<th>Grade 08, STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>79.92%</td>
<td>80.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>74.19%</td>
<td>82.42%</td>
<td>83.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>61.36%</td>
<td>72.24%</td>
<td>75.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>72.87%</td>
<td>74.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>71.79%</td>
<td>82.74%</td>
<td>83.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 38: Percent of Students in Grade 11 Proficient in Science
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

![Graph showing percent of students in Grade 11 proficient in Science from 2009-2010 to 2013-2014 for different subgroups.

Figure 39: Percent of Students in Grade 3 - 8, 11 Proficient in Science by Subgroups: All students, Minority, FRL, ELL IEP
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students' inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

![Graph showing percent of students proficient in Science from 2009-2010 to 2013-2014 for different subgroups.
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**Figure 40:** Percent of Students with Disabilities in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Science  
*Data Source:* AYP Assessment File  
*Definitions:* Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking the alternate assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED in 2008-2009 to 2010-2011 is at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, proficiency is defined by a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject and grade level. Student demographic data is pulled from the district student information system to create the bar code. Missing data indicates there are fewer than 10 students who tested in the subgroup.

![Bar chart showing percentage of students with disabilities proficient in science by year and subgroup, with data values provided in a table format at the bottom of the chart.]

**Figure 41:** Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Science  
*Data Source:* AYP Assessment File  
*Definitions:* Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students' inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

![Bar chart showing percentage of free/reduced lunch students proficient in science by year and subgroup, with data values provided in a table format at the bottom of the chart.]
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Figure 42: Percent of English Language Learner Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Science

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

Figure 43: Percent of Minority (Non-White) Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Science

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.
Figure 44: Percent of Students in Grade 11 College Ready in Reading, Math, Science
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: College ready is defined as the Iowa Assessment National Standard Score that predicts to the ACT benchmark for college readiness.

Figure 45: School Year 2013-2014 High School Carnegie Units Offered by District
Data Source: Winter EASIER/SRI
Definitions: The number of Carnegie Units across the district offered for all courses in each accreditation area.
Figure 46: By Subgroup, High School Graduation Rate for Class of 2013

Data Source: Spring EASIER/SRI
Definitions: The percentage of students who start 9th grade in year 1 and graduate at the end of year 4.

Figure 47: Percent of Students Receiving Disciplinary Removals

Data Source: Fall/Spring EASIER/SRI
Definitions: The number of PK-12 students removed during the school year divided by the district's Fall BEDS enrollment.
Figure 48: Percent of Students with Positive Responses to Questions in the Construct

Data Source: Iowa Youth Survey
Definitions: The percent of students who answered the majority of questions in each construct with positive responses.

Table of Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>44.79%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>No Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Support</td>
<td>34.00%</td>
<td>37.20%</td>
<td>No Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REPORT PURPOSE
The SI 2.5 – School Improvement Data Report allows users to display district-level data on many different topics that are commonly reviewed during school improvement site visits. When available, five years of historical data are displayed in the report.

### DATA THAT ARE INCLUDED / EXCLUDED
This report contains longitudinal district-level data for the following topics:
- Whole grade sharing
- Enrollment trend (overall and by subgroups)
- Annual instructional minutes
- Average daily attendance
- SINA/DINA locations
- DIBELS
- Reading proficiency (by grade levels and subgroups)
- Math proficiency (by grade levels and subgroups)
- Science proficiency (by grade levels and subgroups)
- College ready rates. Cut scores for College Readiness are available in the "Iowa Assessments to ITBS/ITED Subtest Crosswalk" in the "Report Definitions" folder of EdInsight Reports.
- High school Carnegie units offered
- Graduation rate
- Disciplinary removals
- Iowa Youth Survey

Several sections of this report rely on the data collection for Student Reporting in Iowa (SRI), which was formerly known as EASIER.

### REPORT USES
The data in this report can be used by anyone with access to EdInsight to monitor changes across time on each of the topics. The Department of Education uses this report during accreditation site visits, and makes a redacted version of the report public with each site visit report.

### REPORT SECURITY
Any user with EdInsight access may run this report for any district. Users with small cell size access in a particular district may view small cell size data for his/her own district, but will see a redacted version of the report for other districts.

### EXPORT TO MICROSOFT EXCEL OR ADOBE READER
This report may be exported to Microsoft Excel or Adobe Reader using Cognos View options found in the upper right hand corner of the report display.

In some cases, Microsoft Internet Explorer may require modification to security settings to permit the Excel program to launch. If this is necessary, in Internet Explorer:

1) Select ‘Tools’ from the menu bar
   a. Choose ‘Internet Options’ from the drop-down menu
2) Click on the ‘Security’ tab
   a. Highlight ‘Local intranet’ at the top of the tab
   b. Click on the ‘Sites’ button
3) Click on the ‘Advanced’ button
4) Enter the EdInsight web address into the zone box
   a. Click the ‘Add’ button
   b. Click the ‘Close’ button
5) Click the ‘OK’ button on the Local intranet pop-up box
6) Click the ‘OK’ button on the Internet Options pop-up box
7) Close out of the browser, reopen, and try exporting to Excel

For additional assistance or concerns regarding this report, please contact edinsight@iowa.gov